

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: I Corinthians 16: 13: *Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.*

O God, our Father, in whom we find our faith for today and our hope for tomorrow, our pardon of sin and comfort in sorrow; draw us nearer to Thyself in fellowship and make us Thy worthy followers.

Grant that in the uncertainty and perplexity of these days we may have a more adventurous faith with nothing to destroy our sense of brotherhood or limit our personal and social realization of Thy mighty plans and purposes.

May the spirit of our Lord permeate and prevail in all our relations with mankind and in building a better world and a nobler civilization and may our Nation be governed by leaders and people who have the open mind, the fervent heart, and the will to enter into fellowship with all mankind without regard to race or rank.

Hear us in His name who is the only Great Teacher for a world with new outlooks, new demands, and new opportunities. 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 without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 214. An act to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code; and

H.R. 7762. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

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

H.R. 4185. An act to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 8371. An act to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS

of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6767) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes."

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. ALBERT W. WATSON, be permitted to take the oath of office today. The certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

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

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON JUNE 17, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving the *Gemini 4* astronauts, Maj. James A. McDivitt, U.S. Air Force, and Maj. Edward H. White, U.S. Air Force.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF TREASURY AND POST OFFICE, THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7060) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEED, PASSMAN, ADBABBO, MAHON, CONTE, ROBISON, and JONAS.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Thursday, June 17, to file a privileged report on the Department of

Defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1966.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB reserved all points of order on the bill.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night, June 17, to file a privileged report on the public works appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1966.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona reserved all points of order on the bill.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COPYRIGHTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit while the House is in session today and tomorrow during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CEDERBERG. 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. 140]		
Abernethy	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Ayres	Hagan, Ga.	Rivers, Alaska
Bonner	Harvey, Ind.	Rivers, S.C.
Bow	Hébert	Smith, N.Y.
Bray	Hollfield	Steed
Brown, Ohio	Ichord	Thomas
Cameron	Keith	Toil
Chamberlain	McEwen	Willis
Clausen	Macdonald	Wilson
Don H.	Martin, Ala.	Charles H.
Corman	Martin, Mass.	Zablocki
Findley	Morton	
Fisher	Pirnie	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 400 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor may meet tomorrow, June 17, and Monday, June

21, in the afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

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 further 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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 6927, with Mr. Boggs in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday it was agreed that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any time. The Clerk will report the committee amendment as printed in the bill.

The CLERK. Committee amendment:

Page 4, line 10, after the word "time," add a new sentence as follows:

"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.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. DWYER

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill H.R. 6927.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DWYER: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of the bill H.R. 8822, as follows:

"ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

"SECTION 1. There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President an office to be known as the Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Office"). There shall be in the Office a Director and a Deputy Director to be appointed by the President. The Deputy Director shall perform such duties as the Director may designate, and during the absence or incapacity of the Director or during a vacancy in the office of the Director he shall act as Director. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of \$30,000 per annum, and the Deputy Director shall receive compensation at the rate of \$27,000 per annum.

"PERSONNEL AND POWERS OF THE OFFICE

"SEC. 2. (a) The Director, with the approval of the President, may appoint in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949 such additional personnel as he determines to be necessary to carry out the functions of the Office.

"(b) In the performance of the functions of the Office, the Director is authorized—

"(1) to procure by contract services as provided by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates of compensation not exceeding \$100 per diem for the personal services of individuals;

"(2) to appoint such advisory committees as he may determine to be necessary for the effective performance of the functions of the Office;

"(3) to designate such representatives as he may determine to be necessary or desirable to maintain effective liaison with executive departments and agencies, and departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the States, which are engaged in activities related to the functions of the Office; and

"(4) to use the services, personnel, and facilities of executive departments and agencies and those of State departments, agencies, and instrumentalities, with the consent of such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities, with or without reimbursement therefor.

"(c) Upon the request of the Director, each executive department and agency shall furnish to the Office such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics as the Director may determine to be necessary or desirable for the performance of the functions of the Office.

"(d) Subject to the approval of the President, the Director may—

"(1) promulgate such rules and regulations as may be required to carry out the functions of the Office; and

"(2) delegate to any other officer or employee of the Office authority for the performance of any duty imposed, or the exercise of any power conferred, upon the Director by this Act.

"COORDINATION OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 3. (a) Subject to the direction of the President, the Director shall take such action as may be appropriate to coordinate the programs of the various departments and agencies of the executive branch which have a major impact upon the Nation's urban areas. Such programs shall include Federal activities relating to housing, urban development and redevelopment, community facilities, highways and transportation facilities, civil defense, water and air pollution, and such other activities as the Director, with the approval of the President, determines relate primarily to urban needs and problems.

"(b) In carrying out his functions under this Act, the Director shall (1) establish and maintain close liaison with the departments and agencies referred to in subsection (a) and (2) consult with State and local officials, and with interested business, labor, and other groups, concerning urban problems and needs.

"INFORMATION ON URBAN AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 4. The Director shall establish within the Office a Division of Information on Urban Affairs and Community Development. Through this Division the Director shall compile and make available to State and local officials, and other interested persons, through such means as he determines to be appropriate, information concerning the Federal programs referred to in section 3. The service provided by such Division shall include assistance to State and local officials in relating such programs to specific urban problems or needs.

"RESEARCH AND STUDIES

"SEC. 5. The Director shall undertake research and studies with a view of determining what changes should be made (1) in the programs referred to in section 3 in order to achieve a more effective coordination of such programs with State and local programs designed to meet urban needs, (2) in the allocation of such programs among the various departments and agencies of the executive branch, and (3) in the administration of such programs in order to achieve increased economy and efficiency, to avoid duplication, and to coordinate more effectively the activities of such departments and agencies in the administration of such pro-

grams. The results of such research and studies shall be reported from time to time to the President for such action as he determines to be appropriate.

"FEDERAL URBAN AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

"SEC. 6. There shall be in the Office an advisory council, known as the Urban Affairs and Community Development Council. Members of the Council shall be appointed by the President upon nomination by the Director from among persons with broad experience and interest in urban and related problems, and may include persons outside the Federal service. The following Federal officials are hereby designated as members ex officio of the Council: the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The President may designate other Federal officials as ex officio members of the Council. Members of the Council shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed for necessary travel and subsistence expenses as provided in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended. The Council shall meet at the call of the Director, but not less than twice a year. The Council shall be concerned with all the urban problems mentioned in this Act, including air and water pollution, transportation, sewage, water supply, and urban renewal.

"COMMISSION TO STUDY TRANSFERS OF FUNCTION AND INTEGRATION OF ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 7. (a) (1) There is hereby established a special commission (referred to in this section as the "Commission") to study the feasibility of making transfers to and from the several departments and agencies mentioned in section 6 of this Act. The Commission shall consist of twelve members appointed by the President from among individuals in private life having substantial knowledge of and experience in housing, urban affairs, mortgage financing, and related fields.

"(2) The Commission may employ and pay the compensation of such staff as may be necessary to the performance of its functions.

"(3) Members of the Commission shall be compensated at the rate of \$50 a day while actually engaged in the business of the Commission, and shall be paid travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 relating to persons serving without compensation.

"(b) The Commission shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of all functions relating to housing and urban affairs which on the date of the enactment of this Act are being performed by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, giving particular attention to (1) the distribution of such functions throughout the Government and the effectiveness with which they are being carried out by the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities in which they are respectively vested, and (2) the extent to which further coordination in the performance of such functions, with respect to each other, would serve to increase the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the programs of the United States in the field of housing and urban affairs. Upon the completion of its study and investigation, and in no event later than June 30, 1966, the Commission shall submit a full report thereon to the President together with its findings and recommendations.

"(c) The President, after receiving and considering the report of the Commission under subsection (b), shall prepare and submit to the Congress a reorganization plan (or

plans) providing for the transfer to or from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government, of such additional functions relating to housing and urban affairs as he may deem necessary or appropriate to promote efficiency.

"REPORT TO CONGRESS

"Sec. 8. Not later than January 31 of each year, the Director shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a report concerning the activities of the Office during the preceding calendar year."

Mr. FASCELL (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have just offered is in the nature of a substitute for the committee bill. For reasons I shall mention, it is the conviction of those of us who have introduced similar bills that an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development in the Executive Office of the President would be far superior to the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development—superior in terms of assistance to urban areas, superior in the coordination of Federal urban programs, superior in achieving consistent administration of expensive programs, superior in encouraging State, county, and local action in solving urban problems, and superior in mobilizing interest in and attention to the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and their people.

Under our alternative, Mr. Chairman, the Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development would be headed by a Director and a Deputy Director to be appointed by the President. The Director would be required to take appropriate action, subject to the direction of the President, to coordinate all the Federal programs which have a major impact upon urban areas, regardless of the department or agency which administers a particular program. The nature and degree of coordination would, of course, be left up to the President, but the amendment specifies several of the most important urban programs—including those which relate to urban development, housing, highways and transportation facilities, air and water pollution, community facilities, as well as other programs which the Director and the President determine relate primarily to urban needs and problems.

This provision is in sharp contrast to the committee bill which nowhere specifies urban programs other than those actually to be administered by the new Department.

To carry out this basic coordinating responsibility, our amendment would authorize the Director to maintain close liaison with executive agencies and with State agencies having responsibility for urban area programs; to consult with interested people in and out of government; to appoint necessary advisory committees; to utilize the services of and

obtain information from executive agencies; to designate liaison representatives and/or committees of such representatives for purposes of maintaining liaison; and to procure the services by contract of outside experts and consultants.

Here, again, Mr. Chairman, our amendment improves upon the committee bill by expressly providing a whole range of tools with which the Director, subject to the President, can coordinate urban policies and programs.

Our amendment would also establish a Division of Information on Urban Affairs and Community Development which would compile and distribute information about urban programs to State and local governments and other interested persons, and assist State and local officials to relate existing programs to specific urban problems and needs.

While the committee bill also provides for a clearinghouse, I would suggest that it is more appropriate to locate such a service in a coordinating staff rather than in an operating agency which has primary interest in its own limited programs. The proposed new Department would not seem to be in a very good position to be completely objective about offering advice and information concerning programs which might differ or conflict with their own.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment would also require the Director to undertake studies and research, for the use of the President, in three principal directions: toward more effective coordination of Federal urban programs with those of State and local governments; toward a proper allocation of such programs among Federal departments and agencies; and toward the achievement of greater economy and efficiency, less waste and duplication, and more effective coordination in the administration of urban programs.

In undertaking such important studies, I think we can all agree with President Kennedy that the desired evaluation of urban programs cannot be done satisfactorily by an operating agency at the same organizational level as the agencies it is supposed to evaluate.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, our amendment would establish within the Office a Federal Urban Affairs and Community Development Council and a Commission to study transfers of function and integration of activities. The Council would be an advisory body composed of department and agency heads together with others in and out of Government with special experience in urban affairs. It would meet at least twice a year and concern itself with the whole range of urban problems. The Commission, however, would be made up exclusively of persons in private life having substantial knowledge of urban problems. It would be charged with conducting a thorough study of existing urban programs and reporting to the President on the effectiveness with which the programs were being administered and on the need for further coordination or transfer of functions.

As I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, our proposal has broad support among those most experienced in and concerned

with the administration of urban programs. It would meet the primary need for coordination of Federal urban programs far more effectively than could the committee bill. It would create not a huge new Department but a small staff working with policy-level representatives of departments and agencies having urban area responsibilities.

It is somewhat ironic, Mr. Chairman, but very significant that almost all the arguments advanced by proponents of a new Department apply even more directly to our proposal for an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development.

By way of example, I refer to the current, 1965, statement of policy adopted by the National League of Cities. Although this representative organization formally endorsed both a Cabinet-rank Department and a coordinating office in the Executive Office of the President, its major arguments would justify the Office rather than the Department.

Its policy declares—and I quote:

No single individual or agency at the Federal level is concerned with the aggregate of the urban problem. Nowhere at the Federal level has it been sufficiently recognized that the many existing urban problems with which the Federal Government now deals—highways, airports, urban renewal, water pollution control, public facility loans, etc.—are interrelated and cannot be fully effective unless coordinated with one another.

This recognition, and this coordination, can only be achieved through creation of a small unit at the White House level expressly charged with the duty of helping agencies with related programs work together, toward consistent goals, and in full cooperation with States and localities.

Yesterday's debate, Mr. Chairman, raised two or three questions about our proposed substitute which I should like to clarify.

First. The major contention of proponents of a new Department seems to be that top-level attention to the needs of urban areas can only be assured through direct representation at the Cabinet table. The fact, however, is that top-level policy and action is not the job of the Cabinet, as such. Top-level decisions and coordination in the field of military and foreign affairs are achieved through the National Security Council. Major decisions about the administration's overall program are made through the Bureau of the Budget. Decisions on economic policy are reached through the agency of the Council of Economic Advisers. These staff arms of the President do not make the decisions by themselves, but they bring together the policy-making officials of the operating agencies for the purpose of hammering out agreement on basic policies within the limits of congressional authorizations.

This is what is missing in the field of urban affairs. And it is precisely what our substitute would provide.

Second. The Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development would not be a new bureaucracy. It would consist of a very small staff empowered by Congress and the President to bring together the policymakers in other agen-

cies who, in turn, would do the actual coordinating of policy and programs. The Office, of course, would have no operating authority. Its sole function would be coordination and staff work—a function which could not be satisfactorily done by a single department or its Cabinet-level Secretary.

We recognize fully that for our proposal to be effective the President would have to use it. We assume that he would, just as he uses all his present coordinating devices in other fields.

Mr. Chairman, many of us, including myself, agree wholeheartedly with proponents of the administration bill about the needs of urban areas, about the importance of giving increased attention to their problems. The issue before us is how best to reach this objective.

We who favor the coordinating staff device contend that simply giving higher status to one agency is not enough. By itself, it is an empty gesture. What is most needed—and the committee hearings and floor debate show wide agreement on this point—is a means of making existing and future urban programs work more effectively regardless of which agencies administer them.

Our substitute amendment would do just that, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mrs. DWYER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey for her continuing interest in the urban affairs of our Nation. I do not know whether the membership realizes it or not, but I certainly would point out that the gentleman now in the well of the House has had a continuing interest in all legislation beneficial to the city dweller. One of the principal cities of the State of New Jersey is Elizabeth, which is in the gentleman's district. No one in the Congress has worked harder to try to promote the welfare of cities than has the gentleman.

I would like to ask a question. Am I correct that the bill to which the gentleman has offered a substitute would limit the departments that would go into this Cabinet office basically to housing and transportation, and that, generally speaking, all other matters including, as the gentleman has pointed out, area redevelopment, water pollution, civil rights, education, accelerated public-works improvements, all of the myriad public agencies that have as their principal objective benefit to the city dweller are excluded?

Mrs. DWYER. I would say to the gentleman all other agencies are excluded, and other departments. I would not want them included in a Cabinet bill, but I feel our bill is the opportunity for the mayors and those interested in urban affairs to come to a coordinating place to get this help.

Mr. CAHILL. Is not the purpose of this type of legislation to provide assistance to municipal officials so that their problems can be handled in one place; so that a municipal official knows where

to come at the Federal level to get the aid he wants?

Mrs. DWYER. That is correct and that is the purpose of this bill, and the mayors back home—at least the mayors I represent support this measure.

Mr. CAHILL. I would like to again compliment the gentleman.

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

Mrs. DWYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I, too, want to commend the gentleman in the well of the House for her leadership in connection with this particular legislation and in bringing forth the substitute measure which, as I said yesterday, is much better than the committee bill. The gentleman's leadership has been particularly important in the absence of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] who is in the hospital and who I understand is recovering. I know we all join in wishing him a speedy recovery.

The bill that the gentleman is offering as a substitute points up and puts in proper focus the appropriate role which a new agency in this field should perform, and that is the role of coordinating the existing Federal programs and activities already on the books which bear on urban problems.

Mrs. DWYER. That is correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It seems ridiculous to do as the committee bill suggests, to set up a whole new department of the Federal Government and create a new Cabinet post in order to coordinate existing programs that are already operating under the jurisdiction of other departments of the Government.

Surely, the substitute bill that the gentleman is sponsoring makes more sense by placing this coordinating function in the office of the President. After all, it is the President, or someone speaking for him and acting directly under him, who is in the appropriate and proper position to coordinate information concerning existing programs already established under the jurisdiction of various departments of Government.

Mrs. DWYER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have a deep respect and affection for the charming and brilliant gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] but I regret that duty comes before affection and I must oppose her amendment, because I believe it would torpedo the bill before us.

The Dwyer substitute amendment would forbid a Cabinet level Department of Housing and Urban Development. Thus it would prevent what our cities need most, which is a voice at the highest departmental level of the Federal Government.

The bill before us, which is sought to be substituted by the amendment, gives the coordinating power to the new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Under that bill his job would be

to advise the President with respect to all the problems of housing and urban development, to recommend to the President policies for fostering the growth of our urban areas, to exercise leadership under the President to coordinate all Federal activities affecting urban development, to provide technical assistance to our local communities in developing solutions to these problems.

All of this Cabinet level stature would be wiped out if the substitute amendment were adopted. Not only this, but the substitute amendment also would wipe out the application of an excellent recommendation of the Hoover Commission that any agency head must have control over his subordinate agencies.

The bill before us, H.R. 6927, does exactly that. The substitute amendment would wipe out this great opportunity for economy and efficiency.

What it all boils down to is that if one is opposed to elevating the problems of our cities to Cabinet status, he should vote for the substitute amendment. But if he believes that cities are entitled to Cabinet rank, he should vote against the substitute amendment.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Is there any power or authority contained in the substitute amendment which is not presently in the Housing and Home Finance Agency?

Mr. REUSS. There is no such authority. The Hoover Commission recommendation to save taxpayers dollars, by giving authority to the head of the agency, would, if the substitute amendment were adopted, be lost.

The substitute amendment attempts to set up an Office of Community Development at the White House. The justification is that this would provide a one-stop service for the local officials who come to Washington. Let us take a look at this. If it really is going to provide a one-stop service, and if it really is going to put under one hat the functions now exercised by Agriculture for school lunches, Defense for civil defense, HEW, Labor, and almost every other department of Cabinet level, this would mean that the White House would have something like 200,000 officials and employees trying to make this one-stop possible.

Of course, this is not the intent. The intent is to set up a very small office at the White House. This would mean that the overburdened city official would have to make the rounds in Washington he already makes plus one additional, unnecessary and superfluous stop at the White House.

There may be a need for a White House specialist, in addition to a Cabinet office, on the problems of our cities, but this clearly is no substitute for a Cabinet level department.

I hope that the substitute amendment will be voted down.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the issue is very clear as between the bill we have under consideration on the House

floor and the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey. They serve the same coordinating function so far as urban affairs are concerned, except that the bill before us would do it by creating a new department and establishing a new secretary and the substitute amendment would accomplish it by setting up an Office of Urban Affairs in the Executive Office of the President. That is really the issue before us. Which is the better way to do it?

It occurs to us on our side of the aisle who are supporting the substitute amendment that it makes a great deal of sense to do this in the Executive Office of the President.

Let us first take a look at the problem if we did it by a department method. We would set up a department and create a secretary who would have no power and no authority so far as control over urban affairs was concerned.

If you will look in the committee report, there are about three pages of fine print setting out just a partial list of some of the functions of urban affairs that are now in the various departments. For example, there are about 50 in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare alone. In the field of education alone, in the next fiscal year, there is about \$6 or \$7 billion that we are going to devote just to education alone, most of which or a good part of which goes into urban areas. Do you think the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is going to give up any of its power or authority to the new secretary of Urban Affairs in this area? I ask you to look back to last year when we created the Office of Economic Opportunity, which we call the poverty war. Do you remember the currents of dissension that flowed around Capitol Hill and around the bureaus on the question of whether Mr. Sargent Shriver would take some of the power and authority away from some of the present departments of the Government such as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare? There was all kinds of conflict which swirled around here.

Now, what I am trying to point out is that those heads of departments and those secretaries will be very jealous of the powers they have and they will not surrender them willingly. If you have in the Office of the President a person who is an extension of the President's right arm, if you will, as far as urban affairs are concerned, who is charged with the job of coordinating urban affairs and is charged with the job of amassing information and facts and figures about what is going on in the other departments of the Government as far as urban affairs are concerned, and with the mission of advising the President concerning plans in this urban area, and with the mission of consulting with the people from the cities who come to Washington and want information about this matter, do you not think that would be a far more effective way to accomplish this mission than by creating a Cabinet officer who is on a level with the other officers but who obviously cannot pick up the phone and say, "I am speaking for the President in this matter." He cannot, because when

he does they will feel he is trying to usurp some of their authority and trying to do something which is within their own personal special prerogatives.

I think that is the reason why the idea which is in the bill will not work, and I also think it is the reason that we can put our finger on as to why the idea in the substitute amendment will work. So, I submit for the consideration of the House we should give serious thought to adopting the idea in the substitute amendment. I would sincerely hope that the House will support it and vote for it instead of the bill before us.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, with due respect to the arguments that have been made by the preceding speaker and those who advocate supporting the substitute, it seems to me the substitute must be opposed. I say this because I think the problems of our cities are of the first rank. They are of such monumental importance to our way of life that they deserve and they require attention on the Cabinet level. One distinguished architect has rightly said that the salvation of civilization may lie as much in the development of America's cities such as Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and other great metropolitan centers as in the sustaining of Berlin.

It was my responsibility, Mr. Chairman, during the first 14 years I was a Member of this House to be a member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations. In that capacity we reviewed the affairs of some 39 to 40 independent agencies, all of whom have very responsible functions to perform. I spoke frequently to the administrators of those agencies, to executives and officials, and if they had one complaint, it was that they were not on a sufficiently high level in Government to be given the attention that their problems deserved, and conversely, that the departments tended to downgrade them because they were on a lower Government level. They were impressed with the fact that although they dealt with critically important matters, more so, to their mind, than those in some of the departments, they could not get the same kind of attention for their problems as did those who occupied departmental stations. That is why I say, Mr. Chairman, it is important that a department be created that will be able to have the maximum effectiveness in dealing with the problems of the cities.

The second point of disagreement between the majority and the minority on this bill lies in the interpretation of what is meant by the phrase, "urban affairs." From their arguments, I have the impression that the minority believes that the phrase "housing and urban affairs" is to be considered as one phrase, as one unified activity, that urban affairs in this context relates almost exclusively and entirely to housing. I do not accept that interpretation and that is why I take this time now to interrogate the committee for an explanation of the meaning of the phrase. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Florida, who is in charge of this bill, Does the phrase "urban development" as

it is used in the bill and as it is used in describing the proposed Department and its functions, relate exclusively to housing, or does it apply as well to all activities and to all problems which make up the life of the city and the city dweller? My view is that it applies to the latter interpretation.

Mr. FASCELL. Urban development is a broad term; and the gentleman is correct. It applies to whatever may be properly and reasonably interpreted as relating to urban development problems. Housing is only one of them.

Mr. YATES. May I pursue the question further with the distinguished gentleman from Florida? I take it from the gentleman's answer that the proposed department and the Secretary would have responsibility for all activities of the people who live in the city and its environs. For example, does it apply to water and air pollution, also to highways, to health, to employment, to transportation, to civil defense, to recreation, to cultural development, and to social welfare problems, just to name a few of the vital matters which are of concern to those who live in urban communities.

Mr. FASCELL. They include all of those areas dealing with urban development. The language specifically says that the Secretary would have the duty and the responsibility, for example, of developing and recommending to the President policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas. Housing is one of the particular items that has been mentioned. So this bears out exactly the gentleman's argument. It is to be read in the same context, so that it relates to all of the urban development problems.

Mr. YATES. Then I take it from the gentleman's answer—and I certainly agree with him—that the fundamental difference between the bill approved by the committee and the substitute that has been offered by the minority lies in the question as to whether or not there is to be a department to deal with these problems or whether there is to be a minor office to take care of such problems.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct. And the gentleman from Florida made that point.

Mr. YATES. Yes, and I agree with him.

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

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

Mr. ERLBORN. Since the gentleman has brought up the subject of the authority of the proposed Cabinet rank department in fields other than housing, may I ask the gentleman if he can point to any language in this bill that gives this new proposed department any authority outside of the field of housing, except some vague language as to advising the President?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, that was the question that I addressed to the gentleman from Florida in our colloquy a few seconds ago and he answered the question.

Mr. ERLBORN. I would advise the gentleman that the only paragraph in

this bill referring to anything other than housing or other than what is now in HHFA is subparagraph B of section 3 which relates only to advising the President.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, as I stated before that was exactly the question I addressed to the gentleman from Florida. The gentleman from Florida in response to my question declared that the specific items to which I made reference were among those included in the term "urban affairs." He said that the proposed department would have an interest in all those fields, among others.

Mr. ERLBORN. I would challenge the gentleman from Florida or the gentleman from Illinois to find any authority in this proposed department other than the authority to advise the President.

Mr. YATES. Again, may I say to the gentleman that the reply of the gentleman from Florida certainly met that challenge.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, the bill, particularly on page 3, is replete with authority to do a coordinating job.

It is true that the first responsibility mentioned is merely to advise the President. However, there are six other responsibilities: to develop policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas; to exercise leadership; to coordinate Federal activities affecting housing and urban development; to provide technical assistance and information, including a clearinghouse service to aid local governments in developing solutions, and so on and so on.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his additional information.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot declare too strongly the need for approving this most important instrument for dealing with our mounting urban problems. We not only need to develop local institutions cognizant of planning for the orderly growth of metropolitan areas and the skilled manpower needed to work in this highly complex field, we must provide for the orderly channeling of Federal cooperation and assistance in the interstate relationship that exists today between the cities and the Federal Government. There are intergovernmental relations, problems of fragmented governmental authority, and uncoordinated Federal and regional programs. The problems of the aged, the young, the poor, the racial minorities, the poorly housed, all require attention. There are the financial problems arising from increased tax rates, from maximum budgets in State and local communities. There are the fiscal problems of growing congestion, the flight into the suburbs, polluted air and

water, and antiquated and inadequate transportation systems.

Facilities built even recently to accommodate specific and projected numbers of people become obsolete almost as soon as they are constructed. Schools, housing, sewage, mass transportation, streets, all are jammed beneath the growing weight of the numbers of people using them. The problems are likely to become more rather than less acute, unless we plan and prepare for the future. A Department of Housing and Urban Development is necessary for that purpose.

At the present time, 70 percent of our population lives in urban areas. As our population grows, 80 percent of that growth will occur in the same urban areas. The Department of Housing and Urban Development would be of tremendous benefit not only to these urban dwellers but to all our citizens.

Few people in our country know the city's problems as thoroughly and as well as Mayor Richard J. Daley, of my own city of Chicago, who testified on behalf of this bill. He stated to the committee:

Chicago—Like other central cities—is the core of a great metropolitan area with residents of suburbs, towns, and other cities—all with similar urban problems—all facing similar urban problems. I feel that I am here not only speaking for the people of Chicago, but on behalf of a much greater urban population.

The city is a set of interlocking systems—systems of residence areas, industrial areas, recreational spaces, commercial centers, and community facilities. Tying together these systems are webs of communications and transportation. A decision made in any one of these areas will affect circumstances in each of the others. A new industrial center will demand new transportation facilities, and the persons it employs will need housing, health, and recreational facilities, and community services.

Because every system is so related to all the others, it is essential that they be coordinated closely at the highest levels of municipal planning. The Federal Government, too, has a stake in their orderly planning.

The total estimated expenditures of the Housing and Home Finance Administration—the major Federal agency dealing with urban development—for fiscal 1966 are \$1,074,435,000. This figure does not include the expenditures of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, nor the Community Facilities Administration, all of which would be included in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Clearly the number of agencies, the scope of their activities, and the scale of the funds they are handling make the administration of housing and urban development an operation of national dimensions.

Since 1947, when the HHFA was established to provide coordination for the housing programs then existing, new urban development programs—community facilities, urban renewal, mass

transportation—have been established under its jurisdiction. However, in many respects the HHFA remains a holding company in its organizational structure. It should have full authority to accomplish the integration and reorganization of the functions of all these programs, an authority which it will derive from departmental status.

It should also have the authority and responsibility of planning for the future. This it cannot do as a loose federation of agencies. The quality of foresight and of planning today for future operations has always been a respected American attribute. This bill gives us the opportunity to create, today, the framework for dealing with increasingly complex and related problems.

Critics of the bill have asserted that the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development will siphon away from the localities the authority and the incentives which they have to initiate development projects for their communities, in violation of the basic principles of the American system of government. On the contrary, I believe that the creation of the Department should serve to stimulate local and metropolitan planning. Local determination is now being threatened by the rapid growth of State and Federal programs of aid without coordinated administration. If these programs were coordinated under a single Department, the channels of communication would be expanded not only between the Federal Government and the localities, but among the localities as well.

Other critics have said that there is no justification for the representation of a geographical entity such as the city. This criticism reveals a serious misunderstanding of the purposes and scope of the proposed legislation. First, the responsibilities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would not be confined solely to the large metropolitan centers. As of January 1964, 646 out of a total of 1,402 reservations for projects under the jurisdiction of the HHFA were for cities with less than 100,000 residents, and fully a third of these 646 projects were for towns with populations between 10,000 and 25,000. There is no limitation on the size of communities which may benefit from the Department's programs.

Second, it is a serious error, I believe, to think that any program which aids our urban areas is limited only to these areas. This is a united nation. The city is not an entity isolated from rural areas. Both make up our great country. We of the cities are very much aware of the fact that policies which aid those who live on farms benefit city dwellers as well.

On the positive side, Mr. Chairman, and a repugnant point, the life of the cities helps set the tone for the life of the Nation. The comprehensive plan of Chicago makes this point clearly:

The aims and aspirations of a great city must extend beyond merely assuring the basic necessities of life. The city is the source of new ideas of social progress and of artistic achievement, as well as industrial production. It contains art museums, orchestras, and public monuments and open spaces, as well as factories and offices. It is a place to live as well as to make a living.

As long as men live in communities, especially in the highly interrelated communities of today, legislation designed to improve the quality of that life will be of service to all our citizens.

I urge approval of the committee bill.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the issue now before the House is where do we wind up after we have determined, as I believe most everyone in this body has determined, that something should be done to coordinate the proliferation of Federal programs aimed at aiding the urban areas of our country?

Mr. Chairman, the question really is before us as to whether the bill H.R. 6927 which is under consideration, or the substitute which is offered, being the substance of the bill H.R. 8822, which puts the greatest emphasis upon coordination and to solving the problems of the urban areas, should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out in my remarks against the bill on yesterday, I believe there are levels within the executive department, starting with agencies at the lowest level and going to departments, Cabinet-rank departments at the next level and then, of course, I think we would all agree that the highest level in the executive is the President himself.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the bill which has been offered as an amendment by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] puts the greatest emphasis and puts the solution of these problems at the highest level, in the Office of the President himself.

Mr. Chairman, prior similar legislation has been introduced over the years, legislation designed to create a Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs. This year about the only change in this bill is a change in the title. In prior years it was referred to as the "Department of Urban Affairs and Housing." This year it is "Housing and Urban Development."

Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out, in the hearings in the committee, I am not certain whether it was the genius of the draftsman or the genius of the salesman that made this bill all things to all people. But apparently the mere change in the title, putting housing first, would satisfy those who are interested in housing, because many of these same people in prior years came here to testify against almost identical legislation. So those who are interested in public housing and private housing feel that this bill would do some good for them, merely because the title has been changed and the emphasis placed upon housing.

Those interested in urban affairs, such as our mayors throughout the country, feel that this in some way is going to help coordinate the various Federal programs available to them.

But, Mr. Chairman, I submit that there is no real coordination provided for in the bill which has been offered by the majority. However, real coordination can and would be effected if the substitute

which has been offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] were adopted, because at the very highest level of the executive department the authority of the President himself, we would have the Executive Office of the President providing coordination among and between the various departments that have authority in the many, many areas of urban development and the problems which go with it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment which has been offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and I hope that it will be adopted as a substitute to the bill under consideration.

I feel that if this substitute is adopted we will then have a real opportunity to provide some direction to the proliferation of Federal programs for the urban areas.

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

Mr. ERLÉNORN. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us whether or not the committee was able to make any estimate of the comparative costs if the bill as presented as a substitute is adopted and then implemented?

Mr. ERLÉNORN. There was no testimony in the committee concerning that; however, there was testimony as to the bill under consideration in the committee that there may be some savings of \$50,000 possible if the bill were adopted. I think this was incorrectly stated as \$50 million in the debate yesterday. The only testimony as to possible savings, and this would result from the elimination of one or two positions, was something like \$50,000.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. McCLODY. I commend the gentleman on the statement he has made. In addition, it occurs to me that a very weak argument in favor of this legislation is the fact that the proposal has been pending for a long time. However, the substitute about which the gentleman has spoken indicates a definite improvement over any proposal which has heretofore been made, and it appears clearly that a great deal of economy and usefulness could be accomplished by adopting the Republican substitute, H.R. 8822, and enacting this into law.

Are we going to place jurisdiction over subjects of education, health, highways, water and air pollution, and other subjects identified essentially with urban growth, in the proposed Department of Housing and Urban Development?

No, of course not.

Problems of education, health, and water and air pollution will remain with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Many other problems relating to our urban areas will remain with the existing Departments of Labor, Interior, Commerce, and others.

There is no suggestion that the authority or prerogatives of these Departments are to be diminished or superseded.

Accordingly, it seems to me that the proposed new Department of Housing and Urban Development will give status to the new Secretary and bureaucracy to be created—but not service, not economy, and not efficiency, which should be the aim and function of this legislation.

The Republican substitute, H.R. 8822, would fulfill the objectives sought by the Congress.

I urge adoption of the substitute bill as an amendment and the enactment of the substitute, H.R. 8822, as a useful and serviceable change in the law for the benefit of the citizens of the cities and metropolitan areas of America.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the comments of those on the majority side in their attack on the substitute bill. The arguments they make in favor of the administration bill point out the merit of the substitute offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

We can all agree that the Federal Government has made a commitment to assist the metropolitan areas of this Nation in the solution of the problems that a complex society has placed before them. The question is how the Federal Government might best help fulfill that commitment.

There is no mechanism today that would provide for coordination of the numerous Federal programs affecting urban areas. In fact, the administration bill demonstrates this. The fact that there is presently no coordination between Cabinet departments which have responsibility for urban programs demonstrates that the creation of another Cabinet-level department is not going to achieve the coordination which the administration bill seeks.

I have been in the bureaucracy, I have worked in the executive branch. Some of my colleagues have not. I think it is proper to say that a Secretary of a Cabinet-level department is not going to relinquish willingly an activity which has been within his jurisdiction simply because another department having a label which would seem to encompass it is created.

The administration bill would not achieve coordination. On the contrary, it would create even greater chaos, even greater confusion than now exists. We have, as you know, several dozen programs relating to metropolitan activities, to urban affairs, to urban development, whatever you choose to call it, which are now vested in practically all Cabinet departments and the independent agencies of the executive branch.

I think it is imperative to note that closely related programs vested in different departments are handled from entirely different perspectives. The only way to correct this is to create an authority outside all departments which will permit the bringing of all these elements under one effective whole. So when the gentleman from Wisconsin says that what we are seeking to create by

the substitute bill is a minor office, I say to him that what we are seeking to create is an agency within the executive branch which can achieve coordination among the many activities that are presently spread among a plethora of Cabinet departments and independent agencies.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. REUSS. Coordination is great and I am all for it. But why does the gentleman oppose the Cabinet-level Department concerned with the problems of our cities? He can coordinate all he wants to either through their departments themselves or through the special office of the White House, if that is what he wants, but why does he and others who press this point of view fight the Cabinet-level Department for our cities?

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the gentleman, if this bill proposed by the administration were in fact a Cabinet-level Department for urban affairs and for urban development, perhaps the opposition for which I speak today would not be present. But the bill that the administration has brought before this body is not a bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs. It is a bill which does little more than elevate those responsibilities now vested in the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet status. I think the gentleman's own admission that the 30 or 40 or 50 other activities relating to urban affairs would not be touched by the administration bill is evidence of the validity of the position which I and my colleagues take.

Mr. REUSS. Why then does the gentleman not seek to amend the administration's Cabinet proposal by adding to it whatever activities now exercised by other Cabinet-level departments he thinks belong in the domain of urban affairs?

Mr. MORSE. If the gentleman knew of the difficulty I had even to appear before the subcommittee, I think he might not ask that question.

I think it is imperative that the question which was posed by the gentleman from Illinois to the gentleman from Florida with reference to the other activities, which are admittedly not touched by the administration bill, and which the gentleman from Illinois indicated in response to an earlier inquiry would be properly coordinated by the administration be answered. I ask the gentleman from Florida just what would happen to the programs dealing with water pollution and so many other Government activities which affect urban affairs under the administration bill.

Mr. FASCELL. The same things that would happen under the substitute bill.

Mr. MORSE. I think the gentleman would do well to read both bills.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] who just left the well of the House, I wish to call to his attention the language on line 10, page 3, of the bill. We assume that the Secretary will be the head of a cabinet. Other Secretaries are heads of other

cabinets. The Secretary shall do certain things. On line 10, it says:

"Exercise leadership at the direction of the President"—

As you see, it says "at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting housing and urban development."

What additional authority would you give under the substitute bill that could be exercised that would be greater than a Cabinet-level Secretary exercising leadership under the direction of the President for coordination?

Mr. MORSE. In response to the gentleman's question, I will say that it seems to me the concept of leadership as used in the administration bill would require personal initiative. It is not coupled with any specific legal authority vested in the Secretary to effect the kinds of things that would be accomplished under the substitute bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman certainly does not say that when the Congress passes a law directing a Secretary to exercise leadership, under the direction of the President, he carries with him only the mandate of the Congress. He also is authorized to obey the mandate of the President to do the things provided for in section (b) on page 3.

Mr. MORSE. I am quite sure that the Secretary, under the proposed bill, would exercise that leadership. I have no such confidence that the other Secretaries of Cabinet rank would respect that leadership.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The other Cabinet members are subject to serve at the will of the President. Certainly if the President designated one Cabinet officer to do a certain job of coordination the other Secretaries would have a responsibility either to coordinate with him under the direction of the President or to hand in their resignations.

Mr. MORSE. The gentleman has just described the kind of confusion I predict will occur if the administration proposal passes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I see no confusion involved.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Does it not depend upon the interpretation given to the phrase "urban development"? That was the subject of the colloquy between the gentleman from Florida and myself.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct. Mr. YATES. "Urban development" refers to all problems relating to the city and the city dweller.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered today by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER]. I feel, as other Members have said, that it represents on her part, and on the part of more than a score of Members of this body who have put in companion pieces of legislation, a sincere effort to do something about the problem we have tackled in this bill.

I have been interested in the colloquy which has gone on between my friend from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], wherein the gentleman from Illinois has sought to create the impression—I am sure in all sincerity—that this is going to be an all-encompassing department which is going to coordinate and handle all urban affairs as they affect city dwellers.

I am curious, therefore, why in at least two places in the committee report—on pages 13 and 15—there is language stating that the reason the proposed name of this department was changed from that of Department of Urban Affairs to Department of Housing and Urban Development was to make it clear "that the Department would be concerned with the development (but not other 'affairs') of all urban areas—large and small."

The reason I have asked for this time, in addition to raising this issue is to call the attention of Members of the Committee to the fact that we have had raised in the debate, I believe today and also yesterday, the very prestigious name of the Hoover Commission on Government Organization. People have sought to create the impression that this bill is a direct outcome of a recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

I point out that the Hoover Commission Task Force on Lending Agencies, dated February of 1955, recommended not that the Housing and Home Finance Agency be elevated to Cabinet status, as this bill would do, but the very opposite. It said that the Agency should be discontinued and that its components should be divided into three separate establishments. They recommended separating the economically sound, businesslike functions of the Agency from the subsidy programs. In other words they recommended putting the FHA into one department, because this is not a subsidized program on the part of the Federal Government. It has never cost the taxpayers a dime. They recommended putting that into one department, and putting public housing, urban renewal, and so-called welfare programs into another department entirely separate from the subsidy programs.

I should like to clear that up once and for all. The Hoover Commission has not recommended a new Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs, and never did.

As I said yesterday in the debate, I believe the real mischief in this bill is the effect it will have on the complete restructuring of our Federal Government. I listened this morning in the Rules Committee to some testimony on the poverty bill and the compound of chaos and confusion which has arisen out of the attempt, under title II of that bill, for community action programs, to interfere with traditional Federal-State relationships. I believe the seeds of incalculable mischief sown in that bill are going to flourish and grow to a mighty oak if we ever pass this bill and start the kind of bureaucracy which inevitably will result under a Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest and approval to the statements which were made yesterday and today on behalf of the substitute. It seems crystal clear to me that if we really want to do something of substance to help and to assist those who come from my district or from your district or other districts to untangle the maze they are confronted with when they come to Washington to seek a solution to an urban problem. If we want to untangle the maze the substitute is by far the better way to approach it. Under the substitute we will have a centralized operation in the Office of the President in the White House for those who seek information, those who seek help, and those who desperately need action for the solution of those problems that plague our metropolitan areas.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the substitute is approved.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished minority leader for his comments, and I would join him in the plea to this committee and to this House that in the honest and sincere effort that has emanated from both sides of the aisle to do something about urban problems. Rather than plunging headlong into the creation of a new Cabinet department with all of the difficulties it involves, let us try the proposal which has been suggested in good faith and in good logic, I think, by the distinguished Member of this body, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER]. Let us adopt the substitute and create an Office of Community Development within the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me quote very briefly from the Hoover Commission task force report dealing with departmental management and put in proper perspective what the principal recommendation of the Hoover Commission was with respect to departmental management:

Legislative history since 1913 revealed a reluctance to create new executive departments and a disposition to establish many other types of administrative agencies. This tendency should be reversed in the interests of administrative efficiency. We believe that the Federal Government should now proceed to organize most, if not all, of its administrative activities within executive departments.

What we are talking about is strictly the organizational setup. We have never alleged that there was any specific recommendation with respect to a particular department. Obviously that is left to the judgment and to the discretion of the President to recommend and to the House and the other body to legislate on.

This is what we are proposing to do with the legislation before us. Comparing the substitute and the substan-

tive bill before us, I think that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] put his finger right on the issue, namely, do you want an aid in the office of the White House as a director to do the job which is suggested be done under the legislation in the Cabinet office. The proponents of the legislation feel the need is of such interest and of such widespread national importance that it should be done at the Secretarial level in the Cabinet. Those who oppose and are proponents of the substitute feel otherwise. As far as the difference is concerned, it is a difference without a distinction with respect to the authority that might or might not be created, because in the language on page 3 of the substitute it reads:

SEC. 3. (a) Subject to the direction of the President, the Director shall take such action as may be appropriate to coordinate the programs of the various departments and agencies of the executive branch which have a major impact upon the Nation's urban areas.

It is no different than the language in the bill, but it gives the responsibility to the Secretary to coordinate these problems. Why is that? Because we all know it will either take a reorganization plan submitted by the President or it will take a legislative act to make any changes which are not now made in the legislation. The substitute makes no changes, it takes no functions, it takes no powers, or it takes no duties away from any department and transfers them to another department or to the office that they seek to create in the White House. So there is no transfer of authority in the substitute and it accomplishes no more than other language seeking to do with coordination which is in the bill.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the gentleman give any other example in Government today where a Cabinet officer is charged with the duty of coordinating other departments of the Government?

Mr. FASCELL. I believe the Department of Agriculture has that responsibility. We are providing in this bill that this responsibility rests in the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development established thereunder. Nevertheless in order to transfer any function or any duty or modify any program or change the organizational structure of any other department, this would have to be done by a reorganization plan or legislation. The problem with respect to this is no different in the bill under consideration. However, under the bill the Secretary would do the coordinating, advising, and recommending. Under the substitute this would be done by a director in the Executive Office.

Mr. GURNEY. May I pose this further question? I would agree with the gentleman; he is right. But the bill will not accomplish anything unless they send up an Executive order by the President transferring—

Mr. FASCELL. Neither does the substitute.

Mr. GURNEY. Transferring agencies, or unless legislation is passed to that effect.

Mr. FASCELL. Neither does the substitute.

Mr. GURNEY. Cannot the gentleman see a real Donnybrook as far as the Government is concerned, if this is to become law?

Mr. FASCELL. No, I do not see any real Donnybrook. I see an opportunity to bring this subject matter of urban development in proper perspective and begin by an orderly process. That is what the legislation seeks to do from the managerial standpoint. The Hoover Commission said, and that is what this bill says, that we should provide a managerial tool; namely, that the head of a department should be the repository of such duties, functions, and powers assigned by legislation. This is what the President wants. He could have it in the Executive Office, but obviously that is not the answer. We know that. Furthermore, the substitute provides a study and provides a lesser official to do the job, whereas under the bill that job is the responsibility of the Secretary.

But the substitute has this large falling. It does not transfer to the Secretary the powers, the duties, and the functions of the specific departments which are named in the legislation. So in that respect, the substitute is completely inadequate, completely deficient, and does a lot less than the legislation. In other words the substitute leaves the present organizational structure as it is.

I would submit to the gentleman that the issue is, do you want an officer of lesser power and importance to do this job, or rather part of the job, because the substitute does not do everything that the bill does—or do you want a Secretary at the Cabinet level to do it? The answer is obvious.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the substitute ought to be defeated because it does less than its proponents claim.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes. I simply wanted to express the thanks of the minority party to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and the members of the Rules Committee for their cooperation and assistance in developing a situation where the rule would make in order the offering of H.R. 8822 as a substitute, and as a motion to recommit. I think it has helped to provide a most constructive discussion and debate on this important subject.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I support the substitute amendment proposed by the gentlewoman from New Jersey to provide for the creation of an

Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President.

Unlike the administration's bill, which would incorporate existing agencies and administrations into one comprehensive department, the Dwyer substitute would encourage coordination and assistance between the Federal Government and the various local and State governments. This coordination would extend to all programs involving our urban and metropolitan area—not just those now contained in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It would include highways, air and water pollution, airports, education, juvenile delinquency and crime control, unemployment, public health, and a host of other programs that the administration bill would not reach. This cooperative approach would encourage, not discourage, local and State initiative. It would do this by providing these offices with a point of reference instead of a big brother dressed in redtape, for there would be no significant increase in bureaucracy but rather greater efficiency and economy. Mr. Chairman, there are now 60 programs dealing with urban matters. It would be administratively impossible for a Cabinet-level Department to coordinate the programs in coequal Cabinet departments.

The Dwyer amendment is a sound, logical approach to a uniform national policy which would benefit rural, urban and metropolitan areas across the United States. I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ERLBORN) there were—ayes 65, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ERLBORN

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ERLBORN: Page 5, beginning in line 2, strike out "the Federal Housing Administration and".

Page 5, immediately after line 14, insert the following:

"(c) There is hereby transferred to the Department of the Federal Housing Administration, its officers and employees, its insurance funds, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and obligations, together with all functions and powers of the Federal Housing Administration which are hereby vested in, and shall be exercised by, a Presidentially appointed Federal Housing Commissioner under the supervision and direction of the Secretary."

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering at this time was requested by the Mortgage Bankers Association of America. It has to do with the very important future status of the Federal Housing Administration.

As has been pointed out by many of those who have discussed the legislation under consideration, one of the most respected agencies in the Federal Government has been the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. Chairman, this is an agency that does not cost the taxpayers. However,

it has done more, in my opinion, than any other single agency of Government to promote home ownership, which has been and for many years has been, the goal of the average American citizen. FHA, I believe, has done more to promote this goal than any other agency of Government.

Mr. Chairman, the witnesses in the committee who were proponents of the bill, H.R. 6927, all agreed that the FHA had in the past done a good job. They were not saying that this legislation was needed to improve the status of FHA and no one claimed that the Federal Housing Administration needed to be at a Cabinet level in order to do a good job or to do a better job than it presently is performing. But many of the witnesses expressed concern, very real concern, for the future of the FHA.

In effect the bill, H.R. 6927, is silent as to what happens to the FHA in the future. Presently it is an independent agency. It is a constituent agency of the H.H.F.A.

Mr. Chairman, the purport of my amendment would be to take out of section 5 the blanket transfer of FHA along with the other constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and transfer the FHA specifically in a new subparagraph (c) to the new Cabinet-rank department, but to do this in an independent way in order to protect the integrity of the FHA.

This amendment also provides there shall be a Presidentially appointed Federal Housing Commissioner who will have supervision of the FHA in the future. So that the whole purpose of this amendment is to protect the integrity of FHA. If we do not adopt this amendment when we go back to our respective districts and discuss in future years with our constituents the position of FHA which will then have been merged into a Cabinet department and be thrown in with urban renewal, mass transportation, and other problems, we are going to have some very unhappy constituents, people who have in the past relied on the excellent service furnished by FHA to permit individual homeownership.

All of the Members of the House some time this week received a copy of a telegram such as I received in my office yesterday from the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, which reads:

We urge you to vote for the comprehensive amendment we have been endorsing to protect the Federal Housing Administration within the Department of Housing and Urban Development if it is introduced from the floor.

This is the amendment referred to in that telegram, the amendment that has been requested by the Mortgage Bankers Association of America. This is an amendment that will protect the future integrity of FHA. I think we all would be much better off if this amendment were adopted. It would make this bill a better bill, and possibly against my own interests aid in the passage of the bill. However, it will protect the Federal Housing Administration as an independent agency.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN] offered this amendment in committee, and it was turned down by the committee by a vote of more than two to one.

Let me make this very plain. Mr. ERLBORN's amendment would detract from the power and the responsibility of the Secretary in a Cabinet-level department. No other Cabinet-level department has this type of detraction and, because of the language of his amendment, the powers, the responsibilities and the functions would go through a subordinate of the Secretary. While it pays lipservice by using the words "under the direction of the Secretary," it puts the officers and employees, its insurance funds, assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and obligations, together with all functions and powers of the Federal Housing Administration which are hereby vested in, and shall be exercised by, a Presidentially appointed Federal Housing Commissioner under the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

How could the Secretary of a Cabinet-level position direct and supervise a man who had all of the authority vested in him on a subordinate level? That is what we are seeking to get away from at the present time by setting up a Cabinet-level department, because we are seeking to take statutory powers and functions which are in the Administrator of FHA, the Administrator of the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Administrator of the Public Housing Administration, the Administrator of the Urban Renewal Administration, and the Administrator of the Communities Facilities Administration, we are taking away their statutory power and putting those powers in the Secretary of the new Cabinet-level department, which is the principal reason for the bill.

So the gentleman's amendment destroys the purpose of the bill.

Let me point out to my colleagues in the House that on page 4 we have taken care of FHA, the integrity of it, by saying one of the assistant secretaries shall be designated to administer, under supervision and direction of the Secretary, departmental programs relating to the private mortgage market.

So, while we leave the authority in the Secretary, we do say that one of the Assistant Secretaries shall have within his division of the Cabinet-level department, the functions of supporting the private mortgage market which is administered at this time by the FHA and FNMA. Now, while the gentleman has said an organization supports his amendment, that is true. But among the organizations favoring the enactment of this bill and this amendment, which has already been adopted in the bill, were the United States Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Home Builders, the National Housing Conference, the American Institute of Planners, the American Institute of Architects, the

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, and the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. Those are the organizations that endorse the committee bill and stand behind the committee amendment and, by inference at least, they are in opposition to the Erlenborn amendment or against the Erlenborn amendment. So I ask that the Erlenborn amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the Erlenborn amendment on FHA.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from California a question with reference to some remarks he made. Is the gentleman telling the Members of the Committee that all of these organizations which he just listed are supporting the Committee amendment—which I believe is what he said? Or does he mean to tell the Members of the Committee that, in fact, those are the individuals and the organizations that supported the original bill and not the amendment? Have they all been contacted again since the amendment was adopted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All of these organizations supported the bill and we have heard from none of them in regard to the FHA amendment which several of the organizations were concerned about, the FHA, and we were concerned about the FHA and we felt that we have taken care of the FHA.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The gentleman is not leaving the impression that all of these organizations have been recontacted since this amendment was adopted?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, but they are familiar with it. They were present when the amendment was offered by the National Housing Association. We heard from none of them in opposition to this amendment. We assume they are for it.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman. I just wanted to have the RECORD clear on that point.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would merely like to point out that the position which the majority party and my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], take today represents a complete reversal of the position they took in 1961 when at that time there was offered and we accepted within the Committee on Government Operations an amendment which would have the effect of doing what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN] seeks to do: to preserve what has become a household word, the FHA, and to preserve its independent status. I find it passing strange that today we see a complete reversal on this issue and that now, contrary—as I said in the well of the House a few minutes ago—contrary to the recommendations of the Hoover

Commission in 1955 on lending agencies, they want to subsume in this huge new department the activities of the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a rejoinder?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman in a moment. But I would like to leave just this thought and possibly the gentleman would like to comment on it.

The remarks of the gentleman from California in opposition to the Erlenborn amendment seemed to me to leave the impression that the amendment is an unusual one and that this would be a very strange situation indeed. Of course, you know we have the Internal Revenue Service, which is basically a separate entity, as I understand it, within the Department of the Treasury. We have the FBI in large part a separate entity within the Justice Department. I do not see that there is anything so unusual about an amendment which would leave the FHA basically as an entity within the new department.

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

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe the gentleman will find that the statutory power in the case of the different agencies he has mentioned is vested in a Secretary to exercise at the department-head level.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Is the analogy not correct that Presidential appointees head the FBI and Internal Revenue Service and that they function, in large part, apart from the Department?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But the powers of the Cabinet Department are vested in the Secretary of the Department and not in any of the subordinate people underneath.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Is that true with respect to the Internal Revenue Service?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am certain it is true.

Will the gentleman yield further, so that I may make a rejoinder to the comment of my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON]?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am happy to yield further.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As shown on page 13703 of the RECORD for yesterday, I submitted a letter from Charles L. Schultze, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I will read only one sentence from the letter. It is close to the end:

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."

