The history of nations makes clear that if a country can build a better bomb it will do so. The history of treaties makes clear that sooner or later most are broken.

Although I pray that the test ban treaty will not be broken, it is important that we plan for such a contingency in public health terms as well as military terms.

There has not been a major series of weapons tests in the atmosphere for 3 years. Even so, not all of the fallout released into the air has come to earth. The remaining poisons are still drifting about the skies settling to earth.

Last year no one expected the contamination rates in the Arctic to double as they did.

The year before no one expected that they would increase by 50 percent as they did.

Who can say what the levels will be this year or next year or the year after?

Who can say that the great powers will not resume their testing at some dreadful future date?

Who can say that all 18 or 28 or 128 nations will not begin weapons tests of their own?

We spend over $8 billion a year developing and stockpiling our nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. This year we are spending $200 million on radiological health. It is not enough.

We talk a great deal about pollution; pollution of our air, our water, and our land.

This is a pollution far more dangerous far more important—the pollution of our inheritance, the mutation of our genes. The effects, both genetic and somatic, of radioactive fallout are subtle yet so vital that it is foolishness itself to continue our research efforts at their present penny ante level.

We must step up our research on radiation effects, both somatic and genetic. We must step up our radiation monitoring and surveillance, especially in the Arctic.

We must step up our study of radiation countermeasures, especially in the Arctic.

We must make good on the responsibility for the development of countermeasures and the research on the somatic and genetic effects of radiation exposure be separated completely, totally from the responsibility for the development of our nuclear armory. These responsibilities, the men and the money assigned to them, must be separated into independent and distinct agencies each responsible for its own work and wholly accountable to Congress. Congress should provide for the organization and coordination of all the activities and the goals of all the agencies in a single office.

This is not enough.

Surveillance and research programs examining the environment in the Arctic region (should) continue until future trends can be predicted with greater confidence.

This is not enough.

In an important speech on the Senate floor last June, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles from New York (Mr. Kennedy) recently said that at least 18 nations would be in a position to develop nuclear weapons within the next 3 years.
H.R. 4188. An act to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; H.R. 5246. An act to amend sections 20a and 214 of the Interstate Commerce Act; and H.R. 6265. An act to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year ending July 1, 1966.

On July 27, 1965:

H.R. 4528. An act to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1970; H.R. 5041. An act to provide for safety requirements and operating standards for officers and men employed under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes; H.R. 6675. An act to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands; and


H.R. 8765. An act to amend section 2634 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

On July 30, 1965:


H.R. 8484. An act to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the trucking of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces on a change of permanent station; H.R. 8720. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam, and for other purposes; H.R. 1487. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, and for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands; and

H.J. Res. 581. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arlington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees, with an amendment, to the amendments of the House to a bill for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam; H.R. 8720. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam, and for other purposes; H.R. 1487. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, and for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands; and

H.J. Res. 581. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1464) to amend the Constitution of the United States, 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 New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (REPT. NO. 711)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1464) to amend the Constitution of the United States, 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 disagreement to the amendment of the House to the substantive provisions of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment the following shall be inserted:

"That this Act shall be known as the 'Voting Rights Act of 1965'."

Sec. 2. No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, including a test or device, or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color:

"Sec. 3. (a) Whenever the Attorney General institutes a proceeding under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the five hundredth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court shall authorize the appointment of Federal examiners by the Attorney General under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the five hundredth amendment:

"(1) to ascertain the extent of any denial of the right to vote or to engage in the practice or with the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color:

"(2) to determine the number and have been promptly and effectively cured:

"(3) to determine whether a proposed unification or acquisition or standard, practice, or procedure has been imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color:

"Sec. 4. (a) To assure that the right of citizens of the United States to vote is not denied or abridged on account of race or color, no citizen shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device or standard, practice, or procedure.

"(b) Provided, That such qualification, prerequisite to voting, standard, practice, or procedure has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate officer of the State or political subdivision to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not interposed an objection within sixty days after he has received such submission, the court's finding as to the effect of such a test or device or standard, practice, or procedure shall bar a subsequent action to enforce the guarantees of such qualification, prerequisite to voting, standard, practice, or procedure.

"Sec. 5. (a) If any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, standard, practice, or procedure is found by the Attorney General to be unlawful under subsection (c) or in any political subdivision, the Attorney General shall issue a declaratory judgment under this Act, determining that such vote on account of race or color:

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply in a State or local election in which a State or a political subdivision does not have the power to conduct elections."
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SEC. 4. (a) Any person who demonstrates that he has been failed and not permitted to vote in any election because of his inability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language known to him to be relevant to obtaining the right to vote shall have his failure promptly and effectively corrected by such procedure as the Attorney General may deem appropriate to prepare and make such a list of persons otherwise eligible to vote who shall be entitled to vote in such election.

(b) If such person shall object on or before the fifth day prior to any election to his name being entered on such list, the Attorney General shall, within ten days after such objection, render such order as may be appropriate to determine whether such person shall be entitled to vote in such election.

(c) Any person whose name appears on such a list and who has been determined by an examiner to be otherwise eligible to vote shall, upon the court's order, be entitled to vote in any election held in such subdivision for the purpose of observing whether votes cast by persons entitled to vote are being correctly counted and tabulated.

(d) The Attorney General, after notice and hearing, shall determine the eligibility to vote of any person whose name appears on such a list.

(e) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(f) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(g) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(h) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(i) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(j) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(k) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(l) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(m) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(n) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(o) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(p) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(q) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(r) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(s) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(t) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(u) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(v) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(w) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(x) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(y) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.

(z) The attorney general shall, within ten days after such determination, issue an order requiring the State or political subdivision in which such person is qualified to vote to register such person, if eligible, to vote in any election held in such subdivision.
Civil Service Commission shall have the power to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the produc­
tion of documentary evidence relating to any matter pending before it under the authority of this Act or any other order. An examiner shall transmit promptly any such poll tax payment to the office of the State or local official authorized to receive such payment under Section 2, 3, 4, or 5, together with the name and address of the applicant.

"Sec. 11. (a) No person acting under color of Federal law, State law or local law, or in the exercise of any right secured by Federal law, shall deny, deprive, or abridge any person authorized by this Act to make an application for listing, and shall issue an order dismissing the petition if the examiner finds that the applicant has not been correctly included in a list of voters, and that the application for listing was false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document, or falsifies or conceals the voting age residing therein are registered to vote, that (1) all persons listed by an examiner for the purpose of encouraging his false registration to vote or illegal voting, or who offers to pay or accepts payment for the purpose of encouraging his false registration to vote or for voting shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(d) Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of an examiner or hearing officer, knowingly and with the intent to vote, or in the exercise of any right secured by federal, State or local law, or in the exercise of any right secured by Federal law shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, within a year following an election in a political subdivision in which an examiner has been appointed (1) destroys, defaces, mutilates, or otherwise alters the marking of a paper ballot which has been cast in such election, or (2) alters any official record of voting in such election tabulated from a voting machine, or voting machine proceeding under section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(c) Whoever conspires to violate the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or interferes with any right secured by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, or 11 (a) or (b) shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(d) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe he has engaged in any manner prohibited by this act or practice prohibited by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, or subsection (b) of this section, the Attorney General may institute for the United States, an action for preventive relief, in­cluding an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, and including an order directed to the State and State or local election of­ficials to require them (1) to permit persons listed under this Act to vote and (2) to cooperate as may be necessary to make a vote effective in any primary, special, or general
The formula for suspending tests or devices contained in the House bill requires that there shall have been a test or device in use in November 1964 and that fewer than 20 percent of the nonwhite population in the Territory of Hawaii, the District of Columbia, or any other subdivision of a State or subdivision are registered to vote, tests or devices are suspended. The Senate receded, and the conference report adopts the language of the House bill with a minor technical change.

Section 4(d) of the House and Senate bills is substantially identical except for a grammatical difference. The conference report adopts the House version. Section 4(e) of the Senate bill has no equivalent in the House bill. It allows a subsequent lawsuit to enjoin the use of a test or device. The conference report adopts this provision.

Section 5 of the House bill is similar to the Senate bill except for an additional provision providing that a declaratory judgment approving the use of a new voting requirement will bar a subsequent lawsuit to enjoin the use of such a requirement. The conference report adopts the House version with a clarifying amendment and with the Senate provision described above.

Section 6 of the House and Senate bills is substantially identical. The Senate bill requires, however, that examiners shall "to the extent practicable" conduct a literacy test, by demonstrating that he has completed the sixth grade, or whatever grade the State requires of school-aged children. The version adopted by the conferences recommends that tests and devices be conducted in a language other than English.

The conference report adopts this provision.

Section 7(a) of the House bill and Senate bills differs in that the Senate bill permits the Attorney General to require that an applicant for literacy, without taking a literacy test, by demonstrating that he has completed the sixth grade, or whatever grade the State requires of school-aged children. The version adopted by the conferences recommends that tests and devices be conducted in a language other than English.

The conference report adopts this provision.

Section 1(c) and (d) of the House and Senate bills were not in disagreement.

Section 10 of the House bill and Section 10 of the Senate bill relate to the appointment of a commission to be authorized by section 1 of the Act of October 22, 1965, providing for the Civil Service Commission to assign such persons.

Sections 17 of the House and Senate bills were not in disagreement.
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CALL OF THE HOUSE
Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order 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 follow­
ing Members failed to answer to their names:

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of the more arduous tasks in Congress is that of a conference. He must seek to reconcile differences in the bill as passed by both Houses. He must try reasonably to preserve the position taken of the Chamber he represents—but only up to a certain point. He dare not persist in such a way as to bring disbandment of the conference, and thus inaction. Stalemate, to be resolved, oftimes requires parry and thrust, give and take—in short, compromise.

The conferences met numerous times. The differences were many, wide, and deep. Mutual concession was essential otherwise there would have been no re­

Edmund Burke said in his speech on

All government, indeed every human bene­

Men and women are not the same thing.
So, Mr. Speaker, we compromised. This report is the result of compromise. 

In view of the crisis impending on civil rights and on the Federal Government's failure toward genuine democracy, we found it prudent to compromise. In the language of President Johnson, we came to a consensus. The alternative would have been failure.

Some may object to some provisions of the conference report. It is exceedingly difficult to undertake to please everyone—try to please all, and you please none. The members of the conference committee on the House side got much of that which we sought. We had to yield, of course, in some instances.

We prevailed, for example, with reference to the "triggering" formula, a very important provision in the bill. The other side tried to make it more critical and less important, but we prevailed. The conference report adopts the House formula for suspending tests and devices, namely, that there was a test or device in use in November 1964, and that fewer than 5 percent of the population of voting age voted in the presidential election of 1964. The Senate version which added the requirement that 20 percent of the population be nonwhite was not adopted.

In addition, the Senate version containing an alternative method for suspending tests or devices, namely, that less than 25 percent of the nonwhite population be registered, also was not adopted. I would say that that was a very decided victory for the conferees on the part of the House.

As to the escape provisions of the bill, the conference report adopted the House version of the escape provision which requires 5-year and 90-day periods. The House version sets up a bar to the lifting of the suspension of tests or devices for 5 years after the entry of a judgment finding that discrimination had occurred within the 90 days before the court of law from denials by State officials. The conference report adopts the House version prohibiting intimidation of a person for urging or aiding any person to vote.

The Senate bill did not contain this protection for registration workers. This is a highly important provision and the House conferees felt it to be necessary. 

As to the so-called 90-day resolution, the conference report adopts the House version.

The conference report adopts the House version, omitting any authority for the Attorney General to require that an applicant for registration before a Federal examiner allege that he had applied for registration to a State registrar. We also did not compel the nonwhite to go back to the source which originally denied him the right to register or to vote. That would be placing him under obloquy once more. We believed it would be wrong thus to denigrate further the nonwhite.

The residence of examiners: The conference report adopts the House version and omits any requirement or preference that Federal examiners be residents of the State where they are to serve. This matter is left to the discretion of the Civil Service Commission as provided in the House bill. We felt that if there were a command or preference that the examiners be residents of the States where they are to serve, they, taking on the color of their surroundings, might repeat what the State officials had done and thus perpetuate the mischief we are trying to eliminate. Thus we leave it to the Civil Service Commission, a nonpartisan body, a fair body, to determine whether or not the examiners shall or shall not be residents of the States where they are to serve, depending upon conditions to be determined by the Civil Service Commission.

Pocket discrimination, section 3: The conference report adopts the House version respecting preclearance of new voting laws in lieu of the Senate provision requiring the court to order the submission of new voting laws to the Attorney General. The House version automatically provides for the submission of new voting laws to the Attorney General.

The conference report adopts, however, the Senate version authorizing a court to suspend all tests and devices rather than only the particular test or device found by the court in section 2 to have been discriminatorily administered. The House bill in this regard was more restricted, and we accepted the Senate provision.

Under section 4, of course, Members know all these tests and devices are automatically suspended.

Party office: The conference report adopted the House definition of "vote," which includes voting in elections for candidates for "party" as well as public office.

"Willfully and knowingly" and "fraudulently": The conference report adopts the sanction provisions of the House bill without the qualifying and limiting phrases "willfully and knowingly" and "fraudulently," which were contained in the Senate bill. These terms of the Senate bill would have hindered adequate enforcement of the measure.

The conference report provides, in accordance with the recommendation of the House conferees and the House bill, that the voting rights provisions of the 1964 Civil Rights Act be amended to make it apply to State and local as well as Federal elections.

The observer section: Observers are to be appointed by the Civil Service Commission as in the House version and not, as the Senate had it, by the Attorney General.

The so-called Puerto Rican amendment: The conference report adopts the Senate provision, for which there was no equivalent in the House bill. It allows observers to qualify with respect to literacy, with respect to the literacy test, by demonstrating that he has completed the sixth grade, or whatever grade the States require, in a school under the American flag conducted in a language other than English. It is interesting to note that approximately 30 States have no literacy test.

Therefore, in general there is no requirement for the knowledge of English, which the Senate provision, which is firmly grounded in section 2 of the 14th amendment, Congress would be finding that it is an arbitrary classification for a State to refuse to accept the American flag education for its citizens as evidence of his qualification to participate in the voting process.

The poll tax substitute provision: The conference report adopts the substitute poll tax provision which rephrases the findings of Congress and contains a congressional declaration that by the requirement of the payment of a poll tax the right of a citizen to vote is denied or abridged. This provision also contains the clear statement that the Congress is acting under the authority of section 5 of the 14th amendment and section 2 of the 15th amendment to the Constitution. Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of the Senate version practically identical to the Senate version except subsection (d) in the conference report provides—and this is very important—that tender of a poll tax for the current year shall satisfy poll tax requirements during the pendency of lawsuits to invalidate the poll tax.

Now, that means just this: During the pendency of a suit brought by the Attorney General, and thereafter for a period of times, where the court rules, the poll tax provision is unconstitutional, then any individual, particularly a nonwhite, would not be deprived of his right to vote if he has paid his poll tax 45 days before the election for the current year. He would not have to pay any cumulative tax. Some States provide that the poll tax must be paid in January preceding the election. Other States have other onerous provisions. Rather than requiring paying a poll tax. However, here we provide that if he pays his poll tax 45 days before the election, he shall have the right to vote.

The so-called Long-Boggs amendment: Both the House and Senate bills provide
for the removal of examiners by petition to the Attorney General or to the authorizing court with respect to examiners appointed under section 3(a).

In other words, both the House and Senate bills provided for removal of examiners. The conference report adds the additional Senate provision which permits a political subdivision to seek through court action in the District Court for the District of Columbia for the removal of examiners when more than 50 percent of the non-white voting age population is registered and, in addition, first, all persons listed have been placed on the appropriate ballot, and second, there is no reasonable cause to believe that there will be denials of the right to vote.

This provision does not affect the so-called automatic trigger. It does not stay the operation of the bill. It does not prevent the appointment of examiners. It comes into play only after the examiners have been appointed. In the House version examiners could be removed from the political subdivision by the court on motion for a contempt order when you have two conditions present: First. All persons listed have been placed on the appropriate voting list.

Second. There is no reasonable cause to believe that there will be denial of the right to vote.

We add another way to terminate listing procedures under the bill. Access is provided to the political subdivision in the case of a Federal supervisory court of the District of Columbia where a minimum of 50 percent of the non-whites have been registered and those two provisions that I have just read are established to the satisfaction of the court.

So that in general I would say, as I said before, we have a very strong bill. We have an adequate bill. We have a bill we may well be proud of. Of course, we did not get everything that we hoped for. But that is the way things go when you deal with the other body and when the other body deals with us.

As I said before, it was a case of give and take, weighing the equities against the record. There have been few, if any, Members of Congress who have given more of their time and ability to this question that the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio. I am content to let the record tell the story.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things in the conference committee report of which I am most proud is the Bill of Rights amendment which nullifies or seeks to nullify by statute a qualification to vote enacted by the State of New York, and which has been on the statute books of that State for more than 100 years. The qualification in the New York law requires a voting citizen in New York to be able to read and write English. Mr. Speaker, this is an English-speaking Nation. Mr. Speaker, I am official language of our country. I ask the Members of the House and I ask the people of this country, what is wrong with a law requiring citizens to read and write English, before being eligible to vote, when such law is never used to deny or abridge the right to vote by reason of race or color?

Mr. Speaker, as late as 1960, and not longer than 1957 the House and the Senate had the conference committee of that law of the State of Florida which juryman was of the provision, that jurors serving in cases growing out of civil rights legislation of that year must have the ability to read, write, and understand the English language.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, our immigration and naturalization laws require that no citizen of another land may be naturalized in America unless and until he or she can read and write the English language, before being eligible to vote, when such law is never used to deny or abridge the right to vote by reason of race or color?

Mr. Speaker, as late as 1961 this question was raised in the Federal courts of New York, and by a decision of a three-judge Federal court it was held that New York's law was constitutional. The case was not taken to the Court of Appeals to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, if there be a single provision in the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which may be unconstitutional, it is the provision that strikes down the law of New York which requires the voter to read English before voting. The charge that such law has been used to deny or abridge the right to vote by reason of race or color?

Mr. Speaker, it is well within the constitutional power of every State to require literacy in the English language as a condition precedent to the right to vote. The establishment of State and local standards has been held to be within the authority of the States and not subject to Federal supervision—\textit{Guinn v. United States,} 238 U.S. 347 (1915)—unless as such legislature violates either the 14th and 15th amendments—\textit{Breedlove v. Suttles,} 302 U.S. 271 (1937). Payment of a poll tax, a tax which may be levied to a degree for a designation of period of time, absence of criminal conduct, and the passing of a literacy test have all been held to be constitutionally valid State requirements.

But, Speaker, it is true that State and local standards of voter eligibility are suspended, but only where discrimination against a portion of the State's population has occurred in violation of the mandate of another provision of the Constitution. But, through this amendment, rejected by this body only a few weeks ago, we are striking down the constitutional power granted to the States—article I, section 2 and the 17th amendment—to establish voter qualifications without even attempting to rationally base it on a constitutional attack against discrimination, denial of equal protection of the laws, or violation of any other provision of the Constitution.

The proponents of the Puerto Rican amendment cite the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution as the basis for its validity.

However, the case which looked to the validity of the New York requirement of literacy—\textit{English v. Commancho} (tried in the New York State courts and finally in a three-judge Federal district court—199 F. Supp. 155 (1961)—denied the validity of these arguments.

First. It is true that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment prohibits the State from treating people in the same circumstances differently. But a State law requiring literacy in the English language does not distinguish between people similarly situated; it applies equally to all people in the same circumstances. As the district court said in Commancho:

"The literacy requirement is applicable to all citizens of New York without regard to race, creed, color or sex. No charge is made that the test is improperly given or its content unbalanced. The test is equally and fairly applied to all who take it. Plaintiff has not been denied the equal protection of the laws nor has he been deprived of his life, liberty, or property, in violation of the 14th amendment. \textit{Lassiter v. Northampton Co. Board of Elections, supra; Truax v. Barnes, supra.}

Second. In reviewing the applicability of the 15th amendment, which provides that neither the States nor the Federal Government shall deny to any citizen the right of any person to vote on account of race or color, the court in Commancho said in response to the plaintiff who had claimed that he had been denied the right to vote because of his Puerto Rican ancestry:

"Because the plaintiff is unable to vote as a result of his inability to pass the test, it does not follow that the plaintiff is being discriminated against. The 15th amendment was not designed to protect against the claim of this plaintiff. He is not being denied the right to vote because of race, creed, or color, but because of his illiteracy in the English language."


"We do not suggest that any standards which a State desires to adopt may be required of voters. But there is wide scope for exercise of its jurisdiction. Residence requirement, age, and the like—there are obvious examples indicating factors which a State may take into consideration in determining the qualifications of voters. The power to prescribe and write literacy examinations is some relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot. Literacy and illiteracy are neutral on race, creed, color, and sex, as reports around the world
show. Literacy and intelligence are obviously not synonymous. Illiterate people may be intelligent voters. Yet in our society where newspapers, periodicals, books, and other printed matter canvass and debate campaign issues, a State might conclude that only those who are literate should exercise the franchise.

While this decision looked only to that portion of the North Carolina statute which called for a literacy test and did not address itself to the requirement that it be in the English language, it is appropriate in case of individuals literate only in a foreign language. Citizens trained in a language other than English in American-flag schools are no different than children born in the United States who are taken from this country in their childhood and who return later, literate only in a language other than English. If the proponents are to be consistent, must they not allow such persons to vote, also?

A State law requiring its electorate to be literate in the English language does not create an unreasonable classification of its citizens. In addition to the necessity of being able to read a broad variety of current publications and to understand the language used on radio and TV in order to understand the campaign issues, it is reasonable to expect that a voter there function intelligently if he is able to read the language used in the voting system itself.

In the next statewide election in New York, there will be at least 20 special issues printed on the ballot for acceptance or rejection by the voters. These issues are to be printed in English, along with the titles of offices to be filled and the written directions for the procedure to be used in marking the ballot or operating the voting machine. How can the voter there function intelligently if he is not literate in the English language? That he cannot do so is the best evidence that an English literacy requirement is not an unreasonable exercise of State power.

Would the proponents of this legislation suggest that State standards, which require that one must be of a minimum age before he is eligible to vote, constitute a denial of equal protection of the laws? I have never heard such a proposal seriously offered.

Yet what distinction can be validly made between a minimum age requirement and a minimum literacy requirement in the English language? Both apply to all citizens without distinction in order to provide minimum standards for a qualified and responsive electorate.

I believe that some of us are under the impression that this amendment will affect only the State of New York. While it is true that New York has, perhaps, more residents who have been affected by this amendment than any other State, you should know that there are 13 other States that require the ability to read and/or write the English language.

The States which have such requirements are Alabama, Alaska, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, and Oregon.

And, Mr. Speaker, there was the so-called Boggs-Long amendment. At the very last moment I wanted to say that I supported the Boggs amendment when it was offered on the floor of the House, but I supported it on the statement that the companion amendment, the Long amendment, had been adopted in the Senate. The House vote was 263 to 155.

The House conferences abandoned their position on that proposal notwithstanding that vote.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for yielding because this point in the conference report is a significant one.

The House conferences yielded on this amendment. One of the cardinal reasons was that we had differed from the Willis amendment which we considered in the Judiciary Committee where it was characterized as an amendment which would "get the bill." I want to point out that the Long-Boggs amendment does differ from the so-called Willis amendment which we considered in the committee.

The Willis amendment, offered in an effective, well-considered fashion by the Judiciary Committee on May 4, 1965, and the Boggs-Long amendment, now incorporated in the voting rights bill agreed to by the House-Senate conference, are the same in basic intent. Both would give relief to a political subdivision that meet a specified statistical test: a demonstration that a specific percentage of its nonwhite population is now registered or that a specific percentage was registered and voted in the last presidential election.

The Willis proposal would have added a new subsection (e) to section 4, the automatic triggering provision. Its effect would have been to allow a political subdivision, with respect to which the 50-percent test has been applied under section 4(b), to get relief from the bill if, when seeking a declaratory judgment under section 4(a), it could allege and prove that more than 80 percent of the nonwhite voting-age population was registered on November 1, 1964, and that more than 60 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of 1964."

"The Boggs-Long proposal is an amendment to section 13, the "termination of listing" section which was defeated in the House by a rollcall vote of 262 to 155, but adopted by the Senate. By the amendment it would be to bring a termination of listing procedures by the Federal examiners not only where the Attorney General has found, "that all persons listed have been shown to be citizens," but that there is no reasonable cause to believe that voter discrimination will continue," but additionally whenever "the District
Mr. MCCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. MCCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleague from the Fourth District of Ohio (Mr. MCCULLOCH), in my opinion, is the most dedicated individual in this House on civil rights. I know he is standing here today and I am supporting this conference report with a lot of reservations. The Ford-McCulloch substitute bill that he offered and was turned down by the House was a far better bill. That bill was a much stronger and a more effective bill than the shambles that are before us today.

I commend the gentleman for his foresight in the field of civil rights. He recognizes these problems before they are upon us. He has been a champion of civil rights. I congratulate him, but I want to ask him how he can urge his colleagues on this side to support this compromise in view of the fact that we are against the poll tax and we want to get rid of this tax now and forevermore. We do not want to prolong and perpetuate this problem just to carry it over to another campaign. We on the Republican side want to get rid of this tax now. We were not satisfied with the bill. In view of the fact that we did not want to vitiate an English-speaking statute in New York by this legislation, and thirdly, that we defeated the Boggs amendment in the House overwhelmingly, how could the conference agree to this report?

Now in view of these conference changes, how can the gentleman from Ohio, one dedicated to the cause of civil rights, say that this side support this conference report? Before he answers that question, let me ask this second question. Why would it not be better for us on this side to turn this proposal down and send it back to conference?

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, answering the last question first, I regret to say we the minority do not have the king's horses and we do not have the king's men nor are we of the administration supporting this weakened and watered-down bill. We did not have the king's horses and we did not have the king's men in subcommittee nor did we have them in the full committee.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it is so essential in a representative republic that all qualified people be permitted to vote without let or hindrance—and not just 50 percent of them—but all of them—that effective legislation which would meet the test of the Constitution of the United States, but in view of the conditions which are now upon us, I am so interested in seeing that all qualified people get the right to vote, and I am so interested in the clean elections amendment of my colleague from Florida (Mr. Cramer), that I am supporting the legislation as the best we can get at this time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 16 minutes.

Mr. Celler. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boosie).

Mr. BOOSES. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I take this time to review and to report my support of this legislation. I supported this bill when it was here on July 9 and I say today what I said then, that the right to vote is one of the most sacred rights an American citizen has. I shall support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time for just a minute or two, in view of the limitation of time when this bill was originally considered by the House, to talk a bit about the Boggs amendment which was agreed to in the conference. Now the idea that this is, as someone has said, a gutting amendment or this amendment in any fashion weakens the right of American citizens to register and vote is not so. A lot of people like to make a lot of statements and sometimes they do not quite know what they are talking about. This amendment is designed to encourage registration and to reward those who comply with the law.
Now what are the facts? Under section 1 of the bill, as it passed the House, there are certain provisions under which the Attorney General of the United States may remove an examiner. There are two principal conditions. One, that all eligible nonwhites are registered to vote; and two, that there is no discrimination of any kind whatsoever.

If a political subdivision meets these requirements, then the Attorney General of the United States may say that a Federal Senate bill was a different amendment from the one originally considered by the Judiciary Committee.

All this amendment does is supplement the House-passed bill. That is all. It does not take anything away. It says that if all these conditions are met—the same conditions as in the bill—then and if at least 50 percent of the non-whites are registered a political subdivision may come at a worse time. This year, New York's voting machines will contain 25—let me repeat—25 questions, propositions and amendments ranging from budget procedure to water pollution. Of the 25 of these issues will be decided in English and, as sure as God made little apples, will be utterly unintelligible to the newly enfranchised Puerto Ricans.

No one sincerely believes or expects that any new immigrants who vote against the Javits-Kennedy amendment, feel the same.

In describing the unfortunate compromise as arrived at by the House-Senate conference as "bad public policy," and "errors of judgment," the Times went on to say:

It is a device for discouraging the full integration of these citizens into a community that conducts all its public affairs in English.

This kind of compromise on the part of the House conference could hardly be confined to a worse time. This year, New York's voting machines will contain 25—let me repeat—25 questions, propositions and amendments ranging from budget procedure to water pollution. Of the 25 of these issues will be decided in English and, as sure as God made little apples, will be utterly unintelligible to the newly enfranchised Puerto Ricans.

No one sincerely believes or expects that any new immigrants who vote against the Javits-Kennedy amendment, feel the same.
in interfering with New York State's English literacy requirement which our State court of appeals upheld, as constitutionally valid.

This Congress has no right to grant any citizen the right to vote—nor do we have the right to regulate or control any State's requirements and qualifications of voters. We cannot avoid discrimination on account of race or color.

No one has ever said that New York's English language literacy requirement has any racial overtones that would justify its destruction by this provision.

The failure and refusal of the House conferees to stand pat against this provision and its willingness to accept this most discriminatory amendment will mean nothing more than a one-way ticket to trouble for New York State and future trouble in other States of the Union.

I urge this House to vote down this conference report and insist that the House conferees stand fast and firm on this provision.

Mr. Celler. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, to state that the gentleman who just addressed the House very carefully avoided mentioning the fact that the New York State Legislature at its last session adopted a law reducing the requirement of literacy from the eighth grade to the sixth grade and significantly provided that evidence will be in English requirement as a prerequisite to voting; and recommended that the Constitution of the State of New York be changed in that regard. So that in a way the whole question is academic. I wanted the House to know that as far as New York State is concerned it is on its way to striking out from its election laws the requirement of English.

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say in answer to my colleague's statement that the matter is academic that I do not believe it is. I have been advised there are at least 12, if not 14 States of the Union which have the same requirement as does New York.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] 6 minutes.

Mr. Cramer. Mr. Speaker, this was an interesting conference on which I had the privilege of serving. It was interesting for many reasons. One of the principal reasons is this: I always thought that conferees had the responsibility of trying to uphold the position of the House on major questions. I thought, after the House took a vote on some provisions, and regardless of what my position may have been—that the conferees had the responsibility of trying to uphold the House position.

Indeed, the first day we went in conference, the Long-Boggs amendment was agreed to, contrary to the position of the House which defeated it, 282 to 155.

Second, the House voted down the so-called Puerto Rican amendment 202 to 214. That kind of dangled until the last 2 days of the conference. There were two meetings of the conferees on this and on poll taxes. On Tuesday preceding the final decision last week, I, and beheld, I walked into the conference meeting and the House had made up its mind and been made with the other body and that both of these major controversies remaining had been settled in favor of the other body.

All three major questions, major as far as I am concerned, at issue, were all decided contrary to the position taken by the House. The Long-Boggs amendment, which we voted down, was agreed to the very first day of conference. The poll tax ban which the House voted, was bartered away the last day of the conference, after the Tuesday deal fell through, because the conferees on Tuesday were decided contrary to the House position on poll taxes.

On the Puerto Rican amendment, Thursday of that same week, when we met in conference and the House conferees changed their Thursday position, and the House position of the conference on these two major provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I always thought that conferees had a responsibility to uphold or to try to uphold the House position. In my opinion, the conferees did not do so.

Now, admittedly, those in charge of the conference report, will indicate that we had 14 amendments and the Senate had 7 in conference. I am not necessarily too good a horse trader, I guess, but I thought that trading a horse for a rabbit was a good deal. That is just about what the House conferees did. We gave up three horses for a number of rabbits.

On the three major issues we gave up to the other side, I am thinking of the integrity of the House. This has nothing to do with my position. My position is a matter of record on these matters. I voted for the bill on final passage. I say that this writing relationship to these three major questions.

And, it is very interesting to note what happened between the Tuesday conference at which no agreement could be reached with respect to the Puerto Rican amendment and with respect to the poll tax ban and the Thursday conference at which time the position was reversed.

On Thursday we were called to conference again and we were informed of certain meetings with civil rights leaders that had taken place. I was not a party to those meetings. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] shakes his head and indicates he was not a party to the meeting where the position taken on the offer of conference and the conference meeting was held with civil rights leaders who were consulted with respect to what the press said was one of the basic major issues facing the conferences and the House had decided to make the issue of releasing the letter with the distinguished chairman and I would like to ask the chairman now what the chair­ man intends himself to do or does he intend to make the writer of the letter public, that is his responsibility. But the Chair will not. I will not make that public.

Mr. Cramer. Does not the chair­ man feel that this is information to which the House is entitled in that the conferees had such information and unquestionably it affected the judgment of the conferees? Would not the gentleman from New York join me in a request that the writer of the letter make it public?

Mr. Celler. Ali civil libertarians naturally are interested in what we do with reference to this civil rights bill, this voting bill, and all others. Representations are made and requests are made by those who are interested in the bill and we get representations from them. In this particular instance the writer of the letter asked that its contents be held in confidence until he personally would make a public statement. And, I say his confidence should be respected.

Mr. Cramer. I think this should be made public and I shall insist upon the writer doing so. I believe this is in the public domain.

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Gerald R. Ford], our minority leader, the remainder of the time on our side.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today or the conference report in reference to the bill before us has to do with the bill which was introduced in the House July 9. It has been diluted by the capitulation of the House conference in three instances. This has been well explained by the gentleman
from Ohio and others who have taken the floor here this afternoon.

I would like to speak specifically about one concession that has been made by the conference. I refer here to what is called the Boggs-Long amendment.

I am told that in the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, when this amendment was offered, the distinguished Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary indicated that such a compromise would not get the bill. I am told that when the amendment was offered in the full Committee of the House Committee on the Judiciary a similar comment was made, that the Boggs-Long amendment would gut the bill.

On the floor of the House on July 9 a majority, an overwhelming majority of the Members of this body, voted to agree with the opinion that this amendment, the Boggs-Long proposal, would gut the bill. As a matter of fact, the vote was 262 against the Boggs amendment to 155 who voted for it.

Now we have the conference agreeing to accept the so-called Boggs-Long amendment. I say at this time that 23 days later—today—there will be a motion to recommit offered that will move to send the conference report back to the conference committee with instructions to strike the Boggs-Long amendment. A vote for the motion to recommit will sustain the House position. It will strengthen the legislation. Those people who voted to disapprove of the Boggs amendment on July 9 will have a similar opportunity to vote the same way today.

Let me add that on July 10 the President said:

I also congratulate the House on its decisive defeat of the substitute amendment submitted by the Republican leadership, which would have seriously damaged and diluted the guarantee of the right to vote for all Americans.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] and I and many others violently disagree with the President's views in this regard. If the Boggs amendment is defeated today—and I hope it is—I trust the President will make this kind of a statement:

I also congratulate the House on its decisive defeat of an amendment, resented by the Republican leadership, which would have seriously damaged and diluted the guarantee of the right to vote for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman].

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as one who, beginning as early as 1941, was the author of a bill in the other body to abolish the poll tax, I wish to commend the able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and those who worked with him for bringing to this House a conference report which I am morally certain will lay the legislative groundwork for a judicial holding that the poll tax as a condition for the exercise of the right to vote is in violation of the Constitution of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the early cases of the U.S. Supreme Court's failure to strike down the poll tax had nothing to do with the exercise of congressional power under the 14th and 15th amendments. Beginning with Reynolds against Sims, the Supreme Court of the United States laid down the principle of one man, one vote, and a qualify for the franchise on the part of every citizen. In April of this year the Supreme Court of the United States, through the distinguished Chief Justice, in Brown v. Board of Education, significantly referred to congressional hearings and debate, which indicated a "general repugnance to the disenfranchisement of the poor occasioned by failure to pay the poll tax."

Mr. Speaker, since that language was written by the Supreme Court, this House by a vote of 333 to 85 passed the bill outlawing by statute the poll tax. The other body, lacking only four votes, did the same thing. Extensive hearings, reports, and debate have further indicated a general repugnance to the disenfranchisement of the poor occasioned by failure to pay the tax.

Now we have fulfilled, I believe, the requirements of the Supreme Court decision for striking down the poll tax as a condition to voting in the findings made in this conference report. A summary of the findings of the report is in this language:

The conference report adopts a substitute provision which rephrases the findings of Congress in subsection (a) and contains a provision which rephrases the requirement of the payment of a poll tax the right of citizens to vote is denied or abridged.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the able chairman of the Judiciary Committee and his associates for taking the price tag off the franchise to vote in America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman].

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

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I must admit I am dismayed and more than a little frustrated by the action taken on the voting rights bill by the conference committee. I am speaking specifically of their action with respect to the provision which would have outlawed State poll taxes as a qualification for voting.

I am particularly disappointed over the conference committee's determination to retain this provision because it was largely over the poll tax issue that I was assured by the majority of the House that we were going to get a major civil rights bill this year. By removing this provision we are not solving the problem the one man, one vote.

The bill we approve now slips one of the fringe around the edge, but leaves the binding intact.

We will have to come back to it and deal with it in another panicky, so-called compromise in a few years, perhaps in another few months, and I must ask you to answer the same letters from our constituents who will write to find out why.

They will want to know then, as many of them have wondered this year, why it is necessary to tackle another major civil rights bill so soon after we have finished with one. Their questions will have a more pointed ring to them since, by that time, we will have enacted not one but two major civil rights laws in as many years, and one of these will have been in the very same ballpark—voting rights.

I must say, it is not a prospect to which I am looking forward.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, let us look very briefly at where we have been and where we are.

In 1964 we passed a great civil rights bill. It effectively eliminated the scourge of racial discrimination in many areas of our national life. But it was a matter of compromise and in that compromise we weakened the section that dealt with voting rights.

In early 1965 it became apparent that new legislation would be required to implement the 15th amendment. At that time, many supporters of strong civil rights legislation were impatient with the administration and expressed apprehension that the Administration would not be strong enough to correct what had become a disgraceful and intolerable situation in the hard-core areas of segregation.

President Johnson sent us a strong, effective proposal. During our weeks of legislative work, our committee made

This provision was voted on and upheld by the House in our version of the bill. It was knocked out of the Senate version by the narrowest of margins. I cannot help wondering what pressures were brought to bear to prevent the Senate from opposing this provision. I cannot help wondering what pressures were brought to bear to prevent the Senate from opposing this provision and to weaken and undermine the determination to retain the provision expressed by the positive vote of this body.

I intend to support this bill. I will vote for it and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. There is much of merit in the bill. However, it remains incomplete without the ban against State poll taxes. It cannot do the job it is designed to do unless the States are forced to employ fair devices to permit all qualified citizens to vote.

I do not think there can remain any doubt in the minds of any of us as to what these poll taxes accomplish, and what they are specifically designed to accomplish. So long as these discriminatory, unfair devices are permitted to exist. I do not think there can remain any doubt in the minds of any of us as to what these poll taxes accomplish, and what they are specifically designed to accomplish. So long as these discriminatory, unfair devices are permitted to exist.

I am looking forward.
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some improvements and certainly that is as it should be. The Senate amendment simply encourages such com-

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 1564 is now before us. It is the final step in developing this bill on voting rights which is long over-

final statement in developing this bill on voting rights which is long over-

Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the conference report adopted exactly the same amendment to the Constitution as was narrowly defeated in the House. I opposed the Boggs amendment when it was offered in the House. It was defeated then. I regret that the conference report on this constitutional legislation.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I opposed the Boggs amendment when it was offered in the House. It was defeated then. I regret that the conference report on this constitutional legislation.

Mr. Speaker, by adopting the conference report on the 1965 voting rights bill, we will at long last be responding to the conscience of America, a conscience that cries out for an end to voting discrimina-

After the President signs it, I urge the Attorney General to move immediately to implement its provisions.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House the time does not permit ade-

I would like to know how any Member of this Congress can believe that this measure is by any stretch of the imagina-

I would like to know how any Member of this Congress can believe that this measure is by any stretch of the imagina-

This legislation is discriminatory in that citizens of all the States are not entitled by this legislation, as the Constitution provides, to all privileges and immunities of the citizens of other States.

It further ignores the Constitution in that it takes away from a few States the right to prescribe voter qualifications. The penalty of the law is discriminatory in that the penalty is more severe on six Southern States than on the other States. It contains much more. But we've discussed the provisions of this bill on a number of occasions before, and I am convinced that this House is not to be guided by constitutional principles nor by what is right or wrong. The mass hysteria which has swept over this coun-

This further ignores the Constitution in that it takes away from a few States the right to prescribe voter qualifications. The penalty of the law is discriminatory in that the penalty is more severe on six Southern States than on the other States. It contains much more. But we've discussed the provisions of this bill on a number of occasions before, and I am convinced that this House is not to be guided by constitutional principles nor by what is right or wrong. The mass hysteria which has swept over this coun-
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against this conference report and cannot for the life of me, understand how any man, especially a resident of one of the states to be discriminated against, could do otherwise.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly urge upon this committee that we consider and finally accept and approve this historical conference report on voting rights because I very deeply believe its adoption is absolutely vital to the continuous existence of this Nation as a democratic entity.

As a member of this committee, I can conscientiously reassure you that the committee members, from both Chambers, worked diligently and another proponent would construct the strongest possible voting rights measure in our legislative history.

The basic objective of your committee was twofold. We pledged ourselves to forge a legislative instrument that would give to every American citizen everywhere in this country an equal opportunity to participate in the free elections of all public officers and which would encourage him to do so. At the same time, we promised the public that this bill, by the most careful choosing of such language and means as would tend to avoid and minimize the temptations and opportunities to project legal challenges and problems that could result in intolerable obstruction and delay of the fullest and speediest operation and application of all the benefits and provisions of the bill. After reviewing the substance of this report, I feel you will agree it avoids and minimizes the temptations and unnecessary repetitions.

The basic objective of your committee is to forge a legislative instrument that would take the first step toward fulfillment of our traditional goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment for all Americans regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. Let us take that giant step now.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

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

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. Speaker. The motion to recommit.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker. I offer a motion to recommit.

The Speaker. The motion is on the conference report.

Mr. McEWEN. I am, Mr. Speaker. The Speaker. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. McEWEN moves to recommit the conference report on S. 1794 to the committee of conference with further instructions to the effect that the report of the committee on the part of the House to insist upon the following amendments:

In Section 13, the first sentence, clause (a), after the words "Civil Service Commission" insert the words, "or whenever the District Court for the District of Columbia determines for discriminatory judgments brought by any political subdivision with respect to which the Director of the Census has determined that more than 50 per cent of the nonwhite persons of voting age residing therein are registered to vote."

In section 13, the second sentence, after the words "of this Section", insert a period and strike the remainder of the sentence.

In section 13, strike all of the third sentence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas are ordered.

The question was taken; and there were--yeas 118, nays 284, not voting 32, as follows:

(Roll No. 218)
I demand the yeas and nays.

agreeing to the conference report.

changed his vote from "yea" to "nay.

Walker of Mississippi against.

The question was taken; and there voted on the following:

ON GENERAL LEAVE To EXTEND

Mr. Celler. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be extended their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. Morgan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2654) to extend the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes, with the House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference report requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair
hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. Morgan, Mr. Zarlocki, Mr. Keating, Mr. Hart, Mr. Bolton, Mr. Adair, and Mr. Mailly.

SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 24) to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

Mr. DELANEY from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 498, Rept. No. 719) which was referred to the House calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution by the House, I shall request 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. 1790) to provide a two-year extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, the committee shall not adjourn until after three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means now in the bill and such substitute shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No other amendment to the bill or committee substitute shall be in order except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, accompanied as the case may be, if the amendment has 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 with or without instructions.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CASUALTY LOSSES ATTRIBUTABLE TO MAJOR DISASTERS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7502) relating to the income tax treatment of certain casualty losses attributable to major disasters, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of the gentleman's motion. I take this time for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee to make an explanation of the bill.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 7502 as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means is to amend the provisions of existing law relating to the income tax treatment of casualty losses to provide that if property is destroyed or damaged by a storm, flood, or other casualty which is designated by the President of the United States as a major disaster, then, if the losses exceed the gains, both the losses and the gains will be treated as ordinary for tax purposes.

Under present law, uninsured business losses—or those from property held for the production of income—arising from a fire or other casualty are treated as ordinary losses without regard to any gains the taxpayer may have. This rule is not changed by H.R. 7502—which was introduced by our colleague in the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Oregon, the Honorable At Ullman. In the case of major disasters, the pending bill supplements this rule of existing law to provide substantially similar loss treatment for uninsured business property—or property held for the production of income. This loss treatment also is provided in the case of major disasters for losses of personal assets and a personal residence—whether or not it is covered by insurance.

In addition, a technical amendment makes it clear that uninsured losses arising from the destruction—in whole or in part—of theft, or seizure, or requisition or condemnation of property—used in the trade or business or capital assets held more than 6 months—are to be offset against gains otherwise treated as capital gains except to the extent they are specifically excluded from the provision.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objection to this amendment, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in urging its enactment.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 7502

A bill relating to the income tax treatment of certain casualty losses attributable to major disaster

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1221(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of any involuntary conversion of property (subject to the provisions of this subsection but for this sentence) which is attributable to a storm, flood, fire, or other casualty designated by the President of the United States as a major disaster for purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, whether resulting in gain or loss, if, during the taxable year, the recognized losses from such involuntary conversions exceed the recognized gains from such involuntary conversions, subsection shall not apply to taxable years ending after November 30, 1964."

Whereas the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) section 1231(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of any involuntary conversion of property (subject to the provisions of this subsection but for this sentence) which is attributable to a storm, flood, fire, or other casualty designated by the President of the United States as a major disaster for purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, entitled "An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes" (42 U.S.C., secs. 1855-1855g), this subsection shall not apply to such involuntary conversion (whether resulting in gain or loss) if, during the taxable year, the recognized losses from such conversions exceed the recognized gains from such conversions, which subsection shall not apply to taxable years ending after November 30, 1964."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN FORMS OF NICKEL—ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it had been my intention to ask unanimous consent for the consideration today of the bill, H.R. 6431, but I have been advised by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Duncan] that if I did do so he would have to object today. I am, therefore, asking that the bill be considered, but I will ask later in this session for its consideration.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 618) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuell.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TALCOIT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to briefly discuss this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss for a few moments private bill, S. 618, which provides for a $55,000 lump sum payment and certain other benefits to "the widow of a hero for the sacrifices" of Miss Nora I. Samuell, of Rumania, a former employee of the American Legation in Bucharest.
This legislation requires a more complete explanation than we have received to date. The bill was drawn by the State Department, originated in the Senate, and has been passed over thrice by the House objectors when called up on the Private Calendar.

Because of the extraordinary emotional factors inherent in a case of this type, much publicity has been generated which makes objective and rational consideration exceptionally difficult. As the Private Calendar does not permit any question, discussion or debate of a bill. Therefore, I take this time to present some additional facts and views regarding S. 618. I commend the members of the Claims Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee for providing this opportunity for discussion.

Miss Samuelli, by all reports, is a decent, sensitive person who performed her job loyally and well for the United States. She was imprisoned by Romanian authorities for 12 years—probably because of her employment by the United States. She is entitled to full consideration, even sympathy—which I have determined to accord her. But individual personalities and special interests should not supersede the best interests of the United States and its citizens.

Miss Samuelli had been employed by the American Embassy in Bucharest, Romania, as a clerk, performing unclassified duties, for 3½ years. When, in July 1949, she was arrested, tried, and convicted—unjustly by our standards—by the Romanian Commumist regime for treason and espionage as a turncoat spy for the United States. She was confined for almost 12 years. Her imprisonment was harsh—often incommunicado and sometimes in solitary confinement. She suffered a painless, but not disabling, accidental back injury during this period.

Miss Samuelli was not a spy for the United States. There is no evidence whatsoever that she was a spy for the Communists.

After her release from prison in June of 1961, Miss Samuelli went to France, where she contacted her former superior officer who strongly recommended that the Department of State show full appreciation for her loyal services to the United States and the hardships she endured. For several reasons—the unusual circumstances involved, the lack of a clear law or regulation covering the case, the fact that Miss Samuelli had not made a claim for compensation—that the United States reward her comparably with her English and Israeli counterparts, and a variety of bureaucratic mistakes—no satisfactory compromise of her entitlement was effected.

In 1963, Miss Samuelli had an opportunity to come to the United States in order to present her case in person. The State Department agreed to sponsor legislation to compensate all persons in her category for the 12 years she served, plus the time spent in prison. Such a bill is now pending in the House. Miss Samuelli also importuned several Members of the other body, who were impressed with her story, and who urged the Secretary of State to seek a more generous award of her full back salary, plus retirement benefits, plus a $20,000 gratuity.

Miss Samuelli's compensation at the time of her arrest was $1,920 per annum—a fair and mutually satisfactory wage for a typist of her ability and worth at the time. The Department of State, which now contends her case is "the most deserving ever encountered," originally set her entitlement at $26,972.46—computed on the basis of her last prearrest salary rather than the period of her imprisonment.

After the Members of the other body interceded, the Department of State revised the figure upward to $44,873.67—computed on the basis of her last prearrest salary rather than the period of her imprisonment.

Pursuant to standard procedure, the mother of Miss Samuelli received a sum equal to her salary for 6 months shortly after Miss Samuelli was arrested in 1949. Another pending bill would grant U.S. citizenship to Miss Samuelli.

In addition to the above, a $10,000 payment for "suffering and expenses" was recommended by the Department of State. The Department has stated that this sum is "a gratuity in recognition, not only of the physical and mental suffering, but also the expenses to which Miss Samuelli has been put in developing this first case of its kind." These expenses are said to include legal fees and costs of travel in pursuing her claim, although payment of the former is specifically prohibited by the bill. This provision, in effect, pays a bonus to a stateless person for developing a claim against the U.S. Treasury. Some Members believe this is a first-of-its-kind bonus—which should not be encouraged, let alone subsidized.