So we are not going to lose the name of the FHA. We are not going to lose the good will of the FHA. We are not going to lose the name of the Federal Housing Administration. That will be continued, under the same name as now, and it will be concentrated under one of the Assistant Secretaries, who will have the sole responsibility for the FHA function and the Federal national mortgage insurance.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words

and I rise in support of the amendment. I shall be brief.

It was very interesting to note the argument just made in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from California, who pointed out the real dilemma in which the majority party finds itself on this bill. The gentleman said that the principal reason for the bill was to create a Cabinet position and to put Housing in charge of it. He said that is what the bill would accomplish, and the committee amendment accomplished just that, yet the closing arguments made by the gentleman from Florida, a few minutes ago, emphasized what the bill would do as to a Department of Urban Affairs. This is the dilemma. It is supposed to do one thing, but really would do another.

I should like to point out also to the gentleman from California what the gentleman from Illinois pointed out. In the hearings grave reservations were expressed about what the bill would do so far as the private mortgage market is concerned. I quote from the testimony of Mr. Boutin, who is executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders. He said that "primary recognition" must be "given to the role of privately financed housing and proper safeguards" must be "established to insure the continued high level of operations of the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association."

So the witnesses were quite concerned about the role of the mortgage operations under the bill.

I submit that the testimony does not show at all that they are satisfied with the committee amendment.

Furthermore, the Mortgage Bankers Association of course registered, in its statement, stern opposition to the bill as a whole because of danger that mortgage activities of the present housing agencies would be in jeopardy. I would think, in order to satisfy these grave reservations, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois should be supported by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ERLBORN) there were—ayes 74, noes 99.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ERLBORN and Mr. FASCELL.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 153.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYDLER

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYDLER: Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Housing and Urban Development" and insert "Urban and Suburban Development".

Page 2, line 20, strike out "Housing and Urban Development" and insert "Urban and Suburban Development".

Page 2, lines 22 and 23, strike out "Housing and Urban Development" and insert "Urban and Suburban Development".

Page 5, line 20, strike out "Housing and Urban Development" and insert "Urban and Suburban Development".

Page 5, lines 23 and 24, strike out "Housing and Urban Development" and insert "Urban and Suburban Development".

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment, but it goes to the heart of the bill in a manner of speaking, because it would change the title of the proposed Department. I think the change that I am suggesting is a good change, a farsighted change that looks to the future and not back to the past. I wish the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] would accept this amendment. I am a new member of the Committee on Government Operations. I would have offered this amendment in committee had I been a member of the committee at the time of the committee's consideration of the bill. I am not suggesting that the name being suggested is a bad one, but I believe the one I am suggesting is a much better one and a much more descriptive name for the proposed Department.

What I am suggesting is that the name, Department of Housing and Urban Development, be changed to the Department of Urban and Suburban Development. Why? Well, it is pretty obvious to me, if what I have heard in the debate here is true, that as the years go by this proposed Department is going to concern itself with the whole spectrum of urban affairs and suburban affairs relating to our cities and suburbs of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, not too many years from now people are going to ask why is there so much concentration on the word "housing," when this Department is concerned with matters of air and water pollution, with matters of transportation, and so forth? They will ask, Why do we call it the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that question is inevitably going to be asked and that sooner or later the name will be changed to make it more descriptive. I imagine this name was chosen to make it a little easier to get it through Congress in the first place by making it sound as if this was really a housing department. However, I do not believe that is really what is intended here for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I feel we should call the proposed Department by the name that will best describe its proposed activities. All of us know that the relative importance of housing with which this Department will concern itself is going to decrease over the years and the relative importance of the suburban part of the Department is going to increase.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a part of this Nation that is suburban in character, the Fourth Congressional District of New York. I do not mind the farmers having their department, the Department of Agriculture; and the cities having their department, if they want it, the Department of Urban Affairs. But we cannot ignore the fact that the trend today is for the people to move into the suburbs as the suburbs represent the rising, grow-

ing, and dynamic part of our Nation and are going to be the most important part of our Nation in not too many years.

Mr. Chairman, we should recognize that fact now. I am asking that we change this name at the present time, rather than waiting for the future.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say this: There are differences between urban and suburban affairs. So, both are essential. There are some things in our part of the country, the New York metropolitan area, which should be done in concert and in cooperation with the city of New York. But there are other things that we should do independently, between the localities and counties concerned. There are affairs that are uniquely suburban and coordination should be county to county, municipality to municipality. They concern things which have nothing to do with the city of New York. And so it is across this Nation today. The suburbs are no longer satellites of the cities they surround.

Mr. Chairman, the name as proposed in the amendment which I have offered would truly describe the coming relationships that are going to exist with which this proposed Department is supposed to deal.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the amendment adopted and the name of the new Department be the Department of Urban and Suburban Affairs.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee and the subcommittee of which I am a member considered a number of different titles but they felt that considering the substantive legislation, the intent of the legislation, the title which we chose for the bill that is pending before the House today, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, most accurately describes the workings of the department and the intention of the administration as well as the intention of Congress.

To change this name to the name proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would make no substantive change in the bill.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Does not the term "urban" include the core of the city and the surrounding areas?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. It surely does and throughout the bill there is the clear-cut statement that the entire metropolitan area is covered in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to announce that a motion to recommit will be offered with directions to substitute the substance of the bill H.R. 8822, introduced by the gentlewoman from

New Jersey, for the bill under consideration.

I hope that we will at the proper time, when the motion to recommit is offered, receive the support of the House in substituting the language within the Executive Office of the President rather than raising the matter to Cabinet status.

The membership should be advised that the motion to recommit will take that form.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6927, to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development. I am one of the sponsors of this proposal and I see an urgent need for improved operation of the Federal Government's housing and urban development programs which would be provided under such a new, separate department.

The bill will place at the Cabinet level the major Federal-aid programs for coping with the problems arising from rapid growth of our urban areas.

President Kennedy sent the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing to Congress in 1961. I have sponsored this legislation since then, and it has received intensive study by the Congress, the executive branch, and all concerned with and interested in housing and urban development activities.

Cabinet status for housing and urban development programs will give more ready access to the President for the purpose of advice and consultation, and will establish a liaison with other departments concerned with related programs and overall Federal economic and fiscal policy. The programs concerned are of the highest importance in terms of effect on the welfare of our people, on national economy, and on operations of State and local governments.

Our urban population has quadrupled in the past 60 years; almost 135 million. Our 220 metropolitan areas contain 135 million people—over 70 percent of our entire population. Thirty more million people will be added to our cities in the next 15 years.

By 1975, we will need over 2 million new homes a year; we will need schools for 10 million additional children, welfare and health facilities for 5 million more people over age 60, transportation facilities for the daily transportation of 200 million people and over 80 million automobiles.

Thus, in 40 years, when our urban population doubles, we will be faced with the task of duplicating our housing facilities, utilities, schools, recreation, and other urban facilities. Our cities are already in distress. Physical decay—from obsolete schools to polluted water and air, and lack of recreational facilities—breed social decay and this is reflected in the rise in crime rate, juvenile delinquency, and school dropouts. Our national welfare is dependent upon the orderly growth and development of our urban areas.

H.R. 6927 will centralize responsibility and authority of the Federal Government to establish and enforce national standards for planning and improving our cities. The new Department will

serve as a clearinghouse and research center, and will provide local governments with a centralized resource of information and assistance concerning Federal programs affecting urban areas. The mayors of our cities and other local officials have testified and given strong support to this proposal, which will provide a focal point within the executive branch for city and State officials to receive more effective attention to the problems of housing, urban development, community facilities, and mass transit.

Mr. Chairman, it makes sense to have Government programs and activities of such magnitude and importance to our cities under one head and one department.

Several years ago, the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, Robert C. Weaver, pointed out the need to coordinate the greatly expanded Federal activities in the urban and housing fields, such expansion being caused by the mushrooming needs of our cities. He stated that the Housing and Home Finance Agency was an administrative monstrosity whose responsibilities have outgrown its capacities, and pointed out the necessity for consolidation and reorganization.

All of the housing and urban development functions now in the Housing and Home Finance Agency would be vested in the new Department. Housing, with its many related agencies, has become one of the prime economic interests of the Nation. We must provide policy direction and coordination for the dozens of different housing programs that extend assistance to urban areas.

Housing continues to be one of the major problems of the area I represent—the 22d District of New York. The shortage of housing and living conditions in many substandard dwellings have grown worse in recent years.

Mr. Chairman, the establishment of this new Department would make available to Congress a more authoritative and responsible spokesman for the executive branch in the areas of housing and urban development. It would not be costly; on the contrary, money would be saved through stronger supervision over programs involving billions of dollars.

The duties and responsibilities of the new Department, headed by a Secretary appointed by the President, would be first, to coordinate Federal activities affecting housing and urban development; second, to advise the President on Federal programs dealing with housing and urban development; third, to develop and recommend to the President policies to provide for orderly growth and development of urban areas; fourth, to conduct continuing studies of housing and urban development problems; fifth, to provide technical assistance and information, including a clearinghouse service, to assist local and State governments in developing solutions to urban development problems; and, sixth, to encourage comprehensive planning by State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and local development activities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to approve H.R. 6927, to provide a Cabinet-

level Department of Housing and Urban Development, so we may have the needed and necessary leadership to coordinate and operate efficiently and effectively the many Federal programs in the fields of housing and urban development. Placing the functions of housing and urban development under a Cabinet-level Federal department will give proper recognition to the importance of urban problems in the social and economic advancement of our Nation.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6927 because I am convinced that the establishment of a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development is vital to the Nation.

Today, 70 percent of our people live in urban areas and by the year 2000 more than 80 percent of our population increase will occur in urban areas.

As the Representative of two counties in the New York metropolitan area, I know full well how urgent will be the need for homes and schools and public services. In just 10 years, urban areas will require more than 2 million new homes a year; schools for 10 million more children; health and welfare facilities for our senior citizens; and transportation facilities that will carry commuters in and out of the central cities quickly, efficiently, and economically.

In this latter regard, I would like to point out that Westchester County Executive Edwin G. Michaelian, in a statement before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in 1962, urged consideration for the establishment of a Department of Transportation within the executive branch, "to bring together all of the diverse elements in the complex picture of mass transportation."

No one will deny the need for coordination of Federal, State, local, and private efforts to improve mass transportation. But this is just part of the complex situation we face as a result of the massive expansion in urban population. The magnitude of problems faced by our urban areas and the great number of Federal programs designed to help solve them call for coordination and administration at the highest levels.

The bill before us today calls for no new programs, and it was endorsed by the Budget Bureau because it will enable the Federal Government to streamline and make more economical many existing programs. The new Department will not merely add another department to the Federal bureaucracy.

The establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs will provide effective direction, coordination, and management so that the Nation will realize the greatest possible benefits from Federal programs designed to develop and improve our urban areas. I strongly urge support for this legislation.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, opponents of the legislation before us agree that our cities are faced with many problems but they point out that this bill does not authorize any new programs to deal with them. In the next breath they say that State and local responsibility in urban affairs would be discouraged by creating the new Department

because it would somehow indicate that the Federal Government is going to do the whole job.

This is nonsense, Mr. Chairman, and there is no better evidence of this than the fact that the overwhelming majority of mayors throughout the country have endorsed the establishment of this new Department, as have the National Association of Home Builders and scores of other associations and groups closest to the urban scene.

An even worse argument against the bill is that the housing situation in the United States has been greatly exaggerated and that there simply is not the need for a Department concerned with urban development. This, of course, flies in the face of all known facts. The enormous growth of American cities in recent decades is a matter of record and no one yet has come forward to dispute the projections which show that in the next 40 years we will have to build the equivalent of all that has been constructed in America since the first colonists arrived. Must we wait, Mr. Chairman, until we find ourselves further mired in the chaos of unplanned urban sprawl before we begin to organize ourselves to the task ahead? Only those who are incapable of assessing the shifting demands and dynamic changes in modern-day America could recommend such a course.

With respect to the provisions of the bill before us, let me say that I was most impressed with recommendations made by the homebuilding industry that there be incorporated an express provision assuring that the programs of the FHA would be administered at an appropriately high level. The amendment proposed by the Government Operations Committee to section 4(a) of the bill carries out this recommendation. It provides that an Assistant Secretary shall be designated to administer, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary, departmental programs relating to the private mortgage market.

The National Association of Home Builders, which is the major organization representing the private homebuilding industry, has made it clear that it is entirely satisfied with this committee amendment, and that it strongly supports the legislation to establish the new Department. Witnesses on behalf of the NAHB have also made it clear that they view the basic mission of the new Department as being to help provide good homes in good urban neighborhoods, well served by public facilities, including sewer, water and recreational facilities and mass transportation. The industry thus recognizes that good housing development and good urban development are merely two faces of one coin, and not competing currencies.

Under the legislation as introduced, the functions of the FHA will in fact be upgraded. Because ultimate responsibility for these functions will be vested in the Secretary of the Department, they will at long last be represented at the Cabinet level. This is the level where overall economic governmental policy is made; and this is the level where the claims of housing and urban development should receive a fair hearing.

Under the committee amendment, the day-to-day administration of programs affecting the private mortgage market will be assigned to the level of an Assistant Secretary—this being a level as high as, or higher than, that at which the programs are now administered.

The Assistant Secretary will of course be an appointee of the President and confirmed by the Senate. For these reasons, it seems abundantly clear to me that the Federal functions with respect to private housing are assured by this bill of greater attention within the Federal Government than ever before.

It also seems clear to me that any move to place the legal authority for FHA programs in a subordinate official within the Department, rather than in the Secretary, would only serve to downgrade, and not to elevate, these programs. Certainly, nothing could be gained by such a departure from the principles of good public administration—or, for that matter, good business administration. Surely, the ultimate legal authority for a program should rest with the head of an organization, and not with a subordinate official who would, as all agree, be subject to his direction and supervision. Such an arrangement would merely create confusion by seeming to separate final responsibility from legal authority.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering what has recently been termed the most controversial piece of legislation to be introduced in this session of Congress.

It is indeed strange, Mr. Chairman, to consider the forces that have been mustered against the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Whom do they represent?

Certainly there is no doubt that we are an urban nation. In his message on the cities, President Johnson noted that 70 percent of our present population is urban and pointed out that "a half century from now, 320 million of our 400 million Americans will live in such areas."

Is not the Federal Government obligated to structure itself in keeping with its shifting population? Do the opponents of a Department of Housing and Urban Development fail to see the significance of population as the bedrock of true democratic representation in a republican form of government?

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the opponents of this bill represent an outmoded aristocracy that is determined to prevent the growth of democratic government in the United States.

They most decidedly do not represent the little farmers and other rural folks who have long benefited from the programs of the Department of Agriculture.

No, Mr. Chairman, I would say that if they represent anyone it is the local oligarchy in many of our small and middle-sized towns who see the programs of the Federal Government as searchlights that will expose their domination of local affairs to the people.

The creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development is favored by the vast majority of the people of the Nation, be they urban or rural.

The people favor the establishment of this new Department because they realize that we live in a new time, an urban era, that calls for fresh thinking and new institutional arrangements.

When the Congress created the Department of Agriculture, it did so because that was where the problems of our country manifested themselves most clearly. Today our problems are primarily urban problems and we can do no less than recognize this fact by creating a Department in the Federal Government to help deal with them.

Of equal importance is the coordination by this new Department of Federal assistance programs. By focusing attention on the city and its surrounding area, the new Secretary of the proposed Department of Housing and Urban Development can bring to policy-level meetings of the Cabinet a comprehensive overview of problems involving many Federal assistance programs administered by many Federal agencies.

Here at the Cabinet level, coordination can be worked out so that Federal policy is consistent with the desires and capabilities of both the Nation and the local communities involved.

Mr. Chairman, the lengthy debate on this proposal has given ample time for any real grassroots opposition to the creation of a Cabinet-level post for Housing and Urban Development to rise. None has been produced.

In the hearings recently held by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, little opposition was found while witness after witness came to praise the much-needed and much-belated creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Evidence can be found that such a Department has been advocated as far back as the early 1900's and legislation to create a Cabinet post for urban representation has been introduced in every Congress since 1954.

Hearings have been held on such a concept five times in the House of Representatives alone, not to mention those held in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to act on this piece of executive reorganization.

Our urban population can wait no longer for relief.

I propose that H.R. 6927 be enacted without further delay.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my full endorsement and strong support for enactment today of H.R. 6927, to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

As the Representative of California's 30th Congressional District in Los Angeles, I have been acutely aware of the need for this legislation for a long time.

The city of Los Angeles has approximately 2.5 million residents at the present time, while the county exceeds 6 million, and both city and county are growing rapidly.

Taking southern California as a unit, experts now predict that it will more than triple in population from 10 mil-

lion to over 30 million within the next 35 years.

With growth like this, it is vital that we take care of the pressing needs of our metropolitan centers for community public facilities, housing, educational development, mass transportation, recreation, and related necessities of urban life in the latter half of the 20th century.

The problem, of course, is not confined to my own State of California. But in the country at large, whereas more than half our citizens lived on farms or in rural areas at the turn of the century, today some 70 percent live in urban centers. By the year 2000, the Nation's population will have increased by 150 million persons—from 190 million to about 340 million. Of this increase, at least 80 percent will occur in urban and urbanizing areas, adding another 120 million to the present urban population of 133 million.

In my opinion, a widely scattered group of Federal agencies simply cannot deal effectively with such staggering growth of urban areas and massive population shifts.

We urgently need an efficient, unified, and coherent structure to coordinate and administer the many Federal housing and urban development programs, and I hope the Members will join with me in adopting this forward-looking and progressive legislation.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 6927. My district is one of the most completely urbanized areas in the United States. We in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area have experienced for many years the problems which come with almost total urbanization.

We who reside in northern New Jersey live in almost the exact center of the unending city stretching from Boston to Norfolk, Va., which some call megalopolis.

In the last few years, having flown regularly over this great sprawling urban colossus, I have seen the last empty spaces between the great cities gradually filled with suburban developments. At night the lights stretch endlessly from National Airport to Boston.

Halfway up the Baltimore-Washington Parkway near Laurel, Md., the cities of Baltimore and Washington have merged in such a way as to form one great unified metropolitan area.

Philadelphia and Wilmington, Del., are growing closer and closer together. And then if you drive up the great New Jersey Turnpike it becomes evident that much of the Garden State is becoming one large bedroom community for Philadelphia on the south and New York City on the north.

We who live in Hudson County are part of the New York metropolitan area which now stretches far beyond the five boroughs up the Hudson River beyond Westchester County into Rockland, Orange, and Putnam Counties, far into Nassau, and Suffolk Counties in Long Island and almost to Hartford, Conn.

The problems which this rapid growth has posed are far beyond the powers of individual cities and towns, far beyond the counties and the growth pattern has

also been no respecter of State boundaries. Truly, our urban problems can in no sense be considered local or statewide in nature. We are faced with problems which are national in scope and can in many cases only be solved at the Federal level. This is no longer a debatable proposition. Time and time again we have approved piecemeal-fashion programs intended to solve many of the problems which beset urban America.

What we are seeking today by the passage of H.R. 6927 is not any sweeping extension of Federal powers. No, Mr. Chairman, what we seek is a meaningful policy which commits the U.S. Government to the concept that our various programs to aid urban America will be best handled by a single unified agency.

When the Congress approved the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 it was not done in order to facilitate massive Federal spending. Rather, it was a mature realization that Federal spending had become massive and that businesslike steps should be taken to insure an orderly fiscal program.

H.R. 6927 represents this same type legislation maturity. We must realize that for the rest of this century and for as long as this Nation exists urban problems are going to be with us. There is no way short of atomic catastrophe that the United States can go back to the essentially smalltime America that many older Members of this House can recall from their youth. Urbanization is a fact of life, and if we are going to pass—in every session of the Congress—dozens of bills which deal with problems having a common cause then we owe the taxpayers the duty of seeing that these programs are carefully administered and coordinated.

There are many who are hostile to the growth of urban America. I cannot argue with their right to this view and perhaps there is some merit to many of their contentions. This is not the issue today, however; we are not debating this question. We are deciding today whether we are to take reasonable steps to solve a problem which we know exists or whether we are to assume an ostrichlike stance with our heads in the sand hoping that if we do not notice the problems they will just go away.

Our urban problems are not just going to go away. We who are responsible for handling the public's business must insure that our Government operates in a businesslike way. For this reason I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H.R. 6927, is quite explicit in its purposes from its title, to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development. It is not a new idea for it was suggested in 1961 by our late President John F. Kennedy when he said in his state of the Union message:

Our cities are being engulfed in squalor—

And then in his message to Congress on March 9, 1961, when he said:

Urban and suburban areas now contain the overwhelming majority of our population, and a preponderance of our industrial, commercial, and educational resources. The

new housing and urban programs as well as existing housing and community development programs, deserve the best possible administrative efficiency, stature, and role in the councils of the Federal Government. An awareness of these problems and programs should be constantly brought to the Cabinet table, and coordinated leadership provided for functions related to urban affairs but appropriately performed by a variety of departments and agencies.

President Johnson has reaffirmed these beliefs in requesting the establishment of a new executive department so that urban problems may have representation "at the highest level of Government" and that housing programs as well be in the "front rank of Government."

This bill has been carefully considered by the Committee on Government Operations under the guidance of one of Illinois' most outstanding members, Chairman BILL DAWSON, and their favorable recommendation for passage must not go unheeded. The bill makes a declaration 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. A finding is announced that these can best be achieved through the establishment of a new Department headed by a Secretary.

When the United States began to develop it was dotted with small towns and villages linking vast areas of scattered population. People were carving the model of a great country out of the wilderness and the needs of the country at the time were greatest in the rural areas. But with development there was a need for centralized areas whereby these people from the wilderness could meet to barter for goods and the necessities of life. As these necessities became greater so did these small towns and villages grow. And with their growth we were faced with new problems of expansion.

We have now reached an era in which the urban communities have become the heart of our land with the rural areas as the arteries which feed the heart. One without the other cannot survive, and yet when the rural communities dominated our country's makeup, its problems did not go unheeded for the Congress of the United States established a Department of Agriculture to administer to these needs. So, it was true in the area of business with the establishment of a Commerce Department; in labor-management with a Labor Department; the development of natural resources with an Interior Department. And yet, quoting our great mayor of Chicago, Richard J. Daley, who represented the U.S. conference of mayors before the Committee on Government Operations:

But nobody specifically represents the cities. And yet, the productive capacity—the purchasing power—the backbone of our economy—and the people who pay most of the taxes—live in urban communities.

The problems of urbanization become more complex, more intense with each passing day. So the need for a central point in Federal Government where

cities, and I do not mean just the big cities, for this legislation benefits cities who may have a population of only 10,000, can come for help and information.

Congress has not turned a deaf ear to these urban problems, for we have been adopting programs of aid to urban areas. We have delegated the administration of these programs to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But there is a need for stronger programs and more effective coordination of existing activities, and only through the establishment of a Cabinet-level unit which can provide the President the maximum assistance for guidance to the efforts of State, county, and municipal governments and private enterprise to improve the Nation's communities, can we rest assured that a maximum effort is being made to solve the Nation's problems in the expanding metropolitan complexes.

As this Nation grows, prospers, and expands, the burdens of decision facing our Chief Executive also expand, and if he is to effectively execute his duties he must rely on his Cabinet for advice in making these decisions. And as he has pointed out, in order to meet Federal responsibilities in assisting urban areas he needs a more effective executive tool; therefore, the establishment of a new Cabinet post is strongly recommended.

A Department of Housing and Urban Development can correlate present existing programs and specialize in resolving the needs in public housing, transportation, public works, urban renewal and planning, and open space and land preservation. It can take its place at the Cabinet table and voice opinion in other programs that indirectly affect the urban populace. As Mr. Robert L. Williams, executive director of the American Institute of Planners, stated:

The establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development, if accompanied by appropriate means for stimulating local and metropolitan planning and if accompanied by a recognition of the fact that Federal aids should serve locally established objectives, will serve to strengthen rather than weaken our systems of local government.

This is a most important point to consider when deciding this issue. Congress has demonstrated its wisdom in the past through progressive legislation in strengthening all levels of government. Surely we, in this Congress, wish to continue along this path which can be demonstrated by approving this bill now before us. I urge that we vote to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively for 2 days to this debate on the merits and demerits of creating a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development. If this bill does nothing else, it does weaken State and local government, and it does increase dependence on the Federal establishment. It is a further trend toward centralization. And it will in the end cause the expenditure of not just millions but billions of additional dollars which cannot be justified. It is unnecessary, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, in a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life. In a few short decades more we shall be a nation of vastly expanded population, living increasingly in urban areas in housing that does not now exist, served by community facilities not yet built, and moving about by means of urban transportation which in all too many communities are inadequate.

Seventy percent of our population today is urban. In 35 years, 80 percent of a greatly expanded population will be. In the next 40 years we will need to build as many urban homes and related facilities as now exist in all of our cities.

This situation urgently calls for action. It calls for, among other things, a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Affairs such as this bill provides.

To this Department would be transferred all the housing and urban development functions now in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

But how and why, we may ask, does this respond to an urgent call for action? The answer is quite simple and direct.

These several programs include an extraordinary range of diverse yet closely interrelated activities. All affect the lives and welfare of families in our cities and suburbs. All impinge in one degree or another on each other. None can or should stand by itself. The Department will bring a maximum degree of coordination and effectiveness to the planning and execution of them all.

The Secretary of the new Department will be in a much better position than the present Housing and Home Finance Administrator to coordinate effectively the programs under his charge. This means that the Secretary can be held more clearly responsible by both the President and by Congress.

The Secretary as a Cabinet officer, and the Department as an executive department, will clearly be in a better position to work out policies, programs, and problems with other related department chiefs and departments, such as Treasury, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior.

The Secretary, finally, and his Department, will be able to speak out more forcefully and persuasively on the broad range of city interests. He will be able to better stimulate, coordinate, and mobilize the forces to wage effective war on the urban problems of our time.

Some opponents of this measure have suggested that a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs might siphon away from States and municipalities some of their present authority. This simply is not true.

The fact is that the creation of the new Department makes no changes at all in the substantive Federal law affecting housing and urban development. It, of course, makes no changes in State or local laws relating to urban development. It should be pointed out, furthermore, that all Federal programs enacted to date by Congress provide aid to private, State, and local programs which are carried out

under State and local law. There would be no change in this arrangement.

Our cities and the people living in them, who after all represent the overwhelming portion of our population, need an adequate voice in the highest councils of Government.

The executive branch and the Congress need an adequate instrument to assist them in the formulation and execution of policy concerning urban affairs and housing.

States and local governing bodies need an agency at the departmental level to assist them in planning and carrying out their cooperative programs with the Federal Government.

All these needs can best be met through the adoption of this proposal. A scattered array of Federal agencies simply cannot deal effectively with the tremendous growth and staggering problems confronting our urban areas. In the interest of efficiency, economy, and just plain good government, a unified, coordinated structure at the Cabinet level is a necessity, and I urge that this bill be approved today.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 6927, which would establish a new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

It seems to me that the need for this legislation is clear. The Department of Agriculture was created at a time when 70 percent of our population lived on farms or in rural areas. Today the situation is exactly reversed, as President Johnson pointed out in his housing message earlier this year. At that time he said that the housing bills—including the present proposal—he would send to the Congress were predicated on that fact that over 70 percent of our population—135 million Americans—live in urban areas. A half century from now 320 million of our 400 million Americans will live in such areas.

During the next 15 years, 30 million people will be added to our cities, equivalent to the combined population of New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Baltimore.

The President's message declared:

Our urban problems are of a scope and magnitude that demand representation at the highest level of Government. . . . 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.

The new Department will consist of all the present programs of HHFA. In addition it will be primarily responsible for Federal participation in metropolitan area thinking and planning. This new department will provide a focal point for thought and innovation and imagination about the problems of our cities. It will cooperate with other Federal agencies, including those responsible for programs providing essential education, health, employment, and social services. And it will work to strengthen the constructive relationships between Nation, State, and city—the creative federalism—which is essential to progress. This partnership will demand the leadership of mayors, Governors, and State legislatures.

Let us calmly look at the facts behind the disorders in our great cities today, behind the crime, the riots, the human misery. What do we find? The Presi-

dent has pointed to some of the major core reasons for these, and has said:

We have over 9 million homes, most of them in cities, which are run down or deteriorating; over 4 million do not have running water or even plumbing. Many of our central cities are in need of major surgery to overcome decay. New suburban sprawl reaches out into the countryside, as the process of urbanization consumes a million acres a year. The old, the poor, the discriminated against are increasingly concentrated in central city ghettos; while others move to the suburbs leaving the central city to battle against immense odds.

Physical decay, from obsolescent schools to polluted water and air, helps breed social decay. It casts a pall of ugliness and despair on the spirits of the people. And this is reflected in rising crime rates, school drop-outs, delinquency, and social disorganization.

Millions of families and individuals live in substandard housing because their incomes are too low to permit them to afford adequate private housing. The Housing and Home Finance Agency has pointed out that "our existing housing programs cannot fully cope with the problem," and that there are some 13 million substandard homes in our country today. According to the 1960 census about 7.5 million of the 13 million families or individuals in substandard housing had annual incomes of less than \$3,000. While I am reasonably certain that some slums will exist as long as poverty exists in our own country, I believe that the establishment of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development will provide new and effective tools to deal with slums—which I regard as a basic cause of the disorders in our great cities today.

Although slum housing is a central factor in the problems of our great cities, many of the families contributing to these problems are recent arrivals from our rural areas where much of the worst housing in the Nation exists today. Bad housing breeds bad situations in our cities, towns, and rural areas, and the new Department of Housing and Urban Development which H.R. 6927 would establish will enable us to deal with the problems which are, by all accounts, growing worse month by month and day by day.

The spectacular success of our national homebuilding industry to provide homeownership to millions of our citizens is one in which we can all take pride. We have failed, however, to solve the problem of providing homes within the reach of the poorer families. Public housing has failed to meet this need; new tools must be forged, tested, and perfected, so that in our time and for the future we, as a nation, can house all of our people in safe, sanitary, decent housing.

President Johnson has pointed out that it is possible to improve, rebuild, and rehabilitate existing homes with less cost and less human dislocation, and thus to meet our housing objectives without tearing people away from their familiar neighborhoods and friends, by encouraging property owners to improve and rehabilitate their own property so they do not have to move from the path of the bulldozers.

These are the directions in which the new Department of Housing and Urban Development should move, and I am pleased to say that in Wilmington, Del., a rehabilitation project along these lines is now under consideration.

Such a new Department should move forthrightly to solve the housing problems of our rural slums, and I would say that some of the rural slum housing in Delaware is quite as bad as it is in adjoining States and, in fact, is as bad as the housing in some of the rural areas in other nations which I have visited as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The new housing bill recently reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee, provides many new tools and funds for this task, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development should thereby be enabled to make a major contribution to decent, safe, and sanitary housing for our urban and rural slum dwellers. I am very pleased that several of the provisions which I sponsored in my own housing bill have been included in the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, under the excellent direction of its very capable Administrator, Robert C. Weaver, has made unquestioned progress in alleviating the problems of urban people. Programs of slum clearance, urban renewal, rehabilitation, open space, public housing, and others have been implemented with efficiency and imagination.

Even so, there exists a vast area of uncoordinated Federal programs dealing with housing and urban development. Among the most notable are activities concerning farmers' home loans, veterans housing, water and air pollution, waste disposal, aviation, and expressways. Obviously, the Congress should address itself to an honest and sensible reorganization of these many functions. We should provide direction and cohesion through a Cabinet level department.

This is what we need, Mr. Chairman. But this bill, H.R. 6297, nowhere approaches that need. Indeed, try as I might, I find within its pages little more than a change of name. There is no increased responsibility. There is no increased authority.

With its passage, our urban-directed programs remain as they were—uncoordinated, inefficient, and inadequate. For this reason I find it most difficult to support this bill. Rather than a mere change of name, let us develop a department with adequate power and unquestioned responsibility.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me fitting that the bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development comes from the committee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

For many years Chairman Dawson has been a vibrant factor in the life of Chicago in the period of its greatest growth and expansion. His contribution to the city of his adoption and his home during most of his adult years has been large.

No one understands the American city, the problems and the needs and the frustrations as well as the hopes of its people, better than Chairman DAWSON. The enactment of the bill that has come to us from the committee of which he is chairman will climax his fight of many, many years to give to urban America the dignity of Cabinet status.

Mr. Chairman, we are making real progress in eliminating blight and slums from our cities. The day is not yet here when over every family will be a decent roof, and within the reach of every family playgrounds and the environment of comfortable and meaningful living, but that day is not far off. The progress in Chicago and in other large American cities has been large and it has been heartening.

It is as plain to envision as the hand held before the eyes that urban progress will be hastened mightily by the giving to us who live in cities the dignity and the availability to first sources that are inseparable from Cabinet representation. I am at a loss to understand why any American, no matter where he lives, should be in opposition to this bill. If the cities should fall into ruins, where, may I ask, would the farmer find his market, and the Nation the partner of its strength? I strongly urge a vote for this good bill.

From Edwin C. Berry, executive director of the Chicago Urban League, I have just received this telegram:

Representative BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I wish to indicate my wholehearted support for the necessity of a Cabinet-level position dealing with housing and urban affairs. Those of us, whose professional activities center around the massive problems in our city, know that it is past time for the Federal Government to recognize that we are an urban and not a rural nation, and that the health of our cities is synonymous with the health of our country.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to participate over many years in a number of significant developments in the structure of our Federal Government. These structural changes have been designed to reflect the great changes and advances that occur in the life of a dynamic country and a complex, progressive society. But few have given me greater satisfaction than the House's approval today of a new Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development.

By this action we have recognized the great shift in the life of our people from rural, largely farm areas to our great urban and suburban centers. In my State of Florida in my lifetime there has been a dramatic reversal of the urban-rural composition of the State's population. When I first came to the State, from the great State of Alabama, Florida was largely rural in character. But today nearly 8 out of every 10 residents of the great and growing State of Florida live in urban areas, and it is my privilege to share the representation of the State's largest population center with the very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Organization which brought this bill before us.

I particularly want to commend my distinguished colleague from the Fourth District of Florida, the Honorable DANTE FASCELL, for his authorship and sponsorship of this historic measure. His efforts in behalf of the creation of this new Department of Housing and Urban Development will be remembered gratefully by the residents of our area and by metropolitan and urban dwellers throughout this great land.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, today we are once more presented with a proposal to create a Department of Housing and Urban Development, a plan which was defeated by the last Congress. This bill, H.R. 6927, also should be defeated.

I speak as one who is well aware of the special problems of the cities. We are becoming increasingly an urban society and 70 percent or more of our population lives in or near large cities. Vast Federal programs and numerous agencies already exist for dealing with urban problems. These include: the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Community Facilities Administration, Office of Transportation, the Public Housing Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and the Federal Housing Administration, all of which would come under the new Department. Numerous other agencies affecting urban matters would be left out of this legislation. Among these are operations conducted by the Department of Agriculture, the Commerce Department, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Community Relations Service, the Department of the Army, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Labor, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

CLEVELAND BILL WOULD DO BETTER JOB

There is no doubt that coordination of these programs is needed. For that reason I joined earlier this year with a number of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation—H.R. 6206—which would establish an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President. This is a more comprehensive, less bureaucratic, and far less expensive approach. It would provide State and local officials and other concerned citizens with a central place in Washington to bring problems requiring Federal attention. It would save them from having to trek all over town to numerous different agencies seeking to penetrate layers of Federal officials with overlapping responsibilities.

This essential achievement will not be accomplished by the creation of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

There is no special magic in Cabinet status. There is no reason to believe, on the basis of past experience, that all these problems will fall into place once they have been elevated to Cabinet rank. The existence of a Department of Agriculture cannot be said to have solved the farm problem. There are some who say that it has actually created much of the problem.

The administration says this would draw under one roof all the many diverse agencies dealing with Housing and Urban Affairs. As I pointed out above, this bill would not do that. Numerous agencies would be left out. The administration further argues the importance of giving status of Cabinet rank to the official in charge. Status is a wonderful thing and much sought after but, as we see in the Department of Agriculture, it provides no solution. It is true that the head of this new office would be able to sit a few places higher at official dinner parties than he now does but it is not easy to see what this has to do with housing and urban affairs.

NEW DEPARTMENT WOULD BE EXPENSIVE

The administration further says that this new Department would not add to the payroll but would merely bring together existing agencies. The same was said of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The fact is that HEW's payroll has gone from 36,613 in 1953, when it was created, to 83,928 in March of this year. Its budget has risen from an initial \$1,987,000,000 to \$6,985,700,000 in the current year, with another billion to be added next year.

Our Republican bill goes to the heart of the matter. It would be truly inclusive, it would be much more efficient, and it would have the status of the White House itself. It would be more responsive to the problems of Housing and Urban Affairs. It would also not have the built-in tendency to grow that we have seen in other departments.

Mr. Chairman, we need to get a job done not merely to add the tinsel of exalted rank to another Federal bureaucracy. Let us defeat this proposal as we did once before and adopt the Republican alternative in its place.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

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, pursuant to House Resolution 419, he reported the bill back to the House with amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. DWYER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. DWYER moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 6927) to the Committee on Government Operations with instructions to report the

same to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of the bill (H.R. 8822), as follows:

"ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

"SECTION 1. There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President an office to be known as the Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Office'). There shall be in the Office a Director and a Deputy Director to be appointed by the President. The Deputy Director shall perform such duties as the Director may designate, and during the absence or incapacity of the Director or during a vacancy in the office of the Director he shall act as Director. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of \$30,000 per annum, and the Deputy Director shall receive compensation at the rate of \$27,000 per annum.

"PERSONNEL AND POWERS OF THE OFFICE

"SEC. 2. (a) The Director, with the approval of the President, may appoint in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949 such additional personnel as he determines to be necessary to carry out the functions of the Office.

"(b) In the performance of the functions of the Office, the Director is authorized—

"(1) to procure by contract services as provided by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates of compensation not exceeding \$100 per diem for the personal services of individuals;

"(2) to appoint such advisory committees as he may determine to be necessary for the effective performance of the functions of the Office;

"(3) to designate such representatives as he may determine to be necessary or desirable to maintain effective liaison with executive departments and agencies, and departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the States, which are engaged in activities related to the functions of the Office; and

"(4) to use the services, personnel, and facilities of executive departments and agencies and those of State departments, agencies, and instrumentalities, with the consent of such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities, with or without reimbursement therefor.

"(c) Upon the request of the Director, each executive department and agency shall furnish to the Office such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics as the Director may determine to be necessary or desirable for the performance of the functions of the Office.

"(d) Subject to the approval of the President, the Director may—

"(1) promulgate such rules and regulations as may be required to carry out the functions of the Office; and

"(2) delegate to any other officer or employee of the Office authority for the performance of any duty imposed, or the exercise of any power conferred, upon the Director by this Act.

"COORDINATION OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 3. (a) Subject to the direction of the President, the Director shall take such action as may be appropriate to coordinate the programs of the various departments and agencies of the executive branch which have a major impact upon the Nation's urban areas. Such programs shall include Federal activities relating to housing, urban development and redevelopment, community facilities, highways and transportation facilities, civil defense, water and air pollution, and such other activities as the Director, with the approval of the President, determines relate primarily to urban needs and problems.

"(b) In carrying out his functions under this Act, the Director shall (1) establish and maintain close liaison with the departments

and agencies referred to in subsection (a) and (2) consult with State and local officials, and with interested business, labor, and other groups, concerning urban problems and needs.

"INFORMATION ON URBAN AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 4. The Director shall establish within the Office a Division of Information on Urban Affairs and Community Development. Through this Division the Director shall compile and make available to State and local officials, and other interested persons, through such means as he determines to be appropriate, information concerning the Federal programs referred to in section 3. The service provided by such Division shall include assistance to State and local officials in relating such programs to specific urban problems or needs.

"RESEARCH AND STUDIES

"SEC. 5. The Director shall undertake research and studies with a view of determining what changes should be made (1) in the programs referred to in section 3 in order to achieve a more effective coordination of such programs with State and local programs designed to meet urban needs, (2) in the allocation of such programs among the various departments and agencies of the executive branch, and (3) in the administration of such programs in order to achieve increased economy and efficiency, to avoid duplication, and to coordinate more effectively the activities of such departments and agencies in the administration of such programs. The results of such research and studies shall be reported from time to time to the President for such action as he determines to be appropriate.

"FEDERAL URBAN AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

"SEC. 6. There shall be in the Office an advisory council, known as the Urban Affairs and Community Development Council. Members of the Council shall be appointed by the President upon nomination by the Director from among persons with broad experience and interest in urban and related problems, and may include persons outside the Federal service. The following Federal officials are hereby designated as members ex officio of the Council: the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The President may designate other Federal officials as ex officio members of the Council. Members of the Council shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed for necessary travel and subsistence expenses as provided in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended. The Council shall meet at the call of the Director, but not less than twice a year. The Council shall be concerned with all the urban problems mentioned in this Act, including air and water pollution, transportation, sewage, water supply, and urban renewal.

"COMMISSION TO STUDY TRANSFERS OF FUNCTION AND INTEGRATION OF ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 7. (a) (1) There is hereby established a special commission (referred to in this section as the "Commission") to study the feasibility of making transfers to and from the several departments and agencies mentioned in section 6 of this Act. The Commission shall consist of twelve members appointed by the President from among individuals in private life having substantial knowledge of and experience in housing, urban affairs, mortgage financing, and related fields.

"(2) The Commission may employ and pay the compensation of such staff as may be necessary to the performance of its functions.

"(3) Members of the Commission shall be compensated at the rate of \$50 a day while actually engaged in the business of the Commission, and shall be paid travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 relating to persons serving without compensation.

"(b) The Commission shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of all functions relating to housing and urban affairs which on the date of the enactment of this Act are being performed by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, giving particular attention to (1) the distribution of such functions throughout the Government and the effectiveness with which they are being carried out by the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities in which they are respectively vested, and (2) the extent to which further coordination in the performance of such functions, with respect to each other, would serve to increase the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the programs of the United States in the field of housing and urban affairs. Upon the completion of its study and investigation, and in no event later than June 30, 1966, the Commission shall submit a full report thereon to the President together with its findings and recommendations.

"(c) The President, after receiving and considering the report of the Commission under subsection (b), shall prepare and submit to the Congress a reorganization plan (or plans) providing for the transfer to or from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government, of such additional functions relating to housing and urban affairs as he may deem necessary or appropriate to promote efficiency.

"REPORT TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 8. Not later than January 31 of each year, the Director shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a report concerning the activities of the Office during the preceding calendar year."

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 141, nays 259, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—141

Abbutt	Carter	Ford, Gerald R.
Adair	Cederberg	Frelinghuysen
Anderson, Ill.	Clancy	Fulton, Pa.
Andrews,	Clawson, Del	Gettys
Glenn	Cleveland	Goodell
Andrews,	Collier	Griffin
N. Dak.	Colmer	Gross
Arends	Conable	Grover
Ashbrook	Conte	Gubser
Ashmore	Corbett	Gurney
Baldwin	Cramer	Haley
Bates	Cunningham	Hall
Battin	Curtin	Halleck
Beicher	Curtis	Hansen, Idaho
Bell	Dague	Harsha
Berry	Davis, Ga.	Harvey, Mich.
Betts	Davis, Wis.	Horton
Boiton	Derwinski	Hosmer
Brock	Devine	Hutchinson
Broomfield	Dickinson	Johnson, Pa.
Broyhill, N.C.	Dole	Jonas
Broyhill, Va.	Dorn	King, N.Y.
Buchanan	Duncan, Tenn.	Kunkel
Burton, Utah	Dwyer	Laird
Byrnes, Wis.	Edwards, Ala.	Langen
Cabell	Ellsworth	Latta
Cahill	Erlenborn	Lennon
Callaway	Fino	Lipscomb

Long, La.	Pelly	Springer
McClary	Poff	Stafford
McCulloch	Fool	Stanton
McDade	Quie	Talcott
McMillan	Quillen	Teague, Calif.
MacGregor	Reid, Ill.	Thomson, Wis.
Mailliard	Reifel	Tuck
Marsh	Reinecke	Tupper
Martin, Nebr.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Walker, Miss.
Mathias	Robison	Watkins
May	Rumsfeld	Watson
Michel	Satterfield	Whalley
Minshall	Saylor	Whitten
Mize	Schneebell	Widnall
Moore	Schweiker	Williams
Morse	Shriver	Willson, Bob
Morton	Skubitz	Wyatt
Mosher	Smith, Calif.	Wylder
Nelsen	Smith, N.Y.	Younger
O'Neal, Ga.	Smith, Va.	

NAYS—259

Adams	Gilligan	Murray
Addabbo	Gonzalez	Natcher
Albert	Grabowski	Nedzi
Anderson,	Gray	Nix
Tenn.	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien
Andrews,	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
George W.	Greigg	O'Hara, Mich.
Annunzio	Grider	O'Konski
Ashley	Griffiths	Olsen, Mont.
Aspinall	Hagen, Calif.	Olsen, Minn.
Bandstra	Halpern	O'Neill, Mass.
Baring	Hamilton	Ottinger
Barrett	Hanley	Passman
Beckworth	Hanna	Patman
Bennett	Hansen, Iowa	Patten
Bingham	Hansen, Wash.	Pepper
Blatnik	Hardy	Perkins
Boggs	Harris	Philbin
Boland	Hathaway	Pickle
Bolling	Hawkins	Poage
Brademas	Hays	Powell
Brooks	Hechler	Price
Brown, Calif.	Helstoski	Pucinski
Burke	Henderson	Purcell
Burleson	Herlong	Race
Burton, Calif.	Hicks	Randall
Byrne, Pa.	Hollifield	Redlin
Callan	Holland	Reid, N.Y.
Carey	Howard	Resnick
Casey	Hull	Reuss
Celler	Hungate	Rhodes, Pa.
Chief	Huot	Roberts
Clark	Irwin	Rodino
Clevenger	Jacobs	Rogers, Colo.
Cohelan	Jarman	Rogers, Fla.
Conyers	Jennings	Rogers, Tex.
Cooley	Joelson	Ronan
Craley	Johnson, Calif.	Roncallo
Culver	Johnson, Okla.	Rooney, N.Y.
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, Pa.
Daniels	Jones, Mo.	Roosevelt
Dawson	Karsten	Rosenthal
de la Garza	Karth	Rostenkowski
Delaney	Kastenmeyer	Roudebush
Dent	Kelly	Roush
Denton	Keogh	Roybal
Diggs	King, Calif.	Ryan
Dingell	King, Utah	St Germain
Donohue	Kirwan	St. Onge
Dow	Kluczynski	Scheuer
Dowdy	Kornegay	Schisler
Downing	Krebs	Schmidhauser
Dulski	Landrum	Scott
Duncan, Oreg.	Leggett	Secrest
Dyal	Lindsay	Selden
Edmondson	Long, Md.	Senner
Edwards, Calif.	Love	Shipley
Evans, Colo.	McCarthy	Sickles
Everett	McDowell	Sikes
Evins, Tenn.	McFall	Sisk
Fallon	McGrath	Slack
Farbstein	McVicker	Smith, Iowa
Farnsley	Machen	Stalbaum
Farnum	Mackay	Steed
Fasell	Mackie	Stephens
Felghan	Madden	Stratton
Flood	Mahon	Stubblefield
Flynt	Mathews	Sullivan
Fogarty	Meeds	Sweeney
Foley	Miller	Taylor
Ford,	Mills	Tenzer
William D.	Minish	Thompson, La.
Fountain	Mink	Thompson, N.J.
Fraser	Moeller	Thompson, Tex.
Friedel	Monagan	Todd
Fulton, Tenn.	Moorhead	Trimble
Fuqua	Morgan	Tunney
Gallagher	Morris	Tuten
Garmatz	Morrison	Udall
Gathings	Moss	Ullman
Gialmo	Multer	Van Deerin
Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.	Vanik
Gilbert	Murphy, N.Y.	Vigorito

Vivian	White, Idaho	Wright
Waggoner	White, Tex.	Yates
Walker, N. Mex.	Whitener	Young
Watts	Willis	
Weltner	Wolf	

NOT VOTING—34

Abernethy	Fisher	Pike
Ayres	Hagan, Ga.	Pirnie
Bonner	Harvey, Ind.	Rivers, Alaska
Bow	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Bray	Ichord	Staggers
Brown, Ohio	Kee	Teague, Tex.
Cameron	Keith	Thomas
Chamberlain	McEwen	Toll
Clausen,	Macdonald	Utt
Don H.	Martin, Ala.	Wilson,
Corman	Martin, Mass.	Charles H.
Findley	Matsunaga	Zablocki

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Toll against.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia for, with Mr. Zablocki against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Corman against.
Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. McEwen for, with Mr. Rivers of Alaska against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Macdonald against.

Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Findley for, with Mr. Cameron against.

Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Pike against.

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Matsunaga against.
Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Thomas against.

Mr. Keith for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. COLLIER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 217, nays 184, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—217

Adams	Daddario	Fulton, Tenn.
Addabbo	Daniels	Gallagher
Albert	Dawson	Garmatz
Anderson,	Delaney	Gialmo
Tenn.	Dent	Gibbons
Annunzio	Denton	Gilbert
Ashley	Diggs	Gilligan
Aspinall	Dingell	Gonzalez
Bandstra	Donohue	Grabowski
Barrett	Dow	Gray
Beckworth	Downing	Green, Oreg.
Bingham	Dulski	Green, Pa.
Blatnik	Duncan, Oreg.	Greigg
Boggs	Dyal	Grider
Boland	Edmondson	Griffiths
Bolling	Edwards, Calif.	Hagen, Calif.
Brademas	Evans, Colo.	Halpern
Brooks	Everett	Hamilton
Brown, Calif.	Evins, Tenn.	Hanley
Burke	Fallon	Hanna
Burton, Calif.	Farbstein	Hansen, Iowa
Byrne, Pa.	Farnsley	Hansen, Wash.
Cahill	Farnum	Hardy
Callan	Fasell	Hathaway
Carey	Felghan	Hawkins
Celler	Fino	Hays
Chief	Flood	Hechler
Clark	Fogarty	Helstoski
Clevenger	Foley	Hicks
Cohelan	Ford,	Hollifield
Conyers	William D.	Holland
Craley	Fraser	Horton
Culver	Friedel	Howard

Hungate	Morrison	Rostenkowski
Huot	Moss	Roush
Irwin	Multer	Roybal
Jacobs	Murphy, Ill.	Ryan
Jarman	Murphy, N.Y.	St Germain
Jennings	Natcher	St. Onge
Joelson	Nedzi	Schisler
Johnson, Calif.	Nix	Schmidhauser
Johnson, Okla.	O'Brien	Senner
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Ill.	Sickles
Jones, Mo.	O'Hara, Mich.	Sisk
Karsten	O'Konski	Smith, Iowa
Karth	Olsen, Mont.	Stalbaum
Kastenmeier	Olsen, Minn.	Steed
Kelly	O'Neill, Mass.	Stratton
Keogh	Ottinger	Stubblefield
King, Calif.	Patman	Sullivan
Kirwan	Patten	Sweeney
Kluczynski	Pepper	Thompson, La.
Krebs	Perkins	Thompson, N.J.
Leggett	Philbin	Thompson, Tex.
Lindsay	Pickle	Todd
Long, Md.	Powell	Trimble
Love	Price	Tunney
McCarthy	Pucinski	Tupper
McDowell	Purcell	Udall
McFall	Race	Ullman
McGrath	Redlin	Van Deerlin
Machen	Reid, N.Y.	Vanik
Mackie	Resnick	Vigorito
Madden	Reuss	Vivian
Meeds	Rhodes, Pa.	Walker, N. Mex.
Miller	Rodino	Watts
Mills	Rogers, Colo.	White, Idaho
Minish	Ronan	White, Tex.
Mink	Roncallo	Willis
Minshall	Rooney, N.Y.	Wolf
Monagan	Rooney, Pa.	Yates
Moorhead	Roosevelt	Young
Morgan	Rosenthal	

NAYS—184

Abbtitt	Flynt	O'Neal, Ga.
Adair	Ford, Gerald R.	Passman
Anderson, Ill.	Fountain	Pelly
Andrews,	Frelinghuysen	Poage
George W.	Fulton, Pa.	Poff
Andrews,	Fuqua	Pool
Glenn	Gathings	Quile
Andrews,	Gettys	Quillen
N. Dak.	Goodell	Randall
Arends	Griffin	Reid, Ill.
Ashbrook	Gross	Reifel
Ashmore	Grover	Reinecke
Baldwin	Gubser	Rhodes, Ariz.
Baring	Gurney	Rivers, S.C.
Bates	Haley	Roberts
Battin	Hall	Robison
Belcher	Halleck	Rogers, Fla.
Bell	Hansen, Idaho	Rogers, Tex.
Bennett	Harris	Roudebush
Berry	Harsha	Rumsfeld
Betts	Harvey, Mich.	Satterfield
Bolton	Henderson	Saylor
Brock	Herlong	Schneebeli
Broomfield	Hosmer	Schwelker
Broyhill, N.C.	Hull	Scott
Broyhill, Va.	Hutchinson	Secrest
Buchanan	Johnson, Pa.	Selden
Burleson	Jonas	ShIPLEY
Burton, Utah	King, N.Y.	Shriver
Byrnes, Wis.	King, Utah	Sikes
Cabell	Kornegay	Skubitz
Callaway	Kunkel	Slack
Carter	Laird	Smith, Calif.
Casey	Landrum	Smith, N.Y.
Cederberg	Langen	Smith, Va.
Clancy	Latta	Springer
Clawson, Del.	Lennon	Stafford
Cleveland	Lipscomb	Stanton
Collier	Long, La.	Stephens
Colmer	McClory	Talcott
Conable	McCulloch	Taylor
Conte	McDade	Teague, Calif.
Cooley	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Corbett	McVicker	Thomson, Wis.
Cramer	MacGregor	Tuck
Cunningham	Mackay	Tuten
Curtin	Mahon	Waggonner
Curtis	Malliard	Walker, Miss.
Dague	Marsh	Watkins
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Nebr.	Watson
Davis, Wis.	Mathias	Weltner
de la Garza	Matthews	Whalley
Derwinski	May	Whitener
Devine	Michel	Whitten
Dickinson	Mize	Widnall
Dole	Moeller	Williams
Dorn	Moore	Wilson, Bob
Dowdy	Morris	Wright
Duncan, Tenn.	Morse	Wyatt
Dwyer	Morton	Wyder
Edwards, Ala.	Mosher	Younger
Ellsworth	Murray	
Erlenborn	Nelsen	

NOT VOTING—33

Abernethy	Fisher	Pike
Ayres	Hagan, Ga.	Pirnie
Bonner	Harvey, Ind.	Rivers, Alaska
Bow	Hébert	Scheuer
Bray	Ichord	Staggers
Brown, Ohio	Kee	Thomas
Cameron	Keith	Toll
Chamberlain	McEwen	Utt
Clausen,	Macdonald	Wilson,
Don H.	Martin, Ala.	Charles H.
Corman	Martin, Mass.	Zablocki
Findley	Matsunaga	

So the bill was passed.
 The Clerk announced the following pairs:
 On this vote:
 Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Hébert against.
 Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Abernethy against.
 Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.
 Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Findley against.
 Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. McEwen against.
 Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Fisher against.
 Mr. Thomas for, with Mr. Keith against.
 Mr. Pike for, with Mr. Martin of Alabama against.
 Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Bray against.
 Mr. Cameron for, with Mr. Utt against.
 Mr. Matsunaga for, with Mr. Don H. Clausen against.

Until further notice:
 Mr. Bonner with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Ichord with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.
 The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?
 There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify for the RECORD that on rollcall No. 142 on H.R. 6927 concerning the Department of Housing, I was present but did not vote, because I felt I had a possible direct personal interest in the legislation and, under rule 8 of the House, I was prohibited from voting.
 I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be placed in the RECORD immediately after rollcall No. 142.
 The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?
 There was no objection.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 8371, an act to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and

agree to the conference asked by the Senate.
 The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?
 The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, KEOGH, BYRNES of Wisconsin, CURTIS, and UTT.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House on the bill H.R. 8371 have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.
 The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?
 Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the bill to which the gentleman from Arkansas refers?
 Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will yield, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965.
 Mr. GROSS. The same bill?
 Mr. MILLS. The same bill.
 Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.
 The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?
 There was no objection.

NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report 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, 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 California?
 There was no objection.
 The Clerk read the statement.
 The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 514)
 The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, 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 3, 7, and 9.
 That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, and 36, 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 to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: "\$5,190,396,200"; 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 to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: "\$4,536,971,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: "\$43,700,000"; 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 to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: "\$62,376,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(2) Electronics Research Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts, \$5,000,000";

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: "\$591,048,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: "\$57,376,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH KARTH,
KEN HECHLER,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
JAMES G. FULTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
STUART SYMINGTON,
JOHN STENNIS,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
LEN B. JORDAN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Total appropriations authorized by the Senate amendments were \$5,196,826,350. This represented an increase over the House bill of \$12,981,500. As a result of the conference this figure was adjusted so that total appropriations authorized are \$5,190,396,200.

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 are conforming amendments re-

fecting the total revised authorizations resulting from actions of the conferees.

Amendment No. 3: NASA requested a total of \$2,997,385,000 to fund the Apollo program. The House reduced this amount by \$30,000,000. The Senate amendment No. 3 restored \$6,000,000 of this reduction applying the net Senate reduction of \$24,000,000 specifically to the Apollo extension systems program. The Senate conferees receded and agreed to the amount authorized by the House. The total authorization is \$2,967,385,000 for the Apollo program.

Amendment No. 4: NASA requested \$172,100,000 for the physics and astronomy program. The House bill reduced this amount to \$160,500,000 representing reductions in the orbiting astronomical observatory project and the orbiting geophysical observatory project. The Senate amendment No. 4 concurred in the reduction in the OAO project, but restored the full amount of the House reduction in the OGO project. The amount of the restoration was \$5,400,000.

The House reduction in the OGO project was associated with the seventh spacecraft in the series, and constituted a deferral of funding for that spacecraft. The House position was based upon the belief that the present OGO launch schedule appeared overly ambitious, and that improved reliability of spacecraft should provide for longer operating lifetime in orbit and correspondingly fewer launches. The Senate restoration was based upon its belief in the importance of the OGO project to the Apollo astronauts, and the requirement that as much information as possible be acquired regarding the space environment between the earth and the moon prior to an attempt at manned lunar landing. The managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the Senate restoration. The total amount authorized for the physics and astronomy program is \$165,900,000, of which \$31,700,000 is authorized for the OGO project.

Amendment No. 5: NASA requested a total of \$63,600,000 for the launch vehicle development program, of which \$4,000,000 was requested for supporting research and technology. The House reduced this \$4,000,000 request by \$3,000,000 on the basis that the activity appeared to be more properly within the province of NASA's Office of Advanced Research and Technology rather than the Office of Space Science and Applications. The Senate restored this \$3,000,000 reduction in order that studies within the Office of Space Science and Applications might be continued so as to strengthen and improve the composition and capabilities of launch vehicles. Managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration of \$3,000,000 in this category. The full amount of NASA's request is therefore authorized.

Amendment No. 6: NASA requested a total \$194,500,000 for the launch vehicle procurement program. This request was reduced by the House bill in the amount of \$15,000,000. This reduction represented a \$15,000,000 across-the-board cut based upon unobligated balances remaining in this account at the end of previous fiscal years. The Senate bill concurred in this reduction.

In addition, the managers on the part of the House and Senate were in essential agreement on a further reduction of from \$10 to \$10.8 million within the Centaur project, although for different reasons. Based upon recent information received from NASA that advance procurement of Atlas-Centaur launch vehicles in excess of the number previously approved by the Senate is considered crucial to maintaining the Surveyor flight schedule, and that uprating of the Atlas SLV-3 to the proposed SLV-3X configuration is also considered essential to assuring success of the Surveyor missions, the managers on the part of both the House

and Senate agreed that NASA should not be precluded from undertaking these activities, and that, therefore, the reduction of \$10.8 million should be administered by NASA within the total Centaur procurement. Consequently, the total authorization for launch vehicle procurement is \$178,700,000.

Amendment No. 7: The Senate reduced the amount authorized by the House for nuclear electric systems by \$6,000,000. These funds were for the continuation of the SNAP-8 nuclear electric power system. The House has strongly urged NASA over the past years to maintain a vigorous program of research in this area, both for future nuclear electric rocket systems and auxiliary nuclear power devices. Nevertheless NASA had planned to terminate this project at a critical stage in its development. The House provided funds to continue the work. The managers on the part of the Senate agreed, however, to the restoration providing a total of \$33,000,000 for nuclear electric systems. The conferees stipulated (1) that the SNAP-8 project shall be continued and (2) that the funds authorized for SNAP-8 shall be utilized for no other purpose.

Amendment No. 8: The Senate reduced the amount authorized by the House for Chemical Propulsion by \$15,000,000. NASA had planned to terminate the development of the M-1 liquid-oxygen-liquid-hydrogen engine and had not requested funds for its continuation. The outstanding limitation to this Nation's ability to launch large payloads has been the lack of large boosters, both liquid and solid fueled. The House has continued to press for increased research effort in chemical propulsion to overcome this booster deficiency. The House bill provided \$15,000,000 in the fiscal year 1966 authorization to continue the M-1 development since to terminate the project at this time would not take advantage of funds that had been expended to date. The managers on the part of the Senate agreed to the restoration of \$7,500,000 for the continuation of the M-1 development. The managers on the part of the House and Senate stipulated that this amount shall be utilized only for the continued development of the M-1 engine. The total amount authorized for chemical propulsion is \$43,700,000.

Amendment No. 9: The House bill authorized \$242,321,000 for tracking and data acquisition. The Senate bill increased this amount by \$3,879,000. The Senate conferees receded and agreed to the amount authorized by the House.

Amendment No. 10: The Senate bill reduced the amount authorized by the House for technology utilization by \$250,000. The House conferees receded on this item and agreed to the amount authorized by the Senate. The resulting authorization of \$4,750,000 sustains this program at the same level as last year.

Amendment No. 11: This amendment is a conforming amendment reflecting the total revised construction of facilities authorization resulting from the actions of the conferees.

Amendment No. 12: NASA requested authorization of \$10,000,000 to fund construction at the Electronics Research Center. The House bill deleted this amount. The Senate amendment reversed the House action and restored the whole amount. Subsequent to the House action, new information has shown that considerable progress in the negotiations by which NASA would acquire the site for the Center could make the land available before the end of fiscal year 1966. The managers on the part of the House were not convinced, however, that the full amount of \$10,000,000 should be restored in view of the fact that the negotiations would probably not be concluded until close to the end of the fiscal year. The managers on the part of the House, therefore, receded and agreed to authorize \$5,000,000 for this item.

Amendment No. 15: NASA requested \$8,595,000 for construction of facilities at the John F. Kennedy Space Center. The House bill reduced this amount by \$740,600, all in the manned space flight area. The Senate amendment restored \$340,600 for this item. The managers on the part of the House agreed that the House reduction was too severe and receded and agreed to the restoration of the funds recommended by the Senate amendment. The resulting authorization is \$8,195,000.

Amendment No. 19: NASA requested \$4,400,000 for construction of facilities at the Manned Spacecraft Center. The House bill reduced this amount by \$446,700. The Senate amendment restored about 50 percent of this reduction, or \$226,700. The managers on the part of the House agreed that the restored funds would be useful in supporting the manned space flight program and receded and agreed to the restoration of these funds. The resulting authorization is \$4,180,000.

Amendment No. 21: NASA requested \$4,776,000 for construction of facilities at the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center. The House bill reduced this amount by \$484,900. The Senate amendment resulted in a further reduction of \$1,981,650, by virtue of accepting a portion of the House reduction on certain projects and by eliminating two complete project proposals. The managers on the part of the House agreed to keep, to a minimum, the construction of additional facilities for engine testing, particularly in view of the operational status of the Mississippi Test Facility, and receded and agreed to the Senate amendment. The resulting authorization is \$2,309,450.

Amendment No. 23: NASA requested \$300,000 for the construction of a storm drainage system at the Michoud Plant. The House bill reduced this request by \$30,500. The Senate amendment restored \$15,250. The managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the Senate restoration. The resulting authorization is \$284,750.

Amendment No. 25: NASA requested \$2,121,000 for the construction of facilities at the Mississippi Test Facility. The House bill reduced this amount by \$215,400. The Senate amendment restored \$4,850. The managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the Senate restoration. The resulting authorization is \$1,910,450.

Amendment No. 28: NASA requested \$21,694,000 for the construction of facilities at locations other than at NASA centers. The House bill reduced this amount by \$1,822,600. The Senate amendment proposed the restoration of \$311,300, or one-half of that part of the House reduction which was directed at projects for engine-testing facilities at three locations. The managers on the part of the House agreed to the desirability of maintaining a slightly higher level of engine testing capability and receded and agreed to the Senate amendment. The resulting authorization is \$20,182,700.

Amendment No. 30: NASA requested \$7,500,000 for Facility Planning and Design. The House reduced the request by \$284,300, an adjustment made with regard to future construction in support of the Manned Space Flight Program. The Senate further reduced the request to \$5,000,000.

During its initial review, the House recognized that the request included \$2,050,000 for advanced design of facilities in support of programs which are not firm, but may become critical requirements during fiscal year 1966. Although the Senate amendment is \$166,000 short of the authorization needed to meet firm requirements, the conferees agreed that sufficient flexibility is afforded NASA from prior years' unfunded authorization to meet critical requirements should the need arise. Accordingly, the managers on the part of the House receded to the Senate position, and agreed to a total authorization of \$5,000,000.

Amendment No. 31: NASA requested an authorization of \$609,400,000 for Administrative Operations. The House approved \$586,048,850, amounting to a reduction of \$23,351,150. The Senate amendment numbered 31 restored \$10,051,150. The managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to limit the restoration to \$5,000,000 making a net reduction of \$18,351,150, and the total amount for Administrative Operations, \$591,048,850.

Amendment No. 32: NASA requested a new provision (section 1e) to permit the award of service type contracts for maintenance and operation of facilities and other services for periods extending beyond the end of the fiscal year for which the administrative operations funds are authorized. The House agreed with the NASA request, but imposed a requirement on NASA for an annual report to assure that adequate controls are exercised. The Senate amendment imposed an additional restriction which limits the period of such contracts to 12 months. Since both measures are intended to preclude unwarranted use of this authority, the conferees agreed upon the further restriction contained in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 35: This amendment is a conforming amendment reflecting the total revised construction of facilities authorization, less facility planning and design, resulting from the actions of the conferees.

Amendment No. 36: The House bill contained language stating that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to the geographic distribution of research and development funds whenever feasible, and that NASA should explore ways and means of distributing its R. & D. funds to achieve this end. The Senate amendment modified the House language to avoid the implication that present Governmental procurement philosophy, derived as a result of years of experience, will be materially altered by an overriding consideration being given to geographic distribution of Government funds. The House recedes.

All other numbered amendments represent line changes only.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH E. KARTH,
KEN HECHLER,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
JAMES G. FULTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report before the House at this time represents the results of our conference with the Senate on H.R. 7717 to authorize appropriations to NASA for the next fiscal year.

The Senate amended the House bill by increasing the total authorization in the amount of \$12,981,500.

Now, that is all we had in conference, about one-quarter of 1 percent of the total authorization.

As a result of the conference the Senate managers agreed to decrease this figure by a little over \$6 million and thus the total authorization results in a figure of \$5,190,396,200.

I think the statement of managers pretty well sums up the action of the conferees, but I would particularly like to mention two programs which the House was successful in keeping in the bill.

The House bill provided \$6 million for the SNAP-8 nuclear electric power system program, but the Senate amendment did not authorize this program to

be continued, and thus it would have had to be discontinued.

The House has strongly urged NASA over the past years to maintain a vigorous research program in this area both for future electric rocket systems and auxiliary nuclear power devices.

Nevertheless, NASA had planned to terminate this project at a critical stage in its development.

The managers on the part of the Senate agreed, however, to the restoration of sufficient funds to continue this project in the next fiscal year.

The M-1 liquid-oxygen-hydrogen engine is the second program that NASA wanted to terminate, and the Senate amendment had agreed with NASA by including no funds for this engine for the next fiscal year.

Now, I believe everyone here knows that the outstanding limitation to this Nation's ability to launch large payloads has been the lack of large boosters both liquid and solid fueled.

The House has continued to press for increased research effort in chemical propulsion to overcome this booster deficiency.

I am, therefore, happy to report that the Senate receded and agreed to restore \$7.5 million for the continuation of the M-1 engine development program.

Therefore, there will be funds authorized to keep this development going for the next fiscal year.

I should next point out that the conferees agreed to authorize \$5 million for construction at the Electronics Research Center.

NASA had originally asked for \$10 million but the House bill deleted this amount.

The Senate amendment reversed the House action and restored the whole amount.

Subsequent to the House action new information has shown that considerable progress in the negotiations by which NASA would acquire the site for the center could make the land available before the end of fiscal year 1966.

Even recognizing that NASA has \$13.9 million in unused authorization for construction at the Electronics Research Center, the House conferees agreed to restore \$5 million.

The master planning and design is already completed for the Electronics Research Center, and as soon as title is secured NASA wishes to start construction at the earliest possible time.

We agreed with the Senate that we did not wish to take the chance of delaying the construction and, therefore, acceded to the Senate request to restore the \$5 million.

The last matter I would like to discuss is the language which was in the House bill stating that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to the geographic distribution of research and development funds whenever feasible, and that NASA should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds to achieve this end.

The Senate modified this language to avoid any implication that present Government procurement philosophy derived as a result of years of experience will be

materially altered by an overriding consideration being given to geographic distribution of Government funds.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH].

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our committee referred in the latter part of his statement to an amendment which was included in the House bill that I thought was a very gentle, nudging amendment, which would serve the national interest by causing the administration to explore ways and means of distributing our research and development contracts on a geographical basis. The Senate took the very substance out of that amendment by deleting the word "geographic", and if you will refer to the conference report, page 7, amendment No. 26, I believe I can show you what I am talking about by reading, rather than speaking:

The House bill contained language stating that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to the geographic distribution of research and development funds whenever feasible, and that NASA should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds to achieve this end.

The Senate amendment modified the House language to avoid the implication that present governmental procurement philosophy, derived as a result of years of experience, will be materially altered by an overriding consideration being given to geographic distribution of Government funds.

To me that is a ridiculous reason for rejecting this amendment.

First. It was not the intent of the amendment to cause this to become an overriding consideration but we did feel it should be a consideration when it came to the distribution of funds.

Second. The House amendment directed itself to research and development and not procurement. If we would look at the procurement figures themselves, it would be cause enough to say the path that we have been traveling has been the wrong path. When one State of this Union can receive 52.4 percent of procurement funds of one agency, then I say that something is wrong and it is about time we look after the national interest and see to it that other States receive the benefit of one of the greatest scientific programs that this Nation has ever seen. However, this was not directed at procurement. It was directed at the geographical distribution of research and development funds. This same State—one State—receives 38 percent of NASA's research and development funds. The research and development in a project is the very beginning of the procurement process. It is the very beginning of the development of hardware and the creation of factors and other instruments to implement the space program.

It seems to me that we could well pay attention to the distribution of research and development funds and help these research poor sections of the country develop the potential they have in their area of the country.

Mr. Speaker, to implement this belief, I am going to introduce in this House a joint resolution which will authorize a Government industry conference on the

question of geographic distribution of Federal research and development funds. I hope it will receive the support of many of you who do represent research poor areas of the country in order that we might pay attention to what I believe is a growing national problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to advise Members of the House that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] expects to call up tomorrow under unanimous consent the bill, H.R. 4260, the Real Estate Investment Trusts Act, which has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

It is also expected that on tomorrow the conference report on the excise tax bill will be taken up.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it the intention of the leadership to conclude today with the two public works bills from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the bill from the Committee on House Administration?

Mr. ALBERT. We very much hope that we can consider those bills today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER].

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the difficulties that go into the making of a conference report and the give and take that must take place between the Members of the House and the Members of the other body. It is not my purpose here to criticize idly the compromise that must be made. But in reading this conference report, two matters stand out in my mind and they deserve some further explanation because of what I know about these matters since they were specifically discussed in the subcommittee on which I serve in the House.

The first of these matters concerns the compromise that was arrived at regarding the M-1 engine. The House contrary to the wishes of the President and NASA decided to place money back in the budget this year for the further development of the M-1 engine. When we were considering this in committee and having our hearings, we were told that the absolute minimum at which this program could proceed with any good results at all to the Government was at the level of \$15 million and that anything less than that amount would produce a program that was in effect of no value. Now we have a program, as the result of this conference report coming to us, we have a program funded at the level of \$7.5 million.

This appears to me to be a program of the type the country does not need, be-

cause it is likely to give us no good at all.

I should like to ask either the chairman of the subcommittee or of the committee how he can justify that type of compromise, in view of the testimony taken before our subcommittee?

Mr. MILLER. My position is exactly that of the gentleman from New York. I would have liked to have seen \$15 million there. I would have liked to have seen more than that. Unfortunately, there is another body, and there are people just as potent as the people who serve here.

We took this, because it is enough to keep the program going for 1 year and not to dissipate the very fine group which is there or to lose the momentum and know-how. I regret the compromise as much as the gentleman does.

Mr. WYDLER. The difficulty with that is that with \$15 million, we were told, we could get some good from the program. With \$7.5 million, we are told we cannot get any good from the program. The question is, why put in \$7.5 million at all? Why not drop it altogether or use the money where it will do some good?

Mr. MILLER. Because we can get some good out of it. There is still the need for this engine. Although this will slow down the engine and in the long run will cost us more, nevertheless, we will not scrap the \$100 million or more we have in it. I am hopeful that next year we can get more money to do the job and to do it right.

Mr. WYDLER. I should like to discuss further a portion of the report in regard to the Electronics Research Center. I believe this is a most important matter.

Although I realize there is little time left to discuss this, I believe it should be discussed by the House.

The fact of the matter is that the Electronics Research Center program has slipped 1 year, yet in spite of that we are being asked to continue to appropriate money for it as though it were going on as originally planned. This is not a logical or rational way to approach the problem.

The House, after hearing the testimony, took out all the money for this project from this year's budget. The fact of the matter is that not \$1 of this amount of money will be able to be spent in the next fiscal year, yet the Senate insists on putting it in.

I only want to make the point that the program has been handled in what I consider to be a very abnormal way since its inception—in this House, by the other body, and by the Congress in general. I have been preparing a report, which I hesitated to submit to Congress for numerous reasons, but which I have decided, after seeing another \$5 million put in this program for what apparently is no valid reason, that I am going to make to the Congress in the very near future.

I should like to ask the chairman, in closing, what "new information," as described in the conference report the Senate gave the House to cause it to add the \$5 million to the program this year.

Mr. MILLER. After the gentleman has rather severely criticized the committee and the chairman for his handling of this matter, I do not know, after all our discussion, that answering the question will save the gentleman's conscience or help him any. I would say that the Senate had before us some information that the matter was coming along much faster and that they will be able to get into it much sooner than they previously believed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I would agree with the gentleman from New York and perhaps with the gentleman from Indiana that the report is not as good as I would like to see it be but, after all, there are two Houses in the Congress of the United States. While the report, in my opinion, is not as good as the bill that passed the House, still it is a matter of a compromise which was made between the two Houses in an effort to reach an agreement so we could have a bill at all.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I asked for this time—and I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding this time to me—is to call to the attention of the House a very important program which may be subject to cancellation by NASA. As you will recall, both Houses authorized some \$25.6 million for the Advanced Orbiting Solar Observatory, which is a very important program, and a second generation spacecraft which will give us a great deal of information that is extremely important to man's future space flights particularly as it relates to the 11-year sunspot cycle and the radiation effects of sun eruptions on man's space flights. It is my understanding now, however, that to take care of certain contingencies which might arise during the fiscal year, NASA is seriously considering cancelling this program out and using these funds for other purposes. Because there were no differences between the Senate and House bills, obviously, of course, no language could be put into the statement of the managers for fear of raising a point of order. Nonetheless I have discussed this with the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee, and he has proposed to write a letter to NASA suggesting if the AOSO project is eliminated after the authorization and appropriation bills have given the agency some \$25 million for that purpose, the money should not be spent for other purposes. So, just to inform the House that we do have this intention and that we hope this action will save a very important program, I make this statement.

I thank the gentleman from California for yielding this time to me.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and my fellow managers on the conference committee for this conference report.

As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH] so well pointed out, there are many features of this conference report which each one of us individually may not have liked. There are certainly some features of it that I felt definitely could have been improved. I, too, would have liked to have had \$15 million in this conference report for supporting continuing development of the M-1 liquid-hydrogen-liquid-oxygen engine. Yet the fact remains, with \$7.5 million, as the gentleman from California pointed out, we can keep the team together to work on this development. We can carry forward the component development of this very important project, admittedly at a low level, but the important point is we can continue. I am very pleased that the conferees decided to support the full \$6 million for the SNAP-8 nuclear electric system.

I am also pleased that we did approve sufficient funds to authorize the 260-inch solid propellant motor, without limiting language. Congress displayed commendable initiative in exercising its independent judgment in support of these three vital projects. I believe that history will prove the correctness of our judgment.

All in all, I believe this conference report is the best that can be obtained under the circumstances to continue our Nation's strength in space.

I share the feeling that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] has expressed on the need for better geographic distribution of study and research contracts as distinguished from hardware procurement contracts. I certainly hope that the House will pay particular attention to this issue in the future.

I must say that the brief references to this issue in the statement of managers do not accurately reflect an objective account of the legislative history of this item, in my opinion. The statement of managers contains the following sentence: "The Senate amendment modified the House language to avoid the implication that present governmental procurement philosophy, derived as a result of years of experience, will be materially altered by an overriding consideration

being given to geographic distribution of Government funds." In the first place, Mr. Speaker, it is a gross distortion of the House position to state that the geographic distribution amendment unanimously adopted by the House came anywhere near stipulating that geographic distribution must be an "overriding consideration." There was nothing at all mandatory in the House language. It was a very mild and advisory provision, which merely stated that ways and means should be explored and action taken whenever feasible. It merely indicated that some thought ought to be given to this subject, and surely none of us should take a firm position against thought.

There was an excellent colloquy on this subject in the other body between the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. ANDERSON, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIER, in which the gentleman from New Mexico, the chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences stated:

It is the intent of the committee to see that the handling of these funds for research by the NASA organization should involve attention to geographic distribution. There is no question about that.

This statement was made on June 2, 1965, at page 11816 of the temporary RECORD. I would hope that the above statement is read along with the statement of managers in reviewing the legislative history of this provision.

Mr. Speaker, we are making progress in this respect. I have no doubt that additional progress will be made along this line in the coming years. For in order to preserve the strength of the entire Nation in this area of increasing importance, it is inevitable that more serious consideration will be given to these matters which we are discussing.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], the ranking member or the acting ranking member on the committee, to close debate.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, let us look at the budgetary record made by this Congress on the NASA authorization for fiscal year 1966:

	Budget request	House approved	Senate approved	June 10, 1965, conference committee approved
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
Gemini.....	\$242,100,000	\$242,100,000	\$242,100,000	\$242,100,000
Apollo.....	2,997,385,000	2,967,385,000	2,973,385,000	2,967,385,000
Advanced missions.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Physics and astronomy.....	172,100,000	160,500,000	165,900,000	165,900,000
Lunar and planetary exploration.....	215,615,000	215,115,000	213,115,000	213,115,000
Bioscience.....	31,500,000	31,500,000	31,500,000	31,500,000
Meteorological satellites.....	42,700,000	42,700,000	42,700,000	42,700,000
Communication satellites.....	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Applications technology satellites.....	28,700,000	28,700,000	28,700,000	28,700,000
Launch vehicle development.....	63,600,000	60,600,000	63,600,000	63,600,000
Launch vehicle procurement.....	194,500,000	179,500,000	178,700,000	178,700,000
Space vehicle systems.....	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
Electronics systems.....	34,400,000	34,400,000	34,400,000	34,400,000
Human factor systems.....	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000
Basic research.....	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
Nuclear-electric systems.....	27,000,000	33,000,000	27,000,000	33,000,000
Nuclear rockets.....	58,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000
Solar and chemical power.....	14,200,000	14,200,000	14,200,000	14,200,000
Chemical propulsion.....	30,000,000	51,200,000	36,200,000	43,700,000
Aeronautics.....	42,200,000	42,200,000	42,200,000	42,200,000
Tracking and data acquisition.....	246,200,000	242,321,000	245,200,000	242,321,000
Sustaining university program.....	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,550,000	46,000,000
Technology utilization.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	4,750,000	4,750,000
Total.....	4,575,900,000	4,537,121,000	4,533,350,000	4,536,971,000

	Budget request	House approved	Senate approved	June 10, 1965, conference committee approved
CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES				
Ames Research Center.....	\$2,740,000	\$2,740,000	\$2,740,000	\$2,740,000
Electronics Research Center.....	10,000,000	deleted	10,000,000	5,000,000
Goddard Space Flight Center.....	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
John F. Kennedy Space Center.....	8,595,000	7,854,400	8,195,000	8,195,000
Langley Research Center.....	8,250,000	8,250,000	8,250,000	8,250,000
Lewis Research Center.....	867,000	867,000	867,000	867,000
Manned Spacecraft Center.....	4,400,000	3,953,300	4,180,000	4,180,000
George C. Marshall Space Flight Center.....	4,776,000	4,291,100	2,309,450	2,309,450
Michoud Plant.....	300,000	259,500	254,750	254,750
Mississippi Test Facility.....	2,121,000	1,905,600	1,910,450	1,910,450
Wallops Station.....	1,048,000	1,048,000	1,048,000	1,048,000
Various locations.....	21,694,000	19,871,400	20,182,700	20,182,700
Facility planning and design.....	7,500,000	7,215,700	5,000,000	5,000,000
Total.....	74,700,000	60,675,000	67,376,350	62,376,350
Administrative operations.....	609,400,000	586,048,850	596,100,000	591,048,850
Grand total.....	5,260,000,000	5,183,844,850	5,196,826,350	5,190,396,200

A summary of the conference results is as follows:

For research and development NASA asked for \$4,575,900,000. The conference approved \$4,536,971,000. This is \$38,929,000 less than the NASA request, \$150,000 less than approved by the House, and \$3,621,000 more than approved by the Senate.

NASA asked authorization of \$74,700,000 for the construction of facilities. The conference agreed to \$62,376,350. This is \$12,323,650 less than was requested by NASA, \$5 million less than approved by the Senate, and \$1,701,350 more than approved by the House.

For administrative operations, NASA requested authorization for \$609,400,000. The conferees approved \$591,048,850. This is \$18,351,150 less than the amount NASA asked for, \$5,051,150 less than approved by the Senate, and \$5 million more than approved by the House.

The conference agreed upon a total fiscal year 1966 NASA budget of \$5,190,396,200 which is \$69,603,800 less than the NASA request of \$5,260 million, and is \$6,430,150 less than approved by the Senate, and is \$6,551,350 more than approved by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to report to the House that we of the House conferees stood firm as hard as we could. On some things, the House conference committee met with a stone wall. I think that is our chairman was trying to say. The only thing that could be done was to compromise.

On the Electronics Research Center at Cambridge, Mass., we arrived at a 50-50 compromise. Let us face it. The Senate gave half and we gave half.

On some of the things where we could not reach agreement, we stood up for the House side. We just had to say "All right. You give half and we will give half."

I would like to report to the House that we have arrived at a very acceptable figure. The House had approved \$5,183,844,850. When we finished the conference we were only \$6.5 million higher than the House figure.

Out of a total original NASA budget request of \$5,260 million, we ended up with \$6.5 million above the House figure. I must say to the Speaker, and to the gentleman from New York, who was questioning us, that when we can come up with a conference total that is one-

tenth of 1 percent different from our figure, we are doing pretty well. When we are within one-tenth of 1 percent of the House figure out of a total of over \$5,183 million, the House obviously did some pretty good fighting.

I would like to say again that the House committee total figure was accepted almost entirely. We were able to hold the research and development fund level. We on the House side cut administrative operations by \$10 million.

We likewise reduced the facilities request about \$12 million from the request of NASA. The amazing thing is that we were able to hold the research and development figure within \$150,000 of what the House believed it should be. The research and development figures, to me, are the most important.

I would agree with the position of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] and others that, without disturbing NASA's basic procurement policies, we must try to get better geographic distribution of space contracts. I know that NASA officials are working in that direction. There should be more pressure to get broader distribution.

Likewise on the matter of the geographical distribution of people who have masters' and doctors' degrees, we must see to it that they are not drained from certain areas of the country and centered in a few places which will then have the opportunity to advance and progress above other parts of the country.

One other thing I would like to say is that we must progress on propellants. On the House committee we emphasized research and development on propellants because the Russians admittedly have been ahead of us on the big boosters. The only way you can overcome that lead is by having the propellants to give the big push.

We had emphasized research and development on liquid and solid propellants, and the nuclear fuels as well. We in the House committee feel that we must look ahead 3 to 5 to 7 years or more and see that the basic research and development in propulsion is done, without a particular reference to specific missions. Otherwise, we will end up at a blank wall.

For example, none of us is using the same gasoline that we used in 1940 because we now have additives to give us

high energy. In the space business, so far, we have been using mostly the fuels that were developed in 1936, or before, such as liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen.

We badly need earth-storable and space-storable fuels. We likewise need upper stage fuels that are light, easy to carry, and will require no particular insulation for space. Unless we have this kind of a development, I am afraid we will fall behind.

I will include later a statement on di-boron and oxygen di-fluoride to show we are making substantial progress on some of the fuels that we had said to the House should be developed.

I say to the House that this is a good conference report. It is not all we want, but it is within one-tenth of 1 percent of what our figure was. That is pretty good.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks made a few moments ago by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

I would like to ask the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], and perhaps the gentleman can enlighten the membership as to what the new information is that is discussed in the conference report regarding the Electronics Research Center which shows considerable progress. What is that?

Mr. HECHLER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield to me, I shall be glad to answer the question of my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER].

The schedule is proceeding very well. I have a letter in my possession from Mr. William L. Slayton, Urban Renewal Commissioner, which incorporates a copy of the announcement of approval of a \$401,200 Federal advance to enable the Redevelopment Authority at Cambridge, Mass., to begin a survey for preliminary activities.

Mr. WYDLER. If the gentleman will yield further, I am talking about new information, since the time the House acted. This is supposed to be since that time.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. In the conference, we found that NASA is moving ahead much faster and they are going to be able to begin construction on schedule. This was in doubt at the time this matter was pending before the House. This authorizes only \$5 million for the Electronics Center at Cambridge out of \$10 million that was asked.

The gentleman asked, "Why \$7.5 million for the M-1 engine." This was the best we could do to keep the program proceeding on a technology development basis. The \$15 million approved by the House was also based on a technology development program. That has not changed. The \$7.5 million only means the pace of the program will be stretched out, and the research team and the tech-

nology already achieved will be kept intact.

The results of our conference with the Senate on H.R. 7717 are sound and are based upon intensive study and evaluation on the part of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics during its many weeks of authorization hearings.

NASA asked authorization of \$5,260 million. The House reduced that request by \$76,155,150, making a total House authorization of \$5,183,844,850.

The Senate reduced the NASA authorization request by \$63,173,650 for a total of \$5,196,826,350.

The difference between the two bills was \$12,981,500, with the House being that much lower than the Senate.

I am convinced that the House and Senate were so close in the amounts they were willing to authorize that the budget now available to NASA is the best one we could achieve.

A principal factor in the original submission by NASA was the elimination from the NASA programs of the SNAP-8 nuclear auxiliary power program, the M-1 liquid-oxygen-liquid-hydrogen engine program, and the 260-inch solid fueled program.

These three programs were begun by NASA based upon a need that was urgent and supported by technical logic that was accepted by the Congress.

Million of dollars have been expended already on these three programs.

They had been brought to advanced stages of completion, certainly 50 percent.

These were deleted by the administration. It is very difficult to understand the logic supporting this action.

The U.S. people have supported wholeheartedly our space program. The Congress over the past 7 years have supported the NASA program by substantial vote.

The House committee from its very beginning recognized that the key to future success and superiority in space depends upon vigorous research and development of chemical and nuclear energies.

Our continued inability to match the Soviet Union in orbiting heavy payloads—5 tons or more—is still a source of embarrassment to us.

It seems unthinkable that we should default in programs that were designed to match or exceed the Soviet Union's capability.

Hence the House authorized \$15 million for the continued development of the M-1 engine; \$6.2 million for the 260-inch solid engine; and \$6 million for the SNAP-8.

In contrast, the Senate did not authorize in their bill money for the M-1 nor for the SNAP-8.

The conference report speaks for itself. The managers on the part of the House prevailed in their philosophy.

They achieved in conference an acceptance on the part of the Senate that these programs must be supported and carried on to a successful conclusion.

I know of no other way to maintain and preserve this philosophy than to be first in space, and the only way to be first in space is to have the propulsion power to meet our future requirements in space.

This requires research and development in propulsion, especially high-energy products such as boron, diborane, hydrazene compounds and many others, and to develop the engines to utilize these products to the best advantage.

Three years ago, when the committee was considering the fiscal year 1963 budget authorization, I proposed that \$1 million for research in high-energy space-storable propellants, such as boron, flourine, and hydrazene compounds, and \$3 million for research in solid rocket fuel technology be added to the NASA budget. The House Committee agreed. In conference, the Senate also agreed and \$4 million was authorized for research in chemical propulsion to meet the requirements of future deep-space missions. I am advised that the Mars orbiter mission will require the best possible combinations of cryogenic space storable propellants. The most promising are oxygen difluoride-diborane and fluorine-hydrazene. Either will yield a 10- to 20-percent payload in orbit advantage over conventional earth storable propellants.

Further, recent tests conducted by the Air Force at the Arnold Engineering Development Center in Tullahoma, Tenn., on diborane and oxygen difluoride have been successfully completed. Preliminary analysis of the data showed that the performance attained was very high and checked very closely to the previously calculated values.

This success has increased the confidence factor in high-energy systems by many orders of magnitude.

The House Committee has made extensive and penetrating investigations on this subject. It is my strong conviction that the United States must push ahead on research into high-energy propellants. I have since the first days of the committee in 1959, repeatedly urged strong support for high-energy fuels. And I believe that the other members of our House Science and Astronautics Committee share with me that sense of urgency and conviction.

We have already cut the NASA authorization substantially. As a result of this conference I believe we have proceeded sensibly and carefully in providing funds to NASA.

I urge that the House adopt the conference report.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

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

TO AUTHORIZE EACH MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO EMPLOY ANNUALLY, ON A TEMPORARY BASIS, A STUDENT CONGRESSIONAL INTERN

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 416, with amendments thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 416

Resolved, That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, each Member of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico are authorized to hire for ten weeks during the period June 1 to August 31, inclusive, each year, one additional employee to be known as a "student congressional intern". For this purpose each Member of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall have available for payment to such intern a gross allowance of \$750, not to exceed \$75 per week, payable from the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law. Such allowance and such intern shall be in addition to all allowances and personnel made available to such Member or Commissioner under other provisions of law.

(b) No person shall be paid compensation as a student congressional intern who does not have on file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, at all times during the period of his employment, a certificate that such intern was during the academic year immediately preceding his employment a bona fide student at a college, university, or similar institution of higher learning.

SEC. 2. The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 4, strike out "ten weeks" and insert "two and one-half months".

Line 9, following "\$750" insert "at the gross rate of \$300 per month". Also line 9, strike out "not to".

Line 10, strike out "exceed \$75 per week".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Maryland yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Does the immediate consideration of this resolution require unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Iowa that this is a privileged report from the Committee on House Administration.

The question is on the committee amendments.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words on the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will protect Members who are on their feet. The Chair sees them. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] has control of the time. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for a question; yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, are not the amendments subject to the 5-minute rule?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this is being considered in the House and not subject to the 5-minute rule.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for a question.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman from Maryland this question: What is next on the horizon with respect to adding to the payrolls around here and the cost to the taxpayers?

Then let me ask this question: First of all, is there anything in this resolution that would require this intern to be in a congressional office in Washington, D.C.? Could this intern be in a congressional office in Puerto Rico?

Mr. FRIEDEL. If you will read section 2, page 2, it says:

The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

It was considered in the committee whether they should have them in the Washington office or at the home office, but since a lot of Members are saying it should be in the Washington office, I will recommend that to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. If you intend the intern to be in an office in Washington, why did you not so stipulate in the resolution?

Mr. FRIEDEL. It will be in the regulations.

Mr. GROSS. How do I know, or any Member of the House know whether there will be any regulations? I was not aware of the fact a committee of Congress issued regulations.

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is part of the bill:

No person shall be paid compensation as a student congressional intern who does not have on file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, at all times during the period of his employment, a certificate that such intern was during the academic year immediately preceding his employment a bona fide student at a college, university, or similar institution of higher learning.

Mr. GROSS. That has nothing whatever to do with a mandatory provision that these interns will be in the offices in Washington.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I think that is a good question. I told the gentleman I would recommend that to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. That is no answer to the question of where these interns are going to be.

Mr. FRIEDEL. It is intended that they be in the Washington office. This is the first time that question was raised since the bill came out of the committee. The intent is that they be in the Washington office.

Mr. GROSS. How much is this going to cost?

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. In the event that every Member of the House of Representatives, as well as the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, did decide to hire a congressional student intern under this program—and, of course, there is no requirement whatsoever that every Member shall do so; if a Member such as the gentleman from Iowa did not choose to hire a congressional intern he

would not have to do so—but if every Member did so the cost would be \$327,000.

It seems to me that is a modest sum when one considers the cost of living here in Washington and the assistance which a congressional student intern could provide in the office of a Member of the House and, perhaps even as much to the point, considering the significant educational value to the student intern of having an opportunity to have some firsthand experience in the legislative process. I think the gentleman from Maryland may wish to provide some further assurance with respect to the very good question the gentleman from Iowa has been raising concerning where the student intern would work. I can say to the gentleman from Iowa, as the author of the bill, it is certainly my own intention that the intern should be working here in Washington in the office of a Member because it seems to me that is the place where he will learn the most and that is the place where he will be able to contribute the most.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently there is one congressional office functioning in Puerto Rico and I wonder how many more might be functioning in that area.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I assure the gentleman that the committee will recommend that the intern must be in Washington in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Why could not the committee have brought out a bill providing for one additional employee in an office to be paid out of the clerk-hire presently available to each Member instead of loading another \$300,000 plus on the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That was considered in the committee and the committee decided on this extra money for the summer months.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, it is just money and it has got to be spent?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The committee felt that this is very, very good to give the summer intern an opportunity to get a real education. Naturally, if a Member is using all his clerk hire funds, he would not be able to take advantage of having a student intern.

Mr. GROSS. If a Member was using all of his clerk hire, he probably would have someone in the nature of an intern anyway.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to compliment the gentleman on this bill and state from personal experience that we have had interns in our office at various times and they have been tremendously helpful to the office. The student intern also, I think, has profited greatly from an experience standpoint as a result of the opportunity to be in the office. Up to this point, none of these interns that we have had have been on the public payroll in any way.

I think the opportunity to have them at no cost to the taxpayers is a splendid thing when it is available, but I think the benefits are so great and the opportunity for the education of young people in the Government career field is so great

and it is such a fine opportunity, it is a splendid idea to make this program available to every Member through the use of public funds. I want to compliment the committee upon this bill.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I want to inquire of the chairman whether or not your committee considered the effect that this program will have on the voluntary intern programs now being operated by many colleges and universities in the country where voluntary donations, or funds from sources that are nonpublic, are contributed to help pay the cost of the interns in governmental employment. The University of Wisconsin operates an intern program and they make possible the employment of interns in congressional offices and in other offices in Government and pay half of their salary out of these nongovernmental funds. Has your committee considered what effect your proposal today will have on these programs?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The committee went into that very thoroughly. Many schools and colleges do pay part of the interns salaries, but some do not. That matter was considered. This legislation provides one additional employee in a Member's office during the months of June, July, and August.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman not think that this program will destroy the voluntary programs and eliminate the sources of funds, that is not taxpayers' funds, that are now available?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No, I do not think it will have that result.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBISON. I would like to answer the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin at least in part. While these voluntary programs, as he calls them, are being conducted under the sponsorship of various educational institutions that we know of, there are many, many other institutions of higher learning that do not have such programs.

I believe students who are following political science courses in such institutions should have an opportunity also to work here in the Capitol. I believe this proposal would help to equalize opportunity.

This proposal in House Resolution 416 is identical to a proposal I made earlier in this field, in H.R. 5674, though my proposal merely added, as the gentleman from Iowa suggested a moment ago, one to the number of clerks or staff assistants we are permitted in our office and did not include any additional money. I will support this bill but I still think it should be possible for us to pay an item out of our present staff allowance, as I am doing this year.

Mr. FRIEDEL. There many Members who are using all their funds, and they would not have an opportunity to utilize the student program. This is to be an addition to the clerk hire allowance. If

a Member does not wish to use all his funds, he will not have to use all his funds.

We have also set up a regulation that a Member may have only one student on his payroll at any one time, and never more than two during one summer. In other words, it would not be possible to have a different student every 2 weeks, or every month. In this way they will be here long enough to learn how a congressional office operates and the varied duties of their Representatives.

I think this will be a wonderful opportunity for the students and is in line with the President's program to help create more jobs for college students to help them finance their education.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of House Resolution 416. Earlier this session I introduced a resolution providing for a summer intern program in congressional offices. Even though this resolution is not identical to mine, it most certainly conforms to objective and I am delighted to support it.

The benefits of such a program would be twofold. There are very few Congressmen who could not use the additional help in their offices. I am sure that we all feel that we could serve our constituents better if we had a few more hands. The type of person interested in temporary Hill work is able to make a significant contribution in many ways. A deep research project can be undertaken that the regular office staff does not have time to pursue. Mailing lists can be revised and expanded. New cross indexes can be established.

We realize with college costs as high as they are today almost every student must work during his summer vacation to carry him through the fall. Unfortunately, there is usually a shortage of jobs and particularly of those jobs that would contribute to the education of the young man or woman.

What better laboratory could be provided for a political science or history major than service in a congressional office? And the program, by no means, should be restricted to students in these fields. In order for the students to receive the most benefits, I would try to rotate the interns thus enabling them to learn all phases of congressional activity from case work to floor procedures.

We who are deeply involved in the political process ourselves have a responsibility to encourage the widest participation at all levels and especially among the youth of America. The enthusiasm and idealism of young people can be most constructive in providing a broad and informed base for political activity. It is in these ways that we provide insurance for the continuing operation of our democracy. The knowledge gained during a summer's work in a congressional office will more realistically equip a young person for academic pursuits, a political career or simply the duties of good citizenship.

After the introduction of my resolution I contacted the Members of this body requesting that they join with me in presenting testimony before the House Administration Committee and in support of an intern program.

I am pleased to report that I received letters of support from 16 colleagues. For the record, I would like to express my gratitude to the following Representatives: BROCK ADAMS, WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, CLAIR A. CALLAN, TIM LEE CARTER, THOMAS CURTIS, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, DONALD M. FRASER, JOHN R. HANSEN, RODNEY M. LOVE, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, ROLLAND REDLIN, JAMES H. SCHEUER, GALE SCHISLER, WESTON E. VIVIAN, E. S. JOHNNY WALKER, and CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER.

Additional support was received from the Capitol Hill Young Democratic Club, which unanimously adopted a resolution in favor of the summer intern program.

I would like to believe that the enthusiastic response from my colleagues to my resolution and others had a great deal to do with the committee decision to report out this resolution to establish the congressional intern program. Certainly, passage of House Resolution 416 would be an historic step forward by the House of Representatives toward giving tomorrow's leaders a firsthand education in our legislative process.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is simple. It provides that each Member of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico would be authorized to employ a student congressional intern during the summer months at a salary of \$300 a month and for a period of 2½ months.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of Congress receive letters from outstanding college students who are interested in serving in the office of a Congressman during the summer months. I have had a number of these students in my own office and have found them most helpful in getting work done in the office and I know that other Members have had similar experience.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], for example, has been a pioneer in arranging for students to work in a congressional office.

Equally important, the opportunity to serve in the offices of Members of Congress gives college students a firsthand look at the legislative process.

I realize that most of these summer internship programs in past years have been sponsored either by colleges or universities or on the basis of arrangements between the individual Congressman and the student.

It seems to me, however, that it would be wise at this point for Congress formally to recognize the value of these summer internship programs and, because of the increasing volume of requests for such positions, for Congress to provide some more uniform kind of program than is presently available. Needless to say, if this resolution passes, any Congressman would still be free to enter into any kind of arrangements that he cares to make outside this internship program.

To reiterate, this resolution would allow each Member of the House and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico to hire a student intern for a period of 2½ months during the period from June 1 to August 31, inclusive. The compensation of the intern would be \$300 per

month or a total of \$750 at the gross rate for the entire 2½-month period.

The allowance and the intern would be in addition to all allowances and personnel now available to Members of Congress so that the student intern would not be counted against the Member's present staff limitation.

Of course, no Member of Congress would have to hire a student intern if he did not choose to do so.

In order to qualify for the internship a student would have to have been attending a college, university, or similar institution of higher learning during the academic year immediately preceding his employment. Certification of this fact would have to be filed with the Clerk of the House before the student could receive compensation.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this resolution and commend the committee on bringing it out. As one who has had streams of college and high school summer interns working in my office, I can say without reservation that this proposal is a very sound one which deserves to pass.

Now here is a very important point, Mr. Speaker. As a national policy, the President of the United States, and the Vice President, have been urging the employment of students throughout the Nation. Under the Economic Opportunity Act, students are being put to work. President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY have been urging private enterprise to put on more students this summer, and they have been urging the executive branch and State and local governments to do the same. I think it is highly appropriate that the Congress do the same, as they are doing through this resolution.

This resolution will not only help the individual students by giving them practical experience. It will help the Congress. And it will help the country. That is why I hope it will pass by an overwhelming vote.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 229, nays 153, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—229

Adair	Anderson,	Andrews,
Adams	Tenn.	N. Dak.
Addabbo	Andrews,	Annunzio
Albert	Glenn	Ashmore

Barrett	Hagen, Calif.	Philbin
Beckworth	Halpern	Pool
Bell	Hamilton	Price
Bingham	Hanley	Pucinski
Blatnik	Hanna	Puroell
Bolling	Hansen, Idaho	Redlin
Brademas	Hansen, Iowa	Reid, N.Y.
Brock	Hathaway	Resnick
Brooks	Hawkins	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Rhodes, Pa.
Broyhill, Va.	Hechler	Roberts
Burleson	Helstoski	Robison
Burton, Calif.	Holifield	Rodino
Burton, Utah	Horton	Rogers, Colo.
Byrne, Pa.	Hosmer	Rogers, Fla.
Cabell	Howard	Ronan
Callan	Hungate	Roncallo
Carey	Irwin	Rooney, N.Y.
Carter	Jacobs	Rooney, Pa.
Clevenger	Jennings	Roosevelt
Cohelan	Johnson, Calif.	Rosenthal
Conable	Johnson, Okla.	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Johnson, Pa.	Roush
Cooley	Karsten	Roybal
Corbett	Karh	Rumsfeld
Culver	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Curtis	Kelly	St Germain
Daddario	Keogh	St. Onge
Daniels	Kirwan	Scheuer
Davis, Ga.	Kluczyński	Schisler
Dawson	Krebs	Schmidhauser
de la Garza	Leggett	Schneebeli
Delaney	Long, La.	Schweiker
Denton	Long, Md.	Senner
Derwinski	Love	Shipley
Diggs	McCarthy	Sickles
Dingell	McClary	Sisk
Donohue	McDade	Slack
Duncan, Oreg.	McDowell	Smith, Iowa
Dyal	McFall	Smith, N.Y.
Edmondson	McGather	Stafford
Edwards, Calif.	McVicker	Stalbaum
Evans, Colo.	MacGregor	Stephens
Evins, Tenn.	Machen	Stratton
Fallon	Mackay	Sullivan
Farbstein	Mailliard	Sweeney
Farnsley	Matsunaga	Teague, Tex.
Fascell	May	Tenzer
Feighan	Meeds	Thompson, N.J.
Flood	Miller	Thompson, Tex.
Fogarty	Minish	Todd
Foley	Mink	Trimble
Ford,	Moeller	Tunney
William D.	Moorhead	Tupper
Fraser	Morgan	Udall
Frelinghuysen	Morris	Ullman
Friedel	Morton	Van Deerlin
Fulton, Pa.	Mosher	Vanik
Fuqua	Multer	Vigorito
Gallagher	Murphy, Ill.	Vivian
Garmatz	Murphy, N.Y.	Waggonner
Glamo	Nedzi	Walker, N. Mex.
Gibbons	O'Brien	Watson
Gilbert	O'Hara, Ill.	Weltner
Gilligan	O'Hara, Mich.	White, Idaho
Gonzalez	O'Konski	Williams
Goodell	Olsen, Mont.	Willis
Grabowski	O'Neal, Ga.	Wolf
Gray	Ottinger	Wright
Green, Pa.	Patman	Wyatt
Greigg	Patten	Wylder
Grider	Pelly	Yates
Griffiths	Pepper	Young
Gubser	Perkins	

NAYS—153

Abbitt	Clark	Gettys
Anderson, Ill.	Clawson, Del.	Griffin
Andrews,	Cleveland	Gross
George W.	Collier	Grover
Arends	Colmer	Gurney
Ashbrook	Conte	Haley
Aspinall	Craley	Hall
Baldwin	Cramer	Halleck
Bandstra	Cunningham	Hardy
Baring	Curtin	Harris
Bates	Dague	Harsha
Battin	Davis, Wis.	Harvey, Mich.
Belcher	Devine	Henderson
Bennett	Dole	Herlong
Berry	Dorn	Hicks
Betts	Dowdy	Huot
Boggs	Downing	Hutchinson
Boland	Dulski	Jarman
Broomfield	Duncan, Tenn.	Joelson
Broyhill, N.C.	Dwyer	Jonas
Buchanan	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, Ala.
Burke	Ellsworth	Jones, Mo.
Byrnes, Wis.	Erlenborn	King, Calif.
Cahill	Everett	King, N.Y.
Callaway	Fino	King, Utah
Casey	Flynt	Kornegay
Cederberg	Ford, Gerald R.	Kunkel
Cheif	Fountain	Laird
Clancy	Gathings	Langen

Latta	Pickle	Springer
Lennon	Poage	Stanton
Lindsay	Poff	Steed
Lippscomb	Quie	Stubblefield
McCulloch	Quillen	Talcott
Mackie	Race	Taylor
Madden	Randall	Teague, Calif.
Mahon	Reid, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Marsh	Reifel	Thomson, Wis.
Martin, Nebr.	Reinecke	Tuck
Matthews	Rhodes, Ariz.	Tuten
Michel	Rivers, S.C.	Walker, Miss.
Mills	Rogers, Tex.	Watkins
Mize	Roudebush	Watts
Monagan	Satterfield	Whalley
Morrison	Saylor	White, Tex.
Morse	Scott	Whitener
Murray	Secrest	Whitten
Natcher	Selden	Widnall
Nelsen	Shriver	Wilson, Bob
Olson, Minn.	Skubitz	Younger
O'Neill, Mass.	Smith, Calif.	
Passman	Smith, Va.	