It is understood that another almost identical case is known to the Department of State, but was withheld because the Samuelli case has more emotional and political appeal, and also because Miss Samuelli has now been prominent supporters of the object. If that is true, the proponents have suggested that, if the Department of State choose to be a questionable parliamentary tactic—discriminatory and conceivably detrimental to the other case—which casts a shadow of doubt on both, in my opinion. The State Department was assured already in writing that the "Department will not consider the amount provided in this bill as a precedent for other claimants."

In other words, we are assured that other claimants will not be given bonuses. Some Members consider this unfair to other claimants—or special treatment for this particular claimant.

On the other hand, it is also alleged that there are pending as many as 50 comparable or similar cases for which the case would be precedent.

Some Members contend that such a novel first case of its kind, with dozens more standing in the wings, deserves more thorough consideration, debate, and deliberation. This case—no question, see-no-problem, hear-no-answers, assume-no-public-interest Private Calendar procedure can provide.

Some Members have demanded that Congress and the Treasury be forced to know first, why the State Department changed its mind and proposed a more than 100-percent increase in lost back salary; two, whether the U.S. Government intends to pay gratuities for imprisonment to foreign nationals which were not paid to our own military and civilian employees; and three, how this case will affect the computation of salaries of future prisoners. We will also examine the complex potential pay raises and gratuities; and, if so, what will be the criteria?

Some proponents have suggested that, unless we treat Miss Samuelli with removal, national factors for employment in our embassies and legations will be severely handicapped and Communist governments will propagate that the United States pays less compensation for foreign imprisonment; so do not work for economy-minded, inhumane capitalists."

In other words, "do not work for the United States unless you are guaranteed a bonus when we put you in jail." Not everyone concurs.

Some proponents have suggested that our friends in captive nations may say "after all we did for the United States, really, do not get a bonus when we help." Or "after all, if we are volunteers, we did not have to work for the United States—so we should be entitled to special gratuities in addition to back salary, when imprisoned."

The argument may have some validity—and perhaps should be a part of the basis of our foreign employment policy. Perhaps there is no other way we can attract competent, loyal foreign workers. However, the objectors simply believe that these are dramatic deviations from our existing policy and therefore should have a fuller debate than is possible under the Rules of Procedure of the Private Calendar.

Some proponents support the gratuity also on the basis that Miss Samuelli did an excellent job. We do not dispute her competency. If she had not done a good job, she should have been dismissed; if she had not performed a perfect job, she should have been less. The Department of State has changed its mind and proposed a more generous award. Adjustments of compensation at termination has not been the practice of our foreign employment policy. The objectors believe the policy in this respect should not be changed via a private bill.

Other proponents justify the gratuity on the basis that she was loyal to the United States. We do not disparage her loyalty; we even applaud it. But if...
she were not loyal, she should not have received anything. A policy of rewarding her for being loyal, she should receive nothing. A policy of rewarding her for being disloyal, she should not have been asked or received what she deserves.

We do not deny or disparage this. In fact, none of us can fully agree and understand all the historical considerations. Nevertheless, the questions, reservations, and even objections have some validity. Not only is it the official duty of an objector to investigate, question, and call to the attention of the House any reservation or objection he may have, but every Member should interest himself in private bills which are of such great importance to our Nation and to so many individuals who may have been, or may be, similarly situated.

A policy of rewarding her for being loyal, she should receive nothing. A policy of rewarding her for being disloyal, she should not have been asked or received what she deserves.

Some advocates of this bill say that gratuities for Miss Samuellia based on hypothetical potential salary increases, promotions and increments is progressive and enlightened. We do not necessarily disagree, but we believe that there should be some criterion and that the policy should apply also to our own civilian and military prisoners-which is believed not to be the practice now. If our policy is to be changed, some objectors believe it should not be done by a precedent established in the House by a Senate bill without question or debate under the Private Calendar.

A point also is made that England, France, and Israel treat their political prisoners more generously than the United States and that this is embarrassing or damaging to our international reputation, especially when we are more affluent than they. First, substantiating evidence of this argument has not been adduced. Second, if our policy is different, there has been no evidence that a change is necessary. If a change is necessary, the specific proposals for such change have not been suggested. There has been no evidence that our present policy is inadequate, incompetent personnel or that our international relations or goals have been adversely affected by our policy. Some might even dispute the efficacy or applicability of the policy. We now have more generous policies and treatment of our own military prisoners, even death-to themselves and their families. They voluntarily served along with our Army often without pay during the Pacific campaign of World War II, and were later promised compensations equal to our servicemen-not bonuses—but the Government has never seen fit nor thought it appropriate to grant these loyal, competent, suffering nationals any gratuity.

We suspect that many persons through the years, now and in the future, might qualify for money payments under the criterion or principles of this case. The objectors simply think they should have hard evidence, fuller discussion, fuller legislative history before we establish a criterion and policy by the precedent of a private bill.

This case is already beginning to bring inquiries from individuals asking for back pay, gratuities, and retirement benefits for their employment, service, or imprisonment, even death to themselves and their families. They voluntarily served along with our Army often without pay during the Pacific campaign of World War II, and were later promised compensations equal to our servicemen—not bonuses—but the Government has never seen fit nor thought it appropriate to grant these loyal, competent, suffering nationals any gratuity.

We suspect that many persons through the years, now and in the future, might qualify for money payments under the criterion or principles of this case. The objectors simply think they should have hard evidence, fuller discussion, fuller legislative history before we establish a criterion and policy by the precedent of a private bill.

This case is already beginning to bring inquiries from individuals asking if they and others are eligible for back pay, gratuities, and retirement benefits for their employment, service, or imprisonment, even death, during and after World War II. The objectors think it would help these inquiries and more objections before we open the floodgates by passing a private bill granting a special gratuity.

This case could open up an enormous Pandora's box of pending and existing, or future cases which are identical, comparable, or sufficiently similar to warrant or invite an avalanche of private bills and claims. Some Members question even the applicability of a probable, single, pressured, single case should become the criterion for the disposition of all future prisoner-of-war cases.

As one Member of Congress who wants to help Miss Samuellia and expedite her claim, who believes a fair employment practice requires our Government to pay full wages during enemy imprisonments, but as one who concurs with numerous other Members of this House that the novel aspects of gratuities should be the subject of general, rather than special legislation, I concur that the only way this bill can be passed by the House now is for the Speaker's committee amendment proposed by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SENNERS) at my request. I understand that the amendment is being accepted by the minority objectors and the minority members of the Claims Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, I especially commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SENNERS), the proponent of this bill, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. ASHMORE) the chairman of the subcommittee, for their splendid cooperation in working out this compromise amendment which I trust is satisfactory to the claimant and also in the best interests of the United States. I cordially support it.

Scores of comparable cases come to mind—and I believe research and elaboration of comparable situations might be interesting, sobering, and cautionary. The Philippine Scouts, I understand, were certainly competent and loyal, and certainly suffered hardships and imprisonments, even death to themselves and their families. They voluntarily served along with our Army often without pay during the Pacific campaign of World War II, and were later promised compensations equal to our servicemen—not bonuses—but the Government has never seen fit nor thought it appropriate to grant these loyal, competent, suffering nationals any gratuity.

We suspect that many persons through the years, now and in the future, might qualify for money payments under the criterion or principles of this case. The objectors simply think they should have hard evidence, fuller discussion, fuller legislative history before we establish a criterion and policy by the precedent of a private bill.

This case is already beginning to bring inquiries from individuals asking if they and others are eligible for back pay, gratuities, and retirement benefits for their employment, service, or imprisonment, even death to themselves and their families. They voluntarily served along with our Army often without pay during the Pacific campaign of World War II, and were later promised compensations equal to our servicemen—not bonuses—but the Government has never seen fit nor thought it appropriate to grant these loyal, competent, suffering nationals any gratuity.

We suspect that many persons through the years, now and in the future, might qualify for money payments under the criterion or principles of this case. The objectors simply think they should have hard evidence, fuller discussion, fuller legislative history before we establish a criterion and policy by the precedent of a private bill.

This case is already beginning to bring inquiries from individuals asking if they and others are eligible for back pay, gratuities, and retirement benefits for their employment, service, or imprisonment, even death to themselves and their families. They voluntarily served along with our Army often without pay during the Pacific campaign of World War II, and were later promised compensations equal to our servicemen—not bonuses—but the Government has never seen fit nor thought it appropriate to grant these loyal, competent, suffering nationals any gratuity.

We suspect that many persons through the years, now and in the future, might qualify for money payments under the criterion or principles of this case. The objectors simply think they should have hard evidence, fuller discussion, fuller legislative history before we establish a criterion and policy by the precedent of a private bill.

This case is already beginning to bring inquiries from individuals asking if they and others are eligible for back pay, gratuities, and retirement benefits for their employment, service, or imprisonment, even death to themselves and their families. They voluntarily served along with our Army often without pay during the Pacific campaign of World War II, and were later promised compensations equal to our servicemen—not bonuses—but the Government has never seen fit nor thought it appropriate to grant these loyal, competent, suffering nationals any gratuity.

We suspect that many persons through the years, now and in the future, might qualify for money payments under the criterion or principles of this case. The objectors simply think they should have hard evidence, fuller discussion, fuller legislative history before we establish a criterion and policy by the precedent of a private bill.

This case is already beginning to bring inquiries from individuals asking if they and others are eligible for back pay, gratuities, and retirement benefits for their employment, service, or imprisonment, even death to themselves and their families. They voluntarily served along with our Army often without pay during the Pacific campaign of World War II, and were later promised compensations equal to our servicemen—not bonuses—but the Government has never seen fit nor thought it appropriate to grant these loyal, competent, suffering nationals any gratuity.
The Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, William Crockett, has informed me that staff physicians report Miss Samuelli is "physically incapacitated" and would meet criteria for "medical retirement." Under other cir-
cumstances, staff physicians stated Miss Samuelli eligible for a certain percentage of her annual salary for the rest of her life and I trust this will be taken into con-
sideration by Members of the House and by the Senate Committee.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further re-
serving the right to object, it is the intention of the gentleman to offer an amend-
ment to this bill, is it not?

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

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

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman, I would like to inform him that I am presenting a committee amendment to the bill, S. 618, for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli. This bill was referred to the committee on April 14, 1965.

In the time intervening from that date, it has been possible to review the provisions of the bill and to secure additional information. On the basis of this information it has been concluded that there should be a modification of the amount provided in the bill, as to make it correspond with the amount computed by the Department of State to be the equivalent of that Miss Samuelli would have earned had she not been seized by Rumanian authorities and imprisoned for a 12-year period.

This requires a deduction of a $10,000 figure which is stated in the State Department report as being an additional sum over and above that which she should have earned. Further, it appears that Miss Samuelli was imprisoned from July 24, 1949, to June 14, 1961; however, due to some inaccuracy in the period selected in introducing the bill, the computation of the amount Miss Samuelli would have earned, the period covered was extended to 1963. Accordingly, this amounted to the in-
clusion of approximately 2 additional years in the original computation; there-
fore, the figure for the loss of compensa-
tion which previously was $44,873.67 has been reduced by the figure of $8,758.77 to the revised figure of $36,114.90. This is the amount stated in the committee amendment.

Section 2 of the bill provides for the period of Miss Samuelli's imprisonment to be recognized as creditable service for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act. On the committee in reporting the bill assumed that Miss Samuelli would make the required employee con-
tribution in order to receive the credit for this service; however, to make this point absolutely clear, the committee also recommends that the period be amend-
ed to state affirmatively that she shall be granted this service provided she makes the required employee con-
tribution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is the type of bill which ought to have been brought to the House floor under a rule, because I am fearful it does set a precedent. I am not going to ob-
ject, but in the future I will object to the unanimous-consent consideration of bills of such magnitude nature on the floor of the House by way of the Private Calendar where, under ordinary circumstances, it cannot be discussed; no questions can be asked and no answers given. I hope that we have seen the end of this sort of legislation on the Private Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reserva-
tion of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman?

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

S. 618
An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nora Isabella Samuelli, the sum of $55,000 as a gratuity for the sacrifices sustained by her as a result of being imprisoned for 12 consecutive years by the Communist Government of Rumania on charges that the said Nora Isabella Samuelli acted as a spy for the United States while employed in the United States Legation in Bucharest, Rumania: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or re-
cieved by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract or agreement to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SENNER
Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the following:

Amendment offered by Mr. SENNER:
Page 1, line 6, strike "$55,000 as a gratuity for the sacrifices" and insert "$38,114.90 for loss of compensation".
Page 2, line 15, after "$100,000" strike "Provided, That this makes the required em-

The amendment was agreed to.

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

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATLANTIC-PACIFIC INTEROCEANIC CANAL STUDY COMMISSION (H. DOC. 253)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accom-
panying papers, referred to the Com-
mittee on Merchant Marine and Fish-
eries and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:
By Public Law 68-609, I was author-
ized to appoint five distinguished American citizens to serve on the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Commission. They are: Robert B. Anderson, Chairman; Robert G. Storey, Vice Chairman; Milton S. Eisenhower, Kenneth E. Fields, and Raymond A. Kimball.

The Commission immediately set about its difficult and complicated mission. The initial phase of its work has been to develop a program of investigations cov-
ering the many aspects of the construc-
tion of a sea-level canal. It has selected the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, to conduct the engineering feasibility study under the direction of the Commission. The Commission will call upon other Government and private agencies to carry out additional studies to aid in assessing the national implications of a sea-level canal. In the next year or two, the Commission expects to begin onsite surveys of possible canal routes. The Commission is also contemplating a trip to Panama in the near future to study, at first hand, the present Canal Zone and the other possible canal route in Panama's Darien Province.

I am highly gratified by the progress made by the Commission, under the able leadership of Mr. Anderson, during the short period that it has been working.

The Commission has requested the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds in fiscal year 1966 to initiate investiga-
tions on the most promising sea level canal sites. I believe the Congress should be asked to do this in January, with the next annual dry season in the isthmus. I recommend prompt action on the request in order that the Commission be in position to initiate this important aspect of its work during this 4-month period of favor-
able weather conditions.

Under the terms of the authorizing legislation, the Commission is required to report to me on its progress for trans-
mittal to the Congress on July 31 of each year and to make its final report not later than June 30, 1968. I take pleasure in submitting the first annual report of the Commission.

In forwarding this report to the Con-
gress, I wish to reiterate the importance which I attach to pressing forward with plans and preparations for a sea-level canal. I think this is needed for the national security and commercial trade, as well as for the welfare of the hemisphere. It is needed in the true interests of the United States and in fairness and justice to all.

Lyndon B. Johnson.


PRIVATE CALENDAR
The SPEAKER. This is Private Calen-
dary day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.
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MRS. NATHALIE ILINE
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1380) for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iline.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?
Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. GROSS objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommenced to the Committee on the Judiciary.

OUTLET STORES, INC.
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2924) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?
Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. HALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommenced to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHARLES MAROWITZ
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1445) for the relief of Charles Marowitz.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?
Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. GROSS objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommenced to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EDWARD V. AMASON AND EMERITA CECILIA AMADOR AMASON
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1473) for the relief of Edward V. Amason, and Emerita Cecilia Amador Amason.
Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?
There was no objection.

JOANNE MARIE EVANS
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3103) for the relief of Joanne Marie Evans.
Mr. HALL, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?
There was no objection.

DEDRICK A. MAANUM
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4070) for the relief of Dedrick A. Maanum.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?
Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. GROSS objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommenced to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MRS. RUTH GORFAIN
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5206) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Gorfain.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?
Mr. McEWEN and Mr. HALL objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommenced to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LT. COL. JAMES P. HUBBARD, U.S. ARMY
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5815) for the relief of Lt. Col. James P. Hubbard, U.S. Army.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?
Mr. HALL and Mr. GROSS objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommenced to the Committee on the Judiciary.

E. F. FORT, CORA LEE FORT CORBETT, AND W. R. FORT
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6527) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.
There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:
H.R. 6527

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorised and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to E. F. Fort, of Beaumont, Texas, to Cora Lee Fort Corbett, of Lake Wales, Florida, and to W. R. Fort, of Fort, of Palestine, Texas, the sum of $4,000 in full settlement of their claims against the United States for payment for land formerly owned by them and taken by the United States in violation of the act of the 42nd Congress, 2d session, known as tract numbered 131, Camp Murphy, Florida. Provided, That no part of the sum appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:
Page 2, line 4, strike "in excess of 10 per cent thereof".
The committee amendment was agreed to.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARVIN D. NELLS
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7822) for the relief of Marvin D. Nells.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?
Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. HALL objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommenced to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEBRA LYNE SANDERS
The Clerk called the bill (S. 916) for the relief of Debra Lynne Sanders.
Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?
There was no objection.

MRS. MICHIKO MIYAZAKI WILLIAMS
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1274) for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams.
There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:
H.R. 1274

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act.
Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS ADLER
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1821) for the relief of Louis Adler.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?
Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?
There was no objection.

ANNA DEL BAGLIVO
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1871) for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo.
There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:
H.R. 1871

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Del Baglivo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. When the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:
Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Anna Del Baglivo. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Anna Del Baglivo shall not again be subject to deportation proceedings; and the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."
The committee amendment was agreed to.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third
time, and passed, and a motion to recon­
sider was laid on the table.

MRS. GIUSIPPINA RUSSO LUCIFORO
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1415) for the relief of Mrs. Giussipina Russo
Luciforo.

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

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. GROSS objected, and under the rule, the bill was recom­
mitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CARLO ANTONIO DeLUCA
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4032) for the relief of Carlo Antonio DeLuca.

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

Mr. McEWEN and Mr. HALL objected, and under the rule, the bill was recom­
mitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WRIGHT G. JAMES
The Clerk called the bill (S. 1196) for the relief of Wright G. James.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

1ST LT. ROBERT B. GANN
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1644) for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM S. PERRIGO
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6726) for the relief of William S. Perrigo.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

KENT A. HERATH
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8212) for the relief of Kent A. Herath.

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

H.R. 8212
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Rep­resentatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to

Kent A. Herath the sum of $676 in full satis­faction of his claim against the United States for the loss of certain personal prop­erty from his official residence in David, Pan­ama, where he was serving as United States Information Service Branch public affairs officer. That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the con­trary notwithstanding. Any person violat­ing the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon convic­tion thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.00.

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

SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST OF COOPER BLYTH AND GRACE BLYTH
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8350) for the relief of the successors in interest of Cooper Blyth and Grace Johnston Blyth otherwise Grace McCoy Blyth.

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

There was no objection.

CLARENCE L. AIU AND OTHERS
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8351) for the relief of Clarence L. Aiu and others.

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

H.R. 8351
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Rep­resentatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to

Clarence L. Aiu, $562.06; Ralph C. Alex­ander, $228; Donald E. Bereman, $570; Donald F. Berugin, $650.77; John M. Bonvissuto, $1,910.80; Thomas G. Brown, $2,475.45; Norm­an L. Butner, $875; George T. Candy, $1,886; William C. Clark, Junior, $1,257.50; George DeLima, $801; John C. Enlow, $198; Wilfrid F. Geh­rard, $725; Clarence G. Grimes, $650; Emil E. Guenther, $881; Harold W. Hamann, Junior, $235; Chester D. Hand, $1,638.

George T. Harris, $3,084.74; George F. Har­rington, $1,941.50; William L. Hartin, $816.82; Yushio Hirata, $1,250; Guy B. Hud­son, $1,470.10; Ronald H. Inefuki, $483.19; Willard J. Johnston, $1,009; Loren E. Jones, $1,140.93; Leroy E. Joppie, $200; Arthur K. Kawa­il, $892; Lyle V. Kilpatrick, $489; Verden Kim, $876; Albert S. C. Kong, $2,181.40; James Papen, $1,454; Arthur A. Law­less, $1,503.83; Roy S. Makio, $797; Manuel Marin, $6,500; K. Stewart McClelland, $829; Lester D. Muyau, $547; Alexander S. Melligo, $2,584.48; Wallace T. Morikoa, $3,129.19; Thomas J. Morris, $1,284; Judson S. Munsey, $3,463.05; Gary J. Nelson, $401.50; Cornelius E. O'Brien, $1,023; James T. O'Don­nell, $2,336.97; Robert E. Orr, $675; John H. Outcalt, $1,106.23; Daniel J. Pereira, $1,453; James V. Powell, $621; Agnes M. Pratt, $1,144.20; John B. Pratt, Junior, $607.06; Joe C. Price, $947.55; Lloyd V. Richmond, $2,495; Leroy Ross, $80; Kenneth H. Short, $1,768; Wanina G. Short, $1,552; Chester K. Tatsamura, $1,106.50; Raymond S. Toku­moto, $971.22; Charles M. Unten, $3,194.75; Arthur H. Wase, $545; James A. Wens, $449; Homer L. Wilkerson, $2,400; Robert G. Wong, $135; Gordon R. Yen, $400.

Passed, That no part of the amounts appro­priated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or at­torney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the con­trary notwithstanding. Any person violat­ing the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon convic­tion thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.00.

Sec. 2. This Act shall become effective immediately upon its enactment.

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

MAJ. DERRILL DE S TRENHOLM, JR., U.S. AIR FORCE
The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8641) for the relief of Maj. Derrill de S Trenholm, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Rep­resentatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Major Derrill de S Trenholm, Junior, AO-664848, United States Air Force, Outfit Air Force Base, Nebraska, the sum of $472.96 in full satis­faction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount reimbursed under title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects that were lost or destroyed in connection with his acceptance for military service in the United States on August 9, 1963, at the Smit­ty's Van and Storage Company warehouse, Omaha, Nebraska, while the property was stored in a warehouse under a Government contract to pay for services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful,
any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

MAJ. RAYMOND G. CLARK, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 45) for the relief of Maj. Raymond G. Clark, Jr.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

LT. RAYMOND E. BERUBE, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 97) for the relief of Lt. Raymond E. Berube, Jr.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

LLOYD K. HIROTA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 134) for the relief of Lloyd K. Hirota.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

BENJAMIN A. RAMELB

The Clerk called the bill (S. 149) for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

HONORATA A. VDA DE NARRA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 263) for the relief of Honorata A. Vda de Narra.

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

M. SGT. RICHARD G. SMITH, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1892) for the relief of M. Sgt. Richard G. Smith, U.S. Air Force, retired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2571) for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ralph S. DeSocio, Junior, of Pine City, New York, the sum of $1,500 in full settlement of all claims for service rendered in the United States Armed Forces, Navy, for the period of employment with the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.

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

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

There was no objection.

William L. Minton

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4078) for the relief of William L. Minton.

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

H.R. 4078

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William L. Minton, of Tacoma, Washington, Navy service number 358-0001, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $241, the amount of his liability to the United States for overpayments of per diem during the period June 16, 1950, to April 13, 1961, while he was serving as a member of the United States Navy. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said William L. Minton, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section. Any part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MAJ. ALEXANDER F. BEROL, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3684) for the relief of Maj. Alexander F. Berol, U.S. Army, retired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Pacific Missile Range Employees

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3770) for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.

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

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

There was no objection.

William C. Page

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5903) for the relief of William C. Page.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. Harley Brewer

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5915) for the relief of Mrs. Harley Brewer.

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

H.R. 5915

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Harley Brewer (or, in the event of her death, to her estate) of San Ildefonso Pueblo, New Mexico, the widow of Harley Brewer, the sum of $4,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all the claims of the said Mrs. Harley Brewer against the United States for compensation authorized to be paid to him by Private Law 88-860, approved October 14, 1964, but which was not so paid to the said Harley Brewer by reason of his death prior to enactment of the said private law:

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

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

Amend this title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Harley Brewer, deceased."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 strike "to Mrs. Harley Brewer (or, in the event of her death, to her estate) of San Ildefonso Pueblo, New Mexico, the widow of Harley Brewer, the sum of $4,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all the claims of the said Harley Brewer" and insert "the sum of $4,500 to the estate of Harley Brewer, deceased, in full satisfaction of the claims of the decedent."

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Harley Brewer, deceased."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Richard D. Walsh

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7282) for the relief of Richard D. Walsh.
Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

WALTER K. WILLIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8218) for the relief of Walter K. Willis.

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

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

CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8352) for the relief of certain individuals of the Foreign Service of the United States. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 8352

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each individual named in section 3 of this Act, the sum of $2,240; to Anna J. Bryant, $1,625; Ronald G. Green, $1,100; and to Maj. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., $1,000.

There was no objection.

COL. EUGENE F. TYREE, U.S. AIR FORCE (RETIRED)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8642) for the relief of Col. Eugene F. Tyree, U.S. Air Force (retired).

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

H.R. 8642

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Col. Eugene F. Tyree, U.S. Air Force (retired), Louisville, Kentucky, the sum of $3,601.24 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects that were lost or destroyed as a result of a fire of undetermined origin on March 26, 1964, at the Lincoln Moving Storage Company warehouse located in a warehouse under a Government contract: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unenforceable notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

LT. (JG.) HAROLD EDWARD HENNING, U.S. NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4603) for the relief of Lt. (Jg.) Harold Edward Henning, U.S. Navy.