NOT VOTING—52

Abernethy	Findley	Martin, Mass.
Ashley	Fisher	Mathias
Ayres	Fulton, Tenn.	Minshall
Bolton	Green, Oreg.	Moore
Bonner	Hagan, Ga.	Moss
Bow	Hansen, Wash.	Nix
Bray	Harvey, Ind.	Pike
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Pirnie
Cameron	Holland	Powell
Celler	Hull	Rivers, Alaska
Chamberlain	Ichord	Sikes
Clausen,	Kee	Staggers
Don H.	Keith	Thomas
Corman	Landrum	Toll
Dent	McEwen	Utt
Dickinson	McMillan	Wilson,
Dow	Macdonald	Charles H.
Farnum	Martin, Ala.	Zablocki

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Keith.
 Mr. Bonner with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Chamberlain.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Moore.
 Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
 Mr. Dent with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. Sikes with Mr. Pirnie.
 Mr. Hull with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Abernethy and Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Kee with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Findley.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Mathias.
 Mr. Moss with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Thomas with Mr. Bray.
 Mr. Cameron with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Pike with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Minshall.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
 Mr. Ichord with Mr. Holland.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Ashley.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Powell with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Farnum.
 Mr. Dow with Mr. McMillan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the Record on House Resolution 416.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7984, TO ASSIST IN THE PROVISION OF HOUSING FOR LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME FAMILIES

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 425, Rept. No. 524), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 425

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. 7984) to assist in the provision for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, 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 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-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.

GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 398 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 398

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. 237) to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 398 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 237, a bill to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the

Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior.

The purpose of H.R. 237 is to reauthorize the initial stage of the multiple-purpose Garrison diversion unit of the Missouri River Basin project. The plan of development for the initial stage calls for the irrigation of 250,000 acres, municipal and industrial water supply for 14 towns and cities in the project area, full development of the fish and wildlife and recreation potential in the project area, and minor flood control benefits. The physical works which would be authorized for construction, at an estimated cost of \$207 million, consist of over 1,800 miles of canals and laterals, four regulating reservoirs, numerous pumping plants, and an extensive drainage system.

During the 20 years since Congress authorized a comprehensive program of development for the Missouri River and its tributaries, substantial Federal investments have been made in the overall project. In large measure, the planned flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power benefits have been provided, and many outstanding recreational opportunities have been developed. However, irrigation development has lagged far behind the other project purposes even though in 1944 irrigation was recognized by the upper basin States, as it still is, as the most important benefit they will receive from the project and from the water which originates in these States.

The Garrison project will be of increasing importance to the future growth, economy, and well-being of the area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 398.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 398 provides an open rule with 1 hour of debate to be divided equally between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This resolution provides for consideration of the bill H.R. 237, which provides for the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior. This is a reauthorization project. It consists primarily of 250,000 acres of land to be irrigated from the project. It will provide an adequate water supply to 14 towns in North Dakota. It will provide recreation services and fish and wildlife services to residents of that area. In addition, there will be beneficial flood control benefits as a result of the project.

The total cost is estimated at \$207 million. For this \$207 million it is planned to construct 1,800 miles of canals and laterals, four regulating reservoirs, and pumping plants. The major changes in this bill from previous operations of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri River Basin area are two. First of all, the bill provides for an increase in the wholesale cost of electricity generated by the various reclamation and power projects in the basin. An increase of 0.25 mills per kilowatt-hour. This was

announced approximately a year ago and in my State of Nebraska, which is a portion of the Missouri River Basin, I am happy to announce, Mr. Speaker, I have not had one single letter of objection to this increase in the power rates in the Missouri River Basin area.

In addition to this, this bill will change the basic interest rate on money borrowed for power purposes, and reduce it to 2½ percent. This is a logical move. It simply makes the Missouri River Basin compatible with the other areas of the country and the interest paid in those areas. It has been true for some time that the Missouri River Basin has been more or less penalized in respect to interest rates. This brings it in line with interest rates of the various other reclamation areas of the country.

North Dakota, like many of our States in the Missouri River Basin, is a semi-arid area. Some years we have plenty of rainfall and our crops are bountiful because the soil is rich. For many years we do not have enough rainfall and, as a consequence, we suffer economically.

North Dakota has not kept step with the rest of the United States in respect to gains in population. This has been due primarily to economic conditions over which the people of North Dakota have no control, because they could not get the rainfall and the moisture to make for bountiful crops. As a consequence of this fact, they have had very little industry come into the State because of unstable conditions created by the lack of rainfall. This project, which will irrigate 250,000 acres of land, will stabilize their economy, provide for increased earnings for farmers and ranchers and will also provide for increased economic activity from an industrial and commercial standpoint.

The reservoir which has been constructed in North Dakota on the Missouri River took out of production 548,000 acres of land. I think it is perfectly proper that these people should have this Garrison project to irrigate 250,000 acres which they so badly need because they did give up about 548,000 acres for the construction of the Garrison Reservoir with a consequent loss of local tax revenue.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and I support the bill. I am hopeful that we will have further developments in regard to reclamation projects in the Missouri River Basin and favorable approval by the distinguished committee that handles this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS], at present a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, formerly a member of this committee, and the author of this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today is a red-letter day in the history of North Dakota. The diversion of water from the Missouri into central and eastern North Dakota has been actively sought by the citizens of North Dakota for many years. Such a diversion project was included as a part of

the Missouri River Basin project authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

My bill, H.R. 237, provides for the modification and confirmation of the authorization of this diversion project as the Garrison diversion unit. This legislation undoubtedly is the most significant piece of legislation affecting my State that Congress has had before it for many, many years.

I most sincerely request and urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support H.R. 237 and approve the Garrison diversion unit so that the citizens of my State will be in a position to beneficially use their share of the Missouri River water for a number of purposes.

The multiple-purpose Garrison diversion unit that is presently being considered for reauthorization by this House represents an economically feasible and engineeringly sound way to divert water from the existing Garrison Reservoir on the Missouri River into central and eastern North Dakota to serve a number of important purposes.

Its construction and development will fulfill a dream of citizens of the State that originated over 75 years ago. It represents that culmination of years of planning and years of hard work by many citizens. More important, it represents the most practical and effective way to stimulate and stabilize North Dakota's most important industry—its agriculture.

Although proposals for a Missouri River diversion in North Dakota were advanced as early as 1889, it was the drought of the 1930's that emphasized the importance of water to many of the State's citizens and stimulated their thinking and efforts to provide this essential need. These efforts were directed to developing a sound way of accomplishing a Missouri River diversion in North Dakota.

During this drought period, many of the State's rivers and streams practically dried up and the water supplies for cities and towns, as well as for crops and livestock, was practically nonexistent. Many times since that drought period, we have had severe shortages of moisture and our agricultural economy has been adversely affected.

To realize the importance of water to our State, one has but to look at the climate and weather data. First of all, North Dakota's rainfall is marginal for dryland farming with the average throughout the area to be served by the Garrison diversion unit approximately 17 inches each year. If our farmers could be assured of receiving 17 inches of precipitation each year when they needed it, many of our agriculture problems would be solved.

However, our rainfall varies widely from year to year and from month to month. Consequently almost every year our farmers face periods of drought that severely reduces crop production. Our farmers are limited in the kinds of crops they can produce and the income that they receive from such production. Even in years when the average, or a greater than average rainfall is received, it often

does not come when needed, and crop failures result.

The Garrison diversion unit would help eliminate this problem over a wide area of North Dakota. The initial phase of the project would provide water for the irrigation of 250,000 acres of land that are presently being dry farmed. These irrigated areas would be integrated with one-half million to a million acres of dry farmed land.

Irrigation would provide our farmers an opportunity that they do not now have to change from the production of wheat and other small grain crops that are chronically in surplus, to the production of feed crops that would be utilized in the extended livestock industry that is expected to develop in the project area.

Production of other specialty crops that are in demand by consumers will be possible. Experts at our North Dakota State University have estimated that the development of 250,000 acres of irrigation under the Garrison diversion unit will result in a reduction in the acres devoted to wheat and small grain crops in the project area, of approximately 85,000 acres.

Lands proposed for irrigation development under the Garrison diversion unit are not new lands being brought into production but are lands that are presently being dry land farmed and are producing agricultural commodities much of which is in the surplus category. Irrigation development is expected to reduce the production of surplus crops in North Dakota and at the same time provide the farmers with the opportunity to stabilize and diversify their farm operation.

The development of irrigation as proposed under the Garrison diversion unit will go a long way in compensating the State of North Dakota for the loss it experienced when over 550,000 acres of fertile agricultural land was acquired by the Federal Government for main stem Missouri River reservoirs and consequently removed the production and the tax rolls of the State.

The removal of these acres from production has significantly reduced the economic wealth produced in North Dakota each year. Studies by our North Dakota State University indicate that the net losses resulting to the State from the acquisition of this land, approximates \$15 million annually, based on the potential use of the land that was so acquired.

In addition, onetime losses are estimated to equal \$38,650,000 in timber resources, and a loss of over 5,850,000,000 tons of lignite coal resources. These losses are significant. Their effect on the North Dakota economy are significant, and the most logical way to offset them is through development of irrigation that is possible through the Garrison diversion unit.

The multi-purpose Garrison diversion unit will serve several other important purposes besides irrigation. It will provide water for 14 municipalities and 4 industrial areas. Water will also be available for 36 major and 50 small fish and wildlife areas that will be used primarily for the production and pres-

erved under the initial phase of the Garrison diversion unit. These districts have the authority to levy special assessments against benefited lands for irrigation water costs. It will be through them that the farmers and landowners pay their water bills each year and meet their financial responsibilities for the construction and operation and maintenance of the Garrison diversion unit.

erved under the initial phase of the Garrison diversion unit. These districts have the authority to levy special assessments against benefited lands for irrigation water costs. It will be through them that the farmers and landowners pay their water bills each year and meet their financial responsibilities for the construction and operation and maintenance of the Garrison diversion unit.

As a former director of the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District, I have had the experience in working in the establishment of one of the 10 irrigation districts that are in the Garrison diversion area. I can testify to this body that our farmers and our North Dakotans are very sincere in their desire for the Garrison diversion unit and will assume their responsibilities for the development and operation of this project.

Mr. Speaker, the Garrison diversion unit will have a definite salutary effect on the agricultural economy on the State of North Dakota. It will bring many benefits and have an impact on the business and economic growth of the State and the region.

Some of the impacts on the trade and business economy and the indirect benefits that will result from the project are:

Population increase in the project area..... 17,500

New retail business establishments..... 650

New service establishments..... 190

New wholesale establishments..... 185

New manufacturing establishments..... 51

New job opportunities..... 4,500

Annual increase in nonfarm income..... \$26,355,000

Annual increase in Federal income tax..... \$3,200,000

Annual increase in State income tax..... \$550,000

Other estimates indicate that the project will result in an increase in migratory waterfowl production habitat in this duck-breeding area of the United States of over 20 percent; an increase in regional fishing areas of over 700 percent; and a 1,100,000 visitor-day use increase in the recreation areas.

The Federal investment in the Garrison diversion unit will be repaid many times over. Studies indicate that over a 50-year period, the increased income to individual farmers in the project area would yield Federal income tax revenue that is \$160 million greater than it would be under present conditions.

This amount combined with the approximately \$35 million that would be returned to the Government from the irrigators, the conservancy district, the municipal and industrial water users, the fish and wildlife and recreation beneficiaries will nearly equal the entire reimbursable allocation. In addition, power revenues of approximately \$180 million from the Missouri River main stem dams and reservoirs will be dedicated to assist in financing the Garrison diversion unit.

On behalf of North Dakota, I want to thank Chairman ASPINALL and his Interior Committee and all of my colleagues who have been so helpful in bringing this very important legislation to the floor.

erved under the initial phase of the Garrison diversion unit. These districts have the authority to levy special assessments against benefited lands for irrigation water costs. It will be through them that the farmers and landowners pay their water bills each year and meet their financial responsibilities for the construction and operation and maintenance of the Garrison diversion unit.

As a former director of the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District, I have had the experience in working in the establishment of one of the 10 irrigation districts that are in the Garrison diversion area. I can testify to this body that our farmers and our North Dakotans are very sincere in their desire for the Garrison diversion unit and will assume their responsibilities for the development and operation of this project.

Mr. Speaker, the Garrison diversion unit will have a definite salutary effect on the agricultural economy on the State of North Dakota. It will bring many benefits and have an impact on the business and economic growth of the State and the region.

Some of the impacts on the trade and business economy and the indirect benefits that will result from the project are:

Population increase in the project area..... 17,500

New retail business establishments..... 650

New service establishments..... 190

New wholesale establishments..... 185

New manufacturing establishments..... 51

New job opportunities..... 4,500

Annual increase in nonfarm income..... \$26,355,000

Annual increase in Federal income tax..... \$3,200,000

Annual increase in State income tax..... \$550,000

Other estimates indicate that the project will result in an increase in migratory waterfowl production habitat in this duck-breeding area of the United States of over 20 percent; an increase in regional fishing areas of over 700 percent; and a 1,100,000 visitor-day use increase in the recreation areas.

The Federal investment in the Garrison diversion unit will be repaid many times over. Studies indicate that over a 50-year period, the increased income to individual farmers in the project area would yield Federal income tax revenue that is \$160 million greater than it would be under present conditions.

This amount combined with the approximately \$35 million that would be returned to the Government from the irrigators, the conservancy district, the municipal and industrial water users, the fish and wildlife and recreation beneficiaries will nearly equal the entire reimbursable allocation. In addition, power revenues of approximately \$180 million from the Missouri River main stem dams and reservoirs will be dedicated to assist in financing the Garrison diversion unit.

On behalf of North Dakota, I want to thank Chairman ASPINALL and his Interior Committee and all of my colleagues who have been so helpful in bringing this very important legislation to the floor.

On behalf of North Dakota, I want to thank Chairman ASPINALL and his Interior Committee and all of my colleagues who have been so helpful in bringing this very important legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the Garrison diversion unit not only will compensate North Dakota for the loss the State experienced in giving up its land for main stem Missouri River reservoirs, but it will also fulfill a commitment made to the State when the Missouri River Basin project was authorized by Congress in 1944. Most important, it is truly an outstanding opportunity for a resources development program in a State where such a program is urgently needed.

I most sincerely and respectfully urge and request my colleagues to support the Garrison diversion unit and to approve H.R. 237 as it has been recommended by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take anything away from our other colleagues who have done much to bring this bill to the point in history where it is now, but I want to congratulate the gentleman in the well on an excellent presentation and thank him for the leadership that he has provided in the authorizing committee during the first 2 years during which we have been here together. I am aware of the many hours and hours that he has devoted to the progress of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from North Dakota on a job well done. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman from Utah for those comments.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time during the 6 years I have been in Congress that I have found occasion to register opposition to granting of a rule. For I have had great respect for the judgment of the Rules Committee and the manner in which they have so proficiently assigned to this House its work schedule. However, in the instance of this rule, I find the time provided for debate is so glaringly lacking that I would be negligent indeed were I not to call this matter to the attention of the House.

The Garrison diversion project is a very significant and important piece of legislation. It is a very complex bill and bears significance to some of the most controversial and important activities of our Government, our society, and this Nation's entire fiscal policy. It is almost unbelievable that we would consider only 1 hour of debate for a bill that has a direct relationship to farm surpluses, to farm prices, to water supplies, to game and fish habitat, to conservation of natural resources, to budget deficits and our national debt, and a good many others. Providing for 1 hour of debate on this bill, leaving only one-half hour for each side, hardly provides sufficient time to even identify the subjects that are in controversy and, in my judgment, will be adversely affected by the enactment of this bill.

The reason, of course, is obvious. This is a pork barrel bill, and therefore is not to be considered by this House on the basis of its merits or demerits, but rather to be enacted for the sake of expediency. It is the kind of a bill where you are asked to "look the other way and do not explore its contents or its consequences." I think it is important, however, to this House and to this Congress that we do provide at least adequate time in its consideration, for it is the enactment of legislation of this kind that gives rise to public criticism and articles such as appeared in Life magazine a little more than a year ago, entitled "Now See the Innards of a Fat Pig." It is a bill that aggravates the farm surplus problem, that contributes to the deplorably low farm prices, that adds to our budget deficit and our huge national indebtedness.

In fact, if we were to devote a little more time to this kind of legislation, it probably would not be necessary to allocate 4 hours of debate to deciding whether or not to increase the public debt every year by anywhere from \$4 to \$5 billion. It would not be as necessary for the Agriculture Committee to spend endless hours attempting to determine how we can best cope with the agricultural surplus and a farm income that is now back to the level of the depression days of the 1930's. It would not be nearly as necessary to provide adequate time to consider such programs as ARA, APW, and poverty programs, and the many other rural development programs that are designed to improve the economic dilemma that faces our rural communities—all of which have failed, incidentally, in rural areas, because we as a Congress have failed to direct sufficient time to the real cause of that economic dilemma which is further aggravated by the enactment of legislation of the kind that is before us under the provisions of this rule with 1 hour debate.

Yes; we could well save time needlessly expended by the many dedicated Members of this House were we to direct a little more time to legislation that creates as many problems and undesirable results as this bill does. It is the kind of a bill that has caused the downfall of a good many dedicated legislators, as was stated in the article in Life magazine, which said that no Member who opposes this kind of project can expect to grow very old in the Congress. In the light of these facts, of course, it would be much easier for me to look the other way as this bill asks, but frankly, I have too great an interest in the future of agriculture, in the future economic stability of this Nation, in the conservation of our natural resources, to sit idly by, even though it might well be expedient for me to do so. The time provided for debate will not even permit me, however, to state my case to this House, with any semblance of detail or documentation, with what little effectiveness my limited ability will permit. Yes; this is a gag rule by any interpretation, and can only serve to justify the criticisms that have been leveled against the Congress for its lack of consideration on pork barrel expenditures.

These are rather harsh words, I know, but they are made only in defense of 3½ million farm people throughout the Nation, the economic future of younger generations, and the actions of this Congress. Even the President of the United States has acknowledged the folly of producing additional Government surpluses on borrowed money, which he did at one of the briefing sessions that it was my privilege to attend as a Member of Congress. It would seem to me to be the very least we could do by way of exercising our full responsibility, to make sure that we had all of the facts before us, and arrived at a decision on the basis that such knowledge would provide. To do so, I am sure, would better preserve the interests of this Congress, of agriculture, of the consumer, the taxpayer, and the Nation.

Mr. YOUNG. 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.

AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT, AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 399, 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. 485) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 399 provides an open rule with 1 hour of debate for the consideration of H.R. 485, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws.

The plan of development for the Auburn-Folsom South unit is a part of the comprehensive basinwide plan for use of the waters of the American River. It is designed to maximize economic utilization of the remaining waters of the American River Basin for irrigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, municipal and industrial water supply, fish and wildlife, and recreation purposes. It provides additional flood control which will protect the Sacramento metropolitan area against all probable floods. It will firm up the water supplies for a large segment of the agricultural valley lands of Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties and it will substantially improve the water supplies of the foothill areas of Placer, Sacramento, and El Dorado Counties. It will provide greatly increased recreational opportunities for the exploding population of northern California. It will develop the remaining hydroelectric power capabilities of the American River to assist in meeting the ever-increasing demand for electric power and energy. The construction of the Auburn-Folsom South unit will go a long way toward achieving full economic water development of the American River Basin.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 399.

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

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving time, may I state I agree with the statement just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK]. I associate myself with the gentleman and in addition may I simply state, Mr. Speaker, that this proposed Auburn-Folsom South Unit of the Central Valley Project in California, as it is now constituted, is the culmination of 20 years of investigation, planning and formulation by local and State agencies and by the Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal agencies. The cost is estimated at \$425 million.

Of this amount 91 percent is reimbursable and the remaining 9 percent is nonreimbursable. Flood control and a portion of recreation, fish and wildlife are functions considered to be national responsibilities and thus nonreimbursable.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL].

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and H.R. 485. This legislation is the final result of extensive study of a comprehensive basinwide plan for use of the waters of the American River which was developed as an integral part of the Central Valley project ultimate plan.

The benefits-to-cost ratio of nearly 4 to 1 means for every dollar spent on the development, almost \$4 in benefits to the various project purposes will be returned to the Nation. Secretary of the Interior Udall has termed the unit, as planned, a "model of multipurpose developments."

Under the diligent supervision of the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, and the equally learned guidance

of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable WALTER ROGERS, of Texas, the proposal which I have the privilege of cosponsoring has been brought to the floor this afternoon.

Both Mr. ASPINALL and Mr. ROGERS have made on-the-scene inspection visits and have had an opportunity to talk with the people who are so vitally interested in the Auburn-Folsom South project. Careful examination of every facet of this project has been given by the committee during hearings and field studies over a period of several years.

Special tribute also should be paid to my colleague from California, Congressman HAROLD T. (BIZZ) JOHNSON, who is a member of the committee and whose bill is under consideration at this time. "Bizz" is one of the hardest working Members of Congress and has played a major role in the advancement of the project.

The principal feature of the Auburn-Folsom South Unit, the \$282 million Auburn Dam, reservoir, powerplant and appurtenant facilities will be situated in Congressman JOHNSON'S district. But the benefits from the project, both immediate and future, will be shared by a large section of California's San Joaquin Valley.

Of particular interest to my district, comprising San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties, is the Folsom South Canal feature of H.R. 485. It will be designed to carry 852,000 acre-feet of water annually along a 67-mile area. Nearly 400,000 acres of farmland in San Joaquin and adjoining Sacramento County will be served. The city of Stockton would receive supplemental municipal and industrial water, thus removing a threat to future growth which a shortage of water now represents.

Much of the agricultural acreage in the 15th Congressional District, which I represent, currently is supplied by deep wells. Many of them are at dangerously low levels because of the continually decreasing ground-water level. Without supplemental water, within a few years the agricultural economy of San Joaquin County can be expected to suffer great damage because of the forced reduction in irrigated acreage.

The wisdom of providing additional storage space, as Auburn-Folsom South will do, was further emphasized in our State last winter when devastating floods occurred. In addition to providing needed flood protection for the city of Sacramento, the project will furnish electrical energy to meet the demand resulting from California's continued population growth.

These are just a few of the benefits which make the Auburn-Folsom South unit a sound and feasible development from a physical and economic standpoint, as well as the most desirable and next logical addition to the Central Valley project. It is a privilege to ask your support of this extremely meritorious legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT PRIVATE POLL SHOWS NEW YORK CITY SOLIDLY BEHIND PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S HANDLING OF THE PRESIDENCY

Mr. STRATTON. 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 New York?

There was no objection?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride that I rise to inform the Members of the House of a recent poll taken in New York City which discloses that more than 75 percent of the residents of New York City support President Johnson and approve of the manner in which he is handling the Presidency.

This professional and scientific polling of a representative cross section of the city's population conducted in the last week of May, which has just come to my attention, reveals that between March and May the percentage of New York City residents who believe the President is doing an excellent job increased from 14 to 24 percent and those that gave a generally favorable reaction to the manner in which the President is handling his job increased in that period from 68 to 76 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this exceedingly strong backing of the President—and especially the healthy increase during the past few critical months—constitutes persuasive demonstration that there is great support for the President's foreign and domestic policy actions. Unquestionably, the events currently taking place in the world pose, and will continue to pose, difficult problems creating very significant decisions which must constantly be faced by our President. The fact that such a large percentage of citizens approve of the manner in which the President has handled these difficult and delicate issues is most reassuring. In a democracy there is a continuing obligation for the President to consider the desires and the views of the Nation at large, but there is perhaps an even greater responsibility on the part of the President to provide strong and firm leadership in times such as these when we are almost constantly besieged with issues of critical importance.

We have great reason to be encouraged and heartened to know that at this time the conduct of our foreign affairs as well as the maintenance of an expanding and prosperous economy is in competent hands.

The same poll has indicated that New York City would support President Johnson over four prominent Republicans by overwhelming majorities. The poll shows that in a race against Governor Romney, the President would receive 79 percent of the vote; against former Vice President Nixon, 77 percent of the vote; against former Senator Goldwater, 78 percent of the vote and against Governor Rockefeller, 89 percent of the vote.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I can report to the House of Representatives that New York City is solidly behind President Johnson.

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the remarks just made by the gentleman from New York that the city of New York, which he claims is so strong for President Johnson, has another record—it has the highest per capita debt of any municipality in the United States—\$413 for every man, woman, and child or a total of more than \$3 billion.

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

GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. ASPINALL. 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. 237) to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 237, with Mr. GRAY 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 Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, before Mr. ROGERS, chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee which handled this legislation, discusses the details of the Garrison diversion unit and the provisions of H.R. 237, I would like to give you a little history with respect to this project. In particular, I want my colleagues to understand why it is necessary that this unit of the Missouri River Basin project be considered in a different light than a project which has not previously been approved by the Congress.

Technically, the Garrison diversion unit was authorized in 1944, and H.R. 237 provides for reauthorization. It was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944 as a part of the comprehensive program of development of the Missouri River and its tributaries. In a single subsection comprising seven lines in that act, the Congress authorized works which today carry a cost estimate of al-

most \$5 billion. As I have said so many times before, this was a serious mistake and has been the cause of untold problems ever since. I will not go further into that story, but it is something you need to understand in considering the Garrison unit. Suffice it to say that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has called a halt to further construction of Missouri River Basin units by the Department of the Interior under the authority of the 1944 Flood Control Act until they have been reauthorized.

The point I want to make with respect to the Garrison unit is that it was authorized as a part of a comprehensive multiple-purpose development designed to provide irrigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and municipal and industrial water, and recreation and fish and wildlife opportunities, and this overall Missouri River Basin project received the support of North Dakota because Garrison was a part thereof. Garrison diversion unit is North Dakota's most important benefit from the Missouri Basin development and without this unit the State will not only have not gained from the basin development but will have lost about 550,000 acres of fertile farmland inundated by the Missouri River reservoirs that have already been constructed—the Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs. These two dams and other mainstream structures, powerplants, and appurtenant works have been essentially completed by the Corps of Engineers at a cost of approximately \$1.2 billion. In large measure, the planned flood control, navigation and hydroelectric power benefits have been provided. The principal beneficiaries of these purposes are the downstream States. Irrigation development, which is the most important benefit that upstream States will receive, has lagged far behind. To deny North Dakota the Garrison unit, after taking its fertile lands for the benefit primarily of downstream States, would be breaking faith, I believe, with the State of North Dakota.

The Garrison diversion unit is the key to the economic growth of North Dakota. It will partially offset the loss of land that has been flooded to provide mainstream storage. It will stabilize the agricultural economy of this area of the Great Plains where the weather and precipitation have been so undependable. The opportunity for a balanced and vigorous economic growth is locked in the fertile soil. Water supply is the key to this opportunity—water for the land, for industry, and for the growing towns and cities that will evolve. The Garrison project not only will not further aggravate the surplus crop production problem, but it will reduce crop surpluses in this area. Construction of the project will cause a shift away from dryland grain crops to row crops and forage and feed crops for livestock production. All the problems delaying its consideration have now been resolved and it should be approved by the Congress without further delay. North Dakota has worked hard and waited patiently for this project for a great many years.

There is one provision in H.R. 237 that I want to discuss. This is the pro-

vision which the committee placed in the legislation permitting a 2½-percent interest rate in repaying the present investment in power facilities constructed by the Corps of Engineers. This provision, in section 4(b), relates to the financial position of the overall Missouri River Basin project and is one of several actions required to place the project in sound position. Due to drought conditions that have prevailed in the Missouri River Basin in recent years and to power allocations that are higher than expected because of rising costs of construction, the Missouri Basin power system is not in a sound financial position.

About 3 years ago, the Department of the Interior was requested to study ways and means of placing the project in a sound financial position and to report its findings and recommendations to the Congress. "Sound financial position" means full repayment with interest where appropriate within a 50-year period. In response to this request by the committee, and after about a year's study, we received the Department's recommendations. The two major recommendations call for, first, an average increase in firm power rates of 0.25 mills per kilowatt-hour, and second, the use of a 2½-percent interest rate in amortizing the commercial power investment associated with generating capacity constructed by the Corps of Engineers. The first recommendation with respect to a power rate increase will be implemented by the Department as soon as acceptance by the Congress of the second recommendation with respect to the interest rate is assured. Both recommendations must be implemented if the Missouri River Basin project is to be placed in a sound financial position.

The power system constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the Missouri River Basin is the only corps constructed power system built before adoption of the standard interest formula which bears an interest rate of more than 2½ percent. The Bonneville Power Administration System, the Southwestern Power Administration System, and the Southeastern Power Administration System all market power and energy under repayment schedules using 2½-percent interest on previous investments. Another justification for the 2½-percent rate is the fact that had the standard interest formula which is presently used for all Federal power investments been in effect during the period when the power facilities in the Missouri Basin were constructed, the average interest rate would have been very close to 2½ percent. I believe the interest rate provision in H.R. 237 is fully justified and should be approved. Then the power rate increase in the Missouri Basin can go into effect and the Missouri River Basin project will again be operating on a sound basis.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. On page 14 of the report it says, for the various purposes, there is \$12,099,000 for municipal and industrial water. Can the gentleman tell me how many municipalities would be

involved under this particular provision?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] for that answer because the project is in his area.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Approximately 12 municipalities, Mr. Chairman, would be affected including the larger cities in North Dakota.

Mr. COLLIER. Can the gentleman tell me what the aggregate population is of those municipalities?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I would guess close to 100,000 people. The city of Grand Forks which is our second or third largest city was rerefining its own sewage in the thirties with one-third of the present population and has not increased its water supply. The city of Fargo was in a similarly precarious situation. It is the largest city in North Dakota and it has not increased its water supply since those days. The only hope of getting an adequate supply of water is from the Missouri River.

Mr. COLLIER. Can the gentleman tell me whether the allocation is to provide for the construction of all or any part of the municipal water systems?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado will answer that question. There is no provision here to build water mains or distribution systems within the various towns and cities of the area. This is a part of the cost of construction that has been found to be allocable to municipal and industrial water uses. All of it will be repaid with interest at a rate that is now provided by law.

Mr. COLLIER. But it will not be for the actual construction of the municipal facilities; is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished Chairman for yielding.

Apropos of the point just made, will the gentleman from Colorado tell me if the allocation to fish and wildlife enhancement, paragraph (b) page 5, line 20, is likewise to be repayable in line with the recent legislation passed by this body allocating such funds to the Secretary of the Interior for reimbursement based on local municipal use?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. We follow that format in the allocation of costs for reimbursable or nonreimbursable items. I would say to my colleague, to be perfectly honest, that we did go to conference on the legislation heretofore affirmed by the House and there is a conference report coming out and if it is adopted it may be necessary to change just a little bit of the language that we find in this bill when the legislation gets to the other body. At this time it would not be fair to burden this legislation with that operation.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. But generally this and the other user entrance fees for reimbursement are in line with our land and water use fund?

Mr. ASPINALL. Under the recreation and fish and wildlife formula legislation for study and planning purposes.

Mr. HALL. And, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand that generally this 250,000 acres will be used in holding reservoirs or facilities from which water will be doled out for either municipal use or for irrigation or for the other purposes listed in the bill at a time of excessive flow and diversion from the Missouri River?

Mr. ASPINALL. The water will be held, if the gentleman from Missouri will bear with me, in the Garrison Reservoir which is already constructed. It will be taken by laterals or canals from that reservoir. There are two or three small reservoirs that are involved. There is also Devils Lake which is involved, because it is a large natural lake. But most of this money, of course, is for the construction of canals, in fact 1,800 miles of canals, in order to service this area, and the laterals leading from such canals.

Mr. HALL. Which is really a part of the obligation we assumed in the original Missouri Basin Act of 1944?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is the position that the committee takes.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman tell me, inasmuch as I have a letter here from the Governor of the great State of Missouri wherein he is concerned over the safeguards as to the present and future rights of the lower basin, as well as to their portion, and adequate portion, of the stream flow of the great Missouri and Mississippi Rivers, if that protection is written into this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. It is the position of the committee that the protection for the lower users is present in the Missouri Basin project itself. This legislation does not take away from the lower basin users their rights and privileges under the project.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, in other words I am sure the distinguished chairman realizes that only in the last Congress we succeeded in finally completing the channel from St. Louis to Kansas City and beyond, even Omaha and Council Bluffs, authorizing funds to the Corps of Engineers within the limitation of the appropriation of this body for the 9-foot channel, and there will be adequate water in the flowable season to preserve this, if the water falls, and provision will be made, if necessary, to take from the Garrison diversion unit the necessary water in order to maintain the downstream flow and traffic?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. The engineers advise us that this position of the gentleman is correct and that there is available water to profusely service the users in the lower basin.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the

full committee has given you the history and special circumstances surrounding the Garrison diversion unit. I would like to discuss briefly the project and the provisions of the bill.

First, I would like to make it clear that the Garrison diversion unit as reauthorized in H.R. 237 is a self-contained project and does not depend in any way on future expansion to make it physically or economically feasible.

By reference to up-to-date reports, section 1 of H.R. 237 provides for construction of this multiple-purpose development for the irrigation of 250,000 acres, a municipal and industrial water supply for 14 towns and cities, fish and wildlife development at 36 major areas and a number of smaller areas, recreation development at 9 major water impoundments, and flood control. The necessary water supply, estimated at 871,000 acre-feet annually, is diverted from the existing Garrison Reservoir. The amount diverted is less than 5 percent of the average annual flow of the Missouri River at the point of diversion and will not materially affect downstream project operations.

The principal project works include the Snake Creek pumping plant, which will pump water from the Garrison Reservoir into Snake Creek Reservoir, the 75-mile McClusky Canal, which will convey water from Snake Creek Reservoir to Lonetree Reservoir, and Lonetree Reservoir which will store and regulate flows of the McClusky Canal for distribution to the areas to be developed. The entire irrigation system includes 1,865 miles of canals and laterals, 4 regulating reservoirs, 141 pumping plants, and extensive drainage facilities.

Most of the 250,000 acres proposed for irrigation have been fully investigated by a detailed land classification survey. Under irrigation dryland grain will be replaced by row crops and feed crops for livestock production. This will stabilize and strengthen the economy of a State wholly dependent upon agriculture and will partially offset the loss of farmland flooded by main stream reservoirs.

The recreation and fish and wildlife benefits of the development are second only to the irrigation benefits. Relatively little additional construction is needed to provide the many waterfowl and recreation areas and in most cases the water supply comes from project waste water.

The most significant wildlife area and the most important recreation site will be at Devil's Lake which at one time was a fresh water lake covering 142 square miles. In recent times it has shrunk to less than 5 square miles with fish life disappearing and recreational uses abandoned. The Garrison unit plan of development calls for restoration of Devil's Lake to fit its original shoreline so that it will again become an important wildlife and recreational area.

The estimated cost of the Garrison diversion unit is \$248,234,000, of which about \$207 million is the cost of new works and the remainder represents amounts already spent for Jamestown Dam and that part of the Garrison Dam allocated to irrigation. About \$213 mil-

lion, which is more than the cost of the new works, will be repaid. Approximately \$35 million, allocated to flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement, will be nonreimbursable.

The benefit-cost ratio for the Garrison diversion unit is 2.5 to 1.

Section 2 of H.R. 237 establishes the policies and procedures for inclusion of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in the Garrison unit. The language of this section makes H.R. 237 consistent with the provisions of general legislation covering cost allocation and cost-sharing policies relating to recreation and fish and wildlife development in connection with water projects. The conference report on the general legislation, S. 1229, will be brought before the House within the next few days. Under the provisions of this section it will be necessary for the State or a local public body to enter into an agreement with the United States for the administration of those recreation and fish and wildlife areas not designated for Federal administration and to repay about \$2.34 million of the cost of developing these areas.

Section 3 provides for physical and financial integration of the Garrison diversion unit with other works of the Missouri River Basin project. The need to conserve water is emphasized by the language directing the Secretary to give consideration to returning to the Missouri River, to the fullest extent practicable, water which is not required for project purposes.

Section 4(a) sets out the formula which is to be used in establishing the interest rate applicable to the repayment of the municipal and industrial water costs and the reimbursable recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement costs. This is the standard formula that is presently used for all water projects.

Section 4(b) contains the provision discussed by Chairman ASPINALL relating to the overall Missouri River Basin project. It authorizes the use of 2½-percent interest rate in amortizing the present investment in power facilities constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the Missouri River Basin.

Section 5 prohibits for a 10-year period the delivery of project water for the production on new lands of any crop which is in surplus supply.

Section 6 limits the amount authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Garrison diversion unit to \$207 million and authorizes the amounts necessary for operation and maintenance of the unit.

Mr. Chairman, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has had the Garrison project under active consideration since 1957. All the problems standing in the way of its authorization have now been resolved and the committee recommends that the Garrison diversion unit be reauthorized and constructed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of, and deep concern for, the passage of H.R. 237.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what our chairman has just so well said, that this is a reauthorization.

Mr. Chairman, because of my many years of work in the development of the Missouri River program I want to give just a little bit of the history back of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the first interest that was shown was by the Bureau of Reclamation. We in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota had been very much interested in getting water from the Missouri River pumped over onto the divide between the Red River of the North and the James River and bringing it down a big canal, down the divide, using gravity from both sides for irrigation purposes. The Bureau of Reclamation had just about completed their surveys when the Corps of Engineers became interested. They were interested, if the gentleman from Missouri please, in seeing that floods were controlled in the lower portion of the river.

They were interested in seeing that navigation was maintained. So the Corps of Engineers came in with a plan for constructing these large dams, and the Pick-Sloan project was picked by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau. The Pick-Sloan plan was devised. Instead of taking the water out near the Montana-Dakota line, they would construct these large dams in the main stem of the river, then by the power that was generated would permit the water from the Garrison Dam and the Oahe Dam up on the divide to irrigate from that area, but at all times preserving this water in the lower basin for navigation and protecting the country down there from floods.

Following the disastrous Missouri River flood in 1943, when the whole bottom from Yankton, S. Dak., south, including Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri, was inundated, the Flood Control Act of 1944 was passed, which authorized the construction of these dams, and it authorized, as the chairman has said very briefly, the construction of these reclamation projects to replace land that is covered up, a million acres in the State of North Dakota and the State of South Dakota, the best land that probably existed is flooded forever for the protection of the lowlands in the States of Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri.

The first step of this mammoth program has been completed and the dams have been built. A million acres of our country have been flooded.

The second step is the construction of this Garrison Dam. Then, when that has been completed, the third step will be the construction of the Oahe project.

As the chairman has so well pointed out, the question on the passage of this bill is simply this: Do we as Members of Congress honor commitments made to these people back in 1944 when the Flood Control Act was passed by completing the second phase of this program to replace a million acres of land that have been flooded forever to protect the property of people living in the Missouri River bottom below Yankton, S. Dak., and Sioux City, Iowa? It has been determined—and I think properly—that each of these projects should come before the Congress separately, and that

each of them should be fully justified before Congress authorizes them.

This bill is fully justified, and I know this Congress is going to go through and complete the commitment that was made to these people in 1944 when the Flood Control Act was passed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN].

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge support for the legislation to reauthorize the Garrison diversion unit. Our great Speaker, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, and our distinguished floor leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, have been most cooperative in expeditiously moving this legislation toward action on the floor of the House. For this I am very grateful.

This project is an integral part of the multistate Missouri River Basin development, as set forth in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

A primary objective of that act was to prevent disastrous floods. Its success in that respect was noted in an article in the May 30, 1965, New York Times. I quote from that article:

Despite heavy runoff, there has been no flooding on the Missouri River this spring * * * The difference is six huge dams on the Missouri * * * The corps of engineers estimates that in the last 11 months the six dams aided by levees have prevented \$64 million in flood damage.

The ability to regulate the flow of Missouri River water has produced hydroelectric power, promoted navigation and provided recreational areas, as well as flood control benefits.

I am proud that my State of North Dakota contributed toward two of the six dams that made possible these benefits, principally for downstream States.

The Garrison diversion unit would give North Dakota its rightful share of the benefits from the Missouri River development by stabilizing agriculture and ensuring an adequate water supply for municipalities.

In this project, no desert land is being reclaimed, since all the land proposed for irrigation is under cultivation. Irrigation will simply provide supplemental moisture to maintain a constant crop production which over the years has been variable because of uncertain rainfall. I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that less than 1 percent of North Dakota's 25,781,756 acres of cultivated land is involved in the Garrison diversion unit.

In working my farm fields, I have discovered waterfowl nests, and I can personally attest to the fact that this area deserves to be known as the "waterfowl factory" of the Nation. The new development will provide substantial benefits for hunters and sportsmen all over the United States.

The Garrison diversion unit is one of the best planned irrigation projects ever presented to Congress. The reauthorization legislation has undergone the scrutiny of the House Interior Committee, whose illustrious chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], has a reputation for thoroughness. I can

say with confidence that Garrison diversion is a sound, responsible project.

Mr. Chairman, Garrison diversion is in the national interest. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, a point that deserves emphasis is that 21 years ago Congress authorized a diversion project, such as this, in the Flood Control Act of 1944 as an integral part of the comprehensive development of the Missouri River Basin.

A reauthorization is needed because later studies of the lands and the physical plan indicate that a more economical use of the water could be achieved by revising the project area.

The basic policy decision was made, therefore, by the 79th Congress in 1944. All the present legislation does is to make technical changes in the project plan.

Mr. Chairman, since 1944, the Missouri River development program has provided extensive benefits in flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power to 10 States. An analysis of the efficiency of flood control on the Missouri River is contained in the May 30, 1965, edition of the New York Times under the headline, "New Dams Block Missouri Floods."

The story by Donald Janson reads as follows:

OMAHA, May 25.—Despite heavy runoff, there has been no flooding on the big Missouri River this spring.

This is in sharp contrast with the havoc wrought by the Mississippi, the rampaging water of which did tens of millions of dollars of damage from St. Paul, Minn., to Hannibal, Mo.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to interject here to raise the question of how much greater the damage would have been had the Missouri not been under control.

To continue with the article:

The difference is six huge dams on the Missouri * * *. Before that Missouri River floods were among the worst in the country. In 1952, a major flood caused \$179 million in damage on the river from Montana to Kansas.

Only one of the six dams, Fort Peck in Montana, was in operation in 1952.

This year Mississippi flood crests surpassed records set in 1952 from northern Minnesota nearly to St. Louis, but with five more dams in the Dakotas in operation the Missouri was effectively harnessed.

The Army Corps of Engineers estimates that in the last 6 months the six dams aided by levees have prevented \$64 million in flood damage.

Maj. Gen. George H. Walker, engineer in charge of the Missouri River division of the corps, here, flew over the swollen Mississippi recently.

"I couldn't avoid a sense of comfort," he said afterward, "that we no longer face a major flood disaster in the Missouri Valley because of the tremendous reservoir capacities of our mainstem dams."

This week the reservoirs behind the six dams held a record 49,608,000 acre-feet of water.

A year ago, the figure was 39,960,000 acre-feet. By the end of June, corps officials forecast, 59 million acre-feet of water will be impounded in the six reservoirs. Run-off into the Missouri extends through June because snow high in the Rockies is slow to melt.

However, damage of major flooding on the Missouri is a thing of the past, the corps

says, because the rate of flow of the river, regulated at the six dams, now is under the complete control of man.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud that my State of North Dakota has contributed toward two of the six main-stem dams that have brought a new sense of security to thousands of people along the Missouri River, as well as on the Mississippi River toward the Gulf of Mexico. Garrison Dam in North Dakota, in fact, has been providing flood control benefits since 1953 and producing electrical power since January 1956. Most of the benefits from flood control, navigation, and power, I wish to emphasize, have been received by downstream areas.

To make these contributions to the overall Missouri River development, North Dakota sacrificed more than 550,000 acres of good farm and ranch land for Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs, involving an estimated annual loss to the economy of between \$5 and \$10 million. Seven hundred farms and ranches were eliminated, 1,250 residents of towns and rural communities were displaced, and approximately 2,500 Indians were required to find new homes.

In fairness, North Dakota and the other upstream States have a right to their share of the benefits from the Missouri River development, as set forth in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The Garrison diversion unit would help redress balance by diversifying and stabilizing the agricultural economy through irrigation, providing municipal and industrial water supplies, recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement, flood control, and lake restoration.

The Garrison diversion unit provides for the irrigation of 250,000 acres, which comprise only nine-tenths of 1 percent of the 25,781,756 acres of cultivated cropland in North Dakota at the present time. In Garrison diversion, it is inaccurate to say that we are reclaiming desert land, because all of the land proposed for irrigation is under cultivation. Irrigation will simply provide supplemental moisture to stabilize crop production which over the years has been variable because of uncertain rainfall.

With irrigation, there will be impelling economic reasons for farmers to switch from wheat acreage to forage crops and feed for livestock production. A study by the North Dakota State University indicates that 85,000 acres currently devoted to the production of wheat and other small grains will be diverted to crops required for livestock. In this connection, it should be noted that the Nation's requirements for meat are increasing and are expected to increase further with population growth. The Department of Agriculture predicts a demand for 40 percent more food in 1975, with 50 to 60 million more people in the United States.

In evaluating the effects of Garrison diversion on food production, we must keep in mind that the project will not be completed for 25 to 30 years—by 1980, it will be only 20 percent complete. Clearly, the time schedule on Garrison diversion corresponds with the Nation's food demands in the future.

Accompanying this change in the agricultural pattern would be a much-needed diversification of the North Dakota economy. Adequate, low-cost water would build new industry, supplying 18 cities, towns, and industrial areas.

Mr. Chairman, having farmed in North Dakota for the greater part of my life, I can personally attest to the fact that we have the finest breeding grounds for waterfowl. Many times on my own farm I have discovered duck nests. Authorities agree that North Dakota is one of the two most productive waterfowl propagation areas in the Nation.

I am happy to say that the Garrison diversion project includes plans to improve and expand these resources. Thirty-six major areas and thirty minor areas containing more than 56,000 acres of water and marsh would be provided with a constant and controlled water supply for fish and wildlife. Nine recreation areas would be developed.

The sportsmen and hunters of the entire Nation stand to benefit from these phases of the Garrison diversion unit.

All of these developments will spur economic growth in North Dakota, including a population growth of an estimated 17,500 persons. Studies indicate that approximately \$67 million of increased annual trade will result. Every State in the Nation will supply some of the needs of the expanding area economy. Federal tax revenues will register significant increases.

The value of Garrison diversion to the State and Nation is widely recognized in North Dakota, and our people have demonstrated a willingness to accept their responsibilities. In 1955, the North Dakota State Legislature created the 25-county Garrison Diversion Conservancy District, representing the areas that will benefit directly from the project. The district was granted the authority to levy a general tax over all property within its boundaries to finance the repayment obligations for the project.

In addition, nine irrigation districts, including about 420,000 acres of irrigable land have been formed by potential irrigators. These districts stand ready to contract with the Federal Government for their share of the project costs.

Mr. Chairman, the Garrison diversion unit has been studied in every detail over the past 20 years. Undoubtedly it is one of the best planned irrigation projects ever presented to Congress—one that will return \$2.51 for every \$1 invested. The reauthorization legislation, moreover, has undergone the scrutiny of the Interior Committee, whose illustrious chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], has a reputation for thoroughness. I can say with confidence that Garrison diversion is a sound, responsible project.

Once again, let me emphasize that the Garrison diversion unit is an integral part of the multistate Missouri River Basin project. Located in the duck factory of the Nation, it would improve hunting and fishing opportunities for the Nation's sportsmen. Garrison diversion would strengthen the area economy, as well as the national economy, by stabi-

lizing agriculture and providing a dependable water supply for industry.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of my colleagues for the Garrison diversion reauthorization bill.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of this committee for arranging to have this bill come before us at this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to add my words of support for the authorization of the Garrison diversion unit.

I am hopeful that one day it will bring irrigation waters into Brown and Marshall Counties, S. Dak., as contemplated in the plan. I look forward to the time when South Dakota landowners will participate in this project to stabilize production on nearly 56,000 irrigable acres known as the Oakes unit.

We in South Dakota look upon the Garrison diversion unit as holding the key to the vast future potentiality of the Missouri River Basin. We look upon the Garrison diversion unit as the forerunner of similar progress in our State. We look upon it as the predecessor to the construction of the Oahe irrigation unit in east central South Dakota, another great link in the development of the Missouri River Basin.

We in South Dakota, like our friends to the north, have sacrificed hundreds of thousands of good farm and ranch acres, with the resultant loss of tax revenues, for construction of the great Missouri River reservoirs. As a result, the States downstream from us have enjoyed the benefits from improved flood control, navigation, and pollution abatement.

I would like to inject a word, Mr. Chairman, to say that I was superintendent of the reservation of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota at the time of the construction of the Garrison Reservoir and, as the chairman pointed out, the people in North Dakota lost something like 550,000 acres of some of the most fertile lands in the State. This tribe of Indians, the Fort Berthold Affiliated Tribes, lost something in the neighborhood of 152,000 acres of their most valuable lands. This body made adequate, I believe, financial restitution to these people for the loss of this land, but, because of their cultural background and their social orientation to our kind of money economy, there are now many of these same people who enjoyed a good life on these river bottomlands who have become to a great degree the charges not only of the Federal Government but of the State of North Dakota in welfare programs.

If we can have the Garrison diversion project in actual operation, it will bring irrigation waters and other benefits to some parts of North Dakota where Indians are now living, particularly in the Devils Lake Reservation, the Fort Totten Sioux Indians. They can be given opportunities for jobs within the State through the industries which could be brought in by this project and by the

stabilization of agriculture through the water to be provided by this project.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, we in North and South Dakota have not yet realized the promise of irrigation development made to us when the Missouri River dams were constructed. But now we see the fulfillment of this long-overdue legacy with the beginning of the Garrison diversion unit in North Dakota.

The Garrison diversion unit has been very carefully studied and modified over a long period of time. It enjoys a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 2.5 to 1. Its construction will be a wise Federal investment that will be repaid many times over.

Agricultural diversification and economic opportunities will be increased materially in the project area. It will give farmers the opportunity to get out of the business of producing surplus crops, principally wheat, and it will place no new land in production. It will stabilize the entire economy of an area which has been subject to so many vacillations due to irregular rainfall.

Mr. Chairman, we in South Dakota are happy to lend our wholehearted support to this project, for it represents more than just a new beginning for the agricultural economy of our area—it represents a fulfillment of the long-nourished idea of controlling and using the vast waters of the Missouri River for the benefit of man.

I am hopeful that the members of this committee will see fit to give this bill their wholehearted approval. Again I thank the committee for bringing the bill before this committee for action.

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

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to rise in opposition to the Garrison diversion project, the bill that is now before us, but it is rather my purpose to rise in defense of income and opportunity for 3½ million farmers throughout the length and breadth of this Nation, and to register some concern for the continuous expanding budget with consistent budget deficits and a national debt that has grown by more than \$30 billion in the last 4 years. To do so is not an easy assignment, inasmuch as the Garrison diversion project involves a neighboring State and a congressional district that is adjacent to mine. It would have been much easier, I am sure, to look the other way, as I have been asked to do, but I find that I could not in good conscience possibly do this in view of the many statements that I have previously made in behalf of the deplorable agricultural economic conditions that exist throughout the Nation, and the extent to which I have voiced concern regarding this Nation's fiscal policies and problems.

The efforts and desires of the good people of North Dakota to improve their agricultural economy, to want additional recreational and wildlife facilities, and to provide water for their communities are highly commendable. But to do so in a manner that only creates further problems for and at the expense of other farmers throughout the

entire Nation—yes, even in the State of North Dakota—and at a completely unwarranted expense and aggravation of our Nation's deficit and debt, raises some very grave questions indeed. My only problem today in discussing them with you is that, as I mentioned earlier during the discussion of the rule, we do not have sufficient time to consider even the more glaring fallacies that are contained in this bill. Let me attempt to do so as briefly as possible. The expenditure of over \$248 million for the Garrison diversion unit, which might better be known as the Garrison irrigation project, is completely without merit and could have only the following results.

It would further aggravate the surplus problem. It would grant assurance that continued inadequate prices would prevail for agricultural products, add a quarter of a billion dollars to our national debt, place Government obligations on land that would have to be paid by a generation that is not even born yet, increase the cost of food to consumers, create further restrictions and regulations on agriculture throughout the Nation, create further Government expenditures through necessary curtailed productions to offset the production of the 250,000 acres to be irrigated in this project, create an unnecessary tax burden that will go on for the next 50 years, plus numerous other problems such as downstream water supplies, interest rates, power rates, Government acquisition of land, fish, and wildlife, many of which have been referred to so eloquently by the distinguished minority ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

With all of these suggestions, it should certainly seem that the wisdom of this House would dictate that the project should be turned down at this time. However, it is to be remembered that this is a "pork barrel" project, and so is not to be regarded on its merits, but is to be passed on the basis of expediency, so evidenced by the fact that there is not even permitted sufficient time to identify the many objections.

This is strictly an irrigation project, designed to irrigate 250,000 acres of questionable land, at a cost of almost \$2 million, with 2 out of every 3 acres of land to be irrigated classified as class 3 land, the poorest possible land that is considered to be irrigable. Now this amounts to an expenditure of \$796 per acre, and anyone who has been within a shadow of a farm knows that you cannot make that kind of a land investment and expect it to be a paying proposition, regardless of what commodities one might raise at the prevailing prices today. It is only a matter of a few weeks ago since the Governor brought a delegation of people from North Dakota here to Washington in order to call to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress the need for improved farm prices. Right at this moment, he is requesting permission to cut hay on soil bank land and to make diversion and wheat certificate payments to farmers who were not able to seed because of floods and continuous wet weather. Each

of these objectives would be completely negated by this project.

Regardless of what has been said in favor of the project, there will be raised on this land agricultural products that are now in surplus. The arguments that have been made to the contrary might well be laughable except for the very seriousness of the subject. The committee report states, for instance:

North Dakota officials and prospective water users are so confident that this unit will not add to the present agricultural surplus problem that they are willing to place in the legislation a provision that prevents the delivery of water for production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity which is in surplus as determined in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938 as amended in 1949.

Let us look for a moment at what section 5 of the bill provides, and I quote as follows:

For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Now what does that mean? It means the basic commodities as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949, which are tobacco, rice, peanuts, cotton—all of which are not raised within hundreds of miles of this area—leaving them only two; namely, wheat and corn. You will note that it places no such restrictions on oats, barley, potatoes, sugarbeets, dairy products, beef, or hay, all of which have been a part of Government expenditures in order to maintain a minimum price for the past many years and have cost the Federal Government billions of dollars to do so.

But the irony of the matter is contained in the very first line of section 5 of the bill, which as I quoted, says "for a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act." The Governor of North Dakota has stated in testimony before the committee that it will take from 25 to 30 years to complete the 250,000-acre initial phase of this project, and so this provision will expire even before any great irrigated production is anticipated. This is a typical example of how the bill has been misrepresented and constitutes a deliberate attempt to mislead the public. This, of course, is what truly characterizes it as a "pork barrel" project that cannot be approved on the basis of its merits. It, therefore, becomes perfectly obvious that the intention is to raise products that presently are in surplus. This has been true with Government irrigation projects throughout the entire Nation for the past many years.

I hold in my hand a report by the Bureau of Reclamation which provides the statistics for the production on the various projects throughout the country, and let me quote a few statistics from page 107 which identifies the volume as well as the value of these crops during the crop year of 1963. There was over 557,000 acres of barley produced, over 308,000 acres of corn, over 139,000 acres of oats, over 375,000 acres of wheat, over 1,801,000 acres of alfalfa hay, over 1 mil-

lion acres of irrigated pasture, over 539,000 acres of sugarbeets, over 188,000 acres of potatoes, to name but a few of the crops that have been involved in this surplus production. I have taken occasion to add up the value of these kinds of surplus crops that have been produced on these projects over the last 12 years, and find that they total almost \$8 billion, far greater than the total surplus inventory on hand in the country today.

Now let us see how this applies to the State of North Dakota, on farms literally across the road from those involved in this project. During this crop year of 1965, it will be required of the Government to make payments in excess of \$20 million as diversion payments under the wheat and feed grains programs, with an additional \$15 million in order to pay for the land still remaining under the soil bank program. This makes a total of \$35 million of Government moneys that will necessarily be expended during the year 1965, in order not to produce wheat, feed grains, or cut hay on soil bank land. This is to say nothing about wheat certificates, soil conservation payments, price supports, purchases of dairy products, beef and lamb, sugarbeets and the many other economy get-well programs applicable to rural areas. Now, then, can anyone possibly justify an expenditure of \$796 an acre in order to put land into production of these same identical crops? And while it has been said that there might be some wheat and feed grain acres that are converted into the production of hay and pasture, I need not remind you at this moment that these are the same identical crops that we are paying farmers not to cut or to raise on the diverted acres and the soil bank land. It is less than a year ago since the Secretary of Agriculture was almost denouncing the farmers of this Nation for having raised too much beef that resulted in the lower price of beef at that time. Yet we now are recommending these huge expenses in order to increase livestock production, in accordance with the testimony given before the committee.

Let us see what this expenditure amounts to on a per farm basis. On a 320-acre farm, which is the maximum amount allowed under irrigation regulations to a man and wife, this would require an expenditure of more than a quarter of a million dollars, or \$256,000. This is enough money to make a direct grant to that farm operation of \$6,000 a year for a period of 42 years, or you could make a grant of \$8,000 a year for 30 years. Yet, you could save the Government money by doing this, because at least you would not have to pay other farmers not to produce the products that would be raised on this land on which these expenditures are being made. It is truly disheartening to think of these expenditures and then to also recognize that on other farms throughout the Nation, we are literally asking them to get along on poverty rations, and denying them the opportunity to produce in accordance with their own best judgment.

The fact that this is not a paying project to farmers, taxpayers, consumers, or anyone else, is best recognized by the fact

that less than 15 percent of the cost is to be repaid by the irrigators, even though they do not pay interest on that money for the 50-year repayment figure. And I ask you to remember for just a moment, that even at 3½ percent interest—and the Government now pays more than that on our indebtedness—the interest alone would more than double the cost of the project for every 30 years. It follows, of course, that you cannot possibly raise food in this most uneconomical manner without substantially increasing the overall cost to the consumer, and so we see by just these few brief observations of how this project can only aggravate the very problems that your Agriculture Committee has been for the past several weeks trying to find some solution to. The fact that it costs an enormous amount of money to do so was evidenced by the House passing an appropriation bill only a few weeks ago in excess of \$5,600 million providing for agricultural appropriations.

I should be the first to admit that there conceivably could be a time in our future history when this project could be one of merit, but that time is certainly not today.

What a shame it is for the same Government to be asking other farmers, literally across the road from those who are supposedly to benefit from this project, to reduce their production and live on meager incomes. I question that even the irrigators will benefit under today's prices, because you cannot raise these products, even under ideal conditions, on a profitable basis today, so how can one possibly expect that they are going to be able to do it with these added expenditures? But the point I want to make is that because of Government regulation and production restrictions, the income of farmers throughout the Nation is presently at the 1930 depression day levels, creating demands for huge Government expenditures, not only in price support programs, but also in other community development programs, such as ARA, APW, and the poverty program. It has been stated by the Secretary of Agriculture that over 2½ million of these farmers do not even earn the prevailing minimum wages, and it has been suggested that they be moved off the farms.

All these farmers are actually seeking is the privilege to produce food and fiber for this Nation at a reasonable market price at no cost to Government, and yet, by this project, we insist that they are not going to have that privilege. The many fallacies of this project could be enumerated for the rest of this afternoon, but let me just refer to one more before concluding.

The argument has been made that the justification for this project is to somehow replace the land that was taken out of production because of the original construction of the Garrison Dam. However, they have failed to tell you that the project will take an additional 149,000 acres of land out of production and off the tax rolls. But the interesting thing is why they are doing this. And I should quote to you a part of a statement made to the committee by Mr. James C. McBroome, Chief, Technical Services Divi-

sion, of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. I quote him as follows:

The necessary things that have to be done to prepare land for irrigation would destroy thousands of acres of the finest waterfowl production habitat that we have left in this country. Therefore, we felt it necessary to work with the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to the authorization of Congress in the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, to develop the plan that is before me.

And so again we see where the project is actually going to destroy some of the very best waterfowl production habitat that we have in the country, thereby necessitating a further expenditure of over \$21½ million in order to attempt to restore this habitat, which it is very doubtful that we are going to be able to duplicate. And so the project again becomes one of being destructive and harmful to some of the best natural resources that we have in this country, in order that Government can recreate them, all to the detriment of farmers, of consumers, of sportsmen, and the general economic condition of our country.

These are but a few of the many objections that are so prevalent and outstanding in this project that its proponents do not want to have them discussed. And I am fully aware of the futility of raising these items before the House today, for obviously the order is "pass the bill" for expediency purposes only.

But I should want to at this time remind by colleagues that I hope you may be as generous to the rest of our rural and farm population when that question comes before us. I hope that you will then remember that their income has dropped to the levels of depression days, while the rest of our economy has enjoyed a continuous increase, and that farm indebtedness has grown to a point of where it is 50 cents higher today when compared to the per dollar of income than it was in 1929 just before the great economic crash, and that these people too are entitled to equality of opportunity and income, and yes, I would include even those farms that are to be irrigated by this project, for even they will experience hardship under today's prices and today's many government restrictions and regulations, even added regulations that go with irrigation projects, which will not permit them to expand their operation and water supplies beyond the 320 acres allotted to a man and wife. I hope that you will then be consistent and remember that it is perfectly permissible to expend hundreds of millions of interest-free money that this Government does not have. I shall be disappointed indeed if I then hear any reference to accumulated surpluses and huge costs to Government for storage costs and production restriction programs. I hope that everyone will remember that we have truly helped to aggravate those problems today.

While I have stated that there are many more objections that we should do well to make note of today, I think that these I have raised are certainly of sufficient magnitude to warrant the serious consideration of this House in rejecting the project that is before us.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will my genial friend yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The language with respect to the delivery of water for production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity has been placed in bills for such project authorizations, as my colleague knows, for some 12 years.

Mr. LANGEN. I am well aware of that, I say to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take the floor on this matter but after my friend from Minnesota made such an issue of reclamation generally, because this, I think, represents one of the fine reclamation projects in the country, I did not think it would be proper for me, coming from a State that is the headwaters of the great Missouri River, to sit by without stating our position. Certainly, there is always an argument as to whether or not what we do now is going to be of any benefit to those who live in the country at the present time or whether there will be future benefit from what we do now, and whether or not it will actually play an important role in history, whereby we will be judged.

I am certain that the bill as reported from the committee has been given a great deal of consideration. Most of the people on this committee come from areas that have a great deal of agriculture and who have concern for their farmers as much as I do. So I thought it would not be proper to let the record stand at this point without making some retort to the very hard-driving statement of the gentleman from Minnesota. Certainly, with the facts and figures that are given to us on almost a regular basis as to what the needs are going to be for food, not only in the short years ahead but in the eighties and nineties, I think it would be wise to consider the project on a basis, not of producing a surplus crop but of putting our Nation in a position where we will, in fact, be able to supply the needs of the people of this country, as well as meet our commitments overseas for food for those in need who are not able at this time, at least, to produce their own food supply.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the technical aspects of the Garrison diversion unit. I would like to take this time to point out the feeling of individual North Dakotans about this project and the spirit of cooperation which our entire State has shown in the endeavor to get this extremely important project underway.

North Dakota is a State that is proud of its individualism. Perhaps this springs from a feeling bred into those of us who live on the wide prairies. We have not approached this from a standpoint of getting something for nothing from the Government.

In 1944, as has been pointed out, the proposition was made to North Dakota that downstream States needed flood protection and that, by locating dams in North Dakota the reservoirs of which would inundate about half a million acres of our best farmlands, downstream States could be saved millions—yes, billions—of dollars in flood damage. The proposition was made that by doing this we would in turn get irrigation through diversion.

It was no fault of our people that the original point of diversion had been changed because of engineering and soil reasons. Our State has gone ahead, confident in the feeling that Congress would fulfill the commitment made in 1944 by reauthorization. Our legislature set up a conservancy district comprised of over 60 percent of the taxable valuation of our State, whose board of directors is elected by the people and which has the power to levy taxes on all real property in this part of our State. We did this because we realized that Garrison diversion would benefit all parts of our economy and felt the cost should be shared.

So, too, did our legislature set up the Carrington irrigation experiment station by spending State funds to set up a 640-acre establishment where field trials could be carried on so the information needed by our farmers would be available when irrigation began. Our cities and towns have built municipal water supply systems, dependent upon this water from Garrison but confident that Congress would reauthorize, thereby fulfilling its pledge to North Dakota.

Mr. Chairman, simply stated, without this water, North Dakota cannot grow. It is not to bring new lands into production, but rather to change the cropping system of lands now producing surplus crops. It is to provide water for cities whose population has grown threefold since the thirties but whose water supply—the same then as it is now—was down to the point of refining their own sewage in order to get enough water to fill the mains.

North Dakota has sincerely gone the full measure of meeting its share of the obligation incumbent upon developing this water project. We confidently hope that the House, in its wisdom, will recognize the need and approve this project.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] has, of course, made a very good case for his position. I take issue with him on his statement, but certainly he has advised the House as to how he feels and in answer to his statement, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, construction of Garrison unit will bring about a shift from dryland grain crops to row crops and forage and feed crops for livestock production. It is expected that the project will not only not further aggravate the surplus production

problem but it will reduce crop surpluses in this area.

So much has been said about the relationship between the agriculture surpluses problem and the reclamation program you may be interested in the fact that agricultural production on lands reclaimed or protected by the Corps of Engineers has exceeded the production on reclamation projects and the crops on Corps-protected lands are those which contribute more to the surplus problem than crops grown on reclamation projects.

A few weeks ago, the House passed legislation authorizing some \$263 million for continuing the construction program of the Corps of Engineers in 10 river basins. In one of these areas alone, the Corps' program provides for development and use of about 726,000 acres of rich agricultural land which in the past has been practically unused. This brings into cultivation almost 3 times as much land as the Garrison unit and this is only one area. I fully support the program of the Corps of Engineers but I just want my colleagues to know that if the agricultural surpluses problem is going to be an issue in the consideration of water resources development projects and programs—and I do not believe it should be—then the reclamation program is not the greatest offender.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are 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 the general plan for the Missouri-Souris unit of the Missouri River Basin project, heretofore authorized in section 9 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as modified by the report of the Secretary of the Interior contained in House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, is confirmed and approved under the designation "Garrison diversion unit," and the construction of a development providing for the irrigation of two hundred and fifty thousand acres, municipal and industrial water, fish and wildlife conservation and development, recreation, flood control, and other project purposes shall be prosecuted by the Department of the Interior substantially in accordance with the plans set out in the Bureau of Reclamation report dated November 1962 (revised May 1963) supplemental report to said House Document Numbered 325.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized in connection with the Garrison diversion unit to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the unit area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of unit lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with other unit purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and additional development of unit lands or facilities, or to dispose of unit lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes.

The Secretary shall notify the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of any such proposed disposition to a State or local public body by transfer, conveyance, or exchange, or by lease for twenty-five years or more, and no such transfer, conveyance, or exchange shall be effectuated and no such lease shall be executed prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days, however, shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die) from the date of such notification. In connection with the foregoing undertakings and developments for the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources on the Garrison diversion units; (1) Federal costs incurred specifically for land and basic facilities shall be nonreimbursable; (2) joint costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, other than those hereafter specified, shall in the aggregate be nonreimbursable to the extent they do not exceed the sum of \$13,000,000 plus 4 per centum of the cost of joint-use land and facilities of the unit in excess of \$100,000,000; (3) joint costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement which are attributable to migratory waterfowl production habitat benefits shall be nonreimbursable; and (4) other Federal costs, including separable joint costs, allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall in the aggregate be nonreimbursable up to a limit of \$2,500,000. Provision shall be made for the reimbursement, for the contribution by non-Federal interests, or for the reallocation of costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in excess of the foregoing limit under one or a combination of the following method as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary: (1) provision by non-Federal interests of land or interests therein or facilities required for the unit; (2) payment or repayment, with interest at a rate comparable to that provided in section 4 (a) of this Act, pursuant to agreement with one or more non-Federal public bodies; (3) reallocation to other project functions in the same proportion as joint costs are allocated among such functions. Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife shall be treated as unit costs and allocated to the other unit purposes. For the purpose of this Act, "joint use land and facilities" shall mean land and facilities serving two or more unit purposes, one of which is recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation, development of water resource projects, or disposition of public lands for recreational purposes.

SEC. 3. The Garrison diversion unit shall be integrated physically and financially with the other Federal works constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plan approved by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented. The Secretary shall give consideration to returning to the Missouri River to the fullest extent practicable such of the return flows as are not required for beneficial purposes.

SEC. 4. (a) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the capital costs allocated to interest-bearing features of the Garrison diversion unit as authorized in this Act shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

(b) From and after July 1, 1965, the interest rate on the unamortized balance of the investment allocated to commercial power in facilities constructed or under construction on June 30, 1965, by the Department of the Army in the Missouri River Basin, the commercial power from which is marketed by the Department of the Interior, and in the transmission and marketing facilities associated therewith, shall be 2½ per centum per annum.

SEC. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Garrison diversion unit as authorized in this Act, the sum of \$207,000,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the unit.

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read in full and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 7, strike out "May 1963" and insert "February 1965".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 9, strike out all of section 2 and insert the following:

"Sec. 2. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section, the Secretary is authorized in connection with the Garrison diversion unit (i) to construct, operate, and maintain or provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of public outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities, (ii) to acquire or otherwise to include within the unit area such adjacent lands or interests in land as are necessary for present or future public recreation or fish and wildlife use, (iii) to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, and (iv) to provide for the public use and enjoyment of unit lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with other unit purposes. The Secretary is further authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and replacement of unit facilities, and to transfer unit lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease or exchange, upon such terms and con-

ditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement purposes.

"(b) All costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement and incurred in connection with waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas proposed for Federal administration shall be nonreimbursable.

"(c) (1) If, before commencement of construction of the unit, non-Federal public bodies agree to administer for recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement or for both of these purposes pursuant to the plan for the development of the unit approved by the Secretary land and water areas which are not included within Federal waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas and to bear not less than one-half the separable costs of the unit allocated to either or both of said purposes, as the case may be, and attributable to such areas and all the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement incurred in connection therewith, the remainder of the separable capital costs so allocated and attributed shall be nonreimbursable.

"(2) In the absence of such a preconstruction agreement recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities (other than minimum facilities for the public health and safety at reservoir access points and facilities related to Federal waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas) shall not be provided, and the allocation of unit costs shall reflect only the number of visitor days and the value per visitor day estimated to result from such diminished recreation development without reference to lands which may be provided pursuant to subsection (e) of this section.

"(d) The non-Federal share of the separable capital costs of the unit allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be borne by non-Federal interests, under either or both of the following methods as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary: (i) payment, or provision of lands, interest therein, or facilities for the unit; or (ii) repayment, with interest, within 50 years of first use of unit recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement facilities: *Provided*, That the source of repayment may be limited to entrance and user fees or charges collected at the unit by non-Federal interests if the fee schedule and the portion of fees dedicated to repayment are established on a basis calculated to achieve repayment as aforesaid and are made subject to review and renegotiation at intervals of not more than 5 years.

"(e) Notwithstanding the absence of preconstruction agreements as specified in subsection (c) of this section lands may be acquired in connection with construction of the unit to preserve the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement potential of the unit.

"(1) If non-Federal public bodies agree within ten years after initial unit operation to administer for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement pursuant to the plan for development of the unit approved by the Secretary land and water areas which are not included within Federal waterfowl refuges and waterfowl production areas and to bear not less than one-half the costs of lands acquired therefor pursuant to this subsection and facilities and project modifications provided for those purposes and all costs of operation, maintenance and replacement incurred therefor, the remainder of the costs of such lands, facilities, and project modifications shall be nonreimbursable. Such agreement and subsequent development shall not be the basis for any allocation of joint costs of the unit to recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement.

"(2) If, within ten years after initial operation of the unit, there is not an executed agreement as specified in paragraph (1) of

this subsection, the Secretary may utilize the lands for any lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, or may transfer custody of the lands to another Federal agency for use for any lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of that agency, or may lease the lands to a non-Federal public body, or may transfer the lands to the Administrator of General Services for disposition in accordance with the surplus property laws of the United States. In no case shall the lands be used or made available for use for any purpose in conflict with the purposes for which the project was constructed, and in every case preference shall be given to uses which will preserve and promote the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement potential of the project or, in the absence thereof, will not detract from that potential.

"(f) Subject to the limitations hereinbefore stated, joint capital costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be nonreimbursable.

"(g) Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife shall be treated as unit costs and allocated among all unit purposes.

"(h) As used in this Act, the term "non-reimbursable" shall not be construed to prohibit the imposition of entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or charges."

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting reading of amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment, I would like to state that this amendment is the amendment to which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] referred and which he called to our attention during the course of the general debate.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment brings this bill into compliance with the fish and wildlife and recreation allocation to which this House has already given its approval and to which the Senate has already given its approval and upon which the conferees have agreed. Therefore, the conference report will be before the two bodies next week.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAY, 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. 237) to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to House resolution 398, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. ASPINALL. 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. 485) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 485 with Mr. McFALL 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 Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

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

Mr. Chairman, the legislation which the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee brings to the floor today authorizes the next logical extension of one of the outstanding reclamation projects of the Nation and the world—the Central Valley project of California—which moves great quantities of water from the Sacramento River Basin and the Trinity River Basin in northern California, where water has been plentiful, several hundred miles south to the San Joaquin Valley where water is scarce and is urgently needed.

Federal participation in the Central Valley project dates back to 1935 when the initial authorization for construction was included in the Rivers and Harbors Act for that year. The Folsom unit, American River division, was added in 1949 and the Sacramento Canals division was authorized in 1950. The Trinity River division was authorized in 1955 and the San Luis unit in 1960. The works authorized at the present time are estimated to cost over \$1.3 billion of which just over \$900 million, or more than for any other reclamation project, has been appropriated. The State of California is participating in construction of the Central Valley project and also is building its own Feather River

project at a cost of over \$2 billion to convey northern California water all the way to the Los Angeles area. The Auburn-Folsom South unit will add another \$425 million to the cost of the Central Valley project, bringing the total cost to over \$1.7 billion.

The Auburn-Folsom South unit is designed to make maximum use of the remaining water resources of the American River Basin for irrigation, municipal, and industrial water supply, flood control, hydroelectric power, fish and wildlife, and recreation purposes. This unit has been under consideration in the committee for more than 5 years. The first hearings on the unit were held in the 87th Congress and many members of the committee have visited the project area for an "on-the-ground" inspection of the proposed development. Since the committee initiated its consideration of the unit, the plan of development has been modified in order to make maximum use of the available water resources. The reservoir has been enlarged, and the powerplant capacity increased. Under the plan of development more than 400,000 acres will receive a firm irrigation water supply, the Sacramento Metropolitan area will receive additional flood protection and additional water for municipal and industrial purposes, and greatly increased recreational opportunities will be made available to a large part of California's ever-increasing population.

The Central Valley project is presently in a very sound financial position and it will remain so with the Auburn-Folsom South unit added. The unit meets every standard test of current reclamation doctrine and policy and for every dollar spent almost \$4 in benefits to the various project purposes will be returned to the Nation. Full repayment of the reimbursable costs will occur within 50 years. The committee concluded that the Auburn-Folsom South unit is a sound and feasible development from every standpoint and that its construction is urgently needed. H.R. 485 to authorize this most meritorious project should be approved by the Congress.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss briefly the Auburn-Folsom South unit and the provisions of H.R. 485.

Section 1 of H.R. 485 authorizes the Auburn-Folsom South unit consisting of the Auburn Dam and Reservoir and powerplant, the Folsom South Canal, the Forest Hill Divide development, and the Folsom-Malby development. The works that would be authorized are designed to provide maximum economic utilization of the remaining waters of the American River Basin for irrigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, municipal and industrial water supply, fish and wildlife, and recreation purposes.

The 690-foot Auburn Dam on the American River will provide a reservoir

with a total capacity of 2,500,000 acre-feet to serve the project purposes. The Auburn powerplant will have an initial installed capacity of 240,000 kilowatts, and language in section 1 gives the Secretary authority to increase the capacity to 400,000 kilowatts if the additional installation is determined to be feasible and is approved by the Congress.

The main water delivery feature of the unit is the 67½-mile Folsom South Canal which will provide supplemental water to some 400,000 acres of land in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties.

The Forest Hill Divide development is physically separated from the remainder of the unit and would provide irrigation and municipal water service to a 5,000-acre tract between the North Fork and the Middle Fork of the American River.

The Folsom-Malby development involves the construction of facilities to deliver municipal and industrial water to an area of about 12,000 acres in eastern Sacramento County.

The investment cost of the Auburn-Folsom South unit, including interest during construction but not including the foundation and penstock for future power installation, is about \$427 million. Of this amount, there is \$48 million, or 11 percent of the cost, allocated to flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement which would be non-reimbursable. The remaining 89 percent will be repaid, with interest on that part allocated to municipal and industrial water, commercial power, and reimbursable recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Section 2 provides for the operation of the Auburn-Folsom South unit as an integral part of the Central Valley project. There will be both physical and financial integration. On this basis, all reimbursable costs of the project, including the Auburn-Folsom South unit, will be repaid within 50 years, and at the end of this period there will remain a surplus of about \$462 million to assist in additional development or return to the U.S. Treasury.

Section 3 establishes the policies and procedures for the inclusion of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement as unit purposes. The language of this section makes H.R. 485 consistent with the provisions of general legislation which was recently passed by the House. The conference report on the general legislation, S. 1229, will be before the House within the next few days. Under the provision of section 3 it will be necessary for the State or a local public body to enter into an agreement with the United States for the administration of the recreation and fish and wildlife areas and to repay with interest about \$6.2 million of the cost of developing these areas.

Section 4 requires the Secretary to give consideration to the reports and plans of the State of California for developing its water resources, and to consult with local interests who are affected by the proposed development.

Section 5 contains language relating to the project water supply and makes it clear that this legislation does not authorize an allocation of water and that

recommendations for the use of water in connection with the Auburn-Folsom South unit shall be in accord with State water laws.

Section 6 authorizes \$425 million be appropriated for the construction of the Auburn-Folsom South unit. The amount can be adjusted to reflect ordinary fluctuations in construction costs applicable to the types of construction involved in the unit. Language in this section also authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the project.

Mr. Chairman, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has had the Auburn-Folsom South unit under consideration and study for several years and has determined that it meets all of the requirements for approval by the Congress. The committee believes that the services which this unit will provide will greatly benefit the economy of California as well as the entire Nation, and the committee recommends that the Auburn-Folsom South unit be authorized and constructed.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that this bill was carefully and very fully considered both in the subcommittee and in the full committee. I know of no opposition to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] in whose district this project is situated.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the proposed Auburn-Folsom South unit of the Central Valley project in California, which as it is now constituted, is the culmination of 20 years of investigation, planning, and formulation by our local and State agencies and by the Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal agencies.

Auburn Dam, to be located on the American River near Auburn, Calif., would be a zoned earth, gravel and rock structure containing about 63 million cubic yards of material. The dam will rise 690 feet above the streambed. It will be the highest earthfill dam every built by the Bureau of Reclamation and stand as one of the world's highest earth-fill dams. The crest of the dam will be approximately 3,200 feet in length or about five-eighths of a mile. At its maximum cross section, the base of the dam will be about 1 mile wide.

Auburn Reservoir, when filled to its 2½-million-acre-foot capacity, would have a shoreline about 143 miles long. The reservoir will extend 18 miles up the North Fork of the American River, and 24 miles up the Middle Fork. The surface area of the reservoir, at full capacity, is estimated at 10,400 acres. Auburn powerplant would initially contain three generators, of the semioutdoor type, with a total capacity of 240,000 kilowatts. Provisions have been made to allow enlargement to 400,000 kilowatts.

The importance of outdoor recreation to the well-being of the people of California is recognized in all Bureau of Reclamation planning. We have incorporated in our plans facilities designed to insure the maximum realization of

the outdoor recreational opportunities provided by the construction of Auburn would be a zoned earth, gravel, and rock Dam. The National Park Service has recommended that 2,500 camping units and 1,500 picnic units, as well as water and sanitary facilities, roads and trails, beach and boating facilities, and landscaping be provided for the convenience and enjoyment of the public.

Water from Auburn Reservoir will be released through Auburn powerplant to the existing Folsom Reservoir where it will be reregulated as required before passing through Folsom powerplant to Lake Natoma. From Lake Natoma, the water will be diverted into the Folsom South Canal at the Nimbus diversion dam. The Folsom South Canal will extend southward from Nimbus Dam about 68 miles to San Joaquin County. The initial capacity of the canal would be 3,500 cubic feet per second at Nimbus Dam and the maximum capacity would be 7,000 cubic feet per second.

The Forest Hill Divide development, included as a feature of the Auburn-Folsom South unit, will provide water for irrigation and municipal and industrial use. It will assure the growth of the Forest Hill community and provide living space for a growing population. The principal features of the Forest Hill Divide development at Sugar Pine Reservoir on North Shirltail Canyon Creek and a 13.7-mile pressure pipeline. Sugar Pine Reservoir will have a capacity of 16,500 acre-feet and a maximum surface area of 280 acres. A pipeline will convey the water from the reservoir to the 2,800-acre service area.

The Folsom-Malby development is also a part of the Auburn-Folsom South unit. Principal features of the plan are the 40,000 acre-foot capacity County Line Reservoir on Deer Creek; a 10.8-mile-long pipeline; and two pumping plants. This is a municipal and industrial water supply development designed to meet the needs of a growing population. County Line Reservoir also will offer a measure of flood protection along Deer Creek.

The cost of the Auburn-Folsom South unit is estimated at \$425 million. Of this amount 91 percent is reimbursable and the remaining 9 percent nonreimbursable. Flood control and a portion of recreation, fish and wildlife are functions considered to be national responsibilities and thus nonreimbursable.

The potential benefits of the unit stem from so many functions that it is difficult to decide which to mention first. One of the most important functions is that of providing increased flood protection for the highly developed American River valley, which includes the capital city of Sacramento. The need for such increased protection through storage has become more evident since the plan of development was formulated, as three recordbreaking flood events in 9 years strained the storage capacity of Folsom Reservoir and local protective works to their capacities. Each time, disastrous flooding of Sacramento was narrowly averted by emergency measures. Just last Christmas California experienced one of these disastrous storms.

Folsom Reservoir on the American River was just a scant 12 hours from spilling over the top of the dam. If the rains had continued this would have happened and there was nothing that could have prevented Sacramento, the capital of the State of California, from a great amount of damage. At this point I would like to recommend that each of you read "One Day From Disaster," published by the Bureau of Reclamation, which outlines the outstanding work performed by the Bureau of Reclamation facilities in controlling flood damage in the Central Valley project area.

Of equal importance to the region and the Nation is the distribution and delivery of water to be stored in the proposed Auburn Reservoir for service to almost one-half million acres of very rich lands lying south of Sacramento. Irrigation in that area is essential to economic agricultural production. Essentially every drop of surface water is used during the irrigation season, and underground water is being pumped out faster than nature can replace it. The farmers are desperately in need of the water that could be furnished through the Folsom South Canal.

Water from the Folsom South Canal would be delivered to the city of Stockton and other population centers in the area for municipal and industrial uses. Here again the pattern is repeated—as population grows, water demand increases, and the ground water which now furnishes the bulk of the city's supplies is being increasingly overdrawn. In fact, it has been necessary already to abandon some of the wells serving Stockton because the quality of the water as the water level receded under pumping became too saline for municipal use. The service proposed to the Forest Hill area is the only practicable way of permitting this mountain community to grow. Similarly, the Malby area which is normally completely dry can become a valuable suburb of Sacramento by virtue of the water it would receive from the Auburn-Folsom South unit.

California's demands for electric power continue to require the construction of new generating capacity. The Central Valley project, particularly, is about to reach the point where power requirements for pumping project water will absorb all of the uncommitted project power, and, unless new power capacity is added to the Central Valley project system, it may soon be necessary to withdraw power from existing preference customers. Construction of the Auburn powerplant, with an initial installation of 400,000 kilowatts, would substantially relieve the power squeeze which is impending.

Recreation and fish and wildlife benefits are of major importance also. Folsom Reservoir has become a favorite water playground for many thousands of central California's people. Auburn Reservoir, in addition to being an important recreation center in its own right, will augment the usefulness of Folsom Reservoir by maintaining higher, more constant water surface levels. Thousands of additional acres of land and water surface will be provided for

recreation opportunities. The new reservoir fishery will be a valuable asset to the area, and the benefits to the anadromous fish will be substantial.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people of California I want to express my deep appreciation for the fine consideration given to this bill by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, chaired by our outstanding colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], both of whom I believe are among the most knowledgeable people in the Nation when it comes to the problems of irrigation and reclamation. May I urge that the House of Representatives on this day adopt the legislation which has been recommended so strongly by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This is an extremely important project, one which I am confident you will be proud to have supported in the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and as one who believes in reclamation, I commend the author of this bill for a sound bill, which will help to build the West and to build the Nation. I enthusiastically support the bill and urge the members of the committee to do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, this is another example of the statesmanship that has prevailed through the years in drafting and enacting reclamation legislation. This is not just a California project; it is a project contributing to the reclamation of the arid Southwest. As an Arizonan, I might have been expected to oppose a project like this for California, since our States in years past have had differences on water matters. However, those days are past, and we find the States of California and Arizona working together now to solve their mutual water problems.

A further example of this cooperation is the Lower Colorado River Basin project bill, which has been introduced in the House by 33 members of the California delegation and the three members of the Arizona delegation. A comprehensive plan to finance long-range solutions to the water needs of the Southwest, this legislation will probably be the next major reclamation proposal to come before the Congress.

The reclamation idea has proved of inestimable value to this Nation, making the deserts bloom and providing a vital resource to the millions of Americans who have moved to the West in recent decades. I am pleased to see this idea being extended today in California and look forward to the day—hopefully soon—when we will extend it to the development of the Lower Colorado River Basin.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. SISK. I take this time to pay tribute to the great work, the patience, and the understanding of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON] with respect to this project. Having worked with him over the years, I know the many problems he struggled with in pulling together various forces, finally coming to the Congress with a project on which we have unanimous agreement. I pay particular tribute to him, and I especially commend the committee over which the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] so ably presides, for the good work they do, and commend the ranking Member as well as the Members on the minority side.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join with my colleagues from California in urging the adoption of H.R. 485, legislation which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit of the American River division of California's Central Valley project, under provisions of the Federal reclamation laws.

The Auburn-Folsom south unit is vitally necessary to meet our State's rapidly increasing needs and demands for water for domestic, agricultural, municipal, and industrial purposes, for electric power and energy, for additional flood protection, to enhance fish and wildlife, and to provide greater outdoor recreational opportunities.

This proposed multipurpose project is the culmination of some 20 years of investigation and planning by our local and State agencies and by the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation as well as other Federal agencies.

As such, it is part of a comprehensive basinwide plan to maximize the economic utilization of the remaining waters of the American River Basin, which has been developed as an integral part of the Central Valley project's ultimate plan.

The estimated cost of \$425 million is 91 percent reimbursable to the Government, primarily from revenues derived from agricultural irrigation and electric power uses.

In view of the tremendous importance of the development of California's water and power resources to meet the needs of our fast-growing State, and because of the great contribution this project will make in the overall development of the Western States, I strongly urge the adoption of H.R. 485 for the full authorization requested.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 485

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the principal purpose of increasing the supply of water available for irrigation and other beneficial uses in the Central Valley of Califor-

nia, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902; 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, as an addition to, and an integral part of, the Central Valley project, California, the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division. The principal works of the unit shall consist of—

(1) the Auburn Dam and Reservoir with maximum water surface elevation of one thousand one hundred and forty feet above mean sea level, and capacity of approximately two and one-half million acre-feet;

(2) a hydroelectric powerplant at Auburn Dam with initial installed capacity of approximately two hundred and forty thousand kilowatts and necessary electric transmission system for interconnection with the Central Valley project power system: *Provided*, That provision may be made for the ultimate development of the hydroelectric capacity (now estimated at approximately four hundred thousand kilowatts) and such installation may be made when the Secretary determines that it is economically justified and engineeringly feasible;

(3) the Sugar Pine Dam and Reservoir;

(4) the County Line Dam and Reservoir;

(5) necessary diversion works, conduits, and other appurtenant works for the delivery of water supplies to projects on the Forest Hill Divide in Placer County and in the Folsom-Malby area in Sacramento and El Dorado Counties;

(6) the Folsom South canal and such related structures, including pumping plants, regulating reservoirs, floodways, channels, levees, and other appurtenant works for the delivery of water as the Secretary determines will best serve the needs of Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to include in such canal and related operating structures such additional works or capacity as he deems necessary and economically justified to provide for the future construction of the East Side division of the Central Valley project, and the incremental costs of providing additional works or capacity in the Folsom South canal to serve the East Side division of the Central Valley project shall be assigned to deferred use for repayment from Central Valley project revenues. In the event that the East Side division is authorized, such costs shall be deemed a part of the cost of that division and shall be reallocated as the Secretary deems right and proper.

SEC. 2. Subject to the provisions of this Act, the operation of the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, shall be integrated and coordinated, from both a financial and an operational standpoint, with the operation of other features of the Central Valley project, as presently authorized and as may in the future be authorized by Act of Congress, in such manner as will effectuate the fullest, most beneficial, and most economic utilization of the water resources hereby made available. Auburn and County Line Dams shall be operated for flood control in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of the Army as provided for in section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887; 33 U.S.C. 709).

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized as a part of the Auburn-Folsom South unit to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the project area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of project lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other project purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements

with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and additional development of project lands or facilities, or to dispose of project lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The Secretary is authorized to transfer jurisdiction over project lands within or adjacent to the exterior boundaries of national forests and facilities thereon to the Secretary of Agriculture for recreation and other national forest system purposes. Where any project lands are transferred hereunder to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the lands involved shall become national forest lands: *Provided*, That the lands and waters within the flow lines of any reservoir or otherwise needed or used for the operation of the project shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior to the extent he determines to be necessary for such operation. In connection with the foregoing undertakings and developments for the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources on the Auburn-Folsom South unit, (1) Federal costs incurred specifically for land and basic facilities shall be nonreimbursable, and (2) joint costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall in the aggregate be nonreimbursable to the extent they do not exceed the sum of \$17,000,000 plus 2 per centum of the cost of joint-use land and facilities of the unit in excess of \$200,000,000. Provision shall be made for the reimbursement, for the contribution by non-Federal interests, or for the reallocation of costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in excess of the foregoing limit under one or a combination of the following methods as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary: (1) provision by non-Federal interests of land or interests therein or facilities required for the unit; (2) payment or repayment, with interest at a rate comparable to that provided in the Water Supply Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 319), pursuant to agreement with one or more non-Federal public bodies; (3) reallocation to other project functions in the same proportion as joint costs are allocated among such functions. Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife shall be treated as unit costs and allocated to the other unit purposes. For the purpose of this Act, "joint-use land and facilities" shall mean land and facilities serving two or more unit purposes, one of which is recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation, development of water resource projects, or disposition of public lands for recreational purposes.

SEC. 4. In locating and designing the works and facilities authorized for construction by this Act, and in acquiring or withdrawing any lands as authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall give due consideration to the reports upon the California water plan prepared by the State of California, and shall consult the local interests who may be affected by the construction and operation of said works and facilities or by the acquisition or withdrawal of lands, through public hearings or in such manner as in his discretion may be found best suited to a maximum expression of the views of such local interests.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed by implication or otherwise as an allocation of water, and in the studies for the purposes of developing plans for disposal of water as herein authorized the Secretary shall make recommendations for the use of water in accord with State water laws, including but not limited to such laws giv-

ing priority to the counties and areas of origin for present and future needs.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, the sum of \$425,000,000 plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the project.

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read in full, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, lines 17 and 18, strike out "the Secretary determines that it is economically justified and engineeringly feasible;" and insert "duly authorized by an Act of Congress:".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 18, add the following proviso: "Provided further, That no facilities, except those required for interconnecting the Auburn powerplant and the Folsom switchyard and those interconnecting the Folsom switchyard and the Elverta substation, shall be constructed for electric transmission or distribution service which the Secretary determines, on the basis of a firm offer of a fifty-year contract from a local public or private agency, can be obtained at less cost to the Federal Government than by construction and operation of Government facilities:".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 4, line 8, through page 6, line 18, strike out all of section 3 and insert the following:

"Sec. 3. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section, the Secretary is authorized in connection with the Auburn-Folsom South unit (i) to construct, operate, and maintain or provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of public outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities, (ii) to acquire or otherwise to include within the unit area such adjacent lands or interests in land as are necessary for present or future public recreation or fish and wildlife use, (iii) to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, and (iv) to provide for the public use and enjoyment of unit lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with other unit purposes. The Secretary is further authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and replacement of unit facilities, and to transfer unit lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease or exchange, upon such terms and

conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement purposes.

"(b) Costs of recreation facilities at Sugar Pine Reservoir shall be nonreimbursable, and the provisions of subsections (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall not be applicable to such facilities.

"(c) (1) If, before commencement of construction of the unit, non-Federal public bodies agree to administer unit land and water areas for recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement or for both of these purposes pursuant to the plan for the development of the unit approved by the Secretary and to bear not less than one-half the separable costs of the unit allocated to either or both of said purposes, as the case may be, and all the costs of operation, maintenance and replacement incurred in connection therewith, the remainder of the separable capital costs so allocated shall be nonreimbursable.

"(2) In the absence of such a pre-construction agreement recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities (other than minimum facilities for the public health and safety at reservoir access points) shall not be provided, and the allocation of unit costs shall reflect only the number of visitor days and the value per visitor day estimated to result from such diminished recreation development without reference to lands which may be provided pursuant to subsection (e) of this section.

"(d) The non-Federal share of the separable capital costs of the unit allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be borne by non-Federal interests, under either or both of the following methods as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary: (i) payment, or provision of lands, interests therein, or facilities for the unit; or (ii) repayment, with interest, within fifty years of first use of unit recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement facilities: *Provided*, That the source of repayment may be limited to entrance and user fees or charges collected at the unit by non-Federal interests if the fee schedule and the portion of fees dedicated to repayment are established on a basis calculated to achieve repayment as aforesaid and are made subject to review and renegotiation at intervals of not more than five years.

"(e) Notwithstanding the absence of pre-construction agreements as specified in subsection (c) of this section lands may be acquired in connection with construction of the unit to preserve its recreation potential, its fish and wildlife enhancement potential, or both.

"(1) If non-Federal public bodies agree within ten years after initial unit operation to administer unit land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement pursuant to the plan for development of the unit approved by the Secretary and to bear not less than one-half the costs of land acquired therefor pursuant to this subsection and facilities and project modifications provided for those purposes and all costs of operation, maintenance and replacement incurred therefor, the remainder of the costs of such lands, facilities, and project modifications shall be nonreimbursable. Such agreement and subsequent development shall not be the basis for any allocation of joint costs of the unit to recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement.

"(2) If, within ten years after initial operation of the unit, there is not an executed agreement as specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary may utilize the lands for any lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, or may transfer custody of the lands to another Federal agency for use for any lawful purpose within the jurisdiction of that agency, or may lease the lands to a non-Federal public body, or may transfer the

lands to the Administrator of General Services for disposition in accordance with the surplus property laws of the United States. In no case shall the lands be used or made available for use for any purpose in conflict with the purposes for which the project was constructed, and in every case preference shall be given to uses which will preserve and promote the recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement potential of the project or, in the absence thereof, will not detract from that potential.

"(f) Subject to the limitations hereinbefore stated, joint capital costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall be nonreimbursable.

"(g) Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife shall be treated as unit costs and allocated among all unit purposes.

"(h) As used in this Act, the term 'non-reimbursable' shall not be construed to prohibit the imposition of entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or charges."

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as having been read in full, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to advise the committee that this is a similar amendment to the one adopted on the previous legislation, which brings the legislation up to date so far as the formula heretofore adopted in the fish and wildlife, and recreation allocation bill is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 7, line 15, strike out "\$425,000,000," and insert "\$425,000,000 (1965 prices)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McFALL, 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. 485) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws, pursuant to House Resolution 399, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member desiring to do so may have 5 days in which to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the two bills just passed, H.R. 237 and H.R. 485.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID E. BELL

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to a man who 2½ years ago undertook a truly herculean and thankless task and has proved to be one of the best administrators this country has produced.

I refer to AID Administrator David E. Bell who on Saturday reached a record both in tenure of his office and performance. As of Saturday, June 12, he had been running the U.S. foreign aid program for 2 years, 5 months, and 22 days. And that is longer than anyone else has been willing or able to sit in the AID hot seat.

When Bell first took over, his friends offered condolences rather than congratulations. His job, assigned to him by President Kennedy in December 1962, was generally viewed as the most unwelcome Christmas present of the season.

Bell took on the AID chore without political pipelines into Congress. He came to it via work in the aid field in Pakistan, the Littauer School at Harvard, and his success in the demanding role of Budget Director. The consensus at the time was that the best Bell could hope for was a soft landing.

Since then, he has been winning praise from friend and foe alike. As we all know, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has commended Mr. Bell for giving the program its most efficient administration to date.

Members of Congress, no matter what their philosophy on foreign aid, rarely quarrel with Bell's careful, patient expositions of his programs. His listeners invariably know that he is firmly in charge of a program that he thoroughly understands. President Johnson has served clear and unambiguous notice to talent-hunting corporation executives that Bell is definitely not for hire.

His successful tenure will exceed that of Paul Hoffman, who directed most of

the expenditure of the \$12 million Marshall plan in non-Communist Europe, which brought about the dazzling recovery of stricken Europe and halted the march of communism in that part of the globe.

The new aid program is devoted mainly to the developing nations. It is a long-term undertaking where spectacular results—much less a quick cure—cannot be expected. Mr. Bell firmly believes that American assistance by itself can do little, the secret of success, he says, "is to find projects where a margin of external help will release the energies and resources of the people of the country for their own betterment."

Mr. Bell is in charge of spending something like \$2 billion a year.

By revamping the AID program, Mr. Bell, an eminent and hardheaded economist, insured that most money is spent here in the United States rather than overseas. As Bell argues the point, in 1962, approximately 60 percent of AID money was going overseas. Now less than 15 percent goes out of this country. The rest is spent inside the country to buy American goods and secure American services. Thus more jobs are created for Americans.

Mr. Bell has fostered many other changes in our economic aid methods. A major shift from grants to loans has taken place. Private business is increasingly participating in foreign aid, and technical assistance and loans have been used to encourage private enterprise in recipient countries.

As we review the growing evidence of AID's successes, we offer our sincerest congratulations to Mr. Bell on his long tenure. I am informed that he has termed his longevity in a post famous for fast turnovers as "a very minor distinction." He added that he "did not come here to outlast anybody but to try to do a job."

We all agree that David Bell has indeed done the job well—most ably directing programs which contribute immeasurably to the security of the Nation and to peace and prosperity abroad.

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear that Mr. Bell has served as administrator of the foreign handout program for 2 years, 5 months, and 22 days, 7 hours, and 32 minutes, or whatever it was. In that short time he has dispensed to foreigners several billion of our dollars. I might add the wish they could get a personnel manager of the foreign giveaway program that could stay on the job for more than a year.

IMMIGRATION LAW TO BE MODERNIZED

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have called a meeting of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality for 10 a.m. on June 17 for the purpose of continuing our consideration of the various proposals for immigration reform which are pending and for the purpose of marking up the administration bill. All major proposals now pending call for repeal of the national origins quota system. The issue to be resolved by the subcommittee is what system of immigrant admissions shall replace the present system. It is my hope and expectation that the subcommittee will resolve this matter without delay.

POLICE BRUTALITY IN JACKSON, MISS.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, in Jackson, Miss., 472 American citizens were arrested; yesterday 203 more were arrested, making a total of 675 who have been jailed for exercising their constitutional rights, for peacefully demonstrating against the State legislature's special session. John Lewis, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and Charles Evers, field secretary of the NAACP, were among those jailed.

There are reports of demonstrators being made to run a gauntlet. It has been admitted that State highway patrolmen covered their badges with adhesive tape to conceal their identities.

At least five were hospitalized; four had head injuries and scalp lacerations.

Mr. Speaker, this police brutality must cease. I call upon the Attorney General to investigate the conduct of the Mississippi officials. It is but another shocking example of police brutality in that State, another link in a long chain of attempts to deprive free citizens of their constitutional rights. Every day seems to bring another. Americans want an end to this reign of terror. When one constitutional right is denied, all rights are in danger.

Mr. Speaker, the latest brutalities show the need for Federal legislation to help protect these peaceful demonstrators—and all other citizens. Brutality by police officials should not be countenanced in our land.

In this session I reintroduced my bill (H.R. 5426) to protect civil rights by providing civil and criminal remedies for unlawful official violence. It would enact strict penalties for subjecting any person to unnecessary force during the course of an arrest or while the person is being held in custody. It would also provide punishments for other acts of misconduct so prevalent in Mississippi, such as official aid to private persons in

carrying out acts of unlawful violence, and unnecessary force used in eliciting confessions. These vital measures are needed now. I urge the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on this important measure and to report it out favorably. Clearly, if some are unsafe, none are safe. We must enact this bill to protect the constitutional rights so basic to our American way of life.

THE HAND THAT FEEDS HAS BEEN BITTEN AGAIN

Mr. WOLFF. 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. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the hand that feeds has been bitten again. Earlier this year the United Arab Republic came to us calmly and quietly—asked us to feed its starving, impoverished millions. Under the Public Law 480 program, this country agreed to send wheat. Gentlemen, Nasser has played us for a humanitarian sucker.

It has just come to light that he took our surplus wheat, and proceeded to export his domestic rice to China, Cuba, and other Communist nations. When the program was first initiated, it was agreed that Egypt would not export rice, a ready substitute for the proffered American wheat, unless a certain level of rice production had been reached in Egypt—and even then only a certain percentage of rice could be exported, and certainly not to the "Chicom" or Cuba. The rationale behind these arrangements was obvious: we would not pour wheat into a nation which was selling or exporting an agricultural crop which could feed the populace just as well as our wheat.

This agreement has been blatantly violated: Egypt has exported more rice than the percentage agreed upon. In fact, we have been inadvertently guilty of trading with the enemy—we have been subsidizing by a circuitous route, Egyptian exports to Red China and Cuba. This is not only a threat to the rationality of our foreign aid program—it is a direct and dangerous attack on our national security. Egypt today deliberately attempts to foil and circumvent our foreign policy. Two countries we will not trade with because of their clear-cut belligerent attitudes are now receiving the benefits of our Public Law 480 wheat via the United Arab Republic.

Thus, not only do we innocently render aid to our most dangerous enemies; but instead of turning Nasser from communism, we entrench him more firmly within the Communist camp. Not only has Nasser abused us, burned our books, and fanned the flames of war in the Middle East—now he has aided our enemies by taking our wheat and in return sending his rice to China, Cuba, Indonesia, and the Soviet Union.

If an American did that we would call it treason—at the least, we can call it international treachery. Nasser has

broken our agreements and now threatens our national security. Last March we voted on the extension of aid to Egypt and we agreed to give the President the discretionary power to control the flow of foreign aid funds in times of threat to our national security. I personally wrote the President of my concern lest he had any misconceptions of our vote giving him discretion on sales of wheat to Egypt. The President's letter in reply guaranteed that he "will be guided in any decision on these matters by our own national interest and our own national security."

It is obvious that our own national security now is at stake. We as a body must demand the immediate cessation of all further and pending aid to Egypt.

HONORARY DOCTORATES CONFERRED ON CONGRESSWOMAN EDITH GREEN

Mr. BOLAND. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most honored Members of this House is the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]. She has received during her public service many doctorates in many fields. In this year alone, and within the past week, she has received a doctor of laws degree from Hood College, Maryland, doctor of laws from Regis College in Massachusetts, doctor of laws from St. Xavier College, Illinois, doctor of laws from Yale University, and doctor of laws from Keuka College, New York.

She was also honored by a very great institution in Boston, Mass., Boston College. She was awarded a doctor of laws degree by that fine institution of higher education.

I would like to read the citation to the Members of the House:

EDITH GREEN

Now in her sixth term as Member of Congress, EDITH GREEN has won golden opinions as the cogent and compassionate voice for those functions of Government grouped under the term "general welfare." In the Halls of Congress, and even more effectively in the sessions of the Special Subcommittee on Education, of which she is chairman, Congresswoman GREEN's resourceful advocacy and statecraft have brought to successful enactment all manner of laws for the good estate of education and labor, for the protection of children and the aged, for the humane revision of public policy bearing on immigration, wages, and arms control.

Educated at Willamette University, the University of Oregon, and at Stanford, Mrs. GREEN was a teacher in the public schools of Salem, Oreg., for 11 years before engaging in radio broadcasting and in public relations. It was from the post of public relations director of the Oregon Educational Association that she went as a freshman Representative to the 84th Congress. From her first days in Government she has been known as the exceptionally well-informed, courageous, openminded servant of the good society. Today's honorary doctorate is the 10th

which she has been awarded by universities from Alaska to Maryland.

Mindful of the power committed to them by the supreme authority in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the president and the trustees have enrolled the Honorable EDITH GREEN among the honorary doctors of Boston College, and now joyfully greet her as doctor of laws, honoris causa.

MICHAEL J. WALSH, S.J.,
President.

Congresswoman GREEN now adds these 1965 honorary degrees to many other distinguished honors she has received in the past, including the 1964 Distinguished Service Award of the American College Public Relations Association; Distinguished Achievement Award, National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, 1962; 1964 "Top Hat" Award of Business & Professional Women's Clubs of America; 1958 Woman of the Year, National AMVETS Auxiliary; Brotherhood Award, Portland B'nai B'rith, 1956; and the 1964 Outstanding Service to Handicapped Award, Goodwill Industries of America.

I know that one of Congresswoman GREEN's greatest personal satisfactions comes from the successful efforts that the Federal Government is now making in the many fields she so expertly, willingly, and zealously fostered in the Congress. Many of the bills she sponsored and shepherded through the legislation process have become law, including the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1961, the Library Services Act, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, social security improvements, including medicare; hospital and nursing home care for the aged, equal pay for equal work for women, Nurses Training Act, aid to handicapped children, Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills, liberalized immigration laws, and improved minimum wage legislation.

As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, and a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, Mrs. GREEN played a vital role in the enactment of many pieces of progressive legislation. She was a member of the 1962-63 President's Commission on Status of Women, the U.S. Commission to UNESCO, two commissions of National Council of Churches, the 1958 Parliamentary Conference at Clarens, Switzerland, the 1959 NATO Conference at London, and the 1964 UNESCO general conference at Paris, France.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who are members of the Boston College alumni are pleased to have Congresswoman GREEN as one of our honored alumni. We are proud that she joins a long list of distinguished Americans who have received honorary degrees from Boston College. And I know that I speak for all of my colleagues when I pay tribute to her intelligence and graciousness and congratulate her on receipt of honorary doctorates from Hood College, Regis College, St. Xavier College, Yale University and Keuka College, in addition to Boston College. Mrs. GREEN is one of the great women serving in Congress, and when these eminent institutions of higher learning honor her, they are, in a sense,

honoring all of us who serve with Mrs. GREEN in this cherished parliamentary body.

**TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN
ALBERT WATSON**

Mr. CALLAWAY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to personally welcome back to Congress a great legislator and a great American, ALBERT WATSON, of South Carolina.