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

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

AUTHORIZING HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., TO ACCEPT AWARD OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF CHRIST

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10132) to authorize the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, a former Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of the Military Order of Christ with the rank of grand officer.

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

H.R. 10132

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Junior, of Massachusetts, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, is authorized to accept the award of the Military Order of Christ with the rank of grand officer tendered by the Government of Portugal together with any decorations and documents evidencing such award, and the consent of Congress is hereby expressly granted for this purpose as required under section 4 of the Constitution. The Secretary of State is authorized to deliver to the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Junior, of Massachusetts, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, the decorations and documents evidencing such award.

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

PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE EMPLOYEES

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Private Calendar No. 162, for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3770) for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.

There was no objection.

The SFBAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

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

H.R. 3770

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each individual named in section 3 of this Act is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the amount set forth opposite his name, which amount represents an erroneous payment of compensation received by him during the period, 1959 through 1964, as a civilian employee of the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California, and was erroneously paid to him due to administrative error.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each individual named in section 3 of this Act, the sum certified to him by the Secretary of the Navy as the aggregate of amounts paid and retained by him during the period, 1959 through 1964, as a civilian employee of the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California, and was erroneously paid to him due to administrative error.

SEC. 3. The amount set forth opposite his name, which amount represents an erroneous payment of compensation received by him during the period, 1959 through 1964, as a civilian employee of the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California, and was erroneously paid to him due to administrative error, is hereby expressly granted for this purpose as required under section 4 of the Constitution, the United States Code, Title 10, United States Code, Section 10132.
Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 471, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 471
Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee on Rules, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the bill shall be ordered to the House, and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown), and pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 471 provides for consideration of H.R. 8469, a bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule, waiving points of order, for 2 hours of general debate; also, it shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and Civil Service now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, Committee on Rules will report a bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question on the order of amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown).

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.
points of order? In that paragraph it says: "And for payment of administrative expenses incurred by the Commission."

Mr. YOUNG, Mr. Speaker, I will defer to the gentleman of the committee, since this is a substantive matter.

Mr. DANIELS. The answer is "Yes" on subsection (b) on page 2. The other relates to section 3, which provides that these increases be paid from the retirement fund notwithstanding the limitation of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman yield to the distinguished subcommittee chairman advise me whether the payment of administrative expenses incurred by the Commission involves the increased annuities to the civil service retirees, or whether that is simply the administrative expenses of the Commission?

Mr. DANIELS. It is my understanding that it is the expense of the Commission. It would involve an increase in the costs for the retirees.

Mr. HALL. That would not involve the $148 million coming out of the civil service retirement fund, referred to by the gentleman from California, Mr. SCHUYLER, for the correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Where is this fund the gentleman is talking about? I thought that was $36 to $38 billion in the red.

Mr. DANIELS. I understand that the fund has $13 billion in cash assets at the present time.

Mr. GROSS. And it is still $36 billion in the red?

Mr. DANIELS. If the Government does not make its annual contribution to the fund, then there is a deficiency.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I favor this resolution and the passage of the bill, which would increase the compensation paid to civil service annuitants who have retired both before 1956 and since.

We have seen here in the Congress throughout the years a steady inflationary trend as result of our Federal Government engaging in deficit financing. This policy has increased the cost of living for all our citizens; it particularly hurts those people who have been living on fixed retirement benefits.

We have seen Congress increase the pay of many Government employees, including its own Members. I voted against the pay increase for myself, because I did not believe it was a proper thing to vote to increase my own pay, but Congress saw fit to increase the pay of its Members and other executive and high-ranking officials of Government, as well as employees of Government both in the civil service branches and in the Post Office Department.

We have seen the Congress enact legislation to increase by 7 percent the benefits paid to social security annuants because it was necessary to give them that large an increase to meet the increase in the cost of living.

They have to eat the same as the rest of us. We have seen this House pass a bill to increase the pay of our troops three times for those serving in the Armed Forces. It is only fair and only right that the Congress give to these retirees the same treatment and consideration that we have given to our armed and almost every other Government employee.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I favor this bill.

I understand that the cost will be somewhere around $90.4 million a year. If we include certain increases in benefits for widows and others who are not covered under the original bill but who, like the rest of us, must eat, the cost will be increased by another $58 million.

There were no minority views filed on the bill; the measure came out of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with a unanimous vote. It was cleared by the Committee on Rules by unanimous vote to let me believe that the House will approve the measure in the same way.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York, Mr. SCHEUER, for 1 minute for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to explain for the record the request that I make to the Speaker that we be allowed the time to reconsider the voting rights bill. I would have voted for approval of the conference report had I not been called off the floor on an urgent matter concerning my district. Unfortunately, I underestimated the dispatch, speed, and efficiency with which my colleagues can act on a matter of such high national priority. I have enthusiastically supported the action of the conference and would have voted to approve the conference report, had I not missed this vote by a few moments.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF SALARY INEQUITIES FOR OVERSEAS TEACHERS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by Direction of the Committee on Rules and on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, (WILLIAM M. COMBS), I call up House Resolution 483 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. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act. After general debate, which shall be limited to the bill and shall not continue to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill, any amendment that shall be in order and arise shall be reported to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the Committee on Rules shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except on motion of recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. MARTIN, for the purpose of which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 483 makes in order the bill H.R. 6845, to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act. It provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. The Speaker has taken the point of order that the situation has become such in the teaching situation in the Department of Defense overseas that it makes it extremely difficult for the Department to secure teachers for the teaching of dependents' children overseas. The bill provides that the secretaries of the various services in the Department of Defense have authority to adjust the overseas salaries of teachers in accordance with the average teachers' salaries in urban communities in the United States of 100,000 or more.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 483.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has just stated to the House the provisions of House Resolution 483. The resolution makes in order the consideration of H.R. 6845. The open rule is an open one, calling for 1 hour of debate. I know of no opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6845 seeks to correct an inequity in the wage scale which has had an adverse effect in the problem of recruiting, that of retaining and recruiting qualified teachers for the schools operated by the Department of Defense, in connection with the overseas military bases of the United States.

In the hearings before the Rules Committee, testimony brought out that while there are indeed other reasons for the problem, lower wage scales than are available in the average urban school systems, do play a part in that difficulty. The problem, that of securing and retaining qualified teachers for the schools operated by the Department of Defense, in connection with the overseas military bases of the United States, plays a significant part in our securing and retention problem. I should add, Mr. Speaker, that this is true in spite of the fact that the Department of Defense has more applications than it has job openings each year. Many of the teaching positions are located in desirable areas, giving the teacher many opportunities not available in domestic school systems, for trips, study, and vacation.

H.R. 6845 will require that the salaries paid teachers in the DOD overseas schools be equal to the average of the minimum, intermediate, and maximum rates paid teachers holding positions of comparable responsibility in our urban school systems.
school systems in cities of 100,000 or more population. The estimated cost of increasing teachers' salaries is $3,065,000 over the present budgetary amounts for such salaries. The average increase for approximately 6,300 teachers is $785 per year, or $300 more than the budget request.

Mr. Speaker, increased pay alone will not secure and retain qualified teachers for the children of our servicemen in foreign lands. Such positions, as I said, have other benefits not available to teachers in domestic school systems. A full and complete study must be made if the problem is to be removed. The Committee on Education and Labor has looked into the matter for tax legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL TAX COURT JUDGE RUSSELL TRAIN RESIGNS BENCH TO HEAD CONSERVATION GROUP

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the resignation of the Honorable Russell E. Train as a judge of the U.S. Tax Court was announced by the White House, and simultaneously an announcement was issued stating that Judge Train has accepted the presidency of the Conservation Foundation effective August 1.

The resignation of Judge Train from the Tax Court of the United States will be a loss to that institution. Judge Train has participated, since his appointment to that court by President Eisenhower in 1957, in many hundreds of important decisions and in his capacity as a judge has been an important influence on the course of the development of tax law through judicial decisions. I regret that Judge Train decided to leave the court because he brought to his job such rich background which peculiarly suited him for service on the court.

Judge Train, immediately before his appointment to the Tax Court, served as assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury for tax legislation. Prior to his service in that capacity, he served as the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means during the formulation of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 during the 83d Congress and, subsequently, served as minority adviser from 1954 until 1957. Judge Train also had experience prior to his service with the Committee on Ways and Means as a staff member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. This combined background enabled Judge Train to make important contributions to the public interest through his service as a judge on the U.S. Tax Court. I know that his presence there will be missed by his colleagues and by the members of the Tax Court bar.

I decided to take this opportunity, while expressing my regret that he decided to resign from the Tax Court, to express to him best wishes on the very important position which he has accepted as the president of the Conservation Foundation. I understand that organization has performed functions of a very valuable nature in the field of population growth, water resources, air and water pollution, recreation planning, conservation education, and plant and animal life, and that it is one of the foremost of many volunteer organizations which have interested themselves in the increasingly important problem in this country of diminishing natural resources. I know that Judge Train will provide a sound and constructive and imaginative leadership to the work of that organization and its allied groups. I wish him well in his new endeavor.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNEs of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNEs of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I noted with some regret the resignation of Judge Russell E. Train as a judge of the Tax Court of the United States. During the past 9 years, Judge Train has made a great contribution to that court. He will be missed. However, I am glad that he is taking over the presidency of the Conservation Foundation, and will continue his good work in the service of the Nation.

Prior to his appointment as a judge of the Tax Court, Judge Train served as assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury for tax legislation and with the Ways and Means Committee. He was clerk of the committee in the 83d Congress and minority counsel in the 84th Congress. In that capacity, he made valuable contributions in the work of the committee. I am certain that all the members of the committee join me in wishing him happiness and success as president of the Conservation Foundation.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ANNUITY ADJUSTMENT

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Sisk). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DANIELs. 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. 8469) to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes.

The HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

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. 8469 with Mr. STRAIGHT 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 New Jersey [Mr. DANIELs] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CONOVER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 8469 is to provide adequate, and desperately needed adjustments in the annuities of Federal civil service retirees and survivors currently on the annuity rolls, to improve the existing cost-of-living adjustment principle by gearing it to a more sensitive monthly price index indicator, and to increase the survivorship protection of spouses of employees and future annuitants.

H.R. 8469 was unanimously reported by the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without a dissenting vote.

Mr. Chairman, I have always felt that the U.S. Government—the largest employer in the United States—should serve as a model for all employers in the private sphere of our economy. Unhappily, this has for the most part not been the case. The Federal Government has been slower to act than in those areas that deal with the retired civil servant. Granted that we have made important steps in the last few years, but we still have a long way to go.

We are all sharply aware, I am sure, that the vast expansion of our economy is a serious problem to active workers. Are we as well aware, however, of the extent of its effect upon our own Federal retirees? I believe it is an evitable feel the squeeze of steadily rising living costs and fixed, meager income? A serious problem to workers, it has in a way for us to forget that in our Great Society,
and particularly in relation to their friends and former colleagues who make up our family of Federal employees.

At a time when $3,000 is deemed to be the borderline below which a couple is in the poverty class, the record shows that more than 75 percent of retired Federal employees are receiving annuities of $3,000 or less, with the difference that respect to survivor annuitants is even more shocking. One percent receive annuities of $3,000 and about 80 percent receive benefits of less than $1,200. These conditions are the result of a decade of neglect of the welfare of older retirees and survivors.

These are the people of whom I speak today—nearly 700,000, a vast majority of whom have been consigned to lives of marginal survival on the fringes of poverty—innocent victims rather than beneficiaries of this country's expanding economy. If any one group in our society has been denied justice, it is those older retirees who have served the Government for 20 or 30 years or more and whose annuities, based on the smaller salary bases in effect then, are literal pittances in the light of present day standards.

A glance through the records discloses that 44 percent of these retirees are receiving less than $1,800 a year. Even more astounding is the fact that 28 percent are paid less than $1,200, and that 10 percent receive annuities so small as to be comparable to $600 a year. The plight of many of our retirees is literally at the point of desperation, and the record is replete with literal pittances in the light of present day standards.

The increase in two parts: The first part is a straight 6 1/2 percent increase. The second part is a cost-of-living increase upon a rise in the cost of living as reported by the Consumer Price Index published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, over the average of the price index for 1962. The price index for June 1965 had risen 4 1/2 percent since 1962.

I might, at this point, anticipate a question which many Members may have. On page 3 of the report on this bill it states that increases in annuity total 10.2 percent for those whose annuities commenced before October 1, 1956, and 5.2 percent for those whose annuities commenced after that date. The actual figures now are 11 percent and 6 percent, respectively. The difference between the actual current figures and those printed in the report comes about because of a rise of eight-tenths of 1 percent in the cost of living since the Bureau of Labor Statistics first printed the report.

This trend in the rising cost of living is indicative of the urgent need for enactment of this legislation.

The 6 percent rise for those whose annuities commenced after October 1, 1956, is arrived at by combining a 1 1/2 percent increase with a 4 1/2 percent cost-of-living adjustment.

Mr. Chairman, I might explain at this time why we have chosen to distinguish between those who retired before the 1956 date and those who retired later.

The 1956 amendments raised the annuities of those who retired after September 1956 by about 20 percent. These amendments, however, did nothing for those who retired before that date. Since that time, the pre-1956 group have received about 10 percent more in the form of increases than those who retired after the 1956 date. Thus, we have made some progress in closing the gap between the two groups. This bill narrows the gap even more.

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to line 5 on page 2. Therein you will find the sentence which begins at this point grants an increase of 15 percent or $10, whichever is least, to the so-called forgotten widows. These are the widows of employees or annuitants who passed away at a time when widows were not entitled to survivorship benefits.

At present, these annuities which in law are really gratuities, are, for the most part, pitifully small, averaging about $10 a month. One can derive that there is a desperate need for us to do something for these singularly deserving individuals.

One of the most salient facts brought out in the record was the fact that the cost-of-living feature for annuities contained in the 1962 bill is not working out very well.

This provision provides that whenever the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall have risen by an average of 3 percent or more for a full calendar year above its average for the calendar year 1962, annuitants shall receive an increase effective April 1 of the next year.

It also projects into the future with provision for similar cost-of-living adjustments when a like percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index occurs after any cost-of-living increase in annuities is placed in effect.

As a practical matter, this is what has happened since 1962. The rise in the Consumer Price Index over 1962 reached 3 percent in November 1964, and has remained above that figure ever since. In fact the latest available index shows a 4 1/2 percent increase as of June 1965. Under the formula in the 1962 retirement amendments, annuitants will receive an adjustment until April 1, 1966—3 years and 6 months after the 1962 law was enacted.

For this reason we are seeking to change this provision. Under the provisions of H.R. 8469, whenever the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall have risen by an average of 3 percent or more for 3 consecutive months, annuities shall be increased by the highest percentage during those months. At the beginning of the third month which begins after the end of such 3-month period. This provision will retain the spirit of the 1962 amendments but will accelerate the effective application of the cost-of-living feature.

The language beginning with line 12 on page 4 and ending with line 15 on page 5 extends the effect of the basic annuity adjustment to widows and children detrimentally to surviving widows and children.

Mr. Chairman, the bill proposes to amend existing laws, from the date of enactment, to provide that the annuities of eligible widows of employees who die after 1967 and are widows at the time of retirement, be computed at the rate of 60 percent of the earned annuity or of the survivor base elected by the retiree. Existing law provides that such computation be at the rate of 53 percent of the earned annuity or selected base.

By proposing to increase the annuity of future survivors under our retirement laws from 53 percent of the annuity to 60 percent, we are proposing a small attempt to maintain some semblance of equity and justice for very deserving people.

The Government was late—as late as 1920—in getting around to doing anything at all about a retirement program for its employees. Almost every private industry in the country had a retirement program in operation when the Government finally found time to follow suit.

The treatment of survivors of employees and retirees has been even more tardy. Not until 1948 did the Government embark upon a program of providing benefits to widows and children of its employees. The benefits provided then, and subsequently, have been paltry in the extreme.

Under the present laws, for instance, 38 percent of all employees on rolls—and there are more than 200,000 of them—are receiving less than $50 a month. Seventy-nine percent are receiving less than $100 a month. Ninety-four percent are getting less than $150 a month.

With full knowledge of the depressing history of insensitive treatment of the
survivors of Federal retirees in the past, we are, in this bill, trying to avoid some of the mistakes that have been made. We can make a start toward doing this by increasing the annuity rate for survivors from 55 to 60 percent.

I want to make it clear that although there are several categories of survivors in our retirement system, this bill provides for a greater percentage increase for the widows and other survivors, for the most part, about widows. By far, the greatest percentage of our survivors consists of widows of former employees.

I must completely subscribe to the theory, Mr. Chairman, that two can live as cheaply as one, but there is a great deal of solid truth to the saying as far as it applies to elderly retired couples. They have certain fixed expenses: rent or mortgage payments, taxes, and so forth, and these fixed expenses go on undiminished after one member of the couple dies. As a matter of fact, the income taxes go up after one dies, since the survivor cannot claim her spouse as a dependent.

The survivor can save a little on food, but not much, since it is proportionately considerably more expensive to shop for one than it is to shop for two. She may also find she can save a little on clothes, but, again, not very much, since elderly couples in straitened circumstances spend very little on self-adornment.

And that is about all the survivor can effect in savings.

Meanwhile, a surviving widow often finds, as she grows older, that there are other expenses to be met which she did not experience when her husband was alive. She finds herself increasingly unable to take care of herself properly without some kind of help. Help costs money. She finds herself becoming more and more dependent upon her doctor and his prescriptions. These, too, cost money. She finds that she must use public transportation for distances which she used to be able to walk. This also costs money. When you are old, and alone, and a woman, the simple business of keeping body and soul together becomes increasingly expensive.

Under the present 55-percent provision, many widows find they cannot make ends meet, no matter how hard they try. This has led to many of them to panic into hasty, ill-advised remarriages, solely to have someone share the crushing burden of poverty with them. This has caused, in far too many cases, heartbreak and misery during those sunsets when all should be serene and secure.

Mr. Chairman, just because we have treated the widows and other survivors of our Federal employees inadequately in the past, there is no justification for accepting this state of affairs as a way of life and a precedent for our future course.

Even with the increased pensions provided for under this bill, the annuities will not be generous. The value of the dollar—which has been constantly changing, and changing downward, ever since 1921—continues to change. And the great depression—continues to move downward. Unless we increase the percentage of the survivor annuities from 55 to 80 percent, we shall be condemning a whole generation of widows to a life of penury, misery, and insecurity.

We can avoid this course, to a certain extent, by increasing the percentage for the annuities of future widows from 55 to 60. This is a first step. I hope that future Congresses will continue the good work and build on this foundation a pension program for survivors that will be worthy of the Government of the greatest and richest Nation on the face of the earth.

Section 3 of the bill is technical in nature and authorizes payment of the annuity increases from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund. The benefits would not be payable unless funds to cover their cost were appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, the conclusion is inescapable that the vast bulk of annuities now being paid are inadequate, that altogether too large a proportion of our annuitants receiving amounts which represent a minimum subsistence level of living. Meanwhile, these annuitants wait and look to us, the Congress, to act.

It has been said many times, but can never be said often enough, that Government has an absolute obligation to its retired workers. That obligation rests squarely, I believe, on the Congress. The present system and immediate adjustments should not be repeated. Let us start with the simple principle that this Nation has no intention of permitting further deterioration of the relative position of its annuitants. Let our goal be that these senior citizens, whose work laid the foundations of the prosperity the country now enjoys, should not be deprived of a just share in that prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the full support of this body for H.R. 8469.

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

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

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman, who is chairman of the subcommittee who spent a great deal of time and effort on this legislation, and the other members of the subcommittee. As one of those who voted to support this legislation in the full committee, I certainly support it on the floor of the House today.

I think the gentleman and his committee have done a very excellent and outstanding job.

Mr. DANIELS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation and I also want to commend the gentleman in the well who is chairman of the subcommittee on retirement, insurance, and health benefits for bringing this legislation before us.

Mr. DANIELS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. At least that much.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Regardless of percentage, there has been an increase in the retirement for all retirees in the past. It is, therefore, a gap between benefits has been closed.

I notice in the second section of the bill—which I believe is justly done—there is an increase in percentage that future survivor may receive of future retiree’s annuity. It has been increased to 60 percent.

Mr. DANIELS. The base is increased from 55 to 60 percent.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I believe this is well merited. I would hope that in the future attention could be given to increasing the amount that older survivors of annuitants might receive by. say, 80 percent.

Mr. Chairman, while the committee bill would increase the amounts of all annuities, the bill does not go as far as I would like. I supported the bill in committee, but I believe these would be treated a little better than they have in the past.

I sponsored six bills providing better treatment for these survivors, all of which are before our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 286 would implement the 55-percent zero formula to annuities of survivors of a retired employee who retired prior to October 11, 1962. This bill would have required a recomputation of the annuities of these people. The administration objected to this requirement on the basis that it would be too difficult to administer.

I hope in the near future your committee will overcome this difficulty by not requiring recomputations, but will provide a straight 55-percent increase in annuities for these survivors whose annuity is based on service which terminated prior to October 11, 1962.

Another bill I sponsored, H.R. 9, would increase the 55-percent formula to 75 percent.

I believe additional benefits for these survivors are fully justified.

Mr. Chairman, my attentions are directed to the extraordinary inequalities in the case of survivors, but more particularly to the “forgotten widows.”

This latter group are surviving widows of employees or annuitants who passed away at a time when their widows were not eligible for any retirement benefits. Congress recognized that special inequalities existed for this class, and under various
laws about 15,000 widows are receiving an annuity averaging $44 a month. I hope that in the near future we can provide for an additional 20 percent in widows' annuities which are based on laws in effect prior to October 11, 1962, and will be in addition to the increases otherwise provided in this bill. Thus, the monthly widows' annuity for the 15,000 widows will be increased 15 percent under this bill, or by $6.60, and then by 20 percent of the new total, or a new monthly annuity of about $81.

Of course, many of the survivors affected by these sections are receiving amounts in excess of $44. However, I am sure you will agree that this is a most modest increase.

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, we have granted only token annuities to "forgotten widows" of pre-1948 laws. In addition, employees who retired before 1956 are still suffering annuity reductions. They are appointed to provide survivor benefits for their spouses, while persons retiring more recently may provide similar benefits by deductions of only 2½ percent.

Survivors of former employers who retired before October 11, 1962, cannot receive more than half of the annuities paid to their spouses, but in the case of those who retired on or after that date, survivor annuities are 10 percent higher.

The figures with respect to survivor annuities are truly the forgotten people in the United States today. At a time when $3,000 does not go very far when a retired couple confronts the usual health problems, the records of the Civil Service Commission show that more than 75 percent of the 482,131 retired Federal employees on the retirement rolls are receiving annuities of less than $3,000. The figures with respect to survivor annuities are even more shocking. Of 205,856 survivor annuities, only 2,237, about 1 percent, receive annuities of over $3,000, and 163,274, about 80 percent, receive annuities less than $1,200, or under $100 per month.

These conditions are the result of neglect of the welfare of older retirees and survivors. There have been many revisions of the retirement laws since the system was established in 1920, all beneficial and liberal. Not only have annuity increases been provided, but the liberalizations were necessary because of basic retirement benefits were liberalized in 1926, 1930, 1942, 1948, and 1956. It was recognized during the early years that when it was necessary to increase benefits for those who would retire in the future, it was equally necessary to increase the annuities of those previously retired. Those who would retire in the future would have the opportunity of salary increases to boost their retirement annuities while those previously retired were seriously handicapped financially.

Consequently, we see that in the retirement increase legislation approved in 1926, 1930, 1948, and 1946, comparable adjustments were not made in the annuities of persons previously retired to equalize them generally with the new retirees. There was no comparable provision in the 1958 law.

Furthermore, in the first part of the decade between 1950 and 1960, annuity increases were approved to match increases in salaries of employees. The annuity increase of $36 for each half year of service previously had been on the retirement rolls in 1952 was roughly equivalent to a salary increase the previous year. An
annuity increase of 12 percent on the first $1,500, and 8 percent on the excess over $1,500. The increase, which was directly related to the salary increase in that year. Since 1955, there have been no annuity increases to match salary increases.

A limited annuity increase of 10 percent was approved in 1958, only for persons who retired before October 1, 1956. It was a partial compensation to pre-1956 retirees who did not receive the benefits of the 1956 retirement liberalization law. This was not a general annuity increase because it was restricted to a particular class of annuitants. It was a partial compensation to pre-1956 retirees who did not receive the benefits of the 1956 act. We can judge its sufficiency by the statement of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission on the first day of the committee hearings in March of this year that the 1956 act increased benefits for retirees retiring after October 1, 1956, approximately 25 percent, while the 1958 compensating adjustment was only 10 percent.

In round figures this leaves older retirees 10 percent behind and others proportionately.

H.R. 8469 is a compromise of many bills introduced in this Congress. I urge passage of this bill, which is my view.

Mr. OLESEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the request of the gentleman from Montana be granted.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 8469.