In an overwhelming victory yesterday the people of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina sent their Congressman back to Washington to sit on the opposite side of the aisle. Mr. Speaker, we are proud to have him there.

Both as a Democrat and as a Republican, Congressman WATSON has consistently shown the type of dedication and leadership necessary to this Congress and this Nation. He is unyieldingly committed to Americanism and all that that word stands for. I feel that we would be fortunate to have him on either side of the aisle, but I am particularly proud that he chose to sit on mine.

**HEARINGS ON FEDERAL BOXING
COMMISSION LEGISLATION**

Mr. HARRIS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I announced that on Tuesday, July 6, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will begin hearings on legislation to establish a Federal Boxing Commission. The hearings will be held on two identical bills, H.R. 8635, introduced by myself on May 27, and H.R. 8676 introduced by our colleague from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. Our first witness will be the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission Mr. E. William Henry. He will be followed by several persons thoroughly familiar with various aspects of professional boxing who have advised me that they will appear at these hearings to place before the committee their experience and recommendations.

When I introduced H.R. 8635 following the Clay-Liston match I indicated that the Congress of the United States should find some way of restoring integrity to these exhibitions which are of such great interest to so many people in this country. About 15 years ago our committee dealt with a somewhat similar problem; namely, rigged quiz shows. At that time, millions of Americans who had watched these programs with great interest thought they saw a bona fide contest. Actually our investigation

showed that these contests were rigged. Our committee recommended and the Congress passed legislation which laid down important ground rules in this area. It is my hope that a thorough study of the boxing situation likewise will result in remedial legislation and at last restore to their rightful place the exhibition matches which are such national favorites.

WHERE IS THE SPIRIT AND PATRIOTISM OF YOUTH DEFIANT OF THIS COUNTRY'S POLICIES IN A TIME OF CRISIS?

Mr. SAYLOR. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago the last major battle of the Pacific in World War II was under way. On Easter Sunday, April 1, two corps of Army and Marine troops under Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., had invaded Okinawa after cleaning up on Iwo Jima at a cost of almost 5,000 dead.

In desperation, the Japanese launched about 6,000 kamikazes to stave off capture of Okinawa, and before organized resistance to the Allied invasion ended June 21, 1945, the suicide planes had sunk 36 vessels and damaged 332 others.

General Buckner died in the battle for Okinawa, and Allied casualties amounted to approximately 40,000. World War II was now almost over, but it had taken the lives of more than 405,000 Americans and wounded an additional 670,000.

The story for America's civilian fighting force in World War II began on October 16, 1940, when 16½ million men and boys went to a school house or other registration center in response to a provision of the selective service law which, among other things, required every male between the ages of 21 and 35 thereafter to carry a draft card regardless of his eligibility status.

America is engaged in another war today, or perhaps it should be termed an extension of the disorder that tyrants imposed upon the world more than a quarter century ago. Whatever the case, American boys are dying in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic, and every member of our fighting forces taking part in that action deserves the same material and moral support and the same gratitude as those now honored in retrospect for their defense of the Stars and Stripes in past battles. A traitor or a slacker today is every bit as culpable and as contemptible as his counterpart during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that a good many of our citizens do not concur in President Johnson's policy that includes Indochina in this country's line of defense. At least half of our people opposed U.S. participation in World War II, but when our involvement became official men and boys went off in uniform regardless of their individual theories. There were exceptions, as in the case of conscientious objectors guided by reli-

gious convictions, but so far as can be determined none were excused because of political persuasion.

Where have all the soldiers gone? To Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and wherever else their Commander in Chief directs them. But where is the spirit and the patriotism of the growing numbers of young people so openly defiant of U.S. policy as to echo the sentiments and the accusations that originate in Moscow and Peiping? The disgraceful demonstrations perpetrated by college students around the country are particularly disturbing at a time when so many other young men of college age are being exposed to the savagery of the Communist enemy in Asia.

When will they ever learn? Perhaps not at all if their arrogance is not challenged instead of tolerated. To permit hissing and shouting when U.S. Ambassador W. Averell Harriman spoke at Cornell University may be an accepted tradition of the American forum, but allowing the demonstrators to sit-in at the auditorium long after the program had been concluded would seem grounds for arrest.

Perhaps there will come a time when officials in the universities that have been besieged by demonstrators will decide to reclaim the authority they have surrendered to unruly students. Whether they do or not, there is one current fad of the Communist-inspired movement that may require the immediate attention of the Congress. I have asked the Director of the Selective Service System what action has been taken against college students—or any others—who have deliberately destroyed their draft cards. If there has been a relaxing of the law requiring that these cards be retained in possession of all who have registered for selective service, an investigation would seem in order.

Mr. Speaker, within the past weeks I have attended two funerals of young men whom I appointed to the U.S. Military Academy. These West Point graduates were slain at the peak of their youth: Lt. Charles F. Hutchison, of Kittanning, lost his life in the Dominican Republic, and Capt. John C. Sigg, of Johnstown, was killed in Vietnam.

I just wish the people demonstrating throughout this country would have witnessed the shock and sadness on the faces of immediate family members, relatives, and friends. These fine Army officers gave everything they had for this country and to help save its citizens from Godless tyranny.

I am deeply disturbed and grieved to note these demonstrations which are vigorously expounding the Communist conspiracy at a time of national crisis. The participants are either willingly or unwillingly supporting a cause which is foreign to the American way of life.

**AN AGREEMENT BROKEN—A
PLEDGE BROKEN?**

Mr. MICHEL. 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. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, during the agriculture appropriations bill debate we had assurances from the Department of Agriculture that we would not release the \$37 million worth of surplus commodities due to Egypt under Public Law 480. This agreement is due to expire on June 30. Press reports have been coming out of Cairo, claiming that President Johnson has decided in spite of these assurances, to release the \$37 million of surplus commodities. I hope that these reports are rumor and not fact. The Department of Agriculture has said that it has no knowledge of such a decision from the White House.

The importance of discontinuing this aid has again been reemphasized by the exposure of Egypt's bad faith in keeping within the rice crop export quota as established by the present aid agreement between Egypt and the United States. Under terms of the 3-year trade agreement that expires June 30, Egypt is restricted as to the amount of rice it can sell abroad. The agreement specifies that if Egypt's total rice crop in a marketing year—November 1 to October 31—is as high as 1.4 million metric tons, it can export up to 455,000 metric tons. Any amount produced over 1.4 million tons may also be exported under this agreement. In the 1964 marketing year the rice crop was 1.465 million tons. This means that Egypt could have exported an additional 65,000 tons, plus the 455,000 tons, or 520,000 metric tons of rice. The Department of Agriculture has informed me that Egypt actually exported 589,000 tons, or in other words has exceeded the agreement by selling in excess of 69,000 metric tons.

This should help reinforce the President's previous apparent resolve to stop any further shipment of our surplus commodities to Egypt. We have filled many pages of the RECORD with debate on this issue. It is my hope that the President will honor his pledge with the American people and stop this futile attempt to bribe the Egyptian Government to restrain itself from interfering in the affairs of the emerging governments on the African Continent.

"MASTERY OF IDEAS: THE KEY TO THE FUTURE"

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] 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. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, recently at Albion College, Albion, Mich., I had the opportunity of hearing the commencement address by Mr. Alvin C. Eurich, president of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.

I was impressed by his analysis and presentation which he entitled "Mastery of Ideas: The Key to the Future."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this address:

President Norris, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, change is in the air; it is fast becoming commonplace. Change in science, change in technology, change in customs and procedures, change in political and social systems—these are perhaps the most vital in our world. We cannot turn away from them or refuse to recognize their impact on our lives. Indeed this is the most exciting time in human history to be alive—a time in which every field of endeavor sees the dissolution of old notions and the lifegiving yelp of new ideas being born.

Yet change is not all. Change is not what guides our lives and gives them significance. There is something more stable than the dance of atoms which the scientists tell us is the ultimate reality or the dreamlike explorations into space. There is something more meaningful than the buzz of happenings which splash across the newspaper's front page each day.

In this world of rapid change, some basic ideas and ideals give us the stability we urgently need as individuals and as a society. These ideas give form to experience and direction to each of our lives. How can we continue throughout our adult lives to nurture, refine, and enhance the basic ideas which make us more than automatons? How, fully recognizing the achievements of science and technology, can we build upon them a superstructure of life-enhancing and soul-satisfying ideas and ideals? What this really comes to is: How, in the midst of the most advanced scientific civilization in the world, can we become more mature in our thinking about those ideas that have shaped our civilization? This is the principal concern of the humanities. Broadly conceived and concretely applied to human life, the humanities constitute the most potent subjects of study. They enlarge the character. They sharpen the capacity of anyone who dedicates himself to their discipline.

Among the aims of Albion College there is one especially admirable. The bulletin states that your education here has been designed to give you "familiarity with the major ideas that have molded history and which pervade present culture and its institutions." That is an exhilarating and stern goal. The bulletin makes clear that it can hardly be attained as part of a 4-year course of study. It is the job of a lifetime.

If we hope in the years ahead to grow as a nation rather than merely to advance, if we seek to become more broadly sensitive to the world around us and more deeply committed to the highest human values, if we strive not merely to accumulate but to become qualitatively better—if we aspire to these things then we must make the humanities a continuing part of our lives.

Perhaps I need to digress here briefly to make clear what I mean by "the humanities." The humanities are not simply words and books, nor are they just the humanistic fields of study such as philosophy, literature, languages, history, comparative religion, and the arts. Words and books are the invaluable records of the past. But they are dead unless they are interpreted and expressed in the lives of human beings today.

The humanities suggest man's ability to contemplate uncertainty, to resist dogmatism, to take delight in the differences between men, nations, cultures, and ages. The humanities reflect man's capacity to plan, to set goals, to work toward rational ends rather than being governed by instinctive urges. The humanities directly touch the life of man. They encompass our beliefs, our ideals, our highest achievements.

Any person with feeling, any person who is truly concerned with his conduct toward others; any person with ideals to achieve; any person who thinks about the basic ideas that make a difference in the lives of men; any person who creates something, whether in art, music, literature, or scholarship, that vitally affects the way people live; any person who is using his intellect in the interest of mankind—any such person is in a very vital way dealing with the humanities.

Understood in this way, humanistic study constitutes what Frank Jennings calls "one of the most profound, mind-shaping experiences in the life of man * * * (making) it possible for Plato and Christ to instruct us from thousands of years away. It joins minds and times together for the better management of our universe * * * it is through the record that others leave to us in fact and fancy that we as human beings live so richly in so short a time."

Most people today, from college onward, are caught up completely in the busyness of making a living rather than in the rewards and delights of living. The outcome of such preoccupation can be disappointing to us as individuals. The sum total could be disastrous to our Nation. For only as each of us strives to carry forward humane values can mankind understand and control the vast forces unleashed by technology and power.

Let me just say here among you who have shared these delights, what you already know: that he who is a stranger to any tongue but his own; he who believes what he likes and likes what he believes without ever having submitted his ideas to scrutiny; he who has never dwelt with Homer and Shakespeare; he who is deaf to the exaltation of music, blind to the eloquence of paint, marble, and metal—that man is so much the less a full human being.

I believe that we Americans of today are entering a society which is more and more conscious of these values of the humanities. It is no exaggeration to say that we are in the midst of a cultural renaissance in this country. Mr. Alvin Toffler in his recent book "The Culture Consumers" deserves the credit for bringing this trend to public attention. Consumer spending on the arts rose from 1953 to 1960 by about 130 percent, or considerably more than twice as rapidly as spending on all recreation, and better than six times as fast as outlays for spectator sports.

Take the visual arts as an example. One new gallery or museum opened every fourth day last year in the United States, and more people visited galleries and museums than went to baseball games. As a result of this growth, there are more galleries in New York City today than there were in the entire country in 1950.

Similar developments might be traced in the field of music. For example, here in Michigan the Detroit Symphony's attendance has risen from 300,000 to 700,000 in a decade. Or, we could examine the paperback revolution in publishing. It brings scholarly books, formerly passed from hand to hand by faculty members, into the possession of millions of students. In the past 5 years, book sales as well as library circulation have increased three times more rapidly than the population.

Even the mass media have contributed to the cultural explosion. A recent nationwide broadcast of "Hamlet" was seen by more people, in one evening, than the total number who have seen it performed since it was written.

Perhaps it may seem wrong to speak of the arts and the humanities in terms of dollar volume, attendance, and sales. Numbers, of course, are no indication of quality, and the fact that millions of people watched "Hamlet" over television tells nothing about

what benefits, if any, each of those millions derived from the experience.

But in another sense these statistics are very significant. For there cannot be a great flowering of art or of the humanistic studies unless audiences, facilities, and resources are available. Just as students and scholars need books, so painters need galleries, dramatists need theaters, and musicians need orchestras. It is certainly clear that the great cultural epochs of the past were firmly rooted in certain material conditions. When we think of the greatness of Greek drama, we think automatically of the great theaters at Athens and Epidaurus. When we marvel at Shakespeare's achievement, we cannot overlook the challenge that shaped his art: the Elizabethan theater and its London audience avid for rich language and exciting action. The sculpture of Michelangelo and the music of Bach both drew their inspiration and their material support from the church, the great patron of the arts in that time.

In short, statistics and trends are important because they show whether or not a culture is ripe for certain kinds of development. The kinds of support and encouragement of the arts that these figures reveal are the lifeblood of a healthy cultural environment.

As a growing number of instances show, the economic prosperity of whole communities today is directly affected by their cultural climates. Communities and regions that formerly attracted new industry by advertising cheap labor or low-cost power now advertise orchestras, theaters, and universities. Business Week recently quoted the public-relations chief for a large Detroit manufacturer who summed up the new attitude of many corporations toward supporting culture. This executive said: "We have to be interested in the shape of the arts in cities where our plants are located, because if there are none, engineering and scientific people won't come."

Incidentally, the cultural explosion which I have described is having definite effects on the career opportunities. There is, for example, a need for managerial and executive ability in the whole cultural field. "As talent is needed to create and perform a work of art," wrote the recent Rockefeller Panel on the Performing Arts, "so equal talent—though of a different sort—is needed to create and govern the institutions that provide the settings for these arts."

Recognizing this need, the Ford Foundation has supported, over the past few years, an inservice program to train managers for arts organizations, as well as provided graduate fellowships (through Yale and New York Universities) to increase the supply of qualified museum curators and directors. But these programs meet only part of the need.

Arts centers of which there are at present 100 new ones under construction, need sensitive and imaginative administrators. Our museums and galleries must be managed. Orchestras and artists need to be brought to public attention and their careers carefully planned. The new repertory theaters being established in various cities, the educational television stations, the extension activities of colleges and universities—all these are generating unparalleled opportunities for young people who want to devote their skill and talent to the cultural field.

To return to the main theme, it is clear that the interests, tastes, and even the basic concerns of Americans are changing. Americans today have had a higher level of education, can look forward to more stable and rewarding careers, and can expect greater economic security than any generation that preceded them. In this generation there seems to be a resultant waning of purely economic motivations. The climb to the top was thrilling for us but perhaps today's young men and women care more about tak-

ing in the view—or in finding an entirely different kind of mountain to climb. At least, that is what is suggested by the success of the Peace Corps. In this new generation, America seems to be reaching a stage of national development that transcends, in many important respects, the purely material achievements of earlier generations. New needs are emerging that cannot be satisfied by material things alone. These needs cannot be met without understanding ourselves and our world. The preeminent means to understanding them is humanistic study.

How, then, can Americans strengthen their understanding of the humanities and of human values?

Perhaps they might focus on the objective in the Albion Bulletin. They might devote themselves to continuing and strengthening their "familiarity with the major ideas that have molded history and which pervade present culture and its institutions." Such a focus will make much of each individual's experience more comprehensible and valuable. It will also bring greater order and appreciation into our whole cultural life. As a people we will find ourselves able to pierce to the heart of many issues that seem confusing today. As individuals we will find that we can clarify and understand our own thoughts and emotions.

Let me give you a concrete example: Edward D. Myers recently conducted a study of how people at different stages of development vary in their thinking about one of these basic ideas of the humanities—freedom. He asked a group of elementary school children to write about freedom; he did the same with groups of high school and college students. Then he interviewed some college professors and professional men on the same subject and analyzed the papers and his notes from the interviews. Obviously the results are complex, but the trend runs generally as follows:

For elementary school children, the general response is "freedom is something we have. No one else has it." High-school students tend to say, "Freedom is something we have but the Russians don't." A bit more discriminating. College students go a step further, "Freedom entails responsibility." But the college faculty members and professionals are prone to say, "You can't really generalize about freedom. It is much too complex. You have to deal with it in specific situations." In effect, the professors threw in the towel on the complexity of thinking about freedom. To be sure, it is a difficult issue, but is this a valid reason to refuse to deal with it intellectually?

Let us look briefly at another key idea of the humanities that dominates our lives today: "Equality." Here we can draw from history, philosophy, literature, political science, anthropology, and other fields to develop a mature understanding. We might begin with Plato's "Republic," the classic Greek picture of a state based on the natural inequalities between men. For Plato, who assumed that men were unequal, the ideal state was one that organized men according to the true and most relevant order of inequality. Thus his utopia is realized when every man has been put in the place dictated by his nature. Aristotle, too, insisted that justice is proportional, and defended slavery on the basis of natural inequalities, in passages that were quoted widely in the American South before the Civil War.

Christianity injected a new idea of equality by changing the criteria of an individual's worth. Created in the image of God, each individual had an intrinsic worth despite any inequalities in his capacities. Thus spiritual equality superseded the Greek notion of natural inequality. This complete about-face was a chief turning point in Western history.

A further stage was reached when notions of political equality emerged during the enlightenment. This revolution against privilege emphasized a secular and activist equality that contrasted with the spiritual equality of the Middle Ages.

In the 20th century two concepts of equality took shape that still largely guide the world. In America the idea of equality of opportunity became a cardinal principle of social policy. In Russia the notion of economic equality was adopted from Marx and supposedly put into operation—though, as we now know, it quickly degenerated into another form of privileged hierarchy.

In our own country today we are on the verge of social cataclysm in some regions over this issue of equality. We have all seen the buttons distributed widely by civil rights groups—they consist merely of an equal sign. No one can understand the full historical significance of this movement without a firm grasp of the history of the idea of equality. Equally important are the insights contributed by philosophy, literature, psychology, sociology, economics, anthropology, and the other disciplines.

The study of the great generative ideas carries one into many fields. It is an endless but constantly rewarding pursuit. The important thing is not to finish but to start. Let each person select the ideas which most intrigue or stimulate him. Perhaps the idea of God, or justice, or education, or freedom, or equality. Let each person dip into what the great thinkers have said on this idea down through the ages. Let him trace its development through history, noting how it is reflected in contemporary literature, theater, movies, even television shows. He will find its reflection in the actions of people around him as well as in public actions and policies. He will discern consistent patterns emerging; he will see behind common misunderstandings. Then he will be able to apply what he has learned to his own life, to his appreciation of art and literature, to his response to public issues. Any American will find that his understanding of the basic ideas will give him a stability and power of mental functioning that few people readily attain without such discipline. In short, that continuing education in the humanities will go far to promote the intellectual, moral, and spiritual growth of our Nation.

Such growth has significance over and beyond each of us as individuals. If our civilization is moving into a phase in which questions of purpose will be paramount, then dealing with such questions will surely and swiftly become a prime duty of responsible citizens. The qualities of character and intellect which we have always tried to apply in our personal and family lives will be needed, more and more, in the public sphere as well. What August Heckscher has called the public happiness will become a concern of every one of us. The quality of our society, as measured by such standards as justice and beauty, will become a constant concern of the citizenry. The directions and goals we collectively pursue will be proper subjects for public debate—a tendency started a few years ago with the President's Report on National Goals. The state of the arts, of architecture, of music, and of philosophic thought, will engage the attention of more and more people. In short, we will move from a concern with necessities of life to a concern with ends, with purposes, with values—in short, with ideas. For this reason our continued growth toward maturity in dealing with ideas is not merely a personal matter, but an increasingly urgent demand of our society.

In his recent book on "Self-Renewal," the able president of the Carnegie Corp., said: "Instead of giving young people the impression that their task is to stand a dreary watch over the ancient values, we should be telling them the grim but bracing truth that it is their task to recreate those values

continuously in their own behavior, facing the dilemmas and catastrophes of their own time. Instead of implying that the ideals we cherish are safely embalmed in the memory of old battles and ancestral deeds we should be telling them that each generation re-fights the crucial battles and either brings new vitality to the ideals or allows them to decay."

Both maturity in thinking and the vitality of ideas and ideals that have lived through centuries come through a reconsideration, a reappraisal and an adaptation to our times. This is the task of youth; this is the promise for the future.

Now the President has called upon us to lend our hands and our hearts to building the Great Society. This vision demands the reduction of the poverty, ignorance, and sickness which still blemish our affluent Nation. But it can and must mean something more. It must concern itself with the quality of American life, with our ideals, our ideas and with each of our personal lives.

In a real sense the cultivation of the humanities constitutes an integral part of any vision of a new America. To know what is best in ourselves we must know the best that has been thought and felt throughout human history. We must listen attentively to those scholars and artists who deal most directly with the matters that touch each of us most deeply. As we work toward President Johnson's Great Society—which, as he says, "must begin with learning"—let us keep in mind what Wordsworth wrote in "The Prelude":

"There is one great society alone on earth:
The noble living and the noble dead."

NEW HAMPSHIRE GENERAL COURT VOTES VIETNAM SUPPORT

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last month, the New Hampshire General Court adopted a resolution in support of our country's firm stand in southeast Asia. The legislature also expressed its gratitude on the part of the Granite State to the officers and men whose courage and professional skill is carrying out this policy. I concur with the resolution by the General Court of New Hampshire and offer for the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Union-Leader which includes the text of the resolution itself. I am proud of my State and the general court.

SO PROUDLY WE HAIL

Both houses of the New Hampshire Legislature deserve great praise for their unanimous passage of the following resolution:

"Whereas our Nation is engaged in military action in support of the people of Vietnam; and

"Whereas this support calls for difficult decisions and actions by the Commander in Chief and his military and political advisers: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we, the members of the 1965 General Court of New Hampshire, express our approval of such firm and fair action as may be necessary to fulfill our responsibilities in southeast Asia; and be it further

"Resolved, That we express our admiration and gratitude to the members of the Armed Forces and to those other American men and women who are facing dangers on our behalf; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of Defense, and to Gen. William Childs Westmoreland."

As Senator English said, in speaking on behalf of the bill in the senate: "We must support our Government, for failure to do so may cost many lives and lead us into more and more serious situations."

Senator Paul Rinden said: "I am particularly interested, having been born and lived in south China for 10 years. I am impressed by President Johnson's stand there. I know that we shall have to face the Communists sooner or later. The question is whether it should start at Vietnam, Singapore, Australia or elsewhere. If we stand up to it now, we will be in a much better position to stop it than if we allow them to become more powerful."

Senator Louis Martel said: "It's high time that we Americans take a positive stand and face the atheist Communists throughout the world. We support any step that is taken by this administration or any party that takes a stand in this situation."

It would be a mighty encouraging thing if the other 49 States in the Union passed similar resolutions and sent them to the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and to General Westmoreland.

Anyone knowing representatives in other States would do well to forward a copy of this paper to them and ask them to see that such resolutions are introduced into their own State legislatures.

It would not only assist President Johnson but it would impress our Communist enemies, who are apt to be misled by the raucous shoutings of the beatnik groups on our campuses into believing that they represent the true public opinion in the United States, where of course just the opposite is true.

As far as we know, this action by the New Hampshire Legislature is the first in the Nation, which is entirely as it should be. New Hampshire should always be first.

Proudly we hail our legislators for this constructive action.

Publisher.

BALTIC STATES: A TRIBUTE TO FREEDOM-LOVING PEOPLE

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] 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. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, since June 15, 1940, the Baltic States have been suffering under Soviet tyranny. The Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms.

The free world commemorates the loss of freedom of these three nations whose desire in their national existence was to live in peace and security. Geographically small and with limited power resources, the Baltic States fell within the sphere of Soviet influence when World War II broke out. The first breach of their independence occurred with the pacts of mutual assistance imposed upon the states by Moscow in the fall of 1939; the final and most total breach took place

in the summer of 1940 when the three Baltic States, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, were invaded by the Red Army and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The Baltic States have never experienced in their long history through centuries such as extermination and annihilation of their people as during this Soviet occupation since June 15, 1940. During the last 25 years the countries lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. 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 among the most educated, courageous, and industrious elements of the countries, the losses in population become more terrible and almost fatal to the survival of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nations.

Twenty-five years have passed since that fateful occurrence and this is the sad occasion we now commemorate. It is the fervent hope of countless millions of friends of the Baltic peoples that one day they will again enjoy liberty and freedom.

It is toward this end that I have introduced a Baltic States resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 26. It is my sincere hope that legislation along these lines will be approved by the Congress. The text of that resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 26

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia, by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia by force of arms; and

Whereas the Baltic people, Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians, under Communist control were and still are overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets (a) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, (b) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps.

Sec. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia under its supervision.

A NEW COMMITMENT TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] 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. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress the following statement, issued today by myself and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER]:

A NEW COMMITMENT TO THE UNITED NATIONS
(Joint statement by Congressmen ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, FRANK HORTON, CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., F. BRADFORD MORSE, OGDEN R. REID, and STANLEY R. TUPPER)

On June 26, the world will celebrate the 20th anniversary of the United Nations Charter. Today, as 20 years ago, the United Nations is the only global machinery for peace. The political realities of the nuclear age have obscured the commitment that was made at the San Francisco Conference of 1945. If the United Nations is to survive the next score of years the dedication of its members today must match the dedication of those who signed the charter in San Francisco. For its part, the United States must give new testimony of its faith, a new declaration of belief and optimism in the capacity of the United Nations to serve the cause of peace—and of all men.

Those who suggest that the United Nations has not lived up to the full potential seen for it at the San Francisco Conference in 1945 are actually passing commentary on the inability of the five major powers to reach agreement on international crises. The United Nations is not an organization more perfect than man, nor was it intended to be. The fact that the veto for the major powers was included in the charter was tantamount to recognition that the United Nations could act effectively only when great power interests were not directly in conflict.

"The United Nations," wrote Arthur Vandenberg in 1947, "is neither an automatic nor a perfect instrument. Like any other human institution, it will make mistakes. It must live and learn. It must grow from strength to strength * * *. It must deserve to survive." Twenty years have shown the world that the organization deserves not only to survive but to expand its influence at a pace equal to the changes in the modern world community.

Rather than to discredit the United Nations by emphasizing that it has not built an irrevocably stable peace, we should all be grateful that for 20 years it has helped to prevent and limit international conflict. Wherever U.N. operations have been undertaken—in Korea, in Greece, in Kashmir, in the Middle East, in the Congo, in Cyprus—the United Nations has promoted peace, and in so doing has served the interests of the United States.

In a nuclear world, peace with freedom cannot be found in the illusion of isolation or in a retreat from reality. It can be found only in a blend of determination to resist aggression and determination to seek peace through communication, patience, and debate. As a forum for negotiations, as a focal point for communication between nations, and as a vital inducement to economic and social progress the United Nations is

both a symbol of optimism for the future and a very practical instrument of peace.

In a large measure the effect of the U.N. on the national interests of the United States will be influenced by and depend upon the role the United States plays in the organization. As the great power most clearly and most consistently identified with the shared purposes of the U.N. membership, the United States is the greatest single influence on what the United Nations is, does, and can be. To talk about the future of the United Nations therefore, is in substantial measure to talk about the future of the United States participation in it.

This is the proper perspective from which to view the current crisis at the U.N. The United States, together with all members, must make a new pledge of faith to the United Nations and to the principles which we share in common.

Articles 43, 44, and 45 of the United Nations Charter authorize arrangements by which members can make national forces available to the Security Council. The establishment of a permanent internationalized United Nations police force is still far away because members are not yet ready to commit in advance their nationals to fight in a cause which has not yet been determined.

Operations in Korea, the Middle East, the Congo, Yemen, and Cyprus have all required the ad hoc formation of a United Nations force to carry out U.N. directives or recommendations. In some instances, particularly in Cyprus, the delay in being able to form and land a United Nations force may have contributed to the difficulties of restoring stability.

Many persons, notably Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, Prime Minister Lester Pearson of Canada, and U.N. Secretary General U Thant, have recommended that, without jeopardizing the potential of an internationalized force, members earmark contingents of their national forces for potential use by the United Nations in peacekeeping or peace-enforcing operations. At Harvard University on June 12, 1963, the Secretary General stated his case:

"We have already shown that, when the situation demands it, it is possible to use the soldiers of many countries for objectives which are not national ones and that the soldiers respond magnificently to this challenge. We have also seen that, when the situation is serious enough, governments are prepared to waive certain of the attributes of national sovereignty in the interest of keeping the peace through the United Nations. We have demonstrated that a loyalty to international service can exist side by side with legitimate national pride.

"And, perhaps most important of all, we have shown that there can be a practical alternative to the deadly ultimate struggle and that it is an alternative which brings out the good and generous qualities in men rather than their destructive and selfish qualities.

"Although it is perhaps too early to consider the establishment of a permanent United Nations force, I believe there are a number of measures which could be taken even now to improve our present capacity for meeting dangerous situations. It would be extremely desirable, for example, if suitable units which could be made available at short notice for United Nations service and thereby decrease the degree of improvisation necessary in an emergency."

The forces either could be part of the national forces on ordinary defense assignment or could be kept as a separate unit of the national forces. In either case, until called for by the U.N. they would be paid by the member government. No such forces would ever be used without the full consent of the member.

Many nations have answered the call. Canada, Iran, Italy, and the Netherlands have all earmarked units of their national forces

for U.N. use. The four Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland) are creating a special permanent Scandinavian standby force to be on call for U.N. operations. Britain has indicated its willingness to provide significant logistical support for U.N. operations.

The U.S. administration has applauded these steps by others but as yet has not taken similar action of its own. In an article for the New York Times magazine of April 27, 1964, over a year ago, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Richard N. Gardner, wrote:

"U.N. members, as Secretary General U Thant suggested last year in a speech to Harvard alumni, should earmark military units which they might be prepared to make available on request by the United Nations. Earmarking would be voluntary and, unlike a standing army, the earmarked units would be financed and controlled by their governments and made available to the U.N."

We understand fully that for obvious political reasons the United Nations should not and cannot utilize U.S. troops in most of the peacekeeping operations it undertakes. Nonetheless the experience in the Congo and elsewhere has indicated clearly that the major powers can make substantial contributions in the form of transport and technical support.

We do not wish to minimize the crucial nature of the difficult political and financial decisions facing the United Nations and the U.S. administration in its policies toward the U.N. But we do suggest that much more is required of the U.S. policy than only to find some answer to the current impasse which will conveniently allow us merely to continue. It is not enough just to find some way out of the current dilemma. In our view, the Nation must make a more meaningful pledge, a more tangible commitment to the future.

We propose that the United States make a twofold contribution to a standby U.N. force:

First, the services of the Military Air Transport System of the U.S. Department of Defense should be placed on permanent call to the United Nations for the transport of men and materiel in any U.N. peacekeeping operation. MATS has correctly been called the largest airline in the world. With 1,100 planes and 90,000 men operating out of nearly 100 bases around the world, it logged 1,066,325 flight hours in 1964 alone. It is responsible for the efficiency of the long-distance mobility of the Army—the capacity to put U.S. troops anywhere in the world before a crisis grows out of control.

MATS has served the U.N. before. In the Korean conflict, in the Lebanese crisis, and in the Congo it airlifted U.N. forces and supplies.

While the readiness of MATS to serve a U.N. mission might be assumed, a direct and public commitment through a policy declaration of the U.S. Government would give assurance to U.N. personnel and would alert MATS personnel to the vital nature of their U.N. functions.

Second, the United States should create a small volunteer unit of approximately 1,000 men to stand ready to meet a U.N. call for emergency technical support for peacekeeping operations. The unit could be designated the First Brigade of the U.S. armed services (Forces for International Relief on Standby). It should include a company of experts in the establishment and maintenance of communications in crisis conditions, a company of Army and Navy engineers trained in the rapid construction of bridges, roads, and buildings, compact and highly mobile medical teams, technical advisers from the Quartermaster Corps to provide rapid information on the supply needs of any peacekeeping operation, an advisory group from MATS to provide rapid information on long-range

transportational needs, a sizable staff of multilingual interpreters. These are all technical skills at which the U.S. Armed Forces excel, and which might be the most useful and politically feasible contribution which the United States can make in actual U.N. peacekeeping operations.

The First Brigade should have a permanent headquarters. Its personnel should consist only of men and women from the armed services who have volunteered for assignment. They should be given the physical inoculations and equipment necessary for service anywhere in the world on short notice. The entire brigade should be given training in basic language skills in order to facilitate communications with all nationalities. With a separate military designation and insignia, the brigade should be encouraged to consider its service as a unique contribution to the preservation of peace.

The First Brigade might also be available to serve U.N. or other worldwide efforts to counter the effects of natural disasters anywhere in the world—earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, or floods.

Of course, neither the First Brigade nor MATS would be available to the U.N. in any case where the United States expressly prohibits their use. The forces would be paid by the United States until activated by the United Nations, at which time they would be paid for in accordance with the agreed-upon U.N. financial arrangements for the operation. Nonetheless, the United States should never deprive the U.N. of the use of MATS or the First Brigade merely because financial arrangements are not fully established or to our liking.

We know that the U.S. Armed Forces may be able to provide most of these services relatively quickly without a special unit. We know too that the American people and the administration are likely to respond favorably to any U.N. request for help, with or without a special unit. But we feel strongly that the creation of a new U.S. First Brigade for U.N. service can serve two vital needs:

First, it can maximize the efficiency of the technical personnel which the U.N. may need most urgently and thus give the U.N. officials confidence that the manpower and skills are available to do a difficult job.

Second, and even more important, the First Brigade would be a symbol of this Nation's faith in the United Nations and its most cherished principles. Let no nation and no leader doubt our commitment. Let all men, abroad and at home, see that this Government believes in the United Nations, in its purposes and in its capacities.

There is no more important contribution that any people can make to the United Nations and its purposes than a continued effort to rise above the crises of today and to think of tomorrow—to shape the future to the image of our dream.

IMMIGRATION BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] 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. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced an immigration bill designed: first, to bring immediate relief to the thousands of relatives of U.S. citizens and eligible aliens throughout the world in the oversubscribed countries who have been waiting for years for their opportunity to immigrate to the United States, and second, replace the national

origins quota system with a worldwide quota, except for the Western Hemisphere, which will admit aliens without reference to the country of their birth on the basis of their relationship to U.S. citizens and permanent residents, and their ability to contribute needed skills to the United States.

For a number of years there have gone unused in excess of 50,000 quota numbers per year because some countries have failed to make full use of their immigration quotas while in other countries the backlog of persons registered and waiting their turn has grown larger and larger.

In 1964 some 55,317 quota numbers were not used; but at the end of the year a total of 831,881 registrations were pending in the oversubscribed countries. A total of 178,515 waiting registrants held preference status as relatives or urgently needed skilled persons.

My bill will immediately relieve the tremendous pressure of this huge backlog by the allocation of a 3-year period of the unused quota numbers to the oversubscribed countries, and retain in the Congress full responsibility for our immigration policy.

Additionally, my bill will immediately:

First. Admit parents of U.S. citizens as nonquota immigrants; second, remove the bar to the admission of epileptics since the ailment is now controllable by medication, and, third, overhaul and consolidate our refugee program permitting the admission of up to 10,000 victims of communism, persecution, and natural calamity, subject to rigid health and security conditions.

After an interim period of 3 years in which distribution of the unused quota numbers will permit clearing up the oversubscribed waiting lists, my bill will set a worldwide quota of 200,000 immigrants annually. The Western Hemisphere, from which some 140,000 were admitted in 1964, will remain nonquota. Without reference to the place of birth, immigrants will be granted visas on a first-come, first-served basis, with first preferences to relatives so that families may be reunited, and then to specially skilled persons whose services are urgently needed in our country. Immigration from any one country will be subject, however, to a maximum annual ceiling of 20,000.

This bill will make our immigration current in short order and provide an orderly system of immigration, free of discrimination, based upon the best interests of the United States.

QUOTABLE QUOTES FROM GOVERNOR BROWN

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] 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. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the difficult issues in California at the present time is the farm labor problem

caused by the shortsightedness of the Labor Department and the Congress in terminating the bracero program. Governor Brown is on the horns of a dilemma on this issue as he is a stalwart Democrat and therefore adverse to criticize Secretary Wirtz while at the same time mindful of his peculiar State problem.

When the press asked him if he believed Secretary Wirtz was doing a good job handling the farm labor problem, the Governor recently replied:

I think he is doing a good job. Yes, I think it is very difficult. He's doing a different one from the one our department of employment thinks should be done, but it is not easy and he could be right. I think he's wrong but he could be right.

MAXIMUM OF BENEFICIAL TRADE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone believes in a maximum of trade; but some of us would qualify this and say that we believe in a maximum of beneficial trade. Not all trade is necessarily beneficial. We have only to think of the traffic in opium to agree that not all trade is good simply because it is trade. Even speaking economically not all trade is necessarily good under all circumstances. Much depends on the competitive conditions and the fairness of competition.

In relation to many other countries the United States is a high-cost producer because of our high wages. While these wages may be offset by our higher productivity, as they are in some cases, the trend has been in the other direction in many products because of the great technological advancement of other countries in recent years. This has been phenomenal, led in great part by aid from this country and a strong desire abroad to adopt our productive system. While wages have risen abroad they have in many cases not kept up with the advancement in productivity; also, wages have risen in this country. We must not forget that a 5-percent wage increase in this country is the equivalent of a 15-percent to 40-percent increase in other countries, in actual dollars and cents.

The adverse competitive position of many domestic industries has been reflected by the heavy outflow of capital from this country to other areas of the world, particularly to Europe. This outflow was not caused by mere romantic ventures but in search of lower costs, greater proximity to export markets, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, it has been clear for some time that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 does not fit the international economic developments of the past several years. That act calls for a further 50-percent tariff reduction at a time when many industries have found imports increasingly pressing and capturing heavier shares of our home market. We have heard a great deal about steel imports, the imports of woolen goods, beef, radios, tile, plywood, and so forth, but there are many other products that would be in

distress if the tariff were cut at all, not to say 50 percent.

Also, there are instances in which a tariff is not a suitable instrument of import regulation. Imports from some countries are priced so low that unless a tariff rate of 100 percent or 200 percent were levied it would have little effect. Such high rates, however, would exclude imports from other countries where costs are higher because of higher wages. Under these circumstances import quotas are a much more suitable instrument for regulating imports. Import quotas have the further advantage of removing the pall of uncertainty that weighs so oppressively on domestic industries as they plan future development and expansion. The uncertainty produced by rising import competition readily dampens plans for expansion and employment of additional workers.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today designed to be of assistance to American industry and agriculture without curtailing beneficial foreign trade. It is designed to avoid the damage that would result from the intemperate tariff reduction contemplated under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The very likelihood of such reductions as we approach the actual time of active negotiation will cause misgivings and discouragement among many of our industries.

The first part of my bill would remove the disabling language of the Trade Expansion Act as it relates to the adjustment assistance provisions. I am sure that we all now know that the help that was to be extended to industries and labor that were injured by imports under the 1962 act, did not materialize.

The Tariff Commission has processed 17 cases under the adjustment assistance provision of the Trade Expansion Act and in all cases but 1 found unanimously against the industrial and labor groups that made application. This record represents a complete shutout. If, after 2½ years and 17 cases, not a single cent of help has been extended to the injured parties, surely no further evidence is needed to demonstrate that this part of the legislation is a dead letter.

Most of the difficulty, it is said, stems from the word "major" used in the 1962 act in describing the kind of injury that would create eligibility for adjustment assistance. Not only must a previous tariff cut have been a major cause of increasing imports under that act but the increased imports must have been the major cause of the injury complained of.

My bill would delete the word "major" in both instances. This change, it is hoped, would improve the administration of the adjustment assistance provision.

Secondly, and more important, my bill would prevent further tariff reductions if the record shows that imports of particular products have already invaded the market quite freely, having increased as much as 75 percent since 1958 and having risen to a level of at least 7½ percent of domestic production. Obviously, if imports have demonstrated their capacity to reach such levels in this

country no further tariff reduction would be justified to stimulate higher imports. To cut the tariff further in such circumstances would be an act of hostility to legitimate, useful, and often essential domestic industries to which we look for employment.

How would this provision of my amendment work? I shall explain it now. We would retain the function of the Tariff Commission but the Commission would merely certify to the facts.

Should the Tariff Commission, on direct application of an industry, trade, farm, or labor organization, find that imports had increased in the manner specified in the bill, it would so report to the President within 60 days and he must then forthwith delete the item from the list offered for further tariff reduction.

Several criteria are provided in the bill beyond the one I have just mentioned. For example, if imports had by 1958 already supplied at least 20 percent of the market, the product concerned would, on certification of the Tariff Commission, be taken off the list if imports since 1958 have increased more rapidly either in quantity or volume than the domestic production of the product. Such a trend would show that imports already enjoyed a competitive advantage and need no further tariff cut.

Also deleted would be items the imports of which have been limited in quantity or have had a rate of duty increase under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.

Another reason for removing a product from the list would be a decline of at least 10 percent in the number of production workers employed since 1958 by the domestic industry while imports have increased actually or relatively to domestic production. Again, this trend would show that imports already have an advantage over the domestic producers.

Any farm product that is under price support or other agricultural program authorized by Congress causing an increase in cost, would also be eliminated. Increased imports would merely lead to higher domestic surpluses.

Any fishery product would be dropped from the list if there is in effect a research or conservation program under the Department of the Interior with respect to it. This would mean that higher imports would merely aggravate the difficulties of the domestic producers.

Lastly, any farm product that had been harvested during the 1960-64 period with the help of farmworkers brought into this country under Public Law 78 or 414 would, in the absence of a Federal statute providing for the adequate supply of such labor, be withdrawn from the list. Domestic costs would rise, and imports would be stimulated without the incentive of a further tariff cut.

In looking over these deletions it will be seen that items would be dropped from the list offered for further tariff reductions if their level of imports has already demonstrated that the present tariff is not too high or if domestic costs were boosted by domestic programs. This demonstration would be found in

the trend of imports since 1958 and the share of the market already enjoyed by them. In addition there are the items, farm products, that are under some sort of governmental program or operation that would increase costs of production and thus make further tariff cuts contradictory and senseless.

There is nothing in these amendments that is unreasonable. In fact, it seems to me that it would be unreasonable to cut the tariff still more when imports have already invaded the market in growing volume.

The bill is also aimed at the containment of imports that are already doing damage at present tariff levels. This would apply to any product the imports of which have reached at least 7½ percent of domestic production and have increased at least 75 percent since 1958.

Here again the Tariff Commission would make a finding of fact upon application by an industry, labor or farm group, and if the facts sustained the action, it would so certify to the President who must then impose an import quota holding imports to the average level of any 3-year period since 1958; but future imports could grow in proportion of the growth of domestic production.

This provision would offer assurance to such industries that imports would not repeat what they have done in other instances; namely, rise steadily from supplying less than 5 percent of the market to 10 percent, 15 percent, 25 percent, and even more in the span of only a few years. This has happened in an uncomfortably high number of instances. In other cases some of our leading industries have shifted from a longstanding position of net exporter to that of net importer. This has happened with petroleum, steel, automobiles, textiles, typewriters, and other products; and these are not backward industries. They simply could not meet the low prices of their foreign competitors; and the end is not yet.

If our industries cannot have better assurance than has existed in post-war years against the import invasion by cheap goods they will invest more and more abroad to the detriment of the domestic economy. Investments that would be made here and that would provide greater employment would continue to go abroad.

In the case of vegetables we have already experienced a great deal of this even though agriculture is not generally so vulnerable to this type of competition. Mexico, the Caribbean Islands, and Central America offer temptation to our capital because of the cheaper labor available in those areas. If no restrictions are provided, the border States of California, Arizona, and Texas, as well as some inland States, and Florida will suffer severe damage in their farming operations.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is designed to meet the reasonable needs of American industry, its agriculture and its labor in their competition with foreign production that is free of our minimum wage legislation and other labor standards that are a part of the American system. It would not prevent further tariff reduc-

tion in those instances in which imports have not yet risen to highly menacing levels; nor would it automatically impose import quotas without administrative inquiry. It would pave the way for a more orderly expansion of our economy, not by setting aside competition but by regulating the foreign aspect of competition, even as we regulate domestic competition to the vast benefit of the system as a whole.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement and associate myself with his remarks. I think he has dwelt on an area which deserves legislative consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] in the introduction of legislation that would amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to adapt it to the present-day realities of the international competitive position of this country.

The act of 1962 has not only failed to do what it was set up to do but now threatens many of our industries with more severe import competition than any experienced in the past. The proposed tariff reduction of 50 percent with a "bare minimum of exceptions," now under negotiation in Geneva, would pose a most serious threat to the economy of this country—a threat that cannot be lightly entertained. We have enjoyed an unprecedented period of prosperity in this country, with a few setbacks, since the end of World War II. There are those who now recklessly assume that we have nothing further to fear from recessions or depressions.

I very much fear that if we go through with the proposed tariff cuts in Geneva a very different outlook will soon confront us.

I do not have to tell Members of this body how many billions of dollars have already left this country in search of lower costs of production abroad. No such outflow would have occurred if there were no distinct competitive advantage to be gained by investing in Europe, Japan, and other countries. The investments were made for reasons of dollars and cents. If we were in good competitive position in foreign markets it would not be necessary to set up production abroad in order to sell in foreign markets. Yet, to repeat, we have been investing feverishly abroad in recent years. There is nothing wrong with this so long as the investments represent new developments abroad; but it is something else when they reflect lack of equally attractive opportunities in this country. Under the circumstances the investment outflow represents in a considerable part a lowering of the employment ceiling in this country.

What has developed is a combined lure of foreign investment hand in hand with discouragement of a comparable expansion at home. The domestic side has not kept up with its real potential for this reason. The perplexity thus engendered produced a dilemma for some of our

leading industries. If they did not invest abroad they would run the risk of losing the foreign markets already enjoyed; but by expanding abroad rather than at home, the high tide of new workers seeking employment in this country could not be absorbed. Moreover, our exports would be destined to shrink the more we produced abroad. We would be selling those markets from within rather than from this country.

The difficulty, almost without exception, was found to lie in our higher costs of production, and this in turn was a result of the much higher wages prevailing in this country.

Any notion of reducing wages as a means of reducing costs in order to remain competitive against imports at home or abroad was out of the question; but there was an alternative. This was to increase productivity by modernizing plants or mills. It was a matter of installing the most productive machinery and equipment. Most of the investment on the domestic front has indeed been of this type. While no reduction of wage rates was involved, it produced the same effect by displacement of workers and therefore shrinking the payroll.

For example, the coal industry invested hundreds of millions of dollars in more productive machinery in order to keep alive, but in so doing cut the number of mineworkers in half. Thus was the total payroll reduced just as surely as if wages had been cut in half while retaining all the workers.

The steel industry has also been investing heavily in modernization and is employing few workers while producing much higher tonnages of steel than 10 years ago. From 1956 to 1964 the steel industry spent \$11.8 billion for new plants and equipment. This was more than a billion dollars per year. In 1964 alone the outlay was \$1.56 billion, a very considerable sum of money. Unfortunately, most of this money, nearly all of it, in fact, went into modernization. Expansion of capacity was not needed. The result for employment was far from reassuring. The number of production workers fell from 533,000 in 1956 to 476,000 in 1963. This was a decline of 57,000 workers, or over 10 percent.

Much of the investment impetus came from unsuccessful efforts to remain competitive with imports and to hold our exports. Up to 1958 this country was predominantly an exporter of steel. In that year the tide turned, and today we import about twice the tonnage of steel that we export.

It is clear that the great expansion in the outlay for new plant and equipment by the steel industry in 1964 and 1965 in conversion to oxygen furnaces and continuous casting does not assure greater employment in the steel mills.

The same trend has been visible in other industries.

When companies spend millions and even billions of dollars for modernization in order to hold their own against imports at home and in order to remain competitive in export markets, the effect on employment is inevitably depressing.

We have not yet learned that modernization does not breed jobs, as it is sup-

posed to do, when it is resorted to as a means of meeting external, low-wage competition. The effect, in fact, is considered good when the modernization succeeds in holding the line against imports; but that does not replace the displaced workers. A much higher sales volume would be needed to call for additional workers; and holding the line against imports does not necessarily mean much higher sales, if any. Primarily the purpose is to avoid a sales debacle.

If an industry has to reduce its work force in order to reduce costs sufficiently to prevent being driven out of business by imports it is easy to see what must happen to domestic employment.

The steel industry, to repeat, has not been alone. The automobile industry offers another but a different example. It has succeeded up to now in warding off the import onslaught. Investment in new plant and equipment has been above the \$1 billion level in recent years. The effect on employment of production workers has been typical. In 1955, a record year of automobile production, 740,000 production workers were employed. In 1964, a year that broke all previous production records, found employment of production workers down to 593,000, a decline of 147,000 despite the higher output of 1964. Even in 1965, with production reaching new and unprecedented peaks, the number of production workers was only 688,000 in April. This was still down 52,000 from 1955, even though production was well above the level of that year.

In those two industries, among the industrial leaders of this country, we find efforts to fend off imports leading to a lively investment pace in newer and more modern machinery and equipment. The result has been mixed. In the case of the steel industry, imports—despite the defensive efforts—have come to double exports, but domestic production has risen to record heights. Employment, as I have already noted, declined over 10 percent. Meantime, population and the number of workers has increased from 15 to 20 percent. Who then is to absorb these newcomers? Exports have fallen to about half of what they were. Certainly they will not come to the rescue.

In the case of automobiles, the domestic market was maintained successfully against imports by bringing out the compact car, but exports declined to a point of less than half of imports. Yet domestic production reached new heights; but, as in the case of steel, the heavy investment in modernization reduced the number of production workers sharply. Again, who is to absorb the oncoming horde of new workers, if all industries react in this fashion?

The point in common here, and from which a lesson may be drawn, is that feverish modernization and automation in efforts to avoid excessive penetration of imports leads inevitably to the sacrifice of production workers in the industries engaged in the struggle.

Since labor costs reflect not only the wages paid per hour but also the number of workers employed, the total payroll can be kept from going out of bounds

by reducing the work force; and that is what has been happening. It is a wholly natural defensive step toward self-preservation.

Unfortunately, consumer purchasing power is heavily dependent only on employment, and consumer purchases represent the salvation of the mass-production system. We are dependent on good wages and high employment to absorb the great volume of goods produced by our producing plants. There is the rub. Higher productivity means yet more goods and therefore calls for higher, not lower, consumer purchasing power to move the goods from the warehouses and shelves.

In the past, while there was not much foreign competition to be concerned about, because of the tariff and because other countries lacked our technology, cost reduction in this country was the very means upon which we relied for reaching the mass of consumers. The lower prices then opened vast home markets for us, and the workers who were replaced by more productive machinery were soon reabsorbed; and in a few years, as the market expanded, yet more workers were needed. Today imports, produced by highly productive machinery abroad, are often in the position of trailblazers in the field of lower prices; and they rob us of the market bonanzas that in the past greeted our mass-production industries when they achieved sharp cost reductions and price slashes, as exemplified by Henry Ford.

Today, faced with imports offered at prices our industries cannot meet, the panicky installation of laborsaving machinery is a defensive struggle. The purpose is to hold the share of the market already gained, even if workers have to be sacrificed to avoid a yet heavier loss.

The result is that the laid-off workers stay laid off rather than being called back in a few months or in a year or two.

The upshot is that this country is operating under entirely different competitive conditions from those prevailing before the other countries adopted modern technology and our mass-production system as their own. The reaction of our business community was not only natural but beyond reproach, considering the absence of any reliable remedial recourse.

The new competitive developments of the past decade have a direct bearing on our tariff and trade policies. These have been unchanged for 30 years even though the past few years have witnessed a veritable economic transformation of the industrial world. Such a transformation could hardly occur without producing resounding repercussions on our competitive position.

When the other leading industrial nations adopted our technology and system of production and reached for mass markets while their wages remained far behind, we were exposed directly to the shock waves.

It has been an inspiring sight to witness the rapid industrial development of Europe and Japan, and their creation of mass markets; but we should not be blind to the meaning that these great

developments have in store for our economy.

We have indeed been slow in discerning the shock waves produced by the rising imports of finished manufactures on the future prospects of many of our industries. The natural effect of these revolutionary developments is to shake the confidence of our producers in the future of the American home market; and, when confidence is shaken, severe harm has been done. Plans for future expansion are curtailed while the foreign scene is scanned for substitute outlets. The pattern has become familiar.

Under the circumstances it would surely be an indefensible act to confront American industry with another round of extensive tariff cuts, the most far-reaching of all in the past 30 years. The experience of the steel and the automobile industries has been duplicated in many others. The latter do not all enjoy the vast resources of the two giants and are more easily ruined; and, even if the large industries save themselves as industries, the burden of employment falls elsewhere; and it falls where it cannot be borne. Domestic competition itself creates pressure for automation, and if the large industries disgorge their workers as in steel and automobiles, the outlook will become hopeless.

I would like to make it clear that the prospect of further tariff cuts, even as a prospect, may hold the seeds of catastrophe for many industries, especially for their workers.

Would it not be much better to give those of our industries that have already felt the effects of import invasion assurance that more of the same does not loom over the horizon?

That assurance is the purpose of this legislation. It would remove a threat that, if left to operate on the scene, will produce a deadening effect even before any contemplated tariff cuts are actually negotiated. It is not too late to lift this depressing prospect from our economic future.

I am happy to associate myself with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] in the introduction of this legislation.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill designed to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. The purpose of this bill is to put an end to wasteful, extravagant, and excessive appropriations, by studying in depth, the budgetary requests of the various departments.

This joint committee would have bipartisan membership from the two Appropriations Committees and a nonpartisan professional staff of budgetary experts. The need for this is clear; without the expert staff and concentrated efforts of a joint committee like this, the individual legislator, who is concerned with the growth of Federal spending, is

simply overwhelmed by the staggering fiscal responsibilities of the Congress. The difficulty is not that the necessary information is unavailable; rather, so much undigested, unorganized material is dumped on the Congress that it is impossible to get a clear picture of which departments are carrying out their programs effectively and economically, and which are not.

The U.S. Government has undertaken tremendous responsibilities, both foreign and domestic, since the end of World War II. The Congress must take a more active role in financing these responsibilities, or risk the abdication of its prerogative to the executive with its enormous bureaucratic growth.

I would like to emphasize that this joint committee would not only provide a thorough check on every possible misuse of tax dollars, but would fully evaluate every budgetary request. These evaluations would contain reasonable but not burdensome detail, thus enabling every Congressman to have a complete and readable analysis of every appropriations bill.

This more complete understanding of the financial needs of the executive department will allow the Congress to provide the right amount of money for the entire fiscal year. Thus, a joint committee on the budget would be able to put an end to the practice of requesting supplementary appropriations.

In addition, the committee would recommend any changes in the statutory law, needed to bring about savings.

I submit to my colleagues in this House, that it is the job of the Congress—House and Senate working together—to scrutinize the requests of the executive branch. As the distinguished chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, Senator McCLELLAN, said not too long ago, the Congress would be in a better position to proffer corrective criticism of Federal programs if the House and Senate cooperated and worked together on reviewing executive budget proposals and saw to it that their Members were more fully informed.

This creation of a joint committee is not a radical innovation. It has worked well in other cases, notably the Joint Committees on Atomic Energy and Internal Revenue Taxation. The joint committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has proven the effectiveness of a joint committee in coping with far-ranging and complex matters.

By avoiding the duplication of effort that occurs when there are two separate committees, this joint committee could make a more concentrated effort at studying the complexities of the Federal budget. In addition to these timesaving advantages, such a joint committee would also promote a fuller exchange of ideas among legislators of both Houses.

I introduced a similar bill in the 88th Congress, and last month I testified before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, urging the fullest consideration of this proposal. I am happy to say that the Senate has been very strong in its support of legislation establishing this Joint Committee on the Budget. It recently passed just such a

bill, which is now before the House Rules Committee. This marks the seventh time that the Senate has approved the concept of the Joint Committee on the Budget, and I think that House action is long overdue. I urge the Rules Committee to schedule hearings on these bills as soon as possible.

Time and time again, we are told by the executive branch that certain actions are taken to save money. Whenever veterans' hospitals or naval yards are closed, we are told that it is done to economize. But when we investigate these programs carefully, too often we find that these decisions are motivated by factors other than thrift, and that a program that is supposed to conserve the taxpayers' money, actually just blows it to the wind. For that reason I urge all my colleagues to support my bill.

L.B.J.'S MIDDLEMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a magazine article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the June 1965, issue of Esquire magazine carries an interesting article concerning one of the principal stage managers in the play entitled "The Great Society."

He is Mr. Abe Fortas, a Washington lawyer, who emerged from the wings last fall as the go-between for Lyndon B. Johnson when the all but successful effort was made to squelch newspaper publication of the story that Walter Jenkins, the President's White House confidant, had twice been arrested on sex perversion charges.

Fortas is also the former counsel for Bobby Baker, onetime protegee of the President and key figure in the scandals that have rocked Washington for the past 2 years.

It is also interesting to note that the newly designated Commissioner of Internal Revenue is Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen, a former member of the Fortas law firm, who is reported to have given Bobby Baker legal advice on tax matters.

It will be interesting to watch developments as further activities of the Johnson administration unfold.

The Esquire article follows:

ABE, HELP—L.B.J.

(By Charles B. Selb and Alan L. Otten)

Politically, the law firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter is the most powerful in Washington, D.C. The No. 1 partner, Thurman Arnold, was a famous New Deal trust-buster, and is now recognized as one of the wildest old lawyers in the Capital. The third partner, Paul Porter, was in charge of price controls during most of World War II and is on a first-name basis with everybody who matters. And the man in the middle, Abe Fortas, an Under Secretary of the Interior in the Roosevelt era, is confidant, adviser, good friend and behind-the-scenes handyman to the President of the United States.

Arnold is a presence. Porter is a hall fellow. Fortas is a dry, quiet, violin-playing

legal craftsman. And today, in Johnsonian Washington, the greatest of these is Fortas. Any White House insider, when asked to name the men on whom President Johnson most relies for unofficial help and advice, will almost certainly put Fortas on the list, very likely at the top. But ask just what he does for the President and you'll get a mystifying variety of answers: he's a fixer, the man who takes on jobs too delicate to be done by anyone with official status; he's always close at hand, either actually or at the other end of the phone line, suggesting, reacting, developing; his contacts with the President are only occasional but consequential—a discussion of an important speech or message, a hashing over of candidates for a top appointment, the dissection of a proposed Great Society project.

The President and Fortas are on the telephone together at least once a day and often as many as three or four times. One top White House aid says, "He's as close to Johnson as BOBBY KENNEDY was to Jack" (an analogy Fortas rejects out of hand). According to another White House staff member, "There is very little of importance that affects Lyndon Johnson that he won't at some point talk over with Abe Fortas." Fortas himself maintains that the relationship has been greatly exaggerated, but members of his own firm report that he is constantly being called out of conferences to take White House calls. Neighbors say the President is a frequent evening guest at the Fortas home.

The mystery surrounding Johnson vis-à-vis Fortas is unreal, for there must always be a good deal that is secret or at least never revealed concerning the President and the men who do his personal bidding.

Assigning all the unreliable rumors and obfuscations to their proper place, the following emerges as a fair picture of the Johnson-Fortas relationship:

Fortas is respected by Johnson as an extremely intelligent man who is as knowledgeable as anyone in Washington in the technicalities of government and the law. He has the advantage both of a 30-year friendship with the President and the independence that his refusal to accept an official position gives him; he owes the President nothing and the President knows it. In this context, his advice is sought on important appointments; on administration policies, particularly in the domestic field; on the content and phrasing of speeches and messages. He is sought out in times of stress (as in the days immediately after the Kennedy assassination) and when there is a ticklish job to be done (as when the President needed a trust agreement that would disconnect the family television holdings from his high office).

This dependency extends beyond the President. It is clear that when an emergency arises in the Johnson official family, it's Fortas who is called first.

Nothing is more illustrative of this than the Walter Jenkins case. The sequence of events on the day it all came out is revealing.

That morning—Wednesday, October 14, 1964—the Washington Star, acting on a tip, sent a reporter to the records of the Metropolitan Police morals squad. There he found that a Walter Jenkins, on the basis of identifying data clearly the one in the White House, had been arrested once in 1959 and again just the week before in the men's room of the Washington YMCA, a notorious hangout for homosexuals. In both cases he had posted collateral, later forfeited, and been released. A Star editor called Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter, Mrs. Johnson's press secretary (George Reedy, the President's press secretary, was out of the city with Mr. Johnson), told her the facts and asked if the White House knew about the arrests and had any comment. Choking down her shock, Mrs. Carpenter said the whole thing was ridiculous but she would look into it. A few

minutes later she called back and said that she had talked to Jenkins and that he would be calling the Star to deny the story as a case of mistaken identity.

Jenkins never called. But within 15 minutes Abe Fortas was on the telephone to say that he was coming down to the Star at once.

The first edition was about to go to press, but the Star decided to hold out the story of the arrest until Fortas could have his say. And within minutes he appeared with Clark Clifford, another Washington lawyer and friend of the President. Jenkins, it developed, had rushed to Fortas' Georgetown home as soon as he had learned from Mrs. Carpenter that the Star knew of the arrests. He was distraught, Fortas said, in a state of emotional collapse, and asking for help.

Fortas himself was deeply shocked. He examined the Star's information and conceded that it appeared to be true. In a low exhausted voice he urged compassion—saying that this was a sick man, a man who had been working day and night ever since Johnson assumed the Presidency, a man so devoted to his boss and his job that his wife had to bring his dinner to his desk because he wouldn't take time out for meals. The night of the most recent arrest, Fortas said, Jenkins had gone to a cocktail party after a day of hard work and had a few drinks; he couldn't remember what had happened to him after that. (According to the police records, he went to the YMCA, a few blocks from where the party was held, and was there arrested by morals-squad officers in the men's room in the company of another man.)

Fortas urged the Star's editors to think carefully and humanely before they printed the story. He reminded them of Jenkins' wife and six children. He assured them Walter Jenkins would be hospitalized and stated flatly that his days as a White House aid were over.

The Star decided not to print the story—a decision consistent with the paper's policy in such morals cases—and Fortas and Clifford went on to present their case before Washington's other papers. As it turned out, United Press International finally broke the story of the arrests that evening, but by then Jenkins was a patient in a Washington hospital and the President, in New York, was about to "accept" his resignation.

The incident illustrates several things about Fortas. First, his role in the official family: when beset by the blakest trouble man can imagine, Jenkins literally ran to him. Second, his high status: although he had not been in touch with the President, he was able to say confidently in the conference with the Star editors that Jenkins was finished at the White House—and they knew his word had the stamp of authority.

A top-level White House staff member, thinking back over the Jenkins case recently, said it was easy to understand why the distraught man turned to Fortas when he found himself in deep trouble. "Walter had been with Lyndon Johnson for many, many years," he explained. "And he naturally thought of Fortas just the way the Presidents think of him—as the ablest, wisest counselor around." Johnson had this in mind when he offered Fortas—even urged upon him—the job of Attorney General of the United States when ROBERT KENNEDY resigned in the summer of 1964. Fortas turned it down.

While he won't comment specifically on the offer of the attorney generalship, Fortas was willing in a recent interview to hold forth on the question of going back into the Government as a general proposition.

"I have made it clear to the President," he said, "that I'm simply not interested in returning to Government. I've been through all that. Now I'm 54 years old. I want to be able to give time to my music. I have a law firm with large interests. We've got a lot of fine young lawyers who marry fine

young wives and have fine young babies. I have my responsibilities here."

As he spoke his eyes swept contentedly over the modern art and comfortable furniture that adorn his office in the high-ceilinged old mansion his firm occupies in the fashionable DuPont Circle area. It was clear that he likes his life's present rewarding course and that it will take something very special—perhaps the Supreme Court appointment for which he is frequently mentioned—to tempt him to change it.

There may be another contributing reason for his decision to stay out of Government. President Johnson is a notoriously difficult man to work for—insistent, demanding, hard-riding, sometimes brutal. By remaining with his law firm Fortas can avoid the rigors of a formal working relationship with Johnson and possibly, because of his independence, play an even more important role in national affairs than he could if he took a high administration position.

Although the Fortas-Johnson friendship began back in the Roosevelt days, it became considerably closer after President Kennedy's assassination. Johnson turned to Fortas for help almost immediately after his return from Dallas. On the plane to Washington, the President had considered the need for a blue-ribbon investigation of the assassination that would put to rest forever all questions and speculations. The next night at Les Ormes, his Washington home which he continued to use during the early days of his presidency, he asked Fortas to go to work on what was to become the Warren Commission. That was just one of the assignments Johnson gave his old friend during the period of transition. "You must remember," Fortas said recently, "that there was no functioning White House during that time directly after the assassination. President Kennedy's staff was in a state of shock. Ted Sorensen, who had been the key man on the Kennedy staff, was completely out of action. At the Justice Department, of course, it was somewhat the same thing."

Exactly what Fortas did for the President in that period is not known. But it is interesting to note that less than 2 weeks after Johnson took office the lawyer notified a Washington court that he was withdrawing as attorney for the President's one-time Senate aide, Bobby Baker, then under Senate investigation. The reason given: "In the crisis of transition, I have undertaken certain assignments" for the President. He expounded no further, but some of his later assignments are indeed known. For example, he took part in strategy conferences when the Democratic Convention in Atlantic City was thrown into a turmoil by the challenge of the Mississippi delegation by civil rights groups. Also, he and Clark Clifford and White House assistants Bill Moyers and Douglas Cater had weekly strategy luncheons throughout the presidential campaign. In fact, he was in and out of the White House all through the fall, checking on the flood of new scandal rumors released by the Republicans. "We were running a damn vice squad over there the last few weeks of the campaign," an associate recalls. "And Abe was squad leader."

After the election, he and Clifford were asked to suggest ways of streamlining the White House staff and to keep their eyes open for talent to fill a huge backlog of vacancies in key Government posts. One important job was filled, by the way, by a bright young lawyer from Arnold, Fortas and Porter—Sheldon Cohen, who became legal counsel and later Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service.

Through it all Fortas continued to function as the President's personal attorney. Soon after Johnson became President, Fortas presided at a meeting at Les Ormes at which an agreement was drafted to put the Johnson television properties into a trust,

at least, theoretically sealing them off from Presidential influence.

The meeting took place in the elegant second-floor sitting room. Two trustees-to-be, A. W. Moursund and J. W. Bullion, Texas lawyers long involved in Johnson affairs, were present. So were Leonard Marks, the Johnson lawyer on television and radio matters, and tax specialists from the Fortas firm. Mrs. Johnson, active head of the television interests, was there throughout, and the President drifted in and out of the sitting room.

The choices facing the conference were clear: the President and his family could keep the stations and operate them, which, in view of the close Federal control of broadcasting, would mean a highly embarrassing conflict of interests; they could sell the properties outright, paying a tremendous capital gains tax on the great increase in value since acquisition; or they could put them in a trust that would remove them from the family's control for as long as Mr. Johnson held public office. Practically all present favored the trust, and Fortas supervised its creation.

Today Fortas echoes the President's annoyance with criticism of the trust. He defends it as "the tightest, toughest trust arrangement ever drawn for a public official." To those who question the wisdom of appointing a close friend and associate of Johnson to head the trust he says snappishly, "Anyone who says anything like that just doesn't know Judge Moursund."

Despite this spirited defense, some influential voices have been raised against the agreement Fortas devised. The New York Times, for one, recently criticized the President because his assets are "in the hands of a trustee who is an old friend and business associate with whom he continues to maintain a close personal relationship," and because much of the fortune consists of television and radio stations, which depend on franchises issued by the Federal Communications Commission, whose members are appointed by the President.

Fortas is considered an expert on the Johnson financial position generally, although he is not inclined to talk about it. When the Washington Star was about to publish an exhaustive study of the family wealth, Press Secretary Reedy referred the newspapers to Fortas, who went over the proposed story, line by line, disclosing a tremendously detailed knowledge of Johnson's financial position. During the 1964 campaign, when news stories and Republican campaign speeches about his wealth began to get under Johnson's skin, the White House made public a formal accounting by the firm of Haskins and Sells. It was Fortas who made the arrangements with the accountants and gave them their instructions.

In January 1964 Fortas stepped into another delicate situation. The Washington Star uncovered details of the gift of a stereo record player in 1959 to Johnson, then Senate majority leader, by Don Reynolds, who had written several large insurance policies on Johnson's life. It was a touchy matter because the Bobby Baker story had just broken, and Baker was alleged to have solicited the stereo for Johnson. A copy of the Star's proposed story on the gift was taken to the White House and Andrew Hatcher, the assistant press secretary on duty, was asked if the President would care to comment. Hatcher glanced at the story, left the room with it for 10 or 15 minutes, and then returned to say that there was no comment.

But by the time the Star executive handling the story got back to his office, Fortas was on the phone to the paper's editor, urging that publication be withheld. When the full facts came out, he said, they would give a different picture of the whole incident. In this case, after a few minor

changes, the story was published and proved correct in every essential detail.

On the face of it, Johnson and Fortas are an oddly matched pair, a big, driving Texan and a slight, restrained Memphis Jew. Fortas says that originally it was admiration for Franklin D. Roosevelt that brought them together. They met some 30 years ago, when Johnson was an assistant to Congressman Richard Kleburg, the King Ranch cattle baron from Texas, and Fortas was a Yale assistant professor of law getting his feet wet in the Washington bureaucracy on weekends and vacations. As Fortas recalls it, they were introduced by Arthur Goldschmidt, a Texan and a mutual friend. They soon developed a warm friendship cemented by their commitment to F.D.R. and the New Deal. As each man moved ahead—Fortas through a number of Government assignments and then into private law practice and Johnson up the political ladder—the relationship flourished.

One has to go below the surface to find the reasons for their similarities. Both are compulsive workers; Fortas puts in long days at the office, then works beside his phone evenings and weekends almost as feverishly as Johnson. And, as with Johnson, his magnolia-tinted charm does not completely hide the tension and drive.

It would be foolish to deny that self-interest, too, has kept them together. Johnson, as an ambitious politician, needed—and needs—trustworthy counsel. Fortas, first as a rising bureaucrat and later as a practicing lawyer, has not suffered from this important friendship. Finally, just as the New Deal drew them together, they still see eye to eye in their political philosophy.

Fortas subscribes completely to Johnson's Great Society approach and sees it as an extension of the pattern set by Roosevelt. "It is New Deal to the extent that it manifests itself in concern for people and in a readiness to put the Government to work where necessary to accomplish things for them," he says. "But there is a fundamental difference from the old New Deal philosophy, and it's most dramatically illustrated by the President's insistence on unity and consensus. This, I think, accurately reflects the fact that the country's posture today is such that it can and should move as a whole to do the things that need to be done. Back in the New Deal days some segments of society had lagged so far behind that it was necessary to take measures for them alone."

The first professional service Fortas remembers performing for Johnson was crucial to the Texan's political career. In 1948 Lyndon B. Johnson, then a Member of the House of Representatives, was trying to move to the Senate and was engaged in a bitter primary fight with Coke Stevenson, a former Texas Governor. The vote was close and was followed by charges and countercharges of fraud and vote stealing. The State Democratic executive committee finally decided—29 to 28—that Johnson had won the Democratic nomination, which was then tantamount to election, by 87 votes out of almost 1 million cast. But the Stevenson forces went to court with charges of fraud in Jim Wells County and threatened to keep Johnson from being certified as the Democratic nominee. A Federal district judge enjoined the State from printing ballots so designating Johnson, pending an investigation.

As he was later to do repeatedly, Johnson turned to Fortas for help. "I was in Dallas taking depositions in an antitrust case," Fortas recalls, "and suddenly I got a call from Alvin Wirtz [a close mutual friend]. 'Lyndon's here in Fort Worth and he's in trouble,' Wirtz told me. 'Come over right away.'"

Fortas managed to extricate himself from his antitrust case and went to Fort Worth where he found a desperate situation. Johnson, at the end of his money and credit, was faced with the danger of having to go

through another campaign. A strategy was devised by Fortas and the other lawyers that very night. An appeal from the district judge's ruling was filed in the fifth circuit court of appeals and then Fortas brought the case to Washington, going before Justice Hugo Black, the Supreme Court Justice charged with hearing emergency appeals from that circuit. After Fortas presented Johnson's case, Black ruled that the district judge had overstepped himself, and stayed the injunction.

Although the 87-vote margin won him the nickname "Landslide Lyndon," which he hates, Johnson easily won the election and his rise to power and the Presidency was advanced an important step.

Fortas continued to do chores for Johnson all through his career as Senate majority leader and Vice President, but his role only rarely came to public notice. Senate aids say he was an influential adviser on the two civil rights bills Johnson pushed through the Senate in 1957 and 1960—measures Johnson was to cite repeatedly as evidence that he had outgrown his southern background. Fortas proudly states that he backed Johnson's attempt to win the presidential nomination in 1960. "My liberal friends were startled," he says, "but I told them that I knew the man—that if he were to do only one-tenth of what he actually did but spend more time telling people about what he'd done and what he believed in, people would be falling all over themselves to get behind him. I had the advantage of knowing him and what he stood for."

When Johnson, as Vice President, was head of the Government's Equal Employment Opportunity Committee, seeking to reduce discrimination in hiring, Fortas unofficially supervised the early work on policies and regulations. "Any problems we had we were told to 'check it with Abe,'" a staffer recalls.

Fortas refuses to discuss his present work for Johnson. He considers the President as his client, and no good lawyer discusses his client's business. The silence that he—and the White House—observe gives rise to all sorts of conjecture. Early this year, for example, one Washington writer noted that the President's health message had failed to support any campaign to discourage cigarette smoking and suggested darkly: "It may be merely a coincidence that the President's personal attorney and close confidant is Abe Fortas, whose law firm represents Philip Morris cigarettes."

This is recognition in the Washington manner, and it is a sort of backhanded realization of the American dream for the Memphis cabinetmaker's son who began making his living at the age of 13 by playing the violin at dances and parties.

Fortas' family came to this country from England and went directly to Memphis, where his father's older brother lived. Abe was the last of five children, the second to be born in the United States. His childhood, he recalls, was "as poor as you could imagine," but with the help of his violin he put himself through Southwestern College in Memphis and Yale Law School.

Immediately on graduation from law school in 1933 he joined the Yale faculty, serving as an assistant professor under William O. Douglas, the present Supreme Court Justice. Before long, however, Douglas and other Yale colleagues were in Washington working for the New Deal. And soon they were calling on Fortas for special assignments on weekends and vacations at the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Securities and Exchange Commission, and other alphabet agencies. By 1938 he was ready for full-time Washington work, and Douglas, then chairman of the SEC, installed him as assistant director of the Public Utilities Division.

Fortas' sharp legal mind and southern charm moved him steadily up the bureau-

cratic ladder. He became general counsel of the Public Works Administration, head of the Interior Department's Coal and Power Division, and eventually Under Secretary of Interior under Harold Ickes.

Soon after the war ended, he left the Government to form a law partnership with Thurman Arnold and two other former Government lawyers (Porter joined the firm a few years later). Today it is a high-powered operation of about 40 lawyers, most of them former Government officials or teachers, practically all chosen because of their intellectual capacity. Arnold, Fortas, and Porter lawyers tend to throw themselves into cases with distinctive fervor. "We're the *Avis* of the law field," says one partner. "We try harder. We're the firm people come to when they are looking for a miracle."

The business is almost entirely oriented to the Federal Government—cases involving taxes, antitrust suits, savings-and-loan regulation cases, proceedings before the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the like.

The reporter's attempt to link the absence of an anticigarette statement in the President's health message with Fortas' representation of Philip Morris illustrates the delicate position he occupies as a man with the President's ear and a lawyer doing business with the Government.

There are some who feel that Fortas could be a bit more like Caesar's wife when he gets into such activities as, for example, his work for the cigarette makers, who are wrestling with the Government over warnings against smoking on labels and in advertising.

Fortas has described himself as a "meticulous legal craftsman." An associate calls him "one of the most able legal machines I have ever seen." He is rated an outstanding appellate arguer, and one of the best brief writers in the business.

But he is considered a difficult man to work for—demanding, exacting, always after perfection. "Take it back and put some poetry into it," he once told a junior lawyer who had worked up an important brief. He meant the legal work was fine, but the thing needed polish and style.

He is almost unflinchingly serious and businesslike. He has no small-talk topic other than his longtime love, music. "I wish he'd laugh more," a longstanding associate says. And another comments, "I can't imagine any better professional opportunity than to practice law with him, but he's the last guy I'd want to spend a weekend with."

In briefing new lawyers coming into the firm, Fortas declares, "We're not just guns for hire." The firm, he says, accepts its responsibilities to take cases in the public interest, even though no big fees are involved.

Though he is not a criminal lawyer, Fortas himself has won two trallblazing criminal decisions. Each was a feeless case assigned by the court, and the firm bore all of the considerable costs.

One, referred to as the Durham case, gave legitimacy to a psychiatric defense for persons charged with crimes. Fortas has been interested in psychiatry since the late forties. "I feel that a lawyer who doesn't know about the discoveries and art of psychiatry is not a complete lawyer," he says. Apparently aware of this interest, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia appointed him to represent a smalltime criminal, Monte Durham, in a case involving the question of criminal responsibility. Fortas won a new ruling from the court undoing the old right-from-wrong test of responsibility and substituting a broader rule that an accused is not responsible if his crime is the product of a mental disease or defect.

Fortas also was the hero in the 1963 Gideon case before the Supreme Court, recently described by the New York Times reporter Anthony Lewis in his book "Gideon's Trumpet." Clarence Earl Gideon, who had been convicted of burgling a Florida poolroom,

claimed in a handwritten petition to the Supreme Court that he had been convicted illegally. He couldn't afford a lawyer, he said, and the Florida court had refused to appoint one for him. This denied his constitutional right to "due process of law."

In a proud exercise of American justice, the Supreme Court accepted Gideon's case and appointed Fortas to argue it. Characteristically, he threw himself into the assignment. "I want this to be a little jewel," he told the assistant working with him on the brief. The result was a historic decision that the "due-process" clause in the 14th amendment requires that each accused person be represented in State criminal trials by a lawyer whether he can afford one or not. For Gideon, it meant a new trial, with a lawyer, and acquittal.

Fortas has also been involved in a number of the early civil-liberties cases of the McCarthy era, defending government employees and others accused of disloyalty. One of these early cases involved Owen Lattimore, the State Department adviser, a prime McCarthy target. His experience with this case established for him the fact that association with a "cause" case does not necessarily scare away bread-and-butter clients.

The general counsel for Unilever, one of his firm's big accounts, arrived from Holland for a conference with Fortas just as Lattimore was called to testify in Capitol Hill. Fortas told the Unilever man that he wouldn't be able to meet with him since he had to go to the hearing. For lack of anything else to do with his time, the Dutch lawyer went along. There he became so enraged with the McCarthy technique and so impressed with the Fortas performance that he left more enthusiastic about the Fortas firm than ever. Some years later, when Fortas and Porter were on a European trip, they visited the Unilever man at his estate outside Amsterdam and while there noticed a trio of geese parading across the lawn. Their host and his wife informed them that the geese were named Arnold, Fortas, and Porter. They hastened to explain, however, that this was a compliment, since geese traditionally have warned of barbaric invasion, and the law firm was doing the same thing in handling civil-liberties cases.

Perhaps the firm's victories in "cause" cases have convinced businessmen that Arnold, Fortas, and Porter was an aggressive, sharp group of lawyers. Or perhaps the firm's deep roots in government service and impeccable political ties are its main selling points. Whatever the reasons, Arnold, Fortas, and Porter has clearly prospered. The firm represents a number of giant companies, and Fortas himself sits on the board of Federated Department Stores, GreatAmerica Corp. and several banks and insurance companies.

Fortas and his wife, a small, dynamic woman who smokes cigars and is recognized as one of Washington's leading tax lawyers, lead a quiet life in Georgetown. They met when he was alternating between Yale's law faculty and the Department of Agriculture's legal staff. She was an economist at the department. After they married in 1935, he encouraged her to go to law school—so, of course, she went to Yale and graduated number two in a class of a hundred twenty-five. For many years she resisted joining her husband's firm, working instead in the Washington office of Adial Stevenson's firm. But when that office closed in 1960 after President Kennedy siphoned off Stevenson and several of his partners for government assignments, most of the staff moved over to Arnold, Fortas, and Porter and she went along. Today she heads the firm's tax division.

The Fortases have broad cultural interests. He is a director of the Casals Festival in Puerto Rico and a trustee in the Carnegie Hall Corp., the Washington Gallery of Modern Art, and the John F. Kennedy

Center for the Performing Arts, the latter still in the planning stages. They generally shun the social circuit, however. Fortas explains that he developed a profound distaste for the standard Washington function back in his Interior Department days when he had to attend many as a stand-in for Secretary Ickes.

His greatest pleasure is his music. He plays the violin with near professional skill, and every week, without fail, he and three other musicians (two professionals and another amateur) devote an evening to playing string quartets. His cultural interests permit him to serve President Johnson as an occasional pipeline to the arts. Typically, he was chairman of the concert last inauguration eve which, with the help of his friends Isaac Stern, Van Cliburn, and others, brought a touch of class to the somewhat garish inaugural festivities.

For a week or two each summer Fortas takes the other members of his string quartet to his summer home in Westport, Conn., where, he says, "I spend the mornings hauling manure for my wife's garden and the rest of the time playing chamber music." He and Mrs. Fortas usually manage at least one trip to Canada every winter for skiing and skating.

Fortas has a longstanding friendship with Pablo Casals, growing out of ties to Puerto Rico which began when he managed the island's affairs as part of his Interior Department job. He helped arrange the Casals Festivals and also engineered the cellist's White House appearances during the Kennedy administration.

As the first Casals Festival was about to open in San Juan in 1958, Fortas found himself entrusted with a mission as delicate as any he has performed for the President. A seam split in Casals' precious cello, and the maestro would not let anyone repair it but an expert in New York. Fortas was called in. He booked two first-class tickets on a plane for New York, took the window seat for himself and propped the cello in the other, holding it in place by the seat belt. A very moderate drinker, he recalls that he ordered two martinis on that flight—one for himself and one for the cello—and drank both. "I was nervous," he explained. "Carrying a man's cello is like carrying his wife."

AN APPEAL FOR AMERICA'S SHEET GLASS INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the President, under the escape-clause procedure, imposed additional duties on sheet glass imported into the United States as a measure of protection of the domestic glass industry.

Conditions in the industry at that time more than warranted this action. The domestic industry was struggling against adverse conditions, and was desperately seeking stability after a period of disastrous ups and downs over which the industry had little or no control.

While the industry was seeking to find its footing, Western European glass manufacturers had been shipping sheet glass into this country in large quantities, at prices 8 to 9 percent under the best prices the domestic industry could offer.

Last Friday, the U.S. Tariff Commission delivered to the President a report on sheet glass as a result of an investigation conducted under provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. On the

basis of this report, the President will now decide whether to continue the escape-clause tariff on sheet glass, or whether there would be no adverse effects in the domestic industry if the tariff were lifted.

Mr. Speaker, this week I sent a telegram to the President urging that no reduction in duty on sheet glass be ordered. I would like to read this telegram to my colleagues:

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge that no reduction in duty on sheet glass be ordered on basis of Tariff Commission report just filed. The impact of a reduction could be disastrous in areas now responsible for more than one half our domestic sheet glass production, including eastern Oklahoma where two plants are located in Okmulgee County. Your attention is respectfully called to commission finding that imports of heavy sheet glass were highest on record in 1964 despite tariff increases established on commission recommendation 3 years ago. Reduction in duty would almost certainly lead to further increases in imports and resulting unemployment in American glass plant areas. Surely there can be no sound justification for tariff cuts at this time. With great respect and confidence in your decision.

ED EDMONDSON,
Member of Congress.

I think it would be good to review, for a minute, the domestic glass industry and some of its problems, some of the conditions which greatly affect its welfare.

Almost all the sheet glass produced in this country is produced by 7 companies in 14 plants. Four of these plants are in areas of persistent unemployment in Appalachia, and two more are in areas of persistent unemployment in Okmulgee County in my district in Oklahoma. These six plants, four in Appalachia and two in Okmulgee County, employ about half of all the people employed in the United States in production of sheet glass. The President requested, and Congress has authorized, expenditure of almost \$2 billion to help put Appalachia on its feet, and the Public Works Committee is now considering another bill requested by the President which would extend this same effort into other lagging regions. More than 7,000 Americans work at producing sheet glass, and more than 3,500 of them are in these plants in areas of persistent unemployment. Continuation of these duties which already have helped stabilize the domestic glass industry certainly would seem consistent with economic development objectives put forth by the President and endorsed by the Congress.

The glass industry has experienced 15 years of fluctuation, and, because it is dependent upon the construction and automobile manufacturing industries which consume most of the product, it will continue to rise and fall as the welfare of these industries moves upward and downward. However, the sheet glass industry does not, even under the best of circumstances, fare as well as the economy as a whole. U.S. sheet glass consumption has moved irregularly upward during the years 1955 through 1964, but at all times the sheet glass industry has lagged behind the growth of the gross national product and behind industry in

general, as reflected in the Federal Reserve index of industrial production.

The small but vital sheet glass industry is not an industry which can adjust easily to ups and downs. Successful and profitable production of sheet glass requires considerable technical knowledge, large capital investment, extensive marketing capacity, and, for the greatest efficiency, continuous furnace operation. Through technological advances, our domestic industry has increased its production capacity in all but two of the years between 1955 and 1964 without a corresponding increase in production. Last month only 22 of 33 sheet glass furnaces in the United States were in operation. The industry was running at two-thirds of capacity.

This is a picture of an industry which has had a 2-year breather from excessive and depressive competition from imported sheet glass.

What would happen if the escape action should be lifted at this time? Here are conclusions drawn by Tariff Commissioners Talbot and Sutton, and set forth in the report which has been submitted to the President:

A reduction in duty would—

1. Exert a downward pressure on sheet glass prices;
2. Lead to an increase in the share of consumption supplied by imports;
3. Contribute toward a decline in employment and profits; and
4. Idle productive facilities.

These Commissioners also conclude that "one could expect that the actual repercussions would go beyond those which a narrowly focused price analysis would indicate. A less favorable price position of domestic versus foreign sheet glass reduces the opportunities of domestic producers to make the most of strong demand situations and to provide a defense against weak demand situations."

It is significant that the other Commissioners agree that adverse effects would follow a tariff reduction even though differing with Commissioners Talbot and Sutton as to the degree of harm likely to result.

Given these circumstances, and these conclusions drawn by Commissioners who have held hearings, conducted an investigation, and studied the facts intensively, it would appear to be grossly unfair to pull from under this industry the help it has received in finding its feet these last 2 years. It would seem grossly unfair to lift the escape action tariff which gives, at best, only a small measure of protection from low price foreign competition.

I hope and trust the President will reject the pressures for tariff reduction on sheet glass and continue the much-needed rates now in effect.

JUSTICE DENIED?

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, for several years my attention has been called to manifest injustices resulting from abuses of power by the Alien Prop-

erty Custodian under the Trading With the Enemy Act. The express purpose of that law was to sequester property of enemy aliens, not to confiscate it, and to hold it until war ended and then it could not possibly be of aid to the enemy, to return it.

Hundreds of such examples can be found in the hearings on bills providing for amendments to the act. I refer to those before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—House Joint Resolution 272 and those that follow, 84th Congress, July 1 and 11, 1955; Senate Judiciary Committee—S. 34 and those that follow, 83d Congress, July 20–22, 1953; and S. 105, and those that follow, 86th Congress, June 18 and July 1959.

On January 26, 1948, one of the ablest Members of the House, Hon. Eugene Cox, of Georgia, characterized the 1948 War Claims Act as legalized robbery. Under it the Alien Property Custodian David Bazelon, a Chicago lawyer, confiscated the property of many thousands of persons. I should add in passing that this Custodian was later appointed to the Federal bench. The Alien Property Office has had a curious history even from its creation. I have in mind one of the first Custodians, Thomas Miller, whose difficulties are to be found in a Federal court decision reported in 24 F. 2d 353; certiorari denied, 276 U.S. 638, 48 S. Ct. 421. A U.S. court of appeals branded Custodian Miller "as unfaithful to a trust imposed upon him in high office, where his Government had the right to expected fidelity and conscientious performance of duty."

Two of the grossest miscarriages of justice pointed out to me are those of a natural born American citizen, Miss Christel Guessefeldt; and of a naturalized citizen of this country, Mr. John F. Hackfeld. I have introduced bills with respect to these cases, H.R. 8826 and H.R. 4030, respectively. I include these as part of my remarks.

Typical of the mistreatment of Miss Guessefeldt was the confiscation in 1950—long after the end of World War II—of her toy ukelele, dolls, child's spoons, pictures and her book, "Alice in Wonderland." She finally raised funds and bought them back from the APO. I quote from testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee:

Typical of the Government lawyers' attitude, was an inquiry whether her father could have come home (from Europe in 1941) on the Zeppelin *Hindenberg*. That airship had been destroyed 2 years before the Guessefeldts left Hawaii on vacation.

As to Hackfeld, the Government first returned cash, bonds, and securities it had seized. This was done on the orders of the President of the United States and the Attorney General. When he sought to expose the seizure and confiscation of other valuable property consisting of stock in his holding company, the Government persuaded a Federal judge to reopen the case and as a result a portion of his cash and securities were again taken from him on the ground the first return was a "mistake" and that he was an alien. But at the same time it happened to be in the interest of the Gov-

ernment to sue him for huge sums for taxes on the emphatic and insistent contentions by the Revenue Service that at all times since 1900 he was a naturalized citizen of the United States. My bill would require the Government to elect which course it intends to follow. In other words, as a Supreme Court Justice recently stated:

The Government cannot have it both ways in the same case (373 U.S. 144, 195; 83 S. Ct. 554, 581).

The travail of these two individuals and their families at the hands of a Federal bureaucracy and in the courts is illustrated in the memoranda following my remarks. My bills in their behalf set no precedent. In fact the Congress has just returned a substantial sum of money to Dr. Walter Duisberg, a German who became naturalized in May, 1933. The return to Duisberg was accomplished by reference to the Court of Claims of bills for his relief. I include them and Private Law 675, 87th Congress, as a part of my remarks.

In sharp contrast to the unjustified court decisions adverse to Miss Guessefeldt and Mr. Hackfeld, I take this opportunity of calling attention of the Congress to an opinion by Federal Judge Linton Collins. It is in the finest tradition of the judiciary. He has just held that a claimant against the Government is not only entitled to recover damages for losses caused by the United States, but must be compensated for the delay in payment. The judge points out that the claimant had endured not one but "three extensive trials" over a period of "more than 20 years." I suggest that those having difficulties with the Government will take heart upon reading Judge Collins' conclusions that justice after all is available in the courts—certainly in cases before him—notwithstanding the suit is against the United States. Particularly significant is that the case was referred by simple house resolution to the court for its findings and recommendations under existing law.

I am hopeful that Congress will enact the Guessefeldt and Hackfeld bills and thus also end two outrageous injustices to America citizens which have already been endured too long.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT POLICIES OVERLOOK COMMUNITY NEEDS IN HEATH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, at times it appears that the Post Office Department overlooks community needs in determining the fate of local post offices. We have two good examples in my own county in the village of Jacksontown and the city of Heath. It is with compassion that anyone studies the terrific responsibilities of Postmaster General Gronouski in directing the vast postal system. Yet, at the same time criticisms should be voiced on policies which are oblivious to community needs and overlook the value of a post office to a village or city.

In the case of Jacksontown, it was alleged that a saving of about \$5,000 would be accomplished by closing the office and consolidating its postal service with a rural route operating out of Newark, Ohio. On close examination, this saving was superficial but, more importantly, it totally overlooked the value from a service a community standpoint in having a post office. This does not easily translate into dollars and cents but we should never become so materialistic that the human values in the postal service become unimportant. It is important to people of a town or city that they have their own post office, that they enjoy its services and gain the civic pride which comes from the identity of mailing to Jacksontown, Ohio, or to Heath, Ohio.

What the Department seems to overlook is the necessity to a community of having a post office. With the trend of bigness and toward centralization, it is thought that in schools, post offices, businesses—indeed, just about every facet of our economic and political life—we must consolidate and do away with the small, the old. Jacksontown would suffer a blight as a village if their office were to be closed. Civic pride, service, and many factors which do not appear on the ledger are really of prime importance and should be considered in any determination that a post office be closed. This is one of the real reasons that no one gets serious about a postal deficit. There should be one because it is essentially a service and not a profit and loss item.

As a side note, time and time again I have received letters from irritated constituents who wonder why junk mail from the multitude of Government agencies is sent airmail when regular delivery would suffice. Just yesterday, I received a bundle of mail which was sent via airmail to a Zanesville business concern at a cost of 56 cents when there was no urgency to it whatsoever. Many Government officials in Washington feel that as long as the taxpayer is footing the bill, it does not matter. Why then do they set such rigid standards for local post offices which, after all, perform a service function to a community far greater than the tens of thousands of dollars which are used in postage?

At the same time the economy argument was used to close the Jacksontown office and, fortunately we were able to have this order rescinded, a curious argument is used to deny residents of Heath a new post office. As Bert Hobbach, first mayor of Heath and now serving as chairman of the post office committee for that city, put it in a letter to me:

We have moved along from 1,200 population to almost 7,000 in 10 years and it is predicted that we will have 10,000 in a few years.

Why, then, cannot Heath have a new post office instead of being serviced by their neighbor, Newark?

Let us go through the chain of events to see if there is rhyme or reason to this matter. I have been working on this matter for over 3 years and can recount in detail the stumbling blocks which have been thrown along the way. In 1963, the

following letter was received from the Deputy Assistant Postmaster General:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1963.

Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to postal service needs in the village of Heath (Licking County), Ohio, about which you had previously inquired. Residents and civic leaders of Heath indicated that a classified branch post office was needed to improve service and provide a community mailing address.

Our investigation shows that at the present time postal service is provided to every house and business place in Heath by foot, mounted or rural route. The Heath contract branch post office in the Southgate shopping center offers the usual financial services, stamps, money orders, etc. The area gets a collection after 5 p.m. and certain main boxes get a collection after 8 p.m. Special delivery service is given in the evening and on Sunday. In addition the community is less than 2 miles from the Moundbuilders classified station.

Apparently residents are unaware that they can use the address "Heath, Ohio" without including Newark. However, Heath is a bona fide address and is carried in State distributing schemes and the Directory of Post Offices.

The additional expense of establishing a classified branch in lieu of the Heath contract branch would amount to about \$10,000 per annum more than the contract branch post office.

We are having our field officials give publicity to the fact that residents of Heath may use the name of their community as their mailing address and we are authorizing issuance of a Heath postmarking stamp for use on outgoing mail. Mayor Hitchcock will be contacted and the matter discussed with him. If there are specific instances of unsatisfactory service we would like to know about them and would welcome the opportunity to work out any problems that arise.

Sincerely yours,

A. C. HAHN,

Deputy Assistant Postmaster General.

At that time, Heath was not officially a city. Due to the efforts of many public-spirited Heath citizens and officials, a census was conducted and it was determined that Heath was entitled to become Ohio's 196th city with a population of 6,066. Our efforts were given a new boost since certainly a city should have its own post office. At least, this is what one would think. We started anew and sent a letter to the Postmaster General. His reply was brief and he turned the matter over to the Bureau of Operations.

His letter stated:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1965.

Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of April 10 requesting a survey to determine the possibility of establishing a new post office in the city of Heath, Ohio.

Your letter has been directed to the appropriate officials under whose jurisdiction this comes, and a report will be sent to you just as soon as it is available.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General.

A very descriptive and intelligent letter was drafted by the local Heath Post Office Committee and sent to Postmaster General Gronouski. Probably no one was better able to cite the orderly growth and potential of the Heath area than Bert Hoback who made this request. His excellent letter stated:

CITY OF HEATH,

Heath, Ohio, May 26, 1965.

Hon. JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
The Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRONOUSKI: We need help. The people of the city of Heath, Ohio, feel lost without at least a branch post office as a legal mailing address using the city name. The mail service in Heath, Ohio, is confusing and, no doubt, the confusion is increasing since the secretary of state has certified Heath a city.

Incoming mail addressed to Heath, Ohio, goes to the Newark Post Office and finds its way to the Moundbuilders Station for delivery, as that is the nearest station to the Heath area and since Heath does not have a branch office for the mails' destination. The Moundbuilders Station is a small station to serve the western residential section of the city of Newark. Since there is parking space for only two cars, this makes it inadequate for an additional area of 8 square miles and a population of almost 7,000 to properly use it. Heath has a valuation of \$41 million and from the Ohio State survey may have a population of 10,000 by the year 1970.

A centrally located station with adequate parking space would be of great help, and it would be appreciated by all to be permitted to legally use the Heath mailing address without confusion. Heath has grown very fast and is still growing. Probably no one has given a true picture of Heath to the Postal Department prior to this time.

Mail delivered in Heath, Ohio, has been stamped in red to notify your sender of the correct address. By that they probably mean everyone should notify the sender that the address should be Newark and not Heath. It is doubtful if this could ever be satisfactorily done, as there will always be mail addressed to the city of Heath and Heath, Ohio, residents. More residents every day are marking their return address as Heath, Ohio, and a city of 7,000 should feel that to be their correct mailing address.

We are not asking for an independent post office with additional expense to the Postal Department, as they, no doubt, feel there should be more consolidations made using one large independent post office with branch offices for the name of the city or village to which the mail is addressed. The intent of this letter is to inquire how soon the mail that is being addressed to Heath, Ohio, can be a legal address and all people concerned be notified of such to help stop the red stamping of the wrong address.

We would appreciate it very much if some of your people would join us to check the feasibility of securing a branch station and if all concerned may use the Heath, Ohio, mailing address rather than being in a divided situation such as now exists. No doubt, everyone concerned feels that the mail should move along safely and properly. The future potential of the city of Heath is predicted to be great, and it is believed that the Postal Department will lose no money by moving along with us.

Yours very truly,

R. B. HOBACK,
Chairman, Post Office Committee.

The same Mr. Hahn replied as he had in 1963 but this time placed more reliance on centralization than on adequacy of service. Again they overlook the value of a post office to Heath as a civic necessity

and prerequisite to any fast-growing city:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1965.

Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of April 10, to the Postmaster General, regarding your interest in having an independent post office established in the city of Heath, Ohio.

As you know, we must centralize mail handling activities throughout the Nation at a minimum number of key post offices in order to continue efficient and economical postal service to our rapidly increasing population. This has resulted in our decreasing, rather than increasing the number of independent post offices and where postal window service is needed, we operate either a contract or classified station or branch.

I have asked for a study of the postal service being provided by the Heath Contract Branch post office to determine the adequacy of service. This is a service matter which is under the delegated authority of the regional director at Cincinnati, and I have asked that you be given a full report at the conclusion of his study.

Sincerely yours,

A. C. HAHN,

Deputy Assistant Postmaster General.

I naturally continued my fight for this local post office and had little doubt that the Post Office Department would gladly agree to establish a new one for a city. It was with amazement that I read the letter from Regional Director Nolan last week which indicated that "postal service for the Heath community is adequate and satisfactory at the present time."

His letter is as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE,
Cincinnati, Ohio, June 4, 1965.

Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASHBROOK: This has further reference to your letter of April 10 to the Postmaster General in relation to postal service for the city of Heath, Ohio. Pursuant to the Department's reply of April 22, we have given attention to the adequacy of service rendered by the Heath contract branch.

A report from postal service officers who conducted the study indicates that present service is adequate and meets the needs of the community. During the investigation discussions were held with the postmaster and other management officials of the Newark post office to which the Heath contract branch is attached administratively. The manager of Gray's Drugstore, in which the contract branch is located, was also contacted. Insofar as it could be determined no legitimate service complaints have been received from any patrons during the past several months.

In addition to the financial accommodations provided by the contract branch, every house and business place in Heath receives mail delivery by foot, mounted or rural route. Mail is collected from the area after 5 p.m., and there is a second collection after 8 p.m. from certain boxes located on main arteries. Special delivery service is given on Sunday as well as on other days of the week.

The name "Heath, Ohio" is carried in State distribution schemes and the "Directory of Post Offices" as a bona fide address. The fact that residents can use "Heath, Ohio" as their post office address was published in the Heath Herald in May 1963. This community identity, along with the present de-

livery and financial accommodations, is comparable to that which would be provided by an independent post office or a classified carrier branch.

While I feel our postal service for the Heath community is adequate and satisfactory at the present time, please be assured that appropriate changes in service will be undertaken as warranted by future requirements.

Sincerely yours,

J. P. NOLAN,
Regional Director.

Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department may think the service at Heath is adequate but most Heath citizens do not; nor do I. This makes no reflection on the Newark postmaster or post office. They do their duty with no cause for complaint. Our argument is simple: a city of 6,066—now actually well over 7,000 and growing—should not be the victim of bureaucratic shortsightedness which fails to take into account a city's need for a post office. It matters not if the service is adequate from the Department's standpoint. The service will never be adequate to a city when they are without their own independent home post office and all of us will continue our fight until this goal is accomplished. I believe the Department is relenting somewhat in their rigid position and I predict that we will have a post office within the near future.

As a sidelight, I am reminded of how farfetched some of these new, advanced schemes are when they are worked out at the local level. It is one thing to sit in a Washington office and draw lines, work out boundaries, and suggest efficiencies but it is quite different to be out in the field and put these theories into practice. Two years ago, the publisher of the Utica Herald, one of Licking County's fine weeklies, received many complaints from some of their Knox County subscribers who formerly received that newspaper on Thursday but had begun to get it on Saturday or Monday. Of course, in the old and unenlightened days the mail used to go directly to the patrons. Then some hot shot figured out a better way of doing it and to our query we received this blasé reply:

Under the new improved system the mail now goes from Utica to Newark to Columbus to Mount Vernon to the patron.

Sounded great on paper but it did not work well in practice. In both Jackson-town and Heath we have vivid examples of theories which may sound well but in practice are not consistent with the long tradition of service for which our Post Office Department is known.

Mr. Speaker, Heath residents have a right to expect more consideration from their Post Office Department. They want, and they are entitled to, an independent post office for their city; let me repeat, city. We will never relent in this fight until the Post Office Department sees the merit and wisdom of their request.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART XCVIII

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may ex-

CXI—874

tend 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following articles concern a large tract of undeveloped land on Staten Island and plans for its redevelopment and the crime situation in New York.

The articles are part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 25, 1965.

The articles follow:

STILL HOPE FOR A MODEL SUBURB IN THE CITY (By Jerome Zukosky)

At next Wednesday's meeting of the city planning commission, Mayor Wagner's administration expects to do an about-face on an ambitious plan to make a model suburb within the city limits.

The site in question takes in 1,080 acres on the south shore of Staten Island, which still has some 15 square miles of vacant land in a city where big undeveloped parcels are scarce and rapidly getting scarcer.

The Annadale-Huguenot urban renewal plan, given up for dead a year ago, is perhaps the last chance to save the rest of those 15 square miles from the kind of chaotic catch-as-catch-can building that has already enveloped much of Staten Island, to say nothing of the city's other boroughs.

Even the borough president of Richmond, Albert Maniscalco, admits that the housing developments sprouting along the Lower Bay since the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge was started are among the ugliest, worst planned and most expensive in the city.

Without urban renewal, Annadale-Huguenot would be ripe for more of the same. Yet 2 years ago Staten Island citizens' groups and real estate interests forced Mr. Maniscalco to ask Mayor Wagner to kill the plan, and last year the mayor told the planning commission to administer the coup de grace.

THE LOOSE ENDS

The commission had been toying with the plan since 1961, when James Felt was its chairman. The chairman now is William F. R. Ballard, and he says it is premature to discuss the plan before its revival is formally announced by city hall. That announcement is expected Wednesday, but the mayor's housing coordinator, Milton Mollen, is still tying up loose ends and it could be delayed.

This leisurely attitude toward one of the city's last big stretches of prime building land had an unexpected result: the combination of official indecision, bureaucratic immobility, and the planning commission's reluctance to kill the plan gave a handful of Staten Island residents an opportunity to drum up, for the first time, solid popular support for renewal.

"There has been a very noticeable change in attitude toward the whole thing," Mr. Maniscalco mused in a telephone interview the other day, making it clear that he has no intention of opposing the mayor's decision to resuscitate the Annadale-Huguenot plan.

That puts matters back where they were 2 years ago, almost to the day.

Some 600 houses, many of them summer bungalows, dot Annadale-Huguenot's rolling woodland, where most streets are unpaved tracks or dirt paths. About 30 percent of the land is privately owned; the remaining 700 acres belong to the city. But when the planners began looking closely at Annadale, in 1961, they knew its future was firmly fixed in the mold of the developments to the north by the invisible blight that can be seen only on official city maps.

Over that land, covering it completely, is a massive gridiron of nonexistent streets de-

signed like those that run across most of Manhattan. They divide the land into huge rectangular blocks, and they are wide enough to handle garment center truck traffic.

The grid obliterates ponds, woods, and hillocks right to the shore of the Lower Bay. It was laid down by land speculators during the last big land boom before the depression. For the most part the blocks themselves are divided into lots 40 feet wide by 100 feet deep.

AN EMBALMED PATTERN

Few homes or streets were built, but the pattern of land use was embalmed in official city maps. And just one privately owned lot on a block was enough to keep those invisible streets official.

If those maps were used as the framework for new housing, Annadale would be built just as it was laid out by the land speculators, although the grid system violates most of the planning rules for suburban housing that have emerged since World War II.

Provisionally, however, the old maps were inaccurate. New ones were necessary before large-scale building could take place. In 1958, Mr. Maniscalco began supervising a re-mapping by private engineers. For the most part, the new maps laid out the land just as the old ones did, and late in 1960 Mr. Maniscalco got to Annadale.

The maps he submitted to the planning commission for approval are still there—unapproved. Mr. Felt, the chairman of the commission, obtained a "freeze" on the Annadale tract early in 1961, precluding further sale of city land or new homebuilding. Then the planners went to work.

In October 1962, in the supreme court building in St. George, the commission staff presented its general plan to Staten Island civic groups. In February 1963, the commission held a public hearing on the plan at city hall. On April 17, 1963, it designated the 1,800 acres near the old hamlets of Annadale and Huguenot as an urban renewal area, and gave its sanction to a general planning proposal that has since become known as the Annadale plan.

The planners proposed to start from scratch, wiping out lot lines, streets, utilities easements, and other legal clutter forever and effectively turning Annadale into virgin land. The only way to do it was to use the city's urban renewal powers to buy up the privately owned land and replan the entire tract.

After replanning, all the land not used for streets, schools, parks, libraries and other public facilities would be sold to private buyers, including any original property-owners who wanted to return.

The planners figured the city would recoup at least all it spent to acquire the private land in the first place, and no Federal renewal subsidies would be necessary. For one thing, at least 100 of the 357 acres mapped as "streets" in the gridiron were wasted: the planners, by using modern cul-de-sac streets, for example, were able to use the "found" land for extra parks and public utilities.

Groups of houses could be clustered and the clusters separated by strips of parks leading to the bay front, to schools or to stores; houses of different size and cost could be encouraged by pricing lots differently and making them different sizes. New York City could have, for the first time, a suburban community similar to the pioneering Radburn in Bergen County, N.J., and to dozens of "new towns," such as Reston, Va., now rising outside the major cities of the Nation.