Over the past years, the annuities paid to our retired civil servants have failed to provide a comfortable existence for them. Although we have attempted to provide salaries for Government employees which have kept abreast of the increasing cost of living, we have been falling behind in keeping the retirement payments in the same proportion. In addition, we have failed to make substantial compensation for those civil servants whose retirement or survivor benefits are based on wages earned when the cost of living was far below what we enjoy today. As a result, over 75 percent of our retired civil servants are receiving annual payments of less than $3,000, thus placing them in the poverty bracket by our economic standards for today.

Previous legislation has attempted to alleviate the effects of inflation on the annuities of Government employees, but this only has succeeded in providing patchwork remedies. Two major changes occurred in 1948 and 1956. These have either become ineffective due to a lapse of time or have not provided overall improvement of the situation.

There have been no annuity increases to match salary increases in 10 years. The 1948 law, enacted on August 3rd, 1948, was directly related to the salary increase in that year. Since 1955, there have been no annuity increases to match salary increases.

A limited annuity increase of 10 percent was approved in 1958, only for persons who retired before October 1, 1956. It was a partial compensation to pre-1956 retirees who did not receive the benefits of the 1956 retirement liberalization law. This was not a general annuity increase because it was restricted to a particular class of annuitants. It was a partial compensation to pre-1956 retirees who did not receive the benefits of the 1956 act. We can judge its sufficiency by the statement of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission on the first day of the committee hearings in March of this year that the 1956 act increased benefits for retirees retiring after October 1, 1956, approximately 25 percent, while the 1958 compensating adjustment was only 10 percent.

In round figures this leaves older retirees 10 percent behind and others proportionately.

H.R. 8469 is a compromise of many bills introduced in this Congress. I urge passage of this bill, which is my view.

Mr. OLESEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the request of the gentleman from Montana be granted.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8469, a bill which provides relief from hardship to those facing the greatest need.

I want to make the point that it is the responsibility of the Government to maintain the annuities of its retirees and survivors at a level which will enable them to enjoy freedom from want and a measure of economic security throughout their declining years.

Retirement income should be fairly and directly related to the level of earnings and length of service and, as a practical matter, must reflect the increased costs of living, the increased costs of comparing with the millions of private industry retirement plans. The basic system of retirement, as provided for by Federal law, is a disaster to our retired civil servants, many of whom are classified in the poverty bracket.

We are dealing whether or not to provide an opportunity for a comfortable existence in retirement for our fellow public servants who have dedicated themselves to the service of our country, many of them being employed over 40 years. It is a way of life that is fast losing its dignity and a spiraling cost of living. Twenty or thirty years ago, it was impossible to plan for the financial demands that would come with the last half of the 20th century. And yet, under the present conditions, we expect these retirees and their survivors to pay the current taxes, meet the fast-increasing medical expenses, and compete economically with members of private industry retirement plans.

The purpose of the legislation before us is to provide much needed adjustment in the annuities of Federal civil service retirees and survivors to bring their annuity rolls up to date by a generous cost-of-living adjustment principle to a more
sensitive monthly price indicator to meet the exploding cost of living; and, provide an insurance in the survivorship protection of spouses of employees and future beneficiaries.

Mr. Olsen of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Schmidhauser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Sickles. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 8469. The purpose of a pension plan is not simply to pay an employee a set amount of money monthly, but to provide him with a certain amount of financial security after retirement. It is the obligation and duty of the Government to assure Federal employees sufficient retirement income to allow them to maintain an adequate living standard during their retirement years.

Increases in the cost of living present a drawback to most workingmen, but they affect the retired in an even greater sense, since the amount that as the cost of living goes up, their income remains stationary. During the hearings on this bill, spokesmen from groups of retired Federal employees stressed the need for immediate passage of legislation increasing their retirement pay. Their testimony clearly pointed out the necessity of helping those who live on small, fixed incomes in dealing with the problems presented by the wage and price rises in our economy.

In view of the fact that a married couple with an income below $3,000 a year is considered to be living in poverty, it has been pointed out that most Federal civil service retirees are getting annuities of a considerably smaller amount, and are therefore in the poverty bracket. These retirees and their survivors are clearly a neglected segment of our economy, and I feel that H.R. 8469 would come to their rescue. This measure would provide increases in annuities where they are most urgently needed.

The bill would also benefit widows of employees who died before a law concerning survivor protection existed. It has also been disclosed that the survivor benefits currently provided are drastically inadequate and accordingly, H.R. 8469 provides for an increase in these benefits.

The aspect of the 1962 amendments to the retirement act dealing with the automatic cost-of-living adjustment has proven inadequate also and H.R. 8469 provides for a percentage increase in benefits whenever the consumer price index rises. The acceleration of cost-of-living increase provisions, along with other provisions make the bill a much welcomed, long needed asset to our Federal civil service.

Mr. Daniels of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schmidhauser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Schmidhauser. Mr. Chairman, this bill to increase civil service retirement annuities is of great interest to me as Representative of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland. My district, a neighbor of the District of Columbia, is heavily populated with Federal employees. These people have communicated to me their concern for their future after retirement. I have been pleased to tell them that the Congress and their friend in Washington is moving along to enactment of a bill providing substantial increases in retirement annuities.

The Congress has written legislative history by enacting a medical care and social security law that acknowledges the responsibility of a nation to its senior citizens. Can we do any less for those Federal employees who do not have social security benefits?

This Nation is engaged in a siege on poverty with some of the assaults aimed at the older workers will be more likely to affect them. Congress has passed bills providing housing assistance for low income elderly, for medical care and for a special administration on aging. However, when you get right down to it, the most direct weapon against poverty is increased income.

There is another compelling reason for passage of this bill. A decent level of retirement income will improve the employment situation considerably and open the way for younger men to advance themselves. This is true because the older workers will be more likely to retire knowing that, instead of having to eke out a living on an inadequate pension, they will be able to better enjoy their remaining years of service and comfort not previously possible under present, below-standard benefits. Unfortunately, at this time, retirement for thousands of people means not a rest from years of labor, but instead the acceptance of a poorly paying job, unsuited to their talents, to supplement a totally insufficient retirement income.

I am particularly pleased by that feature of the bill which provides for closing part of the gap between annuity improvements for pre-1956 retirees and post-1956 retirees. These people are not recipients of charity. They have earned their retirement and their annuities in working years. It is not their fault if the cost of living has risen so rapidly. We must recognize that we are not dealing with the same dollar today as before the 1962 amendments and those incomes were adequate years ago are severely shortchanged today.

I hope that these factors and the reasons set forth so forcefully in the excellent committee report on this bill will convince the Congress to move swiftly toward passage of this badly needed legislation.

Mr. Brophy of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Schmidhauser. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the civil service retirement annuity adjustments before us today and my only criticism of this legislation is that it does not go as far as it should to provide for the needs of our deserving Federal annuitants. Much has been said in recent days in this Chamber and in the press about poverty. According to most of the definitions of poverty that have been preferred, fully 27 percent of the 250,000 survivors of civil service annuitants are poverty stricken, if their entire income is derived from their annuities.

There were a total of about 657,000 civil service annuitants in all categories at the beginning of fiscal 1965, and fully 75 percent of these annuitants received less than $3,000 per year. This, I believe, the President has cited as the borderline between barely living and poverty. Shockingly, nearly 250,000 Federal retirees receive less than $2,400 a year.

One of the main attractions the Federal service has had over the years has been its vaunted retirement system. I submit that this is rapidly becoming a myth. It is rapidly becoming a myth because the Congress has failed to keep faith with those who served our Government and yet have had no control over the cruel inflation that has ensued over the past several years.

It seems that many of our people still assume that anyone who has retired from the Federal service enjoys the best retirement benefits the world has to offer. Perhaps at one time this may have been true. It is certainly a bitter farce today.

I am aware that the President has called for special studies on retirement systems. I am in full accord with this program and applaud it. However, nothing can be done by special legislation or by the reclassification of an annuitant as a result of that study until next year. The need for relief by our retirees is immediate. They need help now.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in strong support of this measure.
Let us begin to fulfill our obligations to the civil service retiree by enacting this bill at once.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if I have lived long enough to speak for the senior citizens, I would like to say for them, blessed be the name of DANIELS. This is the point where I would like to stand, long overdue.

Mr. DANIELS. I thank you.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the member of the committee (Mr. HENDERSON).

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman and the members of the subcommittee. This has been somewhat controversial legislation in years past, at least among the members of our subcommittee. To find here today that this subcommittee after many long hours of deliberation brought out a bill unanimously supported by every member of the subcommittee is a tribute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DANIELS]. I commend to the members of your subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8469. As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee over the past 1 1/2 years, I have seen the Congress adopt the policy of comparability in establishing compensation for our civil employees and tie to this principle cost-of-living increases. In the business world we see cost-of-living escalation clauses written into employment contracts. I am and have been most concerned about the great number of our retirees who retired 20 or more years ago when basic compensation was so much lower. Although these annuitants have had increases in 1948 or 1950, 1952, 1955, 1958, and 1963, their annuities are still approximately 80 percent below the annuities typically received by today's retirees from the same positions.

There are probably today about 30,000 retirees who are receiving only a little more than half the annuities paid to persons similarly placed from the same or similar positions.

It costs the 1945 retiree just as much to live as it costs the 1965 retiree. H.R. 8469 will help to provide the retiree whose service was terminated at a time when salaries were lower a better break and I support it strongly for this reason.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for the work he has done in bringing this measure to the floor of the House. I support H.R. 8469, and urge the House to approve it. I think it tragic that the very people who need the help the most, our retirees and senior citizens, are the ones who receive it the least. I believe that our Federal retirement annuity system is that the recipients of annuity payments are caught in a cost-price squeeze. Their income is fixed, and their expenses go up steadily. The more elderly they become, the less becomes their real income, but the higher become their expenses. As their medical expenses mount, which they almost invariably do during the declining years, their resources dwindle.

This bill attempts, in a small way, to adjust this gross inequity which afflicts almost 700,000 Federal retirees and their survivors. The bill accomplishes a fair and a just result. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the other members of our committee and congratulate the chairman of our subcommittee who led H.R. 8469 to reality.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of this meritorious and badly needed legislation to help meet the needs of our civil service retirees who, for the most part, are trying to maintain themselves on inadequate pensions.

Now is the time for us to act toward improving the living standards of those dedicated civil servants who have given their best when our Government needed them most. The least we can do here, as a grateful employer, is to help raise our former workers and their survivors out of the depths of poverty into which many have been allowed to remain far too long.

Since the inception of the retirement system in 1920, the Congress has enacted over 200 amendments, the great bulk of them improving the retirement benefits of prospective retirees. As desirable as these improvements have been, they have been seldom applicable to persons previously retired. I am fully aware that Congress has improved conditions, and yet only about 400,000 persons are receiving pensions. I am equally aware that many sad disparities remained. Let us correct some of these disparities by giving them some help now.

In the last several Congresses we made salary adjustments for Federal employees and military personnel. At the present time we are considering additional adjustments for these same groups. Are we now to overlook the people who carried the burden of Government for many years?

Almost a half-million civil service retirees are receiving annuities averaging approximately $2,200 per year. Over 200,000 widows and children of former Federal employees and retirees are receiving approximately $800 yearly in survivor benefits. This pathetic situation exists with almost three-quarters of a million beneficiaries of our retirement program at a time when the badge of the impoverished has been affixed to Americans with annual incomes of less than $3,000. The Government has too long contributed to the very poverty it seeks to alleviate by permitting Federal retirees and survivors to live on inadequate incomes.

These victims of our rapidly expanding economy have but one place to look to for relief—that is, to us, the Congress. H.R. 8469 is a partial remedy, modest as it is, but at least an antidote that is readily available and directly accessible to their needs. I know that Members of Congress are greatly concerned over these inadequate pensions. I urge you all to express that concern by overwhelmingly supporting this measure.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], who is the capable ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HENDERSON], who is a member of the subcommittee who led H.R. 8469 to fruition. The bill accomplishes a fair and just result. I urge its adoption.
index, particularly if the retiree had to spend substantial time in a hospital or nursing home. It is well known that medical costs have risen more than any other single item in the Consumer Price Index. Medical studies disclose that almost one-third of our citizenry of age 65 and older are chronically ill, and that illnesses lasting a week or longer as do of the aged last twice as long as those of the younger population.

In recent years hospital charges have increased over 85 percent, hospital insurance rates over 95 percent; medical services over 40 percent; doctors' fees over 55 percent; and drugs and prescriptions over 10 percent. As these elder citizens require more medical attention, with constantly increasing medical expenses, it is quite obvious that these cost items strike them particularly hard. It is equally obvious that deep-pocketed persons physically able to evade them or adjust to them, as might a younger person. As important as cost-of-living figures are, the Consumer Price Index does not represent all of the changes in the cost of living of retirees. Its official name is the "Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers," and it is weighted to reflect the costs of a wage-earning family, the expenses of which are not representative of the expenses of a retired family. Salaries of active workers have gone up somewhat in relationship to increased living costs, but civil service employees have not obtained a comparable increase. Our social security program has done better, relatively, for elder citizens in the private segment of our economy during recent years and, as all Members of this House are fully aware, in the past week. Roughly 40 percent of the retirees and survivors on the annuity rolls are persons whose benefits are based upon pre-1956 law. Their annuities, on the average, would have been $100 less. The remaining 60 percent, constituting those who enjoy the 1956 retirement improvements, would receive increases, again on the average, of about $5 per month.

A third category consists of only 6 percent of the entire annuity rolls, and represents about 43,000 elderly widows of employees or annuitants who died at a time when no survivor protection was provided by law. Congress has recognized the special equities of these forgotten widows over the years, and bestowed upon them minimal, gratuitous annuities, none of whom could be very small of their annuities, averaging only $44 per month, the committee recommends a slightly larger increase than the percentages otherwise provided. In view of these unique equities and benefits, an average adjustment of 15 percent would increase their annuities to about $50 per month.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8469 is a measure that has been developed after protracted and detailed hearings, a resolution of all of the merits and factors concerned. It was unanimously reported by the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits, and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without a dissenting vote. It is an important measure that cannot remain the past. We cannot alter the evidence that the vast bulk of annuities now being paid are inadequate. However, Mr. Chairman, we propose here to provide a partial remedy that is immediately available, and the access to which is direct.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield simply for the purpose of expressing my appreciation to the committee and to the gentleman from California for bringing this legislation to the floor. I think it is long overdue. I certainly support it and intend to vote for it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. CORBETT be printed in the Record immediately following my own.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted, as a member of the subcommittee, to join in this chorus of praise to our subcommittee chairman for his outstanding leadership. It is particularly a pleasure to be able to agree particularly to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], that we shall be able to increase the annuities now being paid are inadequate. In view of these unique equities and benefits, an average adjustment of 15 percent would increase their annuities to about $50 per month.

In my own State there were some 10,683 of these retirees as of July 1, 1964. In the Nation there are close to 700,000. Many of them are living on incomes pitifully low. This is therefore needed legislation and it is good legislation. This bill does not do all that we ought to do for the retired civil service and postal employees of this country, but it is a significant step in the right direction. It does increase their annuities. It does provide for substantially increased annuities, and it does more closely keep up incomewise with the cost-of-living index in the future. It does make greater provision for the survivors of future retirees.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise particularly to join the gentleman from Montana and the distinguished subcommittee chairman and others in expressing my hope that this shall be the beginning and not the end of corrective action by this body. These people, who have given themselves to Government service through the years, in a more equitable position in the future. I specifically hope that we shall be able to increase the annuities, in later legislation, of survivors of civil service retired employees, not covered by the increase to 60 percent in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we shall be able to continue to work toward placing these whom we touch here today, these 700,000 Americans, in a more equitable position. Many of them are living on incomes well below what this Congress has determined to be the poverty line. At a time when $3,000 is declared to be the borderline the records of the Civil Service Commission show that more than 75 percent of the 482,131 retired Federal employees on the retirement rolls are receiving annuities of less than $3,000. The figures with respect to survivor annuitants are even more shocking. Of 205,855 survivor annuitants, only 2,357, about 1 percent, receive annuities of $3,000 or over, about 80 percent, receive annuities less than $1,200, or under $100 per month.

Mr. Chairman, in addition there are internal inequities. People who retired at different times and did not receive the same salary levels during their working period, did not retire at the same percentage level and hence we have a group of retirees who are in the same grade and class but who are receiving different annuities, not the differing times of their retirement.

Those who worked earlier or the older retirees working on small salaries, are receiving smaller annuities. Later legislation is working on the percentage of the annuities and toward increasing salaries for working employees. Hence, inequities have been created and perpetuated.

Mr. Chairman, this bill goes a long way toward correcting such inequity but it does not fully do the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. Did the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman.
that can be done, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] pointed out, after having received recommendations from the present retirement commission and that it will be done certainly earlier next year.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Montana and assure him that this shall have my personal, active support and I am sure the active interest of the full committee. I share the gentleman's concern. We shall be actively working toward that end.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] is a new member of our committee, but he is a member with a heart, he is a member with a conscience, he is a member who works diligently in the important work of our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman for the very constructive attitude and the constructive work which he has contributed toward the enactment of this bill.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate a real leader, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], for taking the action to get this bill to the floor of the House, and I support it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. CORBETT. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, may I read into the Record some additional facts. Insofar as the benefits for survivors are concerned, one can understand some of the present inequities when one sees this analysis, all based on an annuity income of $3,600 per annum.

Those who retired between 1948 and 1949 must pay $360 per annum in order for the surviving spouse to receive $1,800 annually.

Those who retired between 1949 and 1958 only pay $285 per annum for the same benefits.

Those retiring between 1956 and 1962 have to pay but $180 per annum for the $1,800 benefit. Those retiring now pay only $80 per annum but receive benefits for their survivors of $1,980 per annum.

This illustrates the kind of inequity which we only partially correct here, and which we must more fully eliminate in the future.

I support the bill, and urge your support of this much-needed and worthwhile legislation.

Mr. ELIOWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support my colleagues on the committee in the hopes that this meritorious and sorely needed legislation soon can become law. Reasons for enactment of H.R. 8469 are quite evident and have been carefully defined in the committee report.

Certainly, the increases provided in H.R. 8469 can be considered fair, moderate, and, although not truly corrective, they are at least a start at the Nation's civil service retirees who have seen their purchasing power drained by continuing increases in the cost of living. I am pleased to see that some 43,000 widows of Federal Government retirees are receiving increases to assist in their financial plight.

I would like to direct attention to section 2 of the bill which makes it possible for full-time active employees and/or annuitants to receive 60 percent of the earned annuity. I believe in the case of the retiree, we find a true example of the age-old adage that "two can live as cheaply as one"; however, when that one finds herself alone in the world, the costs originally borne by the two end up, generally, being the burden of the survivor.

Let us consider a typical widow of a retiree who has enjoyed living with her spouse for many years in a home which they were able to call their own. The widow has suddenly found herself alone in the world and her expenses started mounting, despite the fact that under the present law overnight the household income dropped 45 percent. The widow found after her first month of being alone that the electric light bill remained the same, despite the fact that under the present law overnight the household income dropped 45 percent. The widow found after her first month of being alone that the electric light bill remained the same, despite the fact that under the present law overnight the household income dropped 45 percent. The widow found after her first month of being alone that the electric light bill remained the same, despite the fact that under the present law overnight the household income dropped 45 percent. The widow found after her first month of being alone that the electric light bill remained the same, despite the fact that under the present law overnight the household income dropped 45 percent. The widow found after her first month of being alone that the electric light bill remained the same, despite the fact that under the present law overnight the household income dropped 45 percent. The widow found after her first month of being alone that the electric light bill remained the same, despite the fact that under the present law overnight the household income dropped 45 percent. The widow found after her first month of being alone that the electric light bill remained the same, despite the fact that under the present law overnight the household income dropped 45 percent. The widow found after her first month of being alone that the electric light bill remained the same, despite the fact that under the present law overnight the household income dropped 45 percent. The widow found after her first month of being alone that the electric light bill remained the same, despite the fact that under the present law overnight the household income dropped 45 percent.

The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for his helpful suggestions.

Undoubtedly, the legislation is a well-thought-out piece of work. I am sure the gentleman from Arizona will be an active supporter of the legislation and the act, as well as a gentleman with a heart and with a conscience towards the welfare of our Federal employees. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, my support will be as active as his.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Arizona.
leadership. This legislation is a step in the right direction toward a sound and lasting policy with respect to Federal employee retirement benefits.

In my studies of retirement theory and practice as a new member of the House Office and Civil Service Committee, I was impressed by the definition of an effective retirement plan, as stated by an associate of the Society of Actuaries in America. This is what he said:

The basic purpose to be served in establishing a pension plan is to enable each employee to enjoy freedom from want and a measure of economic security after he or she is no longer actively employed.

* * * * * * * * * *

Pension plans are very long-term financial operations. To think of a pension plan simply as a promise to pay a stated number of dollars monthly, commencing at some future date, represents a superficial view. The hopes and expectations of employees are continuously built, during the period of employment, around the concept that they will be able to retire under the plan on a dignified basis as soon with enough income to meet their basic needs.

The ideal plan, in my judgment, would provide for the adjustment of annuities, from time to time, to equate them on the basis of length of service and level of responsibility, regardless of when the service was performed. Sharp disparities in treatment of former employees now exist, as evidenced by an example cited in our hearings. On the one hand, an employee who retired in 1945 from a grade GS-6 position, after 26 years of service, whose original annuity was $150 a month, after all subsequent annuity increases, now receives $257 a month. His surviving widow would receive an annuity of $56 a month.

On the other hand, an employee who retires under today's law from an identical position in grade GS-9, with the same years of service, can provide for a widow's annuity of $165 a month and receive, at the time of retirement, $3,000.

This results from the many pay raises during the 20-year period, plus the 1956 Retirement Act Amendments. The GS-9 salary average for the 1945 retiree was $3,917, whereas for the 1956 retiree, the GS-9 retirement Act Amendments improved annuity benefits by more than 20 percent for those retiring thereafter.

While H.R. 8460 is not by any means perfect, it is, as I have noted, a step in the right direction since it gives at least partial recognition to the relative condition of salary and benefit provisions at various times of retirement.

Mr. Chairman, I am the last to believe that we are not to provide all retirees with a decent living and security. The Government attracts well-qualified personnel for its activities with the promise of a well-designed retirement benefits which would provide a reasonable standard of living after they have retired from active service with the knowledge that they and their dependents will be financially secure insofar as the necessities of living are concerned. The post-Service Commission's own records show that the retirement annuities are even more disgraceful. Just how vital a part these retired employees have played in shaping our Government cannot be fully appreciated until one has observed some of the lesser-developed countries in this world which have failed to provide adequate and necessary retirement benefits to their personnel at all levels has put up the greatest of barriers to effective administration of national affairs. Fortuitously, in this country we have no such problem — and it is because of the dedicated men and women who would be the beneficiaries of the legislation before us today, that this is the case.

A retirement annuity, to pass the fairest tests, must meet two conditions: namely, that the annuity for the principal that is sufficient to maintain dignity and self-respect — and to provide an adequate annuity for survivors who suffer the loss of the principal's salary or annuity income.

Congress has taken cognizance of this, to a degree, by providing increases for other retirement programs within its jurisdiction—social security, veterans' benefits, and railroad retirement. It would be a great mistake for us not to do the same for our own civil service annuitants. We have supported constructive legislation aiding the senior citizens of our country with the medicare bill, we have passed legislation benefiting millions of children with the elementary and secondary school bill, and we are presently involved in writing salary legislation designed to attract and retain high-quality personnel. Yet, we have done nothing or nothing comparable to the results of a retirement program that assists, in many ways, to maintain a high level of quality in Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman, a primary concern of Congress is to legislate towards effectuating equity. The bill now before us will deliver justice to a long neglected segment of our population. These are the ones who have borne too long the burden of Federal service in years past, and are now facing the very real threat of living with a retirement income that was inadequate by fair standards a decade ago. Certainly, this Nation has a primary obligation to its own retired citizens, many of whom are septuagenarians and octogenarians.

Mr. Chairman, the mechanisms of this bill will help to guarantee that the greatest percentage increases will inure to the emergent need of those who need them most. The lesser increases designed for those who have benefited by salary increases and improved computation formulas. We cannot, in all good conscience, deny a degree of comparability to these deserving citizens over whom the ever-increasing cost of living has cast a cloud of poverty during the very years that they had been promised would, at least, be uncomplicated and secure.

As a Congress that is well on its way to bringing about the reality of the Great Society, it behooves us to act in behalf of the old who did not get their compensation, our own retired Federal workers. I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 8469.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say that the gentleman from Hawaii has not only eloquently spoken here on behalf of retired civil service and postal employees of this Nation, but he has worked with energy and dedication on the committee. The gentleman has shown a very active interest in making certain that there shall be no inequity based on year of retirement and that present inequities shall be eliminated. He has demonstrated determination that there shall be adequate provision for those folks who have felt the full brunt of all cost of living increases without comparative increases in their annuities. The gentleman has pursued this with energy and dedication, and I thank him for his work on the committee as well as here.

Mr. MATSUHARA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman from Alabama. I join in the commendation earlier attributed to him for the great contribution he has made to the subcommittee.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS).

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would correct an injustice which has existed far too long and I support it. The need for an increase in annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act has been apparent for several years, and I am gratified that we are now proceeding with legislation to correct this situation. That is the purpose of this bill.

The point which I should like to stress is that the recipients of civil service retirement annuities, the recipients of the increases proposed today, are people who have devoted their lives to public service. They are the manpower behind the process of implementing and administering the laws which this Congress enacts. They have borne too long the burden of the ever-increasing cost of living. However, the recipients of these increases have appeared a few years ago, it is clearly inadequate now. The Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1961 already show that 75 percent of the 462,131 retirees now receive annuities which fall below the "poverty line" of $3,000 per year. The figures for those receiving survivor annuities are even more disgraceful.

This bill would correct the inadequacy of annuities to a more satisfactory level. The bill in part makes up for past neglect by providing increases consistent with the rise in the cost of living. It also
provides for automatic cost-of-living increases whenever the Consumer Price Index registers an advance of 3 percent for 3 consecutive months, and makes needed adjustments in survivor annuities.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not restore to retired Federal employees the retirement income which was lost before Congress responded to the rising cost of living by enacting this legislation. It seeks to provide our civil servants with adequate and equitable retirement annuities. It does affirm our intent to maintain retirement annuities in the future at their present levels of purchasing power, and not to let the real value of an annuity decline as prices rise. It is a promise of continuing attention and further action.

For several years I have advocated the legislation on the Civil Service Retirement annuities. I commend the committee for the hard work which it has done in drafting this comprehensive bill, and urge its prompt enactment.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Frso).

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very important bill. This legislation is long overdue. In recent years, retiree living standards have been progressively undermined by the creeping inadequacy of pension purchasing power. I am glad to see H.R. 8469 come before this House for consideration. It constitutes fulfillment of our Government's obligation to provide a continuing and ascertained standard of living for retired Federal employees. This bill proves that we have come a long way toward seeing pensions as moral obligations and not merely dollars-and-cents contracts. This is only proper and just.

In the first place, this bill includes a much-needed increase in existing pensions. This increase will lessen the inequity which has accumulated over the years as a result of the fact that persons retiring today receive far higher benefits than persons of the same grade received when they retired years ago. The increases provided for—which vary according to whether or not the employee retired before October 1956—will make existing pensions correspond better to those presently being granted. Unfortunately, the increase provided for does not correct for the relative income disability that has been accumulating during recent years of prosperity. My own feeling is that we still have not exhausted our backlog of obligation to our retired workers. We must remember that the boom economy we enjoy—which cuts into the value of fixed incomes—is something our retirees helped to create, and in which they participated.

This bill we have before us does not just aim at correcting the past—it also seeks to better anticipate and solve future retiree needs by making the automatic cost-of-living increase mechanism more responsive to changing conditions and consequent retiree needs. At the present, automatic cost-of-living increases are based on changes in the consumer price index over a period of a year, and these cost-of-living increases thus do not generally become available as quickly as they are needed. Under H.R. 8469, automatic cost-of-living living will be computed every 3 months enabling retirees to more quickly get the increased benefits they need. Such increases need to come with the rising costs of living.

I have also heartened to see the surviving spouse's annuity being raised from 55 percent of the earned annuity or survivor base to 60 percent. This is necessary for the future, but we must also consider those who have already come under the woefully inadequate existing benefit levels. I therefore support the amendments to be offered which will make this increase retroactive with respect to some recently granted surviving spouses' annuities, and provide also for a straight increase in older surviving spouses' annuities.

I have long urged increases in Federal retiree benefits and, I am happy to see this idea that once again made the 83d. I have introduced a packet of legislation designed to improve the status of Federal employees—present and retired—as they so much deserve. I am glad to see the Chafee-Sprague amendment of passage today, with its promise of fulfilling at least some of our Nation's obligation to its retired civil service workers.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Haseny).

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8469. Several months ago I introduced similar legislation to provide reasonable and long-overdue adjustments in the annuities of Federal civil service retirees and surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement.

The record, I believe, clearly shows that this legislation not only is overdue but is fair. As a matter of fact, strong arguments may be made that perhaps it does not go far enough even to meet the switch in the relative purchasing power between retirees and the rest of the country.

As this Congress concentrates and acts on poverty, it should not and must not ignore its responsibility to those dedicated public servants who have served so long and well.

This is a modest bill, providing a 3.8 percent increase in every annuity. There are other provisions, thoroughly discussed by other Members, which attempt to bring the older retiree's annuity more into line with the current annuities. I urge my colleagues to approve H.R. 8469 to bring a measure of relief to the older civil service retirees.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 8469, providing civil service retirement annuity adjustments. The range of this bill covers not only the retirees of our civil service, their dependents and survivors, but expands to benefit all those who are members of the Federal framework. It is a travesty of every form of compensation we hold dear to raise salaries of the military and present Federal workers, without also turning to those retirees of the Civil Service, whose pension cuts no fault of their own are overwhelmingly burdened by inflation. They, too, are entitled to a life of dignity, a life of retirement which shows our appreciation for the services they performed and which will provide us a return of contributions made during their working years.

We can no longer neglect to provide this relief where it is most warranted.
We are all painfully aware of the ex-ploading costs of living and the hardships caused those senior citizens who find themselves victims of our expanding modern economy. It is the fault of the individual, rather than of the system which needs long-overdue correction.

This bill would increase the annuities of pre-1956 retirees by 10.2 percent, and that of post-1956 retirees by 5.2 percent. It would go a long way toward closing the gap created by different systems, the fault of the individual, but rather the administration now has its approval except for section 2. We feel or, rather, it is the feeling of the committee that section that is a much needed provision. It is reasonable, equitable, and I think it would go a long way toward closing the gap created by different systems.

It is my privilege to testify earlier this year before the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance and Health of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I return to the plea I made at that time to do something now, and not wait for future studies by committees appointed to report in the distant future. This is one of those cases where actions speak louder than words; the need for present improvements is the first order of business—it is not only reasonable and just, but mandatory. Let these measures go into effect now; and then, in the future, let us continue to remember our retired and active civil service employees. This annuity increase is only one of many needed measures affecting the condition of American workers.

I think all of us are aware of constituents letters in the files, numerous cases citing need and inequity. I think of no more fitting way of showing our thanks and pride in the long history of selfless service and devotion among this Nation's civil employees than by granting them retirement benefits in keeping with the fine service they have demonstrated.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I, too, rise in support of the legislation before us, as it is quite apparent that most of the Members of the House do favor this necessary legislation. However, in the committee report I notice on page 8 in a letter from Chairman Macy to the President from New Jersey Representative Daniels—and I refer you to the next to the last paragraph thereof—it says that the Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this bill would be inconsistent with the program of the President if it includes the provisions in section 2 of the bill. I understand that these provisions are still in the bill. Does this mean, therefore, that the administration is opposed to the bill as it is being presented to us today?

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

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS. If the gentleman will read that letter very carefully, he will find that the bill which was originally opposed by the administration now has its approval except for section 2. We feel or, rather, it is the feeling of the committee that section of the bill is a much needed provision. It is reasonable, equitable, and I think it would go a long way toward closing the gap created by different systems.

There are thousands who get only meager annuities because when they retired the salaries, and the benefits of retirement laws were then low. Many of the retiree survivors fare worse. Letters bring us data on these folks who are receiving amounts as low as $40 per month, $50 per month and until recent years, very, very few received over $200 a month after a lifetime of work.

Let me read extracts from a letter of one of the more fortunate ones. Surely you will agree his lot is a rough one. We, none of us, would like to be in this predicament:

It is with deep regret I have to write you regarding your low pensioned retiree employees. We need more money and we need it badly now. Life is short—we don't need it any worse.

I get a check for $185 out of which I have to pay $101 for rent and electricity. I cannot pay my hospital policy I gave up. We need more money and we need it badly now. Life is short—we don't need it any worse.

We have money to throw all around the world by the millions to nations we can't depend on in times of war. Yet there is nothing to give but a few crumbs to our faithful servants who gave the best years of their lives serving their country and are old men—some sick and can't get a living pension to enjoy those few years to live. It's time we got action now for more money, next year may be too late.

Mr. PEPPER. Sir, you're doing your best for us retired men. I would appreciate it if you would show some of the Congressmen and Senators this letter.

Yes, we have hundreds upon hundreds of similar letters, and some are really heartbreaking. In Florida we have more than 34,000 of these retirees who need help and need this help now.

I strongly support this measure. I believe it does justice, although in some instances delayed justice, to one of the most deserving and important segments of our citizens, the retirees from the Federal service. I warmly commend the able gentleman from New Jersey for this measure and the Members of this Committee whose present annuity is less than $67 per month, making a total increase of more than 6 percent.

A provision that the minimum increase in the surviving annuity of a former employee who died or retired prior to April 1, 1948, shall be 15 percent or $10 per month, whichever is less. This would mean a minimum increase of 15 percent for each of these survivor annuitants whose present annuity is less than $67 per month.

Automatic cost-of-living increases in the future whenever the Consumer Price Index has registered an advance of 3 percent for 3 consecutive months since the base average, instead of waiting for more than a year under the present law.

Increasing the percentage of survivor annuities for persons retiring in the future to 80 percent and the amendments to give all survivors this needed improvement.

Automatic cost-of-living increases in the future whenever the Consumer Price Index has registered an advance of 3 percent for 3 consecutive months since the base average, instead of waiting for more than a year under the present law.

The Members of this Committee whose present annuity is less than $67 per month, making a total increase of more than 6 percent.

I strongly support this measure. I believe it does justice, although in some instances delayed justice, to one of the most deserving and important segments of our citizens, the retirees from the Federal service. I warmly commend the able gentleman from New Jersey for this measure and the Members of this Committee whose present annuity is less than $67 per month, making a total increase of more than 6 percent.
Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Hanley].

Mr. Chairman, the paramount objective of H.R. 8469 is the granting of the financial relief that our Federal retirees and survivors so desperately need. It has been well substantiated by the testimony offered in the hearings, that tens of thousands of our retired employees are in dire circumstances—and that only a comparatively few are in receipt of annuities that permit them to maintain a reasonably decent standard of living.

The word "poverty" is being bandied about these days by people who set their own standards as to what constitutes impoverishment. Certainly, by any standards, and particularly those which the President himself has adopted in connection with his antipoverty program, a family income of $200 a month is a poverty income. Now, since this Congress has not appropriated massive sums of money to provide the citizenry every conceivable need, are we not at least morally obligated to upwardly adjust the poverty level incomes of those people who have so loyally served their Government?

Mr. Chairman, every conceivable front, are we not at least morally obligated to upwardly adjust the poverty level incomes of those people who have so loyally served their Government? It is these facts that must later completely justify the overwhelming need of this legislation—not next year—but now.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate, but nevertheless true, that a survey of our economic activity over the past decade shows a significant amount of inflation. In its simplest definition, inflation means that a dollar buys less today than it bought yesterday. I believe it is safe to say that this burden falls heaviest upon these persons whose fixed incomes do not rise with the times. It is these persons, with this type of income, with whom we are concerned here today. It is these persons, many of whom paid for their annuities with 100-cent dollars, who are being compensated with 30-cent dollars in their twilight years. We are told that 60 percent of those retired from public service, who 20 or 30 years ago were laying plans for their later years in life, and who could not foresee the inflationary erosion of the household budget in the latter half of the 20th century.

There is much concern, Mr. Chairman, for the welfare of our elderly citizens, as is apparent from the legislative record of the Congress the past few months. Is there similar concern for the welfare of our own former employees? Are we as concerned over the economic requirements of their widows and children? These are the people who have been charged with the "noble mission" of those who worked in our Great Society.

These are the same people who worked to make life better for all Americans, but whose dreams of a peaceful and serene retirement have been turned into an inflationary nightmare in our present-day economy. Legislation providing increases should have been enacted in the 88th Congress, and it ran out that Congress prevented passage last year. Meanwhile, these annuitants wait and look to us, the Congress, to act on an increase that is long overdue. How much longer will the Federal Government—the would-be benefactor of a Great Society—turn a blind eye to the present and existing needs of its own former employees? I hope, not long. The subcommittee has acted, the full committee has acted, and we must see that the Congress acts, and we must see that the Congress acts.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no escaping the fact that this body is dutybound to ease the burden placed upon these worthy persons. By taking diligent and favorable action today we will not condemn them to retirement 5 years that will be unpleasant ones. They are the same golden years for which we ourselves, I am sure, are laying plans. They are the same years upon which we all are continuously building our own hopes and expectations—a concept of hopes and expectations that we may be able to retire from our duties on a dignified basis—and with sufficient income to meet the basic needs of our future years.

As support of H.R. 8469 which amends the Civil Service Retirement Act, I say the bill has four major provisions: percentage increases in the annuities of Federal retirees, a cost-of-living increase in annuities, a modification of the procedures to determine and effectuate cost-of-living increases, and a 5-percent increase in the percentage of the life annuities of their husbands to be received by surviving widows.

It is my belief that H.R. 8469 is a good bill worthy of the support and approval of the Congress. It is clearly a compromise measure with its provisions stemming directly from the information produced in our hearings and discussions with interested parties, including the Civil Service Commission.

To my way of thinking the major feature of the bill is the 6¼-percent increase in the annuities of former Federal employees who retired prior to October of 1956. The bill also includes a 1½-percent increase in the annuities of post 1956 retirees. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Retirement and Pen­sions revealed that 75 percent of the 482, 151 Federal retirees receive annuities of less than $3,000 and 80 percent of the survivor annuitants receive less than $1,200. These figures, shocking as they may be, do not of themselves necessarily demand that we amend the Retirement Act. Again it was testimony before the subcommittee directing our attention to the fact that older retirees were concentrated on the lower end of the annuity scale which prompted that 6¼-percent increase. While it was brought up that many former Federal employees receive small pensions because of short periods of Federal service, it was never suggested that these small pensions are responsible for negligible annuities. This 6¼-percent increase cannot be considered an expedient welfare measure designed to help people who are in need merely because they are in need. Testimony offered before the subcommittee of the magnitude of the problem of the plight of Federal retirees stemming from the departure by the Congress from a principle of long standing.

That principle was expounded by Clarence Tarr, president of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, during the hearings. He said:

The reason H.R. 8469 is before us today is that this principle was not adhered to in the major amendments to the Retirement Act enacted in 1956. Unfortunately 1956 became a watershed dividing Federal retirees. Chairman Ma­nley alluded to this division during the hearings when he said:

The other half of the annuity roll was made up of annuitants with benefits based on service prior to October 1, 1956. These annuities had been computed under the liberalized annuity formula installed by the 1956 Retirement Act amend­ments which affected the 1956 retirement rolls. For that reason it was evident that this principle was not being carried forward.

That the Congress recognized the unfairness of this gap was evident in 1958 when a 10-percent increase in the annuities of pre-1956 retirees was enacted into law. The gap is not to be closed upon the enactment of H.R. 8469. As Congressman Daniels has stated, however, this bill will produce a much more reasonable relationship than presently exists between the two groups.

The second major feature of this bill is the cost-of-living adjustment increase to be granted in the third month following enactment. In 1962 legislation called for automatic cost-of-living increases, and the time has come for one. Our subcommittee chairman, Congressman Daniels, pointed out in the report on H.R. 8469 that there is need for modification of the procedures set up in 1962 to handle the principle of the automatic in­crease. The purpose of the changes the committee suggests is to bring the cost-of-living adjustments somewhat closer in terms of time to the actual changes in cost of living.

The third major feature of the bill, year-round averaging showing a 3 percent or more increase in the cost of living, the annuity increase to become effective in the fourth month following that year, H.R. 8469 would institute a procedure whereby an in­crease will be granted in the third month following a 3-month period showing a consecutive 3 percent or more increase in the Consumer Price Index. I feel that this will result in automatic cost-of-living adjustments in annuities in 1962, it is important that we amend the law to make the application of the principle more effective.

The fourth provision of the bill, the 5 percent increase in the percentage of full annuity provided survivors, will apply to the survivor of an employee who retired or is otherwise separated after the enactment of this bill.

It is the recommendation that H.R. 8469 is the best possible bill the committee could produce at this time, and I earnestly urge all of my colleagues to support its passage.
Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBINSON] such time as he may consume.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8469, a bill designed to give some measure of relief to the more than 700,000 retired civil servants of this Nation whose needs have largely been overlooked in our recent efforts to provide necessary increased benefits for those in retirement. Believing that those other citizens covered by social security.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 8469 and I urge its immediate passage.

H.R. 8469 is a bill which deals with retirement and annuities, one of the complex and difficult functions of our U.S. Government. This is an area of human interest, personal needs, and human living requirements and necessities, which requires constant vigilance by Congress. This retirement legislation must be reexamined and reevaluated by the House of Representatives.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide long overdue and exceedingly necessary adjustment in the annuities of retired U.S. Federal employees and survivors presently on the annuity rolls. The present cost-of-living adjustment will be vastly improved by keeping it to the more sensitive and realistic monthly price index indicative.

It is important that Congress recognize the present hardship plight of the U.S. civil service retirees and survivors. In our age of ever increasing food costs and clothing and rent prices we must provide adequate means for the good and worthy people on our retirement rolls. Congress should not cast them aside, nor should Congress force our retirees to exist on a substandard basis.

It is the duty and the responsibility of the U.S. Government to maintain a living standard comparable to what they had while working, and which they rightfully deserve in retirement. Retirement should be a period of well-deserved good living lived earned through our good service during our working years. Retirement should not be a punishment, a period of lower living standards, and real suffering time of need.

The administration has accepted the standard that an income of $3,000 a year is the borderline below which a married couple is classified as being in the poverty class. Yet most of the good U.S. civil service retirees have a reduced income and receiving amounts which are well below this figure. For the Government to permit this injustice to happen is to me not only wrong but unhealthy for our U.S. economy. This is really hardship to our older people who have given efficient, loyal, and devoted service to the U.S. Government and the American people.

We must not forget that in most instances the cost of living for the elderly is higher than for the general population. It is well known that our senior citizens have special food, special housing needs, medical requirements, and longer hospital stays, than any other age group in our society. We must see that our older people can meet their present needs adequately, and can face the future with confidence.

The retirees of this Nation must not face impaired health, increased medical expenses, and a reduced income. We in Congress have the responsibility to act now.

This bill will provide reasonable and urgently needed increases and adjustments. It will provide a 10.2-percent increase for those who retired on or before October 1, 1956, and a 5.3-percent increase for those who retired after this date. This is a good increase, but we should in Congress examine these U.S. retirement pensions and annuities soon, to make sure these retirees have adequate purchasing power for decent and comfortable living. We are able to keep this purchasing power in spite of inflation and rising costs of living.

The initial cost of the first section of H.R. 8469, covering U.S. retirees, will be justified not only by the investment the Civil Service Commission. The second section covering annuities of widows and widowers, which will be paid into the U.S. House of Representatives.

I am confident this bill will promptly authorize this legislation. I pledge to my colleagues that I will recognize the necessity and desirability of this bill, and will act favorably on this legislation by voting for final passage.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I support this measure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just simply want to point out to the Committee that this has been a year of tax decreases. As you know, we have decreased the income tax rate, we have decreased the excise taxes, the hospital stays, than any other age group in our society.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize that people who are living on fixed incomes wherever they may be in the world or in our Nation are the real victims of rising prices. They are the ones who see their standards of living falling as
perhaps the standards of living may be going up for other people because of easy money, easy credit, and increased salaries.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for most of these retirees there is no place they can turn except to their Representatives in the Congress for any help in a situation that has found them going backward instead of forward.

Mr. Chairman, if there is anything at all to this war on poverty, if there is anything at all to the business that we ought to make this a better place in which to live in these United States, it seems to me it is attacking at exactly the right point today.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this House will be doing the Nation a service and our elderly employees a service if we pass this bill unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that that will be the result of our actions here this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of our time on this side.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McVICKER].

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has just enacted a retirement increase on behalf of some 20 million Americans in adopting the Social Security Amendments of 1965—a measure which has been called the greatest single social enactment of this century. I applaud this action, and I supported it.

But I appear today on behalf of a group which is not mentioned in this momentous legislation—namely the some 700,000 retirees of Federal service in our Government whose retirement income is largely unaffected by this legislation. I support passage of the bill in H.R. 8469, which would make an appropriate adjustment on their behalf.

The bill reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service would help to rectify this situation. I am happy to say that what is contained in my bill, H.R. 8709, introduced on June 2 of this year, in that it triggers the effect of the adjustment to the automatic increased cost-of-living principle incorporated in this legislation and extends it to a monthly rather than an annual measure. The earlier legislation had provided that whenever the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall have risen by an average of 3 percent or more for a full calendar year above its average for 1962, a comparable percentage increase will become effective on April 1 of the following year.

But, during hearings conducted this spring it became abundantly clear that the automatic "cost-of-living adjustment" feature contained in the 1962 amendments has not operated as effectively as was anticipated. The rise in the Consumer Price Index over 1963, alcançed 2.6 percent in 1964, reached 3 percent in November 1964 and has steadily risen to around 3.7 percent. However, under the existing formula, annuitants were to receive no adjustment until April 1, 1966. The need for a better measuring rod is thus apparent.

The present inequity suffered by older retired Federal employees is compounded by the fact that their annuities are based on the low salaries for which they worked for their Government. This result is illustrated by the following example, which were presented to the committee:

A man who retired in 1949, for example, after 30 years of service as a postal clerk is entitled to an annuity of $2,328. Under this plan his wife's survivor annuity would be $1,020.

A postal clerk, with the same years of service, would be eligible for an annuity of $3,624 a year—or 39 percent more—while his wife would be entitled to $2,052, or more than twice of the older wife's benefit.

As I pointed out when I introduced my bill in early June, a person who retired 10 or 12 years ago receives from 30 to 50 percent less than one who has retired recently from the same kind of a position. Moreover, the 5 percent increase enacted in 1963 was meant to cover increases in the cost of living only since 1958. It has proven itself to be unworkable.

Mr. Chairman, in introducing my bill on June 21, I said:

I would make an appropriate adjustment to a monthly rather than an annual measure. Under the bill all annuities would be increased by the same percentage as the rise in the Consumer Price Index from the annual average of calendar year 1962 to the month latest published on the date annuity was to begin, or survivor annuities deriving from annuities which began, or survivor annuities beginning on or before October 1, 1956, would be further increased by 6 1/2 percent while annuities which began after October 1, 1956 would be further increased by 1 1/2 percent.

I know that there has been some argument that such action should be delayed. On February 1, 1965, the President created the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems under the chairmanship of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. However, the Civil Service Commission itself, while holding that no changes should await the report of this Committee, scheduled for December 1, 1965, acknowledged that experience to date has shown that the 1962 formula can be improved by shortening the period from one to 12 months. Accordingly, the Commission does not object to this feature since it makes workable a principle adopted in the 1962 amendments.

As I pointed out when I introduced my bill in early June, a person who retired 10 or 12 years ago receives from 30 to 50 percent less than one who has retired recently from the same kind of a position. Moreover, the 5 percent increase enacted in 1963 was meant to cover increases in the cost of living only since 1958. It has proven itself to be unworkable.

Mr. Chairman, introducing my bill on June 21, I said:

If we want to attract and retain high caliber career Federal employees we must offer them an equitable and adequate guarantee that retirement benefits will keep pace with increasing living costs.

That is good personnel practice and it is good business.

By enacting the bill, which does justice and preserves equity for our currently retired civil servants we will not only be benefiting them, but we will be providing assurance to all present employees of the Federal Government that they will not be forgotten when they have retired from years of faithful and dedicated service.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS].

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8469. I want to say, also, that I feel our subcommittee chairman, my distinguished colleague from the State of New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] deserves the plaudits which he has received, because the gentleman has done an excellent job. I want to say, too, that I am extremely happy that this bill went through the full committee with its original support. I think this is illustrated by the expressions of concern for the 19 million elderly citizens in this country today and for the tens of thousands who are dependent upon their meager annuity or pension. I eagerly look forward to the day when the Members on the Republican side of the aisle join again with the Members of the Democratic side of the aisle to make the next bill unanimous, so removing a bit closer the benefits as compared to the needs of the elderly citizens today.

Although much of its purpose has been amply explained by my colleagues, I should like to emphasize the importance of this bill in our overall legislative program.

We have heard much about the Great Society and the war against poverty. But where should this Great Society begin, if not with those who have given the productive years of their lives in the service of their Nation? Can there be a war against poverty if we ignore the veterans who served unheralded in the domestic battlefields of the past? If we seek to aid today worked unselfishly in an organization which did not keep pace with the salaries of private industry, which did not keep its salary structure abreast of the rising cost of living, and which has provided an inadequate retirement program.

When many of our retirees first entered into Government service, I am sure they anticipated monetary benefits approximating those of private industry. A below-comparable pay scale has increased the burden of a low retirement annuity. The lower salary made week-to-week savings difficult, and there was no prospect that future income would be adequate to live in these productive years of their lives in the service of their Nation?

Could our retirees have left the Government for better-paying jobs? This question can best be answered rhetorically. In my opinion, we certainly did not want to encourage our qualified civil servants to find positions elsewhere.
With the growing need for Government activity produced by the increasing pressures of our fast-paced industrial society, there has been a corresponding need for qualified personnel to administer new Government programs. It would indeed be a sad commentary on our way of life if we removed from the Great Society of the future those individuals who unselfishly laid its foundations in the past.

H.R. 8469 is not a panacea, but it is an aid. Most of our 700,000 civil service retirees are living on less than $3,000 in annuities. That is borderline income, below which a married couple is considered to be living in poverty. An increase in benefits by 5 1/2 or 10 1/2 percent is not going to provide a substantial income. But it will help to supplement past savings.

H.R. 8469 remembers the "forgotten widows." These 43,000 widows whose husbands did not survive them when they retired will receive a 15 percent increase, with the maximum set at $10.

One very important aspect of this legislation is the alteration of the cost-of-living adjustment feature contained in the 1962 amendments to the Retirement Act. This feature, which has not as yet become operable, provided that whenever the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall have risen by an average of 3 percent or more for a full calendar year above its average for 1962, a comparable percentage increase shall become effective on April 1 of the following year. The rationale provided for similar increases when a like increase in the Consumer Price Index occurs after any increase predicated upon such feature.

The rise in the Consumer Price Index over 1962, although averaging 2.6 in November 1964, has steadily risen to 3.7 percent at present. However, under this formula annuitants will receive no adjustment until April 1, 1966.

It should be obvious that retirees are least able to wait for cost-of-living adjustments. With the productive years spent in serving their Nation, they are often unable to supplement their income to meet the rising cost of living. These people did not wait to serve when it was convenient; they should not be made to wait unnecessarily for an annuity that reflects the cost of living. H.R. 8469 does not change the substantive policy that the annuity should reflect the cost of living. It does allow for faster reflections by providing for increases in annuities whenever the Consumer Price Index rises by 3 percent or more for 3 consecutive months after any previous increase.

Thus, I am glad that I have had the opportunity to speak on behalf of H.R. 8469. It is needed legislation; it is equitable legislation. I am happy that I can lend my support to make the future a bit brighter for those who did so much for all of us in the past. And I am proud that the Great Society will benefit some of its greatest workers and that the war on poverty will not neglect the serving domestic veterans.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, it is a long past due privilege to raise a voice in support of H.R. 8469.

This bill to provide increases in annuities payable from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund is an aid which has been taken and needed for a long time. Even the wording of the bill itself, when it refers to these increases as adjustments, is perhaps too moderate. For, the truth of the matter is that these increases are equitable and are desperately needed. No longer is it realistic to look at a pension which states its extent in terms of a stated number of dollars payable monthly. In this day and age that just does not make good sense. If a pension plan has real usefulness it cannot remain static because the basic purpose and the underlying philosophy of any pension proposal is that the pensioners enjoy some measure of comfort and convenience in their declining years. Not only is it important that an annuitant be free from want but that they have a feeling of economic security after the expiration of their active employment.

The reason the enactment of this measure is so important is that our retirees and their survivors thought or expected at the time of their retirement that there would be of income of some proportionate to what they had received during their active employment. We all prefer times of prosperity and we all hail these 52 uninterrupted months of prosperity for the American economy. Yet who can deny that the present tempo has posed serious problems for elder citizens caught in the squeeze between rising prices and their fixed incomes in the form of an annuity that remains the same number of dollars they had received before the expansion of our economy. Yes, prosperity is good for most of us but the fact is it's impact on a large group of our senior citizens has been very critical.

The question is about what measure of income puts a person in the poverty class. We hear that if one receives less than $3,000 a year he is a borderline case. Yet, the bulk of our 700,000 civil service retirees have annuities in an amount much less than $3,000.

Mr. Chairman, every time in recent months when I have visited my congressional district, I have been reminded by the elderly the need for the bill. For a long time now I have assured them that they would soon be given consideration. H.R. 8469 is fair. Maybe it does not go far enough but it does provide a directly needed adjustment and after the action of the House on this bill, may be able to say to these retirees with reduced income, impaired health along with increased medical expenses who are existing upon depressed incomes, that they will no longer be the truly forgotten people in this present era of economic prosperity. H.R. 8469 will also give assurance to these annuitants that, in the future, which should have more frequent and hence more flexible and more responsive adjustments in annuities to reflect the increased costs of living. Our enactment in 1962 providing for an adjustment on an annual basis has been shown to be a too-infrequent adjustment. The bill under consideration now will assure an increase in annuities to be reflected immediately upon a change in the cost of living. This should be some assurance to our people who have been so badly neglected in the past will not be forgotten in the future.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8469, a bill which provides for long-overdue adjustments in the annuities that our civil servants must live on in retirement.

H.R. 8469 is a simple, straightforward proposal, to help better the lot of the Federal civil service retirees, whose economic future of our ever-expanding economy, civil service retirees are caught in the economic straightjacket of fixed incomes and rising prices. It is shocking to learn that most of the 700,000 Federal retirees and survivors are receiving annuities of much less than $3,000 yearly, the income below which a married couple is considered in the poverty class. This bill would increase by about 10 percent the pensions of the 700,000 civil service retirees, the annuities of those who retired after that date, but neglected to adjust the annuities of those who retired before.

Mr. Chairman, we have been told that Federal civil service retirees are the forgotten people of the affluent society of the United States today. Well, that is why we are considering this legislation. Let the Congress and the people of the United States not forget these civil servants who spent their lifetimes in the service of their Nation. These men and women have toiled for the Government of the United States; they and their survivors, deserve retirement annuities at least comparable to those who retire from employment in the private sector of our economy.

H.R. 8469 also provides a higher increase in annuities for approximately 43,000 elderly widows of employees who worked in the Civil Service before October 1, 1956, and by approximately 5 percent those which commenced thereafter. The reason for this difference is quite evident: The 1956 reformation of a long-overdue actuarial adjustment in the annuities of those who retired after that date, but neglected to adjust the annuities of those who retired before.

Mr. Chairman, we have been told that Federal civil service retirees are the forgotten people of the affluent society of the United States today. Well, that is why we are considering this legislation. Let the Congress and the people of the United States not forget these civil servants who spent their lifetimes in the service of their Nation. These men and women have toiled for the Government of the United States; they and their survivors, deserve retirement annuities at least comparable to those who retire from employment in the private sector of our economy.

H.R. 8469 also provides a higher increase in annuities for approximately 40,000 widows of employees who retired or who die in service.

Finally, H.R. 8469 would correct the presently slow-moving adjustment principle, based on the fluctuations in the cost of living, to be more sensitive to changes. Under the bill, whenever the Consumer Price Index rises by 3 percent or more for 3 consecutive months the annuities would be increased to the same amount.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8469 is an important step forward in realizing the goal of providing our Federal civil service retirees with an adequate retirement income. I strongly urge my colleagues to give it their support, so that this House may move up to keep those men and women who dedicated their working years to the service of the U.S. Government.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 8469, to provide certain...
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increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund will provide substantial and desperately needed adjustments in the annuities of Federal civil service retirees and survivors currently on the annuity rolls, to improve the existing cost-of-living adjustments applicable by gearing it to a more sensitive monthly price index indicator, and to increase the survivorship protection of spousal benefits of current and future annuitants.

The only general annuity increase legislation that has been enacted since 1955 was the 5-percent increase enacted in 1962. Yet the cost of living rose by 14 percent between 1955 and January 1, 1963, the effective date of the 1962 increase. I think that we should make this effort to allow retired Federal employee benefits from our expanding national economy. American workers today are entitled to more than increases in real wages; and this is particularly true of Federal employees who have benefited from several substantial salary increases in recent years. Retired Federal workers have not been treated as generously as have active employees in this regard. I urge my colleagues to vote for this much needed legislation for retired civil service employees.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, most Americans, I am happy to say, make allowances for their retirement years and most Americans by the time they reach retirement age have a pretty good equity in their homes. Many have life insurance policies.

The one thing that most senior citizens cannot predict is the rising cost of living and inflation. For this reason I am pleased to add my support to H.R. 8469 and I would like to commend the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for reporting out this legislation because it is, in my opinion, a good bill.

It has been reported that, since 1960, the number of persons in the United States below the poverty level that increased from 3.1 million to well over 15 million. It also has been reported that over 10 million are receiving or participating in compensation retirement programs. This is a good bill because it will enable the recipients to take care of what they have in a dignified and deserving fashion.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, the main reason for a retirement plan is to enable an employee to live in dignity and enjoy economic security upon his retirement and through his declining years. It is the responsibility of Congress to maintain the annuities of our retired Federal employees at a level that gives them a living comparable to what they had looked forward to and expected upon their retirement.

Our elderly citizens living on fixed incomes have suffered more than any other segment of our population to the spiraling cost of living. Retirees and survivors are being forced to get by on very low annuities; nearly 300,000 of them receive less than $100 a month. We cannot give up. I propose a couple for a decent living and less than that is considered in the poverty class, and yet the records of the Civil Service Commission show that more than 75 percent of the 462,131 retired Federal employees are receiving annuities of less than $3,000. Of the 205,855 survivor annuitants receive as much as $3,000; and about 80 percent receive less than $1,200 a year—or under $100 a month. Retaining the annuities of persons who retired 15 and 20 years ago up to a fair comparison with the annuities of current retirees. We must improve the existing cost-of-living adjustment principles to provide for an adequate protection of spousal benefits of current and future annuitants.

Mr. Chairman, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee held extensive hearings on annuity-increase proposals, and the committee has recognized the urgent need of retirees living on fixed incomes. The committee is to be commended for reporting out H.R. 8469. I believe it will benefit annuitants and survivors who are most in need.

H.R. 8469 will provide increases totaling about 5.2 percent in all annuities based on service which terminated after October 1, 1956, and will provide a 10.2 percent increase in all annuities based on service which terminated prior to October 1, 1956. The bill also provides up to 15-percent increase in the annuities of widows of persons who retired or who died prior to April 1, 1948. It will change the plan for automatic annuity increases to match increases in the cost of living, and will liberalize survivor annuities for personnel deficiency in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I voice my support of H.R. 8469. The increased cost of living in recent years makes this adjustment in annuities imperative, and I call upon my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 8469 which provides increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

The adjustments proposed in this legislation will appreciably relieve the economic burdens of Federal civil service retirees and survivors presently on the annuity rolls. The record shows that the bulk of the 700,000 civil service retirees and survivors are receiving annuities of much less than $3,000 yearly—the borderline below which a married couple is included in the poverty class. Compounding the effect of the reduced income, these civil service retirees and survivors generally face higher medical expenses and a mounting cost of living. The increases in annuities in the country have lagged far behind rising prices.

H.R. 8469 provides fair and reasonable adjustments to benefit these annuitants currently receiving annuities, and ultimately a 10.2 percent adjustment in those annuities which commenced on or before October 1, 1956, and 5.2 percent in those which commenced thereafter. The difference in relief is aimed at closing an inequity in the gap in annuity improvements for the pre-1956 retirees as compared to improvements which benefited the post-1956 retirees.

The bill also fulfills a moral obligation on the part of the Government in providing for a 5-percent increase in the annuities for some 43,000 elderly widows of employees who passed away at a time prior to the enactment of survivor protection. In addition, the bill would remedy a serious defect in application of the cost-of-living principle in the 1962 amendments to the Retirement Act. While the bill will not alter the substantive policy of the Retirement Act, the revision provides for automatic adjustments in the Consumer Price Index on all survivors' annuities. Thus, whenever the index increases by 3 percent or more for 3 consecutive months after any previous increase resulting from this feature, the level of annuities will be raised.

I hope and trust that passage of this bill will not jeopardize the chances for improvements in the health benefits program for retired Federal employees. This is the contribution contained in the Conference Report on the Social Security Act Revisions—one we must redeem.

In passing H.R. 8469 Congress will demonstrate its ability to meet responsibilities to our senior citizens whodeserve their more productive years to the service of our Government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will give prompt approval to this long overdue legislation. While more and more groups in our society have moved forward to full participation in our economy and our national growth, the men and women who have served our Government faithfully over the years have been left behind.

We should never have permitted the income of the majority of the 700,000 annuitants and their survivors to fall below the $3,000 poverty level. Now we have an opportunity, to right this wrong and to guard against such developments in the future.

This bill will increase the annuities of those who retired on or before October 1, 1956, by approximately 10.2 percent and the annuities of those who retired after that date by approximately 5.2 percent. This difference is necessary to close the gap in the pensions now available to those early retirees. The 1956 amendments were of great benefit to those who retired after that date, but did nothing for those already retired. This legislation will not right the balance completely, but it goes a long way toward that goal.

The other significant amendment would increase Social Security benefits in the determination of the cost-of-living increases. According to the findings of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, this automatic provision has not worked successfully, because of the lag between the increase in the cost of living and its reflected in the annuity checks. This measure, by providing for immediate reflection in the annuities after a 3-month period of 3-month increases in the index, may well solve the problem of fixed incomes immediate relief from inflation. I urge the passage of H.R. 8469.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8469, legislation which
it is imperative that we enact and which is long overdue.

We all know from our own experience how rising costs hit each of us. However, I am sure that no one feels the effects of the rising cost of living more than annuitants living on fixed incomes. The bill before us provides for a much-needed increase for the primary beneficiaries, and, furthermore, it provides increases to bring more closely together the annuities of those who retired prior to October 1, 1956, and those who retired after that date and who have thus far fared better than the "prior to October 1, 1956, group."

It is to the credit of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that it has seen the need to provide higher percentage increases for the approximately 45,000 elderly widows of employees who passed away before survivor protection was enacted into law. The gratuity payment they receive under existing law averages only $44 per month, absolutely inadequate.

Our Federal retirees are at the age where many are chronically ill or can expect more disabling illnesses than the general population, all know the cost of medical care, medicine, and hospitalization. This group can least afford it. The bill before us today will not solve all the problems of our annuitants, but it will be a big help.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in 1962 when we enacted legislation to provide for an automatic increase in annuities, based upon the consumer price index. Unfortunately, the best-of-living adjustment provision has not worked out as well as we had anticipated. The bill before us today seeks to correct this, and future increases in the consumer price index will be more quickly reflected in annuity benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I can recall no legislation which has evoked such support since I have been in Congress. I have received a great deal of mail on this subject and not a single letter or postcard has been against this legislation.

As I have stated, this legislation is overdue, I support it wholeheartedly, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 8469 and urge its approval.

This bill is urgently needed to meet the problem of rising living costs for our civil service retirees and survivors. For many years the needs of this group have been neglected and this action is already in the category of "too little and too late."

Certainly this great Government, which commands our common allegiance, should not delay any longer in assuring at least a minimum opportunity for a dignified and decent retirement to millions who have served America honorably and well.

This bill should be approved without a discussion by the Congress, and speedily sent to the President.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the passage of H.R. 8469. I think we all recognize the dire need for all the older retirees of our Federal Government. Of the more than 650,000 Federal retirees and survivors in the United States, more than 10 percent reside in the State of California.

Inflation has hurt our Federal retirees with all the rest of us. Therefore thousands of our retirees have very low incomes. This is due to two causes, the first being inflation and the other being low salaries at the time of retirement.

The Federal Retired Civil Employees is the champion of these former Federal workers. This association has asked the Congress through the years to introduce bills in their behalf and is just as much interested in being fair to the Federal retiree as the Federal retiree. H.R. 8469 was proposed by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and is a fair bill, although it does not give all that these folks deserve. However, it gives encouragement and will aid retirees who find themselves in most difficult situations because of the inroads of inflation.

An analysis of cost-of-living figures from 1956 to 1964 will disclose there was an increase of approximately 15 percent. Only a part of this gap was covered by the increase of 1962 which became effective January 1, 1963. This bill will correct this deficiency.

Again, let me tell you the reason for my deep concern. In California we have over 70,000 Federal retirees, so you can easily see the reason for my great concern about these developing folks. Because of its climate and environment, California, with the many friendly and desirable locations, such as the San Francisco Bay area, Point A, and Escondido, San Diego, and others, is the goal of retirees. I shall continue my interest in their welfare.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, an article on the front page of last Friday's Washington Post announced that the cost of living last month set a 23-month high—the biggest jump in nearly two years of steady increase.

The consumer price index is over 10 percent higher than it was from 1957 to 1959. The recent increase is blamed on the 6-percent rise in the cost of meat and the 10-percent rise in potato prices, both staple foods.

This increase in the cost of living was no news to me. It was no news to the housewife who shops for her family's food every week. And it was no news to the retiree on the fixed income. To him and his family it is especially cruel. The potato is of steady increase. The potato is mighty common in the diet of many of these retirees. The retiree of the 1940's or 1950's may have left for other jobs where the pay was less than a princely one—it is barely above the limit this Congress has set in its definition of poverty. But the man who retired in 1949 is far below these limits.

We, the more recent retirees, are not buying food at 1950 prices, yet he is paid 1950 wages. What would have happened to our civil service employees if we had not raised their salaries in the past 15 or 20 years? We would have mighty few civil servants—they would have left for other jobs where the pay scale kept up with the economy. But we have done just this for our retirees, and they cannot go out and get another job.

I think it is about time we asked ourselves what our responsibilities are in this area—our responsibilities to the retirees who have served their Government even when they could have made more money in private enterprise, and our obligation to the whole country. A pension plan is not merely a promise to pay a man a certain number of dollars every year as long as he lives. It is a financial obligation to to provide him with enough money to assure them freedom from want and a small measure of financial security. It is our unquestionable responsibility to assure these men and women a living comparable to that which they had at the time they retired and
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were led to expect that they would always have. The impact of the squeeze between fixed income and the rising cost of living is the greatest upon our senior citizens and the Government when we pass legislation here to aid the poverty stricken with incomes below $3,000 and ask our older citizens to live on less?

My friends, the letters from older people trying to maintain a decent home and live in dignity on unbelievably low incomes. I hear from men who are trying to save enough from this pitiful amount so that their wives will have a more decent income than the pittance we will allot them when their husbands die. Some of the cases are heartbreaking.

What are these people asking for? For luxury—they are people with simple tastes who ask only for clothes and a roof over their heads and food on the table. It amazes me that some of them are able to provide even a semblance of these necessities from the amounts we give them. These are not people asking for handouts, they are loyal citizens who have spent their lives working for us, and who were promised that when they retired, they would not be forgotten to live on the charity of their relatives.

Our treatment of them is one economy of which the Congress cannot be proud. H.R. 8469, civil service retirement annuity adjustments, has my complete, unqualified support.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. As a sponsor of legislation to increase annuity adjustments for retired Federal employees, I am pleased that the Committee has taken action on this matter.

My bill, H.R. 6693, would have allowed annuities increases for the 462,000 retirees of the Federal Government. Approximately 75 percent of those annuitants were receiving annuities of less than $3,000 per year at the end of the last fiscal year. At a time when there is growing national concern about poverty, and the poverty label has been applied to those Americans with annual incomes of less than $3,000 per year, I feel that strong action is needed by the Congress.

The bill recommended by the Committee would have a total effect of giving a combined increase of at least 10.2 percent to those whose annuities were in effect on or before October 1, 1956, and not less than 5.2 percent to those whose annuities went into effect after that date.

Mr. Chairman, the elder annuitants are those who are feeling the greatest hardships today as they were Federal employees. The annuities of these people were generally less than they are now. This measure will do much to alleviate the inequities presently imposed on those whose service to the United States contributed to our present well-being.

I urge that this Congress give speedy enactment to this legislation.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the passage of H.R. 8469, a bill which will provide equitable adjustments in the annuities of civil service retirees and survivors. I introduced a measure similar to H.R. 8469 into the House of Representatives, and I was happy to lend my support to the final piece of legislation which was reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The history of civil service annuity adjustments to meet the rising costs of living has been one of too little and too late. At a time when $5,000 yearly is the bare borderline below which a married couple is deemed to be in the poverty class, the record shows that the bulk of our 700,000 civil service retirees and survivors are receiving annuities of much less than such amount.

During the period of employment, the hopes and expectations of employees are built around the concept that they will be able to retire in a dignified manner and meet their basic needs. But as people reach age 65, they require more medical care and the costs of living in retirement are continually rising. I feel it is the responsibility of the Government to maintain the annuities of its retirees and survivors at a level that will give them a living comparable to what they had, and rightfully expected to have, at the time of retirement.

This bill provides fair, moderate, and directly needed adjustments designed to increase annuities where the greatest relief is warranted. It provides an adjustment in benefits of approximately 11 percent in those annuities which commenced on or before October 1, 1956, and approximately 6 percent in those which commenced thereafter. The increase is designed to compensate for the lag in annuity improvements in past years. This legislation would provide a higher percentage increase for approximately 43,000 elderly widows of employees of annuitants who passed away at a time when no survivor protection was afforded him.

The Civil Service Commission estimates the initial increase in annuities to be about $80.4 million. No longer will civil service retirees be forgotten people in the economic life of the United States. This legislation means that our retired citizens, whose hard work laid the foundation of the prosperity our country now enjoys, will not be deprived of a just share in that prosperity.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8469

A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1(t) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251(t)), is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The term 'price index' shall mean the Consumer Price Index (all urban—United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The term 'price index' shall mean the interstate price index, and the price index for the month latest published on date of enactment of this amendment, plus 2(1/2 per centum if the consumer price index (or the survivor of a deceased annuitant the commencing date of the annuity of the retired employee) occurred after October 1, 1956, 11/2 per centum if the commencing date (or in the case of the survivor of a deceased annuitant the commencing date of the annuity of the retired employee) the consumer price index occurred after October 1, 1956. The rate used in determining the increase based on the per centum base month, the following adjustment shall be the base month for determining the per centum change in the price index until the next succeeding increase occurs. Each survivor annuity authorized (1) by section 8 of the Act of May 29, 1930, as amended to September 1, 1950, or (2) by section 2 of Public Law 66-490, shall be increased by any additional amount which may be required to make the total increase under this provision equal to at least 3 per centum over the price index for the base month, the following adjustment shall be made:

"(b) Each month after the first increase under this section, the Commission shall determine the per centum change in the price index. When the Commission determines the per centum change for the period of three consecutive months a rise of at least 3 per centum over the price index for the base month, the following adjustment shall be made:

"(1) Effective the first day of the third month which begins after the date of enactment of this amendment each annuity payable from the fund as of the effective date of an increase, except as follows:

"(1) Effective from its commence date, and the annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 10(d), which annuity was in effect at the date of enactment, and after the effective date of the first increase under this section, shall be increased by the total per centum increase in the annuitant was receiving under this section at
death, except that the increase in a survivor annuity authorized by section 8 of the Act of May 29, 1950, as amended to September 1, 1950, is provided as if the annuity commencing date had been prior to the effective date of the first increase under section 10(d).

(2) For purposes of computing an annuity which commences after the effective date of the first increase under section 10(d), the items $600, $720, and $1,800 appearing in section 10(d) shall be increased by the total per centum annuitant the items 40 and 50 per centum appearing in section 10(d) shall be increased by the total per centum allowed and in force under this section to the annuitant at death.

(3) If the annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

(4) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar, except that such installment shall after adjustment reflect an increase of at least $1.

Sec. 2. Section 10 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2300), is amended by striking out "40" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "60".

The amendments were agreed to.

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 bloc.

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 question was taken, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

YEA—397

NAY—0

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following page numbers:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Barton.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Morton.
The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time and passed.

A similar House bill (H.R. 5915) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF SALARY INEQUIITIES FOR OVERSEAS TEACHERS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the resolution, House Resolution 483, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 6845. Agenda items 1 and 2 in connection with this amendment to stay seated in these respective positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act.

This was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be passed by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have a 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just presented.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. HARLEY BREWER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1196) for the relief of Mrs. Harley Brewer, a bill similar to House bill H.R. 5915, as passed by the House today on the call of the Private Calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

* * *

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1196) for the relief of Mrs. Harley Brewer, a bill similar to House bill H.R. 5915, as passed by the House today on the call of the Private Calendar.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill (S. 1196) and insert the provisions of H.R. 5915 as passed today.

The amendment was agreed to.
understood and agreed to be the size and complexity of the overseas dependents school system as compared to school systems of various sizes and complexities in the United States. In other words, the necessity of making salary comparisons in consideration of size and complexity was recognized during the deliberations on the legislation and the writing of the bill.

Today there are some 160,000 American children who look to the Department of Defense dependents school system and its teachers for the kind of education they could receive were they in the United States. Any diminution in the quality of instruction—whatever the cause—makes these children the innocent victims.

Both the numbers of students and teachers and their diverse geographical locations in fact constitute the overseas dependents school system one of the larger and most complex school systems operating anywhere for American children. It is the ninth largest in point of numbers alone.

According to the National Education Association, a school student population of 100,000 or more is representative of an urban school jurisdiction with 100,000 population in the United States. Against this test, therefore, a fair comparison of the 160,000-student overseas dependents school system properly could be made with an urban school jurisdiction in the United States having several times more population than the 100,000 level prescribed by administrative regulation under the Civilian Law 86-91 and the Kindergarten Teachers Act in H.R. 6845. I cannot too strongly emphasize this point, in view of certain suggestions that have been made for reducing the 100,000 population standard to a ridiculously low level—and other proposals I anticipate here today which would have a similar damaging effect.

Incidentally, let me remind my colleagues that in writing Public Law 86-91 we removed the overseas teachers from the definition of teachers for the purpose of determining their salaries under the Civilian Law 86-91 and the Kindergarten Teachers Act in H.R. 6845. I cannot too strongly emphasize this point, in view of certain suggestions that have been made for reducing the 100,000 population standard to a ridiculously low level—and other proposals I anticipate here today which would have a similar damaging effect.

But, however that may be, the salaries of these overseas teachers now average $785 below the levels authorized by Department of Defense regulations issued in accordance with Public Law 86-91. H.R. 6845 will merely bring them up to the level authorized by the regulations.

Should the 100,000 population standard of comparison provided in this bill and the administrative regulations be revised downward to 50,000, for example, it would mean a reduction of $150 in the average salaries authorized by the bill. This mistake absolv in the burden and the damage in such a change would fall squarely on the students. The already serious difficulty in recruiting and retaining teachers of the required professional competence would be aggravated. Numbers of applicants alone are misleading and meaningless.

One hundred or more applicants for physical education positions can do nothing to meet the need for capable school physical education personnel and, in American history, High-quality teaching skills cannot be purchased at cut-rate prices.

H.R. 6845 as introduced would have tied the additional salaries given to those of teachers with similar levels of responsibility in the District of Columbia school system. This standard was opposed by the administration and the Department of Defense, in particular, because it already authorized by administrative regulations—that is, equating of overseas teaching salary rates to salary rates for teaching positions with similar levels of responsibility in urban school jurisdictions in the United States having 100,000 or more population.

The committee amendments carry out this Department of Defense recommendation that the full range of rates, including minimum and maximum rates, be recognized in making salary comparisons. It is to be noted, in passing, that one of the military departments already is paying its dependents' teachers in Puerto Rico salaries equal to teachers' salaries in the District of Columbia school system.

The salary-determination procedures of H.R. 6845 are intended to require that the salary scheduled for a particular school year will be set in consideration of rates paid in school jurisdictions in the United States for the preceding school year and for the following year. Whether or not the Department of Defense budget must be prepared during the preceding year when salary schedules in the United States for the coming school year cannot be determined. Under Bureau of the Budget regulations, departments may not budget for anticipated increases in wages or salaries based on prevailing rates outside of the Federal Government. Only wage or salary schedules based on wages or salaries actually being paid can be considered.

To sum up, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6845 will reaffirm the policy laid down by the Congress in Public Law 86-91 and, at long last, make it fully effective as originally intended. It will help restore to children of our overseas military and civilian personnel access to the kind of American education which is their right. It will halt the gradual erosion in teachers' morale and overall level of professional competence that has reached a critical point—an erosion far more damaging to the 160,000 students than to the teachers.

I earnestly hope that our committee bill will receive the same overwhelming approval of the House which was given in 1959 to our bill which became Public Law 86-91.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of my colleagues, I believe I can state what this bill is about in 3 or 4 minutes.

We have a very serious problem. It involves some of the largest American school systems in the country. There are 160,000 American children who go to school in American schools overseas.

These are dependents and children of military people stationed in Germany, Italy, Japan, and other locations overseas. They are located in some 200 different locations.

There are about 6,000 American citizens who are teachers in these schools. The dependents schools have B.A.'s. They have M.A.'s. Many of them have teaching experience in this country.

The shocking fact is that these people are now paid an average of $750 a year less than is paid to comparable teachers in this country.

This bill would do something about it. I am concerned about an injustice to the teachers, but I am also concerned about an injustice to the students. These are American children who, through no fault of their own, are forced to live abroad because their parents are serving our country in the Defense Establishment, in the foreign aid program, and in the other vast operations overseas.

These children are not getting the kind of education they deserve because we have not provided the quality of teaching the Defense Department cannot recruit good teachers as a result of the salaries which are paid.

Let me give the cold statistics quickly. The turnover is reflected by the fact that in a recent study made, 58 percent of the teachers were there in the first year. Eighty-one percent of them had been there for 1 year or 2 years. How in the world can we provide a high school or grammar school education when they lack experienced teachers to carry the work along from year to year and to provide continuity? That is the kind of turnover we have had under the present salary schedule.

Another plain fact is that a GS-4, a secretary-typist in the base adjutant's office at one of these air bases, who perhaps has had 2 years of high school and a little business school education, is paid more than a professional teacher because she is under the Classification Act.

There are all sorts of inequities. In the United States the teachers in the Bureau of Indian Affairs are mostly rated GS-7, yet we are providing less than GS-4's for these overseas teachers.

One of the really ironic things is that the Defense Department operates a school in Puerto Rico under a different law and pays its teachers the same salaries paid to District of Columbia teachers.

I could outline the inequities in other ways, but this is the heart of the problem. What will this bill do? How will the bill solve the problem?

This bill will solve the problem by fixing mandatory standards for teachers' pay at overseas dependent school systems equal to the average salary rates in U.S. school jurisdictions of 100,000 or more population. This is a well-recognized standard used in educational statistics all over the country.

It is recognized as the medium grade of the larger American school systems. This bill will put the overseas teachers effective in this next school year to the salary level paid in jurisdictions in this
country of over 100,000 people. It simply
puts in statutory form what the De-
partment of Defense always tries to do,
because their regulations under existing
law fix teachers' pay at the level of 100,-
000 population or more and which we
have been unable to do.

The cost of this bill will be $3 million a
year. This will be $3 million invested in
better salaries and in better schools for
these 160,000 students overseas. This
bill is supported by the National Educa-
tion Association, the Overseas Teachers
Association, the AFL-CIO teachers group,
and the American Legion. It was voted
out of our committee without a single
vote being cast against it. It has broad
bipartisan support. The distinguished
gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]
has a companion bill. The distinguished
gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON]
who will be unable to participate in this
debate with us, has a companion bill. The
gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUMAGA]
also has a companion bill. This bill has broad bipartisanship in the committee and I hope
without a great deal of argument or dis-
cussion here that we can pass this badly
needed bill.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chair-
man, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman
from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chair-
man, I wish to commend the
gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]
for his effective leadership in bringing
this very much needed legislation to
the floor of the House. I rise in support
of the legislation.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I had
hoped for some support in this debate
from the gentleman from New York [Mr.
STRATTON] but because I am unable to
see him here, I ask unanimous con-
sent that he have leave to revise and ex-
tend his remarks in connection with this
bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. STRATTON). Is
there objection to the request of the
gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I
rise in support of H.R. 6845 which would
correct the salary inequities of our over-
seas teachers and I wish to commend the
gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] for
his effective leadership in guiding this legislation through
council and here on the floor.

I joined in the fight to correct this inequity by introducing a companion bill
because I believe that there is need for
the Department of Defense to correct this area-
and as a member of the Armed Services
Committee, I have long been concerned
with the problem of pay for our Defense
Department's schoolteachers overseas.

Legislation was passed by Congress in
1959 which took teachers in these de-
pendent schools overseas out of the regu-
lar classified civil service structure. The
reason for this action was that their po-
sition as schoolteachers overseas was of
professional and, therefore somewhat more difficult to evaluate and
grade than would be the case of regu-
lar civil service personnel. Needless to
say, had these teachers remained in the
classified civil service, they would have
been eligible for all the regular pay in-
creases which have come to civil serv-

or of the committees on defense appro-
priations. The requirement of equity
must be incorporated into the law itself.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I whole-
heartedly support this bill and urge its
adoption today.

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

Mr. UDALL. Yes. I am glad to yield
to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I
take this time to ask a question in order
to get it on the record. I was some-
what surprised this summer when one of
these teachers in transit from one area
from the Philippines in this instance—to
a European destination came to my
office with a Secretary of Defense card
showing she was unemployed and there-
fore entitled to draw unemployment
compensation. I was somewhat sur-
priised to find this is the general situation
with reference to these teachers. They
teach overseas and are entitled to unem-
ployment compensation for 3 months. I hope
that the committee has done something about
this, because certainly it is unfair to our
American teachers the way we do busi-
ness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the
gentleman has expired.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield
myself I additional minute.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman
from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman said a
little while ago one of the authors of the
bill would not be able to participate. I
would like to say for his benefit to the
gentleman from Arizona that the gentle-
man from New York cannot participate
because he is presiding over the Com-
mittee of the Whole.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman
for that information, of which I was
not aware. I had intended to revise my re-
marks to take out what I thought was
a humorous reference here.

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

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

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I
certainly want to commend the gentle-
man who was the chairman of the sub-
committee which handled this bill. I
think he did an excellent job along with
the other members of the subcommittee.
He worked long and hard on this meas-
ure. I certainly want to join with him
in support of this very important legisla-
tion.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman
for his support.

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

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

Mr. KREBS. I, too, as a member of
the committee, want to commend the
gentleman for his hard and diligent work
in bringing this bill to the floor today,
and I want to say further that I am
happy to associate myself with all of the
people for this legislation.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank
the gentleman and thank him for the
contribution that he made to this legislation as a member of the committee.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 5 minutes now to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I strongly feel that there are serious inequities in the compensation of our overseas teaching establishment. I certainly feel that this legislation is a sincere attempt to correct these inequities. I believe that we should provide a basic formula under which these teachers are paid and on which the compensation is based.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) has explained this legislation to you. Certainly he has given you an adequate picture of what we are trying to do in this particular bill. I do not want to take a lot of time. He has mentioned the fact that there will be amendments offered. I do intend to offer, when we are under the 5-minute rule, two amendments which I feel are very important. One of them relates to the salary formula itself. Under the bill the teachers' salaries are fixed at those levels or averages for teachers in cities of 100,000 population or more.

One amendment that I shall offer is to the effect that these teachers' salaries will be fixed to school systems with a student population of 12,000 or more rather than the current 100,000 in the city, but not necessarily students.

The other amendment will be an amendment limiting to 5 consecutive years the appointments of these teachers to the overseas school system. These teachers then would return to this country for 1 year and then would be eligible for another 5-year appointment.

Mr. Chairman, in just a very few moments, that is my explanation. I shall explain in greater detail these amendments when we come under the 5-minute rule.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHEL. Can the gentleman tell us how much of a backlog we have in applications for teachers for overseas appointments? Is that information available at all?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I do not have that information available to me on the spot. I understand there are a number of people who are applying for these positions. They do have a considerable turnover in these positions and continually they have to go out and get new people to fill the vacancies that do exist every year.

Mr. MICHEL. I gather the justification for your amendment is the turnover rather than a lack of applicants because, as I am informed—and as a matter of fact, we have in our own office a number of requests by teachers who have already gone overseas to teach; which raises the question, if these jobs are so attractive why do we have to raise the salary, if there are sufficient teachers who are applying?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I should like to yield to the gentleman from Arizona to answer that question specifically. Before I do, however, I would like to say that one of the problems is that so many of these people who are applying for these overseas teachers positions I feel are not really sincere in their expression of wanting to go overseas to teach. They rather want to go over there as tourists, run around the country, for the fun of it.

Mr. MICHEL. I think of the things we need to do, and one of the things we are trying to do in this legislation, is to raise the professional status of these overseas teachers.

There is one other thing I might add in response to the gentleman from Illinois and that is that our committee has specifically stated that we are going to look into this whole question in considerable detail in the future. I think you will find such an intent in the committee report.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, there are two answers to the gentleman's question. One of them the gentleman from North Carolina has just made better than I could make it. That is the quality problem. The second is that it does not help us at all to have a backlog of 1,000 physical education instructors, if we do not have enough good chemistry teachers, or history teachers, et cetera. The fact that we do have a backlog—and I concede we have—does not mean that we have a backlog of the quality and the specific kinds of instructors that we need.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee this year I was greatly disturbed by two matters disclosed during our public hearings on H.R. 8945.

The first is the glaring failure to carry out the clear policy laid down by the Congress when Public Law 86-91 was passed, and placed on the statute books. The second is the seemingly total disregard of the Government's high moral obligation to provide, for the children of our military and civilian personnel assigned to overseas territories, education substantially equal to that afforded children in the United States.

As chairman of our Subcommittee on Compensation, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), has so ably stated, our chief concern is with the impact of the inferior school program on 160,000 dependent students, who may be removed through no fault of their own. Already we find difficulty in accreditation of some of the overseas schools and the placement of dependent students in suitable schools in the homeland. There is no question but that attention to overseas school facilities, and particularly to the need for high-caliber teachers, has taken its toll and threatens irrepairable future harm if we do not approve the corrective measures provided for by H.R. 8945.

With respect to salaries, the record shows that one of the key objectives of Public Law 86-91 was to bring the salaries of overseas teachers from the Classification Act of 1949 because its salary provisions were completely inappropriate for teaching positions. Our committee, which developed Public Law 86-91, was informed at that time that overseas teachers would be placed in the proposed new salary system on the basis of a conversion formula of 87.5 percent of Classification Act salaries. Under 1959 salary rates these was Indian reservations, grants of from $5,294 to $6,869 for teachers who had been classified at grade GS-7. For those who had been classified at grade GS-8, the salary range was to have been from $6,240 to $8,247. I repeat, these were 1959 salary rates.

Since Public Law 86-91 was passed, the entry or base rate for grade GS-7 has been raised nearly $1,100, while the base rate for overseas teachers has been $789. It is obvious that the disparity is even greater at the maximum rates.

For certain Government-operated schools in the United States, such as schools run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the War Department, salaries are paid for what is considered to be the "journeyman" teacher's rate. Presently, the entrance rate is $6,050, the top rate is $7,850, and the fourth step, which tends to be the average rate, is $6,650.

The average overseas teacher's salary in the fiscal year 1965, according to testimony by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, is only $5,030, or $1,220 a year less than the average paid a teacher on an Indian reservation. If we were to apply the 87.5-percent conversion formula of Public Law 86-91, the average should be 87.5 percent of $6,850, or $5,918. Based on official Civil Service Commission testimony, then, the overseas teachers on an average have been shortchanged by approximately $789 a year. Under the circumstances, how can we blame the teachers for feeling that there has been a cutback?

It should be noted, too, that this $789 salary shortage is calculated on figures before enactment of the liberal new salary increases now awaiting approval for the Classification Act and other statutory salary systems enjoyed by 1.8 million other Federal employees.

But this overly frugal treatment of overseas teachers' salaries is only the outward evidence of the far more dangerous internal condition. Plainly, the intent of the Civil Service Commission's Public Law 86-91 has not been carried out—a circumstance warranting very thoughtful examination in and of itself. The overarching question of the moment, however, is simply this: What is the ultimate result—the real injury of this serious act of congressional negligence? We are in any way minimizing the failure of responsible officials to implement fully Public Law 86-91, or the harsh inequity visited upon the teachers, I concur heartily in our subcommittee chairman's view that the greatest
mischief is being imposed on the innocent students.

Our Federal Government has been dependent on the military and foolish in forecasting cutrate salaries on these teachers. The meat-ax approach which has kept the teachers' pay so far in arrears has done nothing but weaken and cheapen educational opportunities for the children of our military and civilian dependents. It is my duty as chairman to carry out our critical overseas commitments.

Enactment of our committee bill, H.R. 6845, is essential to carry out—finally—the objectives they intended in Public Law 86-91. The bill provides a mandate for this purpose—an obvious need to replace the authorization in present law which has not been implemented.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to give this worthy measure overwhelming support.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY), the author of a similar bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I introduced an identical bill to H.R. 6845. This legislation is badly needed to correct from the basic compensation of our overseas teachers.

Mr. Chairman, there is a very serious situation affecting approximately 160,000 children attending overseas schools of our military abroad. At this time there are employed about 7,600 overseas teachers who are grossly underpaid. Needless to say, if we wish to give these children the type of education that they deserve, then we must be willing to pay the price, and the most important thing in a classroom, outside of the child, is the caliber of the teacher. Constant low pay breeds constant low-caliber teachers.

Favorable action today on this legislation will go a long way in upgrading our overseas schools to the position that they so rightly belong. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6845.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD), the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset, I speak as a former member of the Committee on Appropriations that for the last few years has had the responsibility of funding the overseas dependent school system. For 12 years I served on a subcommittee for the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON). This subcommittee has the responsibility of looking into the overseas dependents school system, of approving or modifying the recommendations of the executive branch of the government for this school system.

In the course of a number of trips overseas during the 12 years I served on the committee, I did visit and examine the schools themselves, the performance of areas that the Department of Defense has operated.

I have a somewhat different view, perhaps, than those expressed here a few minutes ago. I believe we have a good dependents school system. I think the quality of the teachers in that school system is very good with few exceptions. On the other hand, I have some reservations on approval of the bill to fix salaries in the teaching group in the dependent school system. Unfortunately, whenever the pay demands that this limited group had asked for were not granted by the Secretary of Defense, the subcommittee, or the Congress, it brought a few vitriolic, bitter letters to Members of the House, and I assume Members of the Senate, condemning the attitude of the executive branch of the Government and of the Congress.

I would not put in the Record of the House of Representatives some of the letters that were received by me and others which letters were from a very limited number of those teaching in the overseas dependent school system. These letters I might say were a disgrace. The public would be shocked by intertemporal letters written and sent by these few teachers in the overseas dependent school system.

I concede that the group in this school system do need a pay increase. But the poorest way to get it was by the kind of letters that were sent to the Members of Congress from this limited percentage of the teaching staff in the overseas dependent school system.

I said earlier that the teachers in the overseas school system were a good group. I believe the teachers who come from my district who teach in the system for 2 years are in the top layer of the teachers in my particular congressional district. We have more applicants for the program among the best teachers than they can accept.

I would like to add this: These teachers who go overseas help to improve that system. I think they infuse new experience, new ideas, and new energy in the system and in addition when these teachers from my part of Michigan come back home to teach again in their local school system, they are better teachers.

I happen to feel very strongly that the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina is necessary. Particularly is it necessary to have the amendment on mandatory rotation. There are teachers in this system, some of them in administrative capacities, who have been overseas far too long. They ought to come back home and live in America again. They would be better teachers.

So this amendment to be offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is necessary. I understand that the gentleman from Arizona is willing to accept it and I compliment him for his fine and responsible attitude.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman by request.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. I do intend to urge the adoption of the amendment. I think it is a constructive suggestion. I want to say this: There is one other aspect. Further, the gentleman from Michigan has an intense interest in the schools and I know he believes in good schools. I regret the controversy that has developed between him and some misinformed people in this school system and some of the intemperate things that they have said about him.

I want to say here and now, I appreciate his constructive attitude toward this legislation. I look forward to putting this smoldering controversy to bed once and for all by the passage of this bill. It will lay out a statutory salary and we will know what it is and the gentleman from Michigan will not have to be troubled by the criticism that he has had.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Arizona. I do intend to support the legislation, but I do think these two amendments are desirable. I am very happy that the gentleman from Arizona is accepting the amendment on mandatory rotation. I will support the bill whether the other amendment is accepted or not by the Committee of the Whole. I think it is good that these salary scales are being set in the manner in which this legislation proposes rather than to leave it up to the executive branch of the Government to establish it. I am willing to support a bill that has been used in the past, with the subsequent approval or disapproval of the Congress.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for that statement. I think this is a very happy day for me and I think for the overseas teachers because we will spell this out in a fashion that reasserts the authority of the Congress and we will be fixing the salaries and it will no longer be done by the Department of Defense. I deeply think this is a constructive and statesmanlike attitude with reference to this problem.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I do want to say in conclusion, this is good legislation. It can be improved in two instances. I am delighted that the gentleman from Arizona has agreed to accept the one amendment. The other amendment I believe is desirable and I hope it will be approved, but if it is not, I will support it.

Mr. Chairman, the time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, for the wonderful work he has done and the leadership he has provided on this measure. I wish to join my own colleague from the State of Hawaii in his great efforts to see that our teachers overseas receive recognition in the pay bill we are now considering.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of a similar measure I rise in support of H.R. 6845. This bill is designed to correct at least in part gross inequity that has developed in the methods of paying teachers in schools at Defense Department overseas installations.

In brief, the bill will require that these teachers be paid on a level equal to the average of the range of rates paid teachers having comparable positions in urban
serving overseas teachers is presently several hundred dollars per year below the median range authorized by the existing regulations.

Certainly the American children who must attend school outside of the United States because of their father's military assignment should not be short-changed in their educational pursuits by a lack of well-qualified teachers, which only adequate pay can attract.

Certainly American teachers serving overseas should not be subjected to standards of pay that are grossly inferior to what they would receive at home.

Unfortunately, I have received a number of letters which indicate that both of these circumstances do in fact exist.

This bill, by calling for a formula which is variable although positive, because precise dollar amounts are readily ascertainable, is both an important and a long overdue step in the right direction.

I intend to vote for it as a matter of equity and good educational insurance and I call on my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of H.R. 6845, a bill which will correct the inequities in the basic compensation for our overseas teachers.

I recall President Johnson's words on May 28, 1964, at a rally in Madison Square Garden when he said:

I ask you to march with me along the road to the future—where no youngster will go un schooled, where every child has a good teacher and every teacher has good pay, and both have good classrooms.

The President was including American teachers who are teaching overseas in his Great Society. But until the passage of this bill some 6,000 American citizens who are teaching in schools overseas—professional people with B.A. and M.A. degrees—would be receiving a basic compensation of $750 a year less than comparable teachers in this country.

As I have said before, I believe the quality of education is dependent upon the pay received by our teachers. There are 150,000 American children who go to school in American schools overseas. These are dependents and children of military people stationed in Germany, in Japan, and in some 28 other countries. They are located in some 200 different locations.

While educational standards and teachers' salaries have shown some improvement in schools in the United States, this has not been true of our overseas Defense Department schools. In order to remain open, the overseas schools have found it necessary to cut corners, to economize, and to find other means to finance an inadequate program.

I will vote for H.R. 6845 because this legislation will help restore to children of our overseas military and civilian personnel access to the kind of American education which is their right. Every other employee in Government has received some kind of pay increase since 1959. It is my belief that these additional funds will halt the gradual decline of teachers' morale and thus strengthen their capacity to teach our American youth.

This legislation will, I believe, go a long way in upgrading our overseas schools to the position where they rightly belong.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, we seem to be fresh out of speakers on this side.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6845

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section (a) section 4(a)(2) of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (73 Stat. 214; Public Law 86-91; 5 U.S.C. 2353(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the fixing of the rates of basic compensation for teaching positions at the rates of basic compensation for similar positions of a comparable level of duties and responsibilities under the municipal government of the District of Columbia or the United States or of 100,000 or more population;"

The amendments made by this Act shall become effective at the beginning of the first school year which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. UDALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record and be considered as open to amendment at any point.

Mr. Chairman, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments and strike out line 9 and all that follows through line 2 inclusive, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) the fixing of the rates of basic compensation for teaching positions at rates equal to the average of the range of rates of basic compensation for similar positions of a comparable level of duties and responsibilities in urban school jurisdictions in the United States or of 100,000 or more population;"

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

On the first page strike out line 7 and all that follows to and including line 2 on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) the fixing of the rates of basic compensation for teaching positions at rates equal to the average of the range of rates of basic compensation for similar positions of a comparable level of duties and responsibilities in urban school jurisdictions in the United States or of 100,000 or more population;"

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROYHILL OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina to the committee amendment:

In that part of the committee amendment in lines 3 to 8, inclusive, on page 2, strike out "urban school jurisdictions in the United States or of 100,000 or more population" and insert in lieu thereof "public school systems in the United States with enrollments of 10,000 or more students."

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, all of us on the Com-
sation Subcommitteee and, I know, all Members of Congress are very much interested in assuring that the teachers in our nation's school systems are properly and fairly compensated and I believe this bill will do much to alleviate the confusion and dissatisfaction that has arisen over this question. Certainly, I know that the interest, understanding, and sincere effort has been so greatly responsible for bringing this bill to the floor.

While I am in full accord with the principles of the bill, I offer the amendment today to perfect it. The amendment is offered in the same spirit of fairness that has gone into the writing of the bill. As things stand, the present bill calls for the fixing of basic compensation for teachers in our schools at rates equal to those being paid in school jurisdictions in the United States of 100,000 or more. My amendment would substitute for the last phrase the words "public school systems in the United States with enrollments of 12,000 or more students.

Mr. Chairman, the 1963 Federal Salary Reform Act adopted the principle of comparability in establishing rates of pay for Federal employees. This is a sound and just principle which protects the interests of the Government, the taxpayers, and the Federal employees. It makes sense. In a sense, we have sought to reach some formula for comparability in this bill and I believe that is entirely proper.

As the bill was first discussed, the overseas teachers pay would have been computed at the same rates as those paid in the District of Columbia. The committee recognized, however, that