But the planning commission's vision got nowhere. The housing and redevelopment board, which normally takes over after the commission approves a general scheme, failed to draw a detailed project. The housing and redevelopment board has never publicly given a reason for this, but the answer is not difficult to discover. On Staten Island, the citizens who did care about what was happening at Annadale did not like it.

AD HOC COMMITTEE

"Most of the people that came out, 98 percent of the people that came out, were against it," said Mr. Maniscalco, recalling the month after April 1963. At a public hearing called by the borough president to "test public opinion" some 250 people shouted down anyone favoring the project who did not live near the Annadale area.

On September 30, Mr. Maniscalco wrote to Mr. Mollen, then chairman of the housing and redevelopment board, to Mayor Wagner and to Francis Bloustein, acting chairman of the planning commission, requesting that the project be abandoned.

"You must have been aware—as we were at our public hearing last April—of the strange alliance of opposition to the proposal," Mr. Bloustein wrote back on October 15. The residents of the area, he said, "wanted everything to remain in its rural state," while their allies were "real estate interests who were vigorously opposed to renewal planning because they want to move in immediately and build as much as they can as fast as they can."

Mr. Bloustein asked Mr. Maniscalco to reconsider. "Failure to take advantage of this great opportunity will prove a mistake that will haunt not only Annadale but the entire borough for generations to come," he said.

The borough president was unmoved, and the following May, a brief press release handed out on a Friday afternoon at city hall, for suitable burial in the Saturday papers, said that Mayor Wagner had ordered the planners to drop the project. But he did it with a typical compromise that may have saved the plan.

The mayor told the commission to try to overcome the "invisible blight" without urban renewal. This proved an impossible task: "Any technician could have told the mayor that right away," said one staff planner for the commission. But for 8 months the commission tried to follow the mayor's orders. It was just enough time for it to be rescued by a handful of Staten Islanders.

Frank Duffy, a 36-year-old lawyer for Union Carbide Corp., and three friends—a newspaperman, a graphic arts designer and a Wall Street corporation lawyer—set up the "Ad Hoc Committee on Open Lands on Staten Island" last fall.

FINALLY, SUPPORT

The committee's first problem was to offset the fear and resentment that had welled up in 1962 and 1963 as the planners fruitlessly tried to allay the belief "renewal" was, among other things, a Communist plot, a foot in the door for Negroes and poor people or some other vague menace.

The second front was the courts. To gain time Mr. Duffy's group filed suit against the city in supreme court in Manhattan. The Islanders argued that the planning commission could not abandon its plan without the kind of precise new land layout the housing and redevelopment board had never produced.

Lawyers from the city corporation counsel's office, the housing and redevelopment board, and the planning commission tried to have the petition dismissed, but Justice Irving H. Saypol disagreed. More important, opposing lawyers informally agreed that no city-owned land within the Annadale tract would be sold until the end of litigation, which seems nowhere in sight. The city has yet to file its answer to the complaint. This city land is a problem that has plagued the Annadale plan from the beginning. Real estate department officials, Commissioner Frank Lazarus and Budget Bureau Director William Shea have made no secret of their desire to auction it off as quickly as possible. The land is estimated to be worth at least \$10 million.

The desire of the men who watch the budget to sell that land was made clear to the planning commission chairman, Mr. Ballard, at a meeting of the site selection board early in January. Within a few weeks, the commission picked its March 16 meeting to end the plan, release the maps it had been sitting on since 1960 and permit the sale of city land on the old grid.

But by then the planners had support on Staten Island.

"For the first time there came an uprising from people not only outside the area but inside it too, saying they wanted a plan," Mr. Maniscalco said of the March 16 hearing.

Now the planning commission is expected to vote against its own proposals of March 16, and authorize the housing and redevelopment board to apply for Federal funds to make a detailed plan of the Annadale tract. The board of estimate must approve the application, then the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and both the planning commission and the board of estimate must approve the product of the drawing boards.

This may take a year; the Annadale project is said by Federal renewal officials to be one of the few "open land" renewal ventures in the Nation. But if it succeeds, the Wagner administration, almost in spite of itself, will have started the first publicly planned modern suburban community in the city's history.

THE OVERTIME BEAT: QUIET IN CRIME AREA
(By Fred C. Shapiro)

Detective Thomas McGuinness, 34, tall and a little ill at ease, stood in ranks at the 17th Precinct stationhouse, 167 East 51st Street.

It was 7 p.m. and the first time in 8 years—except for election day duty—that Detective McGuinness had worn the blue, high-collared uniform of a New York City patrolman.

Besides that, he was out of place—geographically speaking. As a detective, he is assigned to the Charles Street station but Friday night when 500 New York City officers hit the streets on a special 7 p.m. to 3 a.m. shift to beef up the war against crime, Detective McGuinness was uptown.

His beat was Post 31, one of the 12 highest crime-rated posts among the 17th Precinct's 71 footbeats, from 42d to 44th Streets on Lexington Avenue.

With him on the special shift were eight men normally assigned to clerical duties and three other detectives from other commands.

This shift, Precinct Capt. Richard Di Roma told them at muster, was designed "to bring added protection to the people of the city of New York, to give the citizens a feeling of security by the presence of a uniformed conspicuous patrol."

How did it work?

Fine, on Lexington Avenue from 42d Street to 44th Street and halfway down each side street—but inconclusively at best elsewhere.

There was no official breakdown by police statisticians on the number of arrests made by men on the special shift, but in the reporting period beginning at 4 p.m. and ending at 3 a.m. yesterday, there were arrests for 19 felonies, 10 misdemeanors and 26 offenses.

This compared with arrests for 27 felonies, 22 misdemeanors and 50 offenses for the same period last week. But a check of police teletype slips showed 13 reports of violent crime throughout the city between 7 p.m. and 3 a.m., with robberies totaling \$4,358.

Only one arrest was reported in connection with these cases, an assault and robbery of \$93 from Jamaica, Queens, pedestrian. In addition, one of the other crimes of violence took place on the subways—less than three weeks after 1,200 other regular police and Transit Authority police were assigned to overtime duty on trains and platforms.

At 12:30 a.m. yesterday, IND subway change clerk Maxine Leacock, of 157 Warren Street, Englewood, N.J., was held up at the 163d Street and St. Nicholas Avenue station of the Eighth Avenue IND. She handed over \$15 and the robber fled without attracting the attention of the patrolman on duty in another level of the station.

One possible tragedy was averted on the subway, however, when a patrolman arrested a knife-wielding truck driver on a Bronx-bound IRT White Plains Road express. Police said the driver, identified as Paul Glenn, Jr., 45, of 630 Lenox Avenue, had seized Marcial Blum, 18, who was going home to the Bronx from a night class at City College.

David Glover, 23, of 639 Jefferson Place, Bronx, intervened and Glenn, police said, drew a hunting knife. Miss Blum then ran through the cars until she found Patrolman Louis de Virgilio who took the knife away from Glenn at gunpoint.

Glenn was held in \$1,500 bail by Criminal Court Judge Simon Silver who commended Mr. Glover for "the courage to try and protect this girl. It's about time people did care about their fellow citizens."

Outside of the subway, one of the crimes reported resulted apparently in the death of a 17-year-old City College honor student. At 12:10 a.m., the body of Richard Sachs, of 1225 Sherman Avenue, Bronx, was found in the backyard of his five-story apartment house.

Police said Richard, returning from the movies, found his apartment ransacked, and after notifying a neighbor, apparently started to chase a suspect up the five-story building's slippery, wet fire escape. Physicians said it appeared that the boy, the son of a U.S. customs inspector, apparently fell from a height of one to two stories.

But this was a long way from 42d and Lexington early yesterday morning, and, where the power of the law was being displayed, things were quiet.

Detective McGuinness didn't make an arrest all night, and wasn't even forced to resort to his newly drawn book of summonses. He walked up and back along the well-lit streets, trying building doors, and, during the early part of his shift at least, kept busy giving directions to theaters and hotels to out-of-towners who sought him out.

Later, after midnight, when the flow of pedestrian traffic had diminished, the detective-in-uniform continued, undiscouraged, on his way up and down the empty streets, a comforting figure in the chill April morning.

From time to time he would reach up and reposition his uniform cap. He had lost a good deal of his hair since the last time he had worn it, the officer explained, "and now it feels like it's going to knock my ears off."

Did he feel that the patrol was something of a comedown after 8 years of detective duty?

"I've got four kids," he said. "I can use the overtime."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART
XCIX

Mr. REDLIN. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns subway crime in New York and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 26, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: CAN CUT SUBWAY CRIME FURTHER, GILHOOLEY SAYS
(By James W. Sullivan)

The 67.5-percent decrease in felonies on subways during the night hours still isn't good enough, Transit Authority Member John J. Gilhooley said yesterday.

"Our aim here is to get felony crime on the subways down to the irreducible minimum," Mr. Gilhooley said. "I certainly don't think that a reduction of 25 felonies in 15 days is the best that we can do. I think we can do a lot better."

The TA official was disagreeing politely with Mayor Wagner, who said last week that he was heartened by the decrease in felonies which had taken place when 800 extra policemen were assigned on overtime to subway trains and platforms during the night hours.

In the second phase of the city's war on crime, the police department announced yesterday that 500 extra patrolmen assigned to the streets had apparently held down the crime rate—or, at least, there were fewer arrests than the previous Saturday night.

From 4 p.m. Saturday to 3 a.m. Sunday, there were 23 arrests for felonies, 19 for misdemeanors and 35 for lesser offenses. In the same period of the previous week, there were 17 arrests for felonies, 28 for misdemeanors and 56 for lesser offenses.

PREMATURE

Mr. Gilhooley said the mayor's announcement of the decrease in subway crimes was premature, and that Mr. Wagner was putting "too much emphasis on experience which is too short for meaningful analysis."

"It's too early to crow," he said. "I don't think we have very much to crow about. The only fact that's relevant is that crime in the subways has gone up 123 percent in the last 2 years."

But he admitted that the program he proposed to the mayor appears to be having results.

"I have been out on the lines. I have seen the men operate, I have seen the passengers relax," he said on the WCBS radio program "Let's Find Out."

"I think the kooks and the punks are beginning to realize that the subways are being patrolled and that the subways are no longer for mugging."

At the same time, Joseph E. O'Grady, chairman of the transit authority and a Democrat, was continuing the long-standing polite disagreement with Mr. Gilhooley, a Republican, over the policing problem.

Mr. O'Grady said on the WOR-TV program, "New York Report," that crime in the subway is only a small part of the total crime picture in New York City, and blamed the rising crime rate in the subways on the general increase in crime throughout the Nation.

Both Mr. O'Grady and Mr. Gilhooley said the 15-cent transit fare will continue to the end of the year. Mr. O'Grady said the transit authority is conducting a study to determine whether it would be best to raise the fare at the risk of losing business or to continue with the 15-cent fare and retain passengers.

Mr. Gilhooley denied again that he is a candidate for mayor or expects to be one.

HOBART ROWEN, FINANCIAL COLUMNIST, CRITICIZES CHAIRMAN MARTIN

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, following is an article which appeared in the Washington Post of June 14 by the widely read financial writer, Hobart Rowen. Mr. Rowen makes the very good point that because of Federal Reserve Chairman Martin's high public position, his words and deeds should be of a highly responsible quality as well. After all, it is the Federal Reserve which has the great power to singlehandedly put us into recession and depression. Rowen rightly castigates Martin's Columbia University speech as being "badly timed, badly balanced, and a great exaggeration of reality." Rowen goes on to say that Martin's extreme words aimed to reestablish a tight-money, high-interest economy as we had during the Eisenhower days served to focus attention on the "curious and crucial role played by the Federal Reserve System." Naturally, Rowen is referring to the Federal Reserve's claim of independence of the rest of the Government and he says that "the Johnson administration's differences with Martin are sharp and severe."

I have no intention of abandoning my position that William McChesney Martin, Jr., should resign. Furthermore, I look forward to the Banking and Currency Committee hearings on H.R. 11, my bill aimed at complete reform of our monetary system, which Business Week magazine recently referred to as "anomalous." Recurring disputes between the Government and the Federal Reserve money managers are making us the laughingstock among industrialized nations.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 14, 1965]

ATTACK ON THE HORNETS' NEST

Bill Martin can't be blamed for last week's stock market break: when the market is ready to slide, it looks for any excuse, and Martin's speech was convenient—just as President Kennedy's rollback of steel prices was convenient in what was called the "Kennedy market" in April 1962.

But even if this is not a "Martin market," the now-famous speech at Columbia University by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve was badly timed, badly balanced, and a great exaggeration of reality.

Probably anyone else could have made such a speech without creating a storm. But when the head of the Nation's central bank talks about "disquieting similarities" between the current business situation and the days before the great crash in 1929, few pay attention to the "differences" he specifies.

This is especially so when the "differences" are watered down by qualifying phrases, and he concludes: "With the best intentions, some experts seem resolved to ignore the lessons of the past."

Martin, moreover, holds a well-deserved and special reputation in the world of business and finance. He is a man of impeccable integrity, and in the financial markets, it's as if his words were chiseled in stone.

Thus, he had a great responsibility in making a speech like the one at Columbia. He has since said that he didn't expect it would "attract the attention it did." Privately, many of Martin's conferees in the Johnson administration are angry enough to suggest that he couldn't be that naive.

What is clear in any event is that Martin felt the Nation was becoming too euphoric in the face of real economic problems—and he was willing to risk administering shock treatment. He is concerned about the balance-of-payments problem—and worries that the "voluntary" program isn't enough to assure elimination of the deficit.

He argues we must make sure that what happened to the British pound in 1931 doesn't happen to the U.S. dollar in 1965. He is critical of former Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon for saying in April, as he left his post, that the balance-of-payments problem was solved.

On the domestic side, Martin fears that prices may be edging too high—and that President Johnson and his team are too casual in their efforts to launch an advance attack on inflation. He would like to be more free than he is to tighten up interest rates.

With all this on his mind, Martin decided to swing hard at euphoria. But it was like a man going after a hornet's nest with a blowtorch: If you're not careful, you can bring the house down.

The whole affair has served to focus attention again on the curious and crucial role played by the Federal Reserve System. Despite President Johnson's attempts to disguise his differences with Martin, they are sharp and severe.

Martin believes there is a leading role in the current situation for tighter money. President Johnson doesn't. Martin believes that prices may be getting out of hand. Mr. Johnson doesn't. Martin believes that in trying to get unemployment closer to 4 percent, we risk a runaway expansion with a possible bust. Mr. Johnson doesn't.

No one knows better than the astute Federal Reserve Chairman that he can't go for long in one direction while the national administration moves the other way. He is independent within—not of—the rest of the Government.

Thus, the only rational explanation of Martin's worrisome speech is that he is risking a head-on collision with the Johnson administration on how to protect the U.S. dollar. If necessary, Martin feels, domestic expansion would have to give way—suffer under tight money, that is.

The Johnson administration believes that the way to protect the dollar is to assure that we have a strong and expanding economy—and that a tight-money route would be self-defeating.

It seems to me that unless Martin backs off, a showdown is inevitable. Against a determined President, that's a fight he can't win.

YALE UNIVERSITY AWARDS HONORARY DEGREE TO THE HONORABLE EDITH GREEN

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, Yale University conferred its coveted degrees in its 264th annual commencement. By custom, the recipients of Yale's honorary degrees are not announced until the actual ceremonies. The list is carefully chosen and represents the highest tribute that can

be paid by this university. Yale's reputation is virtually unexcelled and throughout the years, the recipients of its honorary degrees have reflected the meticulous attention and devotion which Yale University pays to excellence and the recognition of achievement.

It was with great pleasure, pride, and personal delight that I learned that one of these honorary degrees was awarded to our colleague, the distinguished Representative from Oregon, Mrs. GREEN. Throughout the years that I have known EDITH GREEN, I have never ceased to marvel at her ability, courage, and personal dignity and charm. She is without a doubt one of the finest Members of this body and it is a pleasure to have worked with her and to number myself among her many admirers and friends.

Yale University has once again shown its appreciation for ability and genius—and its honorary degree, given as it is by one of America's oldest and finest educational institutions, epitomizes, in fact, the appreciation of all American education for the contributions made by Mrs. GREEN. The entire list of recipients of this year's honorary degrees sparkles with achievement. It included: U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations; Robert Ernest Marjolin, vice president of the European Economic Community; Wilmarth Sheldon Lewis, of the class of 1918 in Yale College, fellow emeritus of the Yale Corp.; Owen Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Minnesota; Paul Codman Cabot, treasurer of Harvard University; Rev. John Coleman Bennett, president of Union Theological Seminary; Claude Levi-Strauss, professor of social anthropology at the College de France; Marshall Nirenberg, head of the Section of Biochemical Genetics, National Heart Institute, National Institutes of Health; Dr. Benjamin Spock, of the class of 1925 in Yale College, professor of child development, Western Reserve University School of Medicine; Rev. Roland DeVaux, O.P., director of the Ecole Biblique et Archaeologique Francaise, Jerusalem; Louis Isadore Kahn, professor of architecture at the University of Pennsylvania.

It is a pleasure to represent Yale in this Congress and to congratulate Mrs. GREEN on being honored by the university, and commend Yale for their selection. This was a well-deserved honor for a lovely and talented lady, and I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the citation which accompanied Mrs. GREEN's honorary degree.

EDITH STARRETT GREEN, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE
FROM OREGON

Teacher, legislator, champion of women's rights, you have graduated from the classroom in Salem to the halls of Congress, where your grace and efficiency have been coupled with energy and stubborn courage. You have not hesitated to take an unpopular position in your defense of minority rights. Your vision and initiative have made it possible for the Government to assume the responsibility for investing in the education of oncoming generations without trespassing upon inherited constitutional values. As one of the legion of educational institutions in your debt, Yale confers upon you the degree of doctor of laws.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS IN THE COMMUNIST RUSSIAN SLAVERY

Mr. REDLIN. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, 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 people as during this Soviet occupation since June 15, 1940. During the last 25 years the countries lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. 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 population 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. Interpreted only by a temporary Nazi occupation of Lithuania from 1941 to 1944, when the Soviets reoccupied 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 twenty percent of the population, or 600,000 Lithuanians. In two 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 terrorism 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 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—or even more—right to be free and independent as any new state in Asia or Africa. We should have a single standard of freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, any place in the world, including the Soviet Union, is surely intolerable.

THE COTTON SUBSIDY

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to again warn Congress of the serious matter of cotton subsidy.

As a freetrader in world goods based upon the ability of a nation to compete without subsidies for world trade I have consistently fought against unsound policies that weaken our own economy while jeopardizing the growth of other world nations that cannot compete with a subsidized trade policy.

This is true whether the goods are import or export.

We found out but would not admit that our two-price cotton system was detrimental to our domestic industry and its workers.

Instead of solving the problem of textile competition we have aggravated the situation to the tune of about \$300 million more tax dollars into the never-ending drain of unsound trade policies.

I believe we have the intelligence to resolve the trade problem but we have not the courage to say "No" at the right time.

I believe the cotton double subsidy plan is the forerunner of the time when every item we sell in the competitive export trade will be subsidized by U.S. taxpayers.

The fight to renew this Treasury raid has started and I believe the following analysis of the problem is important enough for all Members to read and study:

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU
FEDERATION BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE
ON AGRICULTURE WITH REGARD TO PROPOSED
COTTON LEGISLATION

A review of the cotton situation shows the cotton problem has grown progressively worse since the basic philosophy of the Agricultural Act of 1958 was abandoned in 1961. Since that time cotton consumption has declined, production has continued to increase despite a cut in allotments of more than a million acres, carryover has shot upward from 7.4 million bales to an estimated 13.4 million on August 1, this year, manmade fiber consumption has continued to eat away cotton markets, the cost of the cotton program has grown higher and higher and farm income from the sale of cotton has weakened materially.

APPRAISAL OF THE RESULTS OF THE 1964 EMERGENCY COTTON LAW

It is now evident that the present law has failed to fulfill the claims made for it at the time of its passage by Congress last year. We recall that its proponents indicated that under the program consumption of cotton would increase, cost to the U.S. taxpayer would decline, consumer prices of cotton goods would be lowered, the upward trend in manmade fiber use would be halted, and farm income from cotton would be maintained.

As we now review what actually happened after a year of experience with the program we find:

1. Cotton consumption did increase domestically but much less than the increase shown by manmade fibers. Cotton's share of the fiber market actually dropped by more than a full percentage point.

2. Cotton exports this marketing year are now estimated to be down by a fifth from last year and indications are that the drop will be even greater.

3. Cost of the program ran up to more than \$800 million, far exceeding the cost of the previous program.

4. Prices of cotton cloth did not decline; in fact the average price of 20 cloth constructions was 63.89 cents in April 1965 compared to 61.83 cents in April 1964.

5. Mill margins in April 1965, as reported for 20 major cloth constructions, averaged 36.49 cents compared to 26.19 cents in April 1964.

6. The combined value to farmers of cotton and cottonseed from the 1964 crop totaled \$2,546 million, or more than 8 percent less than the value of \$2,784 million from the 1963 crop. Yet the 1964 crop was equally as large as the 1963 crop.

From these facts it is clear that the accomplishments of the present cotton program during the last year were far from what the Congress was led to expect when the underlying law was passed just over a year ago.

THE COTTON CYCLE

Mill consumption of fibers runs in cycles. A chart showing the movements of the cycle from the year 1935 through the end of 1964 cannot be included in the RECORD.

Per capita mill consumption of cotton in calendar 1964 was slightly over 22 pounds. This was nearly a pound more than in 1963 when per capita cotton consumption was the smallest since 1934. Per capita manmade fiber consumption totaled about 16.5 pounds, up nearly 2 pounds from 1963.

Cotton's share of total fiber consumption declined slightly in 1964 to a record low of 54.5 percent. Manmade fibers' share in 1964 was about 41 percent—a record high. Wool use accounted for about 4.5 percent.

This chart shows that there is a constant up-and-down trend in cotton mill consumption and a very similar trend for manmade fiber. When changes in cotton consumption are considered, therefore, they should be looked at in relationship to what is happening to manmade fibers as well as where we are in the cycle of mill consumption.

You will also note that the proportion of total mill consumption has been increasing dramatically for manmade fiber and decreasing for cotton.

The following table shows by months for cotton and manmade fibers the domestic mill consumption for the year from April through March for 1963-64 and 1964-65. April was the month that the current cotton law became effective and therefore is the true starting point for judging what has happened during the first 12 months of the program.

You will note from this table that domestic mill consumption of cotton is up 8.4 percent during this period from a year earlier, and manmade fiber is up 11.9 percent. Since manmade fiber consumption has increased more than cotton consumption during the

last year, it is obviously erroneous to conclude that the increase in use of cotton is due to the new mill subsidy.

Domestic mill consumption of cotton and manmade fiber by months, April-March 1963-64 and 1964-65

Month	Cotton		Manmade fibers (cotton system spindles)	
	1963-64	1964-65	1963-64	1964-65
	(Running bales)	(Running bales)	(1,000 pounds)	(1,000 pounds)
April	798,901	822,946	78,573	89,760
May	685,608	680,395	67,001	73,565
June	654,787	676,822	68,817	73,678
July	677,629	735,735	72,790	80,404
August	657,697	705,705	68,962	77,444
September	651,702	695,029	66,929	75,262
October	823,449	872,570	85,395	94,719
November	669,305	716,202	70,678	76,827
December	587,982	791,215	63,554	84,856
January	807,610	722,306	85,387	76,204
February	676,325	733,785	73,265	78,245
March	665,196	905,074	72,758	96,837
Total	8,356,191	9,057,783	874,109	977,801
Difference		701,592		103,692
Percent change		+8.4		+11.9

From these data we see:

1. That domestic cotton consumption has not increased "800,000 to 1 million" bales but 701,592 bales.

2. That the relative gain in consumption of manmade fibers was 42 percent (11.9 to 8.4) greater than the gain in cotton.

Considering these facts it is clear that the increase in consumption of cotton over the last year was due to something other than the cotton program and that this "something" affected the synthetic fibers more favorably than cotton. Or to put it more simply, instead of gaining relative to synthetics under the new program, cotton has lost market position.

Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and others have indicated that the cost of the current cotton program is in excess of \$800 million annually. This high cost is in conflict with the claims made by the proponents at the time the law was passed. Because of its high cost and poor performance, the entire program has been highly embarrassing to the executive branch of our Government and a matter of concern to all people who are interested in solving the cotton problem at reasonable public cost.

Another claim of the proponents of the current cotton law was that consumer prices would be reduced. The ex-Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges, on January 31, 1964, wrote Senator ELLENDER the following:

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that during the course of your current hearings on the need for emergency cotton legislation, the question continues to arise as to whether or not a reduction of 8½ cents per pound in the cost of cotton to domestic mills would be reflected in savings to American consumers of cotton textile products. When similar legislation was being considered by the House Committee on Agriculture, Hickman Price, Jr., then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, testified in behalf of this Department that savings to consumers would amount to about \$90 million for each cent of reduction. A reduction of 8½ cents per pound would thus result in a saving to consumers of more than \$700 million. This saving, Mr. Price said, would come with a lag of from 3 to 8 months, the time from first consumption at the mill to ultimate consumer, and would be reflected in either lower prices or higher quality of the merchandise."

The following table indicates the effect of the present cotton program on the cost of raw cotton to the mills, the average mill selling price, and mill margins.

Cloth and raw cotton prices and mill margins by months beginning with 1962

	[Cents per pound]		
	Average for 20 constructions		
	Unfinished cloth prices	Raw cotton prices	Mill margins
1962			
January	60.63	35.78	24.85
February	60.76	35.82	24.94
March	61.07	35.98	25.09
April	61.23	35.85	25.38
May	61.19	36.13	25.06
June	61.24	36.34	24.90
July	61.29	36.19	25.10
August	61.12	35.89	25.23
September	60.93	35.23	25.70
October	60.71	35.08	25.63
November	60.68	35.10	25.58
December	60.67	35.30	25.37
1963			
January	60.55	35.45	25.10
February	60.47	35.66	24.81
March	60.49	35.95	24.54
April	60.26	36.08	24.18
May	60.00	36.16	23.84
June	60.11	35.86	24.25
July	60.28	35.57	24.71
August	60.60	35.33	25.27
September	60.99	35.19	25.80
October	61.34	35.11	26.23
November	62.00	35.27	26.73
December	62.29	35.37	26.92
1964			
January	62.32	35.47	26.85
February	62.37	35.55	26.82
March	62.37	35.58	26.79
April	62.00	35.63	26.37
May	61.62	35.67	25.95
June	60.87	35.76	25.11
July	60.95	35.60	25.35
August	61.00	35.64	25.36
September	61.02	35.82	24.20
October	61.25	36.80	34.45
November	61.48	26.98	34.50
December	62.58	27.30	35.28
1965			
January	63.24	27.30	35.94
February	63.28	27.26	36.02
March	63.42	27.26	36.16
April	63.89	27.40	36.49

¹ Does not include the 6.5 cents per pound cotton equalization payment made to domestic cotton users on all bales opened beginning 12:01 a.m., Apr. 11, 1964. USDA made no adjustment for these payments prior to August 1964.

Source: "Cotton Price Statistics," Cotton Division, Consumer and Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It is obvious from the record that raw cotton prices were reduced by the amount of the mill subsidy; but instead of unfinished cloth prices declining a similar amount, they actually rose slightly and of course the mill margins widened by even more than the amount of the mill subsidy. This is all in direct conflict with the promises made for the current cotton program.

In addition to the fact that the promises of proponents of the current cotton program have not materialized, the industry itself from the producer to the consumer, including the marketing mechanism, has been badly disrupted by this program.

The compensatory payments paid to small allotment holders and to those who stay within their domestic allotments and the mill subsidy payments have proved to be extremely costly and of little value in alleviating the cotton problem.

PANAMA CANAL: NEW YORK SOCIETY'S 1965 RESOLUTION

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the last decade, I have addressed this body on many occasions concerning key elements in the interoceanic canal problem, repeatedly emphasizing the absolute necessity for retention of our exclusive treaty-based sovereignty over the Canal Zone territory in perpetuity and strongly opposing its dilution through the salami process of piecemeal erosions. The overriding reason for my stand is that where there is responsibility there must be authority.

The magnitude of the discussions of the canal problem in recent years is shown in the comprehensive bibliography prepared by my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 2, 1964, under the title "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Documentation, 1955-64."

Notwithstanding the extensive efforts made, the crucial canal subject has not been presented in the mass news media of our country forthrightly and comprehensively as it should have been. The result of such management of news has been that our people have been kept in the dark as to crucial facts, but such denials have not fooled members of the Panama Canal Societies in various parts of the United States.

The New York Society of the Panama Canal, an organization of which Gen. George W. Goethals was organizer and first president, at its 1965 annual meeting, passed a resolution calling upon our Government to retain exclusive U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal, and over any other interoceanic canal that might be constructed by the United States, and distributed it to key officials, including the President. The last, in turn, called upon the Department of State to reply to the society's letter.

A copy of the State Department's answer, signed by Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Jack H. Vaughn, has come to me and I have studied it. In view of the objective clarifications that have been made of significant canal issues, especially that of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone, in addresses in the Congress and in extensive correspondence with the executive departments, some of this letter's statements and conclusions are truly amazing.

In describing the rights, power, and authority of the United States under the 1903 treaty, Secretary Vaughn stresses that article III grants to the United States such rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone "which it would have if it were sovereign of that territory." He neglects, however, to state that such grant was made to the "entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority." Nor does he explain that in addition to the grant of sovereignty over the Canal Zone, the United States obtained by purchase from individual owners a clear title to all land and property in the zone.

The Secretary then goes on to explain the effect of the article as giving the United States "the right to exercise powers in the Canal Zone while titular sovereignty over the zone rests with Panama." This statement is grossly misleading because he does not define the term, "titular sovereignty," which should be done. This expression merely means a reversionary interest of Panama in the zone in the sole event the United States should fail to meet its treaty obligations or decide to abandon the Panama Canal. In such event, the Canal Zone territory would revert to Panama or to a successor state.

Again, Secretary Vaughn stresses the long dissatisfaction by Panama with the sovereignty provisions of the 1903 treaty for alleged purposes "not directly related to the operation, protection, and sanitation of the canal" and with the lack of a fixed date for the termination of U.S. rights. He fails to reveal that President Taft by Executive order of December 5, 1912, pursuant to the 1903 treaty, proclaimed that "all land and land under water within the limits of the Canal Zone are necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, protection, and sanitation of the Panama Canal." Nor does he show how the canal enterprise can be efficiently maintained, operated, and protected with less authority than that granted in the 1903 treaty.

It is appropriate at this point to add that the sovereignty and perpetuity provisions of the 1903 treaty were not accidental or the result of alleged machinations of foreign agents. They were in compliance with the 1902 recommendations of the Isthmian Canal Commission headed by Adm. John G. Walker. They were parts of the inducement for the United States to construct the canal at Panama instead of Nicaragua, which latter location was up to that time the preferred site of various U.S. boards and commissions.

Further on in Secretary Vaughn's letter, he quoted the President as stating that the United States is prepared to "recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone" and to provide for the termination of the treaty when a sea level canal comes into operation as meeting two major Panamanian objections to the 1903 treaty. Here, another time, Secretary Vaughn does not tell the whole story. He does not mention the fact that except for the provisions for perpetuity and sovereignty as set forth in the 1903 treaty, the United States would not have undertaken at its entire expense the construction of the canal nor its obligations to the entire world to maintain and operate it on equal terms for world shipping—whereas Panama has no such obligation whatsoever. Nor does he reveal of what such Panamanian sovereignty would consist.

In another place Secretary Vaughn states that the "United States believes that it has an obligation to guarantee the availability of an interoceanic canal." This is not a matter of belief or conjecture of an official not empowered to speak for the United States. It is a matter of fact. The United States is obligated un-

der the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 with Great Britain and the 1903 treaty with Panama to maintain and operate the Isthmian Canal in perpetuity for all nations on terms of equality with tolls that are just and equitable.

Secretary Vaughn also repeats the old gags that the "vulnerability to sabotage of the present canal" and the "relative immunity to sabotage" of a canal at sea level. He does not mention that the Department of State, in disregard of oft-expressed views in the Congress, brought about the employment of alien Panamanians as members of the Canal Zone police force charged with protection of the canal and the greater vulnerability of the central highland in a canal at sea level to closure through massive slides.

Of all times in the history of the Panama Canal, when the world is on the verge of nuclear war, this is the worst possible for the abrogation of the 1903 treaty on the questions of sovereignty and perpetuity. At this hour the tides of revolutionary communism are surging at the gates of every Latin American country with their utmost strength and they will break through the moment that U.S. rights, power, and authority with respect to the canal are abrogated or impaired.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have often said to this body: Except for the presence of the United States on the isthmus clothed with the treaty authority that Panamanian radicals complain of, the Republic of Panama, which was born out of the great movement for an Isthmian Canal, could not stand alone for a day. If U.S. authority over the Canal Zone is liquidated, Red revolutionaries would immediately take over Panama and all Latin America would share a similar fate.

It is, indeed, tragic that the State Department has adopted and is practicing a policy toward the Panama Canal enterprise of surrendering indispensable rights and authority guaranteed by treaty negotiated pursuant to law and seems bent on liquidating every vestige of such power and authority regardless of the consequences.

As a whole, Secretary Vaughn's letter is evasive, inadequate, and misleading. Moreover, it shows conclusively that he has not studied, does not comprehend, or care for what has been carefully presented on numerous occasions in the Congress. In these days of grave crises, our officials should not be discussing the reduction of our sovereignty over the Canal Zone but the extension of the zone to include the entire watershed of the Chagres River and the removal of all confusion that has been generated by our inept diplomacy over the last decade as to what nation is the sovereign of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

In order that the people of the Nation may know the considered views of the New York Society of the Panama Canal composed of survivors of the canal construction era and the reactions that they evoked from Secretary Vaughn, I quote the indicated resolution and letter together with the bill introduced by Rep-

representatives ANDERSON, BOW, and myself, mentioned in the society's resolution:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 41ST ANNUAL REUNION HELD ON MAY 1, 1965, OF THE NEW YORK SOCIETY OF THE PANAMA CANAL

Whereas the press reports that the United States is now discussing with the Republic of Panama a revision of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 which guaranteed to our country unrestricted sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone so long as we continued to operate the canal; and

Whereas our country built the Panama Canal at the cost of several thousands of lives and with the expenditure of almost \$400 million; and

Whereas we guaranteed in the above described treaty to operate and maintain the canal for the benefit of the commerce of all nations; and

Whereas we deem it essential that our country should retain complete sovereignty over the existing canal in order that we may continue to operate it in accordance with our promise for the benefit of the commerce of the world and for the defense thereof; and

Whereas it has been further reported in the press that the Commission recently appointed by the President pursuant to an act of Congress has been charged with the responsibility of examining into the needs and possibilities of improvements to the existing canal or to the building of another canal in some other place in Central America, or elsewhere: Now be it

Resolved, That our society, composed of members who participated in the construction and operation of the Panama Canal, petition the President and the Congress to insist upon retention of complete sovereignty over the existing canal in the event a revision of the 1903 treaty with Panama should be negotiated and approved; and further

Resolved, That we urge the President and the Congress to insist upon complete sovereignty over any new Isthmian Canal which we might agree upon with any one of the Central American Republics; and further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President, to Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, to Congressman WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, of Tennessee, and to Congressman FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, who have introduced into Congress companion bills calling for the appointment of an "Interoceanic Canals Commission" to study and report upon improvements to the existing Panama Canal, the construction of a new Panama Canal or the construction and ownership by the United States of another canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 24, 1965.

MR. JOHN J. FITZPATRICK,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: President Johnson has asked me to reply to your letter to him of May 6, 1965, in which you enclosed a copy of the resolution adopted by the New York Society of the Panama Canal urging that the United States retain exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone and over any interoceanic sea level canal which might be constructed. I appreciate your interest in this matter and welcome the opportunity to comment on the resolution.

The rights and authority which the United States exercises in the Canal Zone were obtained under the General Convention between the United States and Panama of 1903. Article III of the 1903 convention gives to the United States all the rights, power, and authority in the Canal Zone which it would have if it were the sovereign of that territory. The effect of the article is to give the United States the right to exercise sovereign

powers in the Canal Zone while titular sovereignty over the zone rests with Panama.

Panama has long been dissatisfied with certain provisions of the 1903 agreement, especially with the exercise of sovereign powers by the United States for purposes which are not directly related to the operation, protection, and sanitation of the canal and with the lack of a fixed date for the termination of U.S. rights.

On December 18, 1964, after careful study and frequent meetings between the United States and Panamanian special representatives who had been appointed to find ways to eliminate the causes of conflict between the two countries, President Johnson announced that the United States will proceed with plans for the possible construction of an interoceanic sea level canal. The President also announced that the United States is prepared to negotiate with Panama a new treaty for the Panama Canal which would recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone and would provide for its own termination when a sea level canal comes into operation—thus meeting two of Panama's major objections to the present treaty.

Nevertheless, the United States believes that it has an obligation to guarantee the availability of an interoceanic canal open to the ships of all nations and adequate to the needs of world commerce. Therefore, the President emphasized in his December 18 statement that the United States must retain under the new agreement all the rights necessary for the effective operation and protection of the canal.

The complexity of operation and the vulnerability to sabotage of the present canal do require the retention by the United States of certain rights and powers in the Canal Zone, and any new treaty with Panama must perforce provide for such necessary rights and powers. This is not to say, however, that changes in the existing treaty arrangements, consistent with basic U.S. and world commerce interests and requirements, cannot be made. As President Johnson said in his December 18 canal policy statement, "The canal is growing old, and so are the treaties for its management, which go back to 1903."

A sea level canal, because of its relative immunity to sabotage and ease of operation, could be operated under a very different arrangement than that required for the existing waterway. Therefore, although a treaty which would govern the possible construction and operation of a sea level canal has not yet been negotiated with any of the countries concerned, the United States does not believe that any cessation of sovereignty by the host country would be required. Furthermore, in this era of strong nationalism, it is quite clear that none of the countries involved would be willing to enter into an agreement which resulted in a loss of sovereignty over national territory. The United States does believe, however, that a treaty for the construction and operation of a sea level canal must contain satisfactory guarantees that access to the canal will not be restricted and that tolls for its use will be kept at reasonable levels.

I hope that the foregoing information has helped to explain U.S. policy regarding the Panama Canal and the possible construction of a sea level canal. If I can be of any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Very truly yours,

JACK H. VAUGHN,
Assistant Secretary.

H.R. 4871

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 "Interoceanic Canals Commission Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. (a) A commission is hereby created, to be known as the "Interoceanic Ca-

nals Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and to be composed of 11 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: One member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Army; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Navy; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Air Force; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers (retired) of the United States Army; and seven members from civil life, four of whom shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering. The President shall designate one of the members from civil life as Chairman, and shall fill all vacancies on the Commission in the same manner as original appointments are made. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the completion of its work hereunder.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of \$30,000 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of \$28,500 per annum, each; but the members appointed from the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall receive only such compensation, in addition to their pay and allowances, as will make their total compensation from the United States \$28,500 each.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for—

(1) an increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the adaptation of the third locks project (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end, or by other modification or design of the existing facilities;

(2) the construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, or any modification thereof;

(3) the construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(4) the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal, and of any other canal or canals which may be recommended by the Commission;

(5) treaty and territorial rights which may be deemed essential hereunder; and

(6) estimates of the respective costs of the undertakings herein enumerated.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of conducting all inquiries and investigations deemed necessary by the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Commission is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other officer, of the Commission, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Commission may deem relevant or material for the purposes herein named. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress, not later than two years after the date of the enactment hereof, a final report containing the results and conclusions of its investigations and studies hereunder, with recommendations; and may, in its discretion, submit interim reports to the President and the

Congress concerning the progress of its work. Such final report shall contain—

(1) the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the Panama Canal, and to any new interoceanic canal or canals which the Commission may consider feasible or desirable for the United States to construct, own, maintain, and operate;

(2) the estimates of the Commission as regards the approximate cost of carrying out its recommendations; and like estimates of cost as to the respective proposals and plans considered by the Commission and embraced in its final report; and

(3) such information as the Commission may have been able to obtain with respect to the necessity for the acquisition, by the United States, of new, or additional, rights, privileges, and concessions, by means of treaties or agreements with foreign nations, before there may be made the execution of any plans or projects recommended by the Commission.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall, without regard to the civil service laws, appoint a secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission and shall receive compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 7. The Commission is hereby authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such engineers, surveyors, experts, or advisers deemed by the Commission necessary hereunder, as limited by the provisions in title 5, United States Code, section 55a; and may make expenditures, in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, for travel and subsistence expenses of members of the Commission and its employees while away from their homes or regular places of business; for rent of quarters at the seat of government, or elsewhere; for personal services at the seat of government, or elsewhere; and for printing and binding necessary for the efficient and adequate functions of the Commission hereunder. All expenses of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission, or such other official of the Commission as the Commission may designate.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

SEC. 9. The Act entitled "An Act to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans" (Public Law 88-609, 78 Stat. 990), is hereby repealed.

UNITED STATES REAFFIRMS ITS SUPPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am very gratified and I thank those of my colleagues who have supported or introduced companion legislation to House Joint Resolution 499, a bill that says:

That as the twentieth anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the United Nations approaches it is the sense of the Congress of

the United States and the people of the United States that the United States reaffirms its faith in, and support of, the United Nations and the principles of the United Nations Charter and urges such reaffirmation of faith and support by all the members of the United Nations and peace-loving people everywhere.

I commend this proposal to the rest of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate in view of the forthcoming 20th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter.

It is my firm conviction that this is a momentous time in the history of the United Nations and that in this crucial period of the U.N.'s life it is important that our great Nation reaffirm its faith in and support of the United Nations and the principles of the United Nations Charter.

When the United Nations was conceived in 1945, many had their doubts as to its prospects for success. It was feared that it might be another incomplete and inert amalgamation of national states which would suffer the fate of its predecessor, the League of Nations. But, after 20 years, we may proudly say that the United Nations has become more than a collection of individual states. It has become a living organism, a living force in history, guided by many dedicated and expert men, of whom the late Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjöld, was an inspiring example.

The United Nations has had its failure. It has not fulfilled all of our hopes for world peace and the construction of a world of justice, prosperity, and freedom for peoples. And, while the United States has not failed the United Nations in its financial need, other nations have seen fit to accept the benefits of its peacekeeping efforts without contributing their share of the support of these essential efforts.

I am sure we all agree that a failure to support the United Nations either financially or with the best of our hearts and minds would be a disastrous betrayal of man's hopes for peace through diplomacy and law. It would be a confirmation of the cynical belief that no good can come from the diplomatic dialog between and among nations.

The United Nations has also had its successes—far beyond, perhaps, our most optimistic early expectations. The U.N. has fostered the birth and development of many new nations, easing the transition from colonialism and strengthening the independence of these infant nations through its many specialized health and development services. It has helped to bring these young nations into the community of world affairs and inculcate the sense of international responsibility that must accompany the rights and privileges of nationhood.

Whether in peacekeeping efforts, in serving as a forum for international debate and discussion, or in presiding over the birth of nations and the changing world order, the United Nations has become the vanguard of hope for peace-loving men and nations. Because the United Nations exists we are spared direct knowledge of what the world would be without it; we can cite its faults and failings, because it sustains us in our

aspirations for building a world of justice and peace.

The fact that the United Nations has survived for two decades makes it unique among the practical embodiments of man's ancient dream of an effective alliance of nations in the cause of world peace. This alone would make it incumbent upon us to mark its 20th birthday with an affirmation of our faith in its principles and of our support for its efforts to achieve the elusive goal of permanent peace.

I am delighted to join with so many of my colleagues in making specific for this forthcoming occasion our faith and hope for this instrument of the search for a world of happiness and peace.

SELECTION OF SITE FOR PARTICLE ACCELERATOR

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the 15th of June, was the deadline for the submission of State site proposals to the Atomic Energy Commission for a major scientific installation—a 200 Bev particle accelerator. During the months to come, the relative merits of these various proposals will be evaluated by the National Academy of Sciences, by the AEC, and eventually by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of this Congress.

One of the proposals submitted yesterday was one from my State of Michigan for the construction of this installation on a site in my district, the Second District of Michigan. Several of the top experimental nuclear physicists, geologists, and other specialists on the staff of the renowned University of Michigan in my district participated in the preparation and organization of this proposal.

Its authors informed me that the proposal should satisfy in every major respect the technical requirements posed by the Atomic Energy Commission. In addition, the nearby university community of Ann Arbor offers demonstrated scientific talent, and a vital human environment.

Beyond these essential considerations, however, lies one more important consideration: Of the eight major accelerators built in these United States to date, only one has been located in the Midwest—the accelerator at the Argonne Laboratory. Also, virtually all of the major nuclear development and production facilities have been located outside the Midwest—such as the plants at Hanford and at Savannah River, and the Los Alamos and Livermore Laboratories, to name a few. By comparison, however, the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan alone, produced almost 30 percent of the doctorates in the natural sciences at work in this Nation in 1962. Furthermore, as is thoroughly documented in Government and Science

Report No. 4 of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House of Representatives entitled "Geographic Distribution of Federal Research and Development Funds" prepared for the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, chaired by the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. EMILIO DADDARIO, the Midwest has shared to a negligible degree in the massive flow of Federal funds into research and development.

Gentlemen, I think it is time that the Midwest receive fuller opportunity to put its demonstrated talent to work. I think it is time that the Midwest receive a far larger return of the enormous sums of money that it contributes to the national research programs.

When the time comes, some months in the future, to decide the location of this accelerator, I hope a satisfactory and advantageous site will be recommended in that region, and I ask all of its friends and Representatives here, irrespective of State or party, to support that choice.

PRAISE DUE CORPS OF ENGINEERS ON 190TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today is the 190th anniversary of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The fine record of public service accorded to this agency deserves the praise of all Americans. Handling projects which contribute immeasurably to America's progress during peacetime, the Corps of Engineers has also established a record of distinction during time of war.

In Florida the Corps of Engineers has handled itself with real professionalism. The Florida landscape has changed immeasurably under the Corps' guidance, and construction continues on programs of flood control, waterways development, and beach erosion. In addition, the military construction carried out in Florida under Corps of Engineers' guidance includes not only Army and Air Force bases, but the Nation's space effort at Cape Kennedy.

It should be noted also that the Corps today celebrates its 120th anniversary in Florida. The same year the Corps established its first office in Florida our State was admitted to the Union.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans owe a debt of gratitude to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and I am sure the Congress will join in voicing confidence in the fact that the Corps will continue to serve the Nation in time of war as well as peace with the same fine record it has established for itself.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R.

8371) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NEDZI, for June 17, 21, and 22, on account of official Armed Services Committee business.

Mr. WOLFF, for Monday, June 21, on account of official business.

Mr. HARDY, for June 17 through June 23, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. ADAMS, for June 18-21, on account of official business.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina, for June 17 through June 23, 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. RYAN, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday next; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 15 minutes, today. Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. GROVER), for 15 minutes, today, and for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARTER (at the request of Mr. GROVER), for 30 minutes, on June 23.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. FASCELL and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GROVER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BETTS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REDLIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORRISON.

Mr. RYAN.

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. MORRIS.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 856. An act for the relief of the estate of R. M. Clark; and

S. 2089. An act 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 17, 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:

1232. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 11, 1962, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Taylors Bayou, Tex., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 206); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1233. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 18, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations on a survey of El Paso, El Paso County, Tex., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved July 3, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 207); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with five illustrations.

1234. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report to the Congress of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1235. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of excessive costs incurred by purchasing from commercial sources rather than utilizing General Services Administration supply sources, Panama Canal Company; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1236. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of deficiencies in supply management procedures resulted in overstocking at supply depots, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1237. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 31, 1964 (78 Stat. 751), relating to the satisfaction of scrip and similar rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1238. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the law establishing the Indian revolving loan fund; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1239. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, together with reports covering certain foreign-trade zones, pursuant to section 16 of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, Public Law 81-566; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 893. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 388), as amended, relating to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7466. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 416. Resolution to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ annually, on a temporary basis, a student congressional intern; with amendment (Rept. No. 523). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 425. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7984, a bill to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 524). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 8371. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 525). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 9127. A bill to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act to former administrative and supervisory employees of the Works Projects Administration, classified a noncertified and nonrelief, to allow credit under such act for service in such capacity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 9128. A bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 9129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9130. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9131. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 9132. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9133. 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. LEGGETT:

H.R. 9134. A bill to establish a new program of grants for public works projects undertaken by local governments in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9135. A bill to authorize the naming of the reservoir to be created by the Little Goose lock and dam, Snake River, Wash., in

honor of the late Dr. Enoch A. Bryan; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 9136. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 9137. A bill to amend the act establishing the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 9138. A bill to amend the Employment Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 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. TUNNEY:

H.R. 9139. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to dates to provide for paid advertising; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9140. A bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Federal boxing commission for the purpose of insuring that the channels of interstate commerce are free from false or fraudulent descriptions or depictions of professional boxing contests; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9141. A bill to provide assistance in training State and local law-enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 9142. A bill to amend the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) to provide that exclusive territorial franchises, under limited circumstances, shall not be deemed a restraint of trade or commerce or a monopoly or attempt to monopolize, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 9143. A bill to allow the State of Texas to use certain funds for the improvement of National Guard armories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9144. A bill to amend sections 13(b) of the acts of October 3, 1962 (76 Stat. 693, 704), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9145. A bill to repeal the release and reallocation provisions for cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9146. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to permit the publication of patent applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 9147. A bill to amend section 301 of title III of the act of August 14, 1946, relating to the establishment by the Secretary of Agriculture of a national advisory committee, to provide for annual meetings of such committee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9148. A bill to amend section 8(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9149. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9150. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9151. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of

1961, as amended, to provide for more effective security servicing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9152. A bill to provide a uniform period for daylight saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9153. A bill to prescribe certain safety features for all motor vehicles manufactured for, sold, or shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 9154. 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. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 9155. 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. McFALL:

H.R. 9156. 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. MILLER:

H.R. 9157. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 with respect to health benefits of certain former Members of Congress and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9158. A bill to promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by modernizing practices of the Federal Government relating to the inspection of persons, merchandise and conveyances moving into, through, and out of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 9159. A bill 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.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 9160. 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. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 9161. A bill to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Uinta National Forest in the State of Utah, by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit pension and profit-sharing plans to provide contributions or benefits on a nondiscriminatory basis for certain self-employed individuals without special limitations on the amount of contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 9163. A bill to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that certain surplus property which is not used in the donable property program shall be offered for sale to levee districts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 9164. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 9165. 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. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 9166. 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. CELLER:

H.R. 9167. A bill 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.

H.R. 9168. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9169. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.J. Res. 525. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to provide for the development of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.J. Res. 527. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 528. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 529. Joint resolution that the United States reaffirms its support of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.J. Res. 530. Joint resolution authorizing a Government-industry conference on the geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 441. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the study entitled "Comparative Regulations for Financial Institutions"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 424. Resolution declaring the Eastern Orthodox Church to be a major faith in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

318. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, relative to the termination or appreciable reduction in the Army Reserve program, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. 9170. A bill for the relief of Lee Bon Sheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 9171. A bill for the relief of Tai Sun Fat and Setzo Lal Sheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9172. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Murray and Maisie M. Murray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9173. A bill for the relief of Maria Coltabellotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9174. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Piraneo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 9175. A bill for the relief of Mary Phillip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 9176. A bill for the relief of Hai Ja Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 9177. A bill for the relief of Mr. Rosario Vancheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9178. A bill for the relief of Mr. Chang Ming Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 9179. A bill for the relief of Elio Pozzetto and his wife, Virginia Pozzetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLODY:

H.R. 9180. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Korkovelos, his wife Helene Korkovelos, and their children, Kathrine Korkovelos, Soterios Korkovelos and Demetrios Korkovelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 9181. A bill for the relief of Miriam Odenia Bradshaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9182. A bill for the relief of Saleh (Charles) Ezra Sassoon and his wife, Valentine Sassoon, and their children, Ezra Sassoon, Ruth Sassoon, and Rachel Sassoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

230. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Edward Vieira, Jacksonville, Fla., relative to a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, who knowest the burdens we bear, the tasks we face, and the problems affecting so many, which confront those who belong to this exalted body of governance: Grant them, we pray, the royalty of inward content which comes only from uncompromising personal integrity and from the calm

composure which is the reward of doing always the things which please Thee.

So, let the spirit of joyous service dwell in our hearts, that we may carry about the infection of a good courage, meeting all life's tests with gallant-hearted devotion and dedication to the highest we know.

As in Thy name we contend against the vile treacheries which today foul the earth and enslave so many of Thy children, make us the kind of persons fit to be the defenders of the regal and precious things which ennoble life and crown it with glory.

In the dear Redeemers' name, we pray, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 15, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 14, 1965, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 435) to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

WITHDRAWAL OF A NOMINATION— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, withdrawing the nomination of William O. Gambill to be postmaster at Gallatin, Tenn.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1481. An act for the relief of the estate of Donovan C. Moffett;

H.R. 2913. An act for the relief of Lt. Thomas A. Farrell, U.S. Navy, and others;

H.R. 3750. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 4324. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army;

H.R. 4719. An act for the relief of Josephine C. Rumley, administratrix of the estate of George S. Rumley;

H.R. 5265. An act for the relief of Gordon E. Martin;

H.R. 5471. An act for the relief of the widow and minor children of the Reverend Donald Aksel Olsen;

H.R. 5613. An act for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.;

H.R. 5819. An act for the relief of John Henry Taylor;

H.R. 5839. An act for the relief of Sgt. Donald R. Hurrell, U.S. Marine Corps;

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Cecil Graham;

H.R. 6318. An act for the relief of Lee R. Smith and Lee R. Smith III, his son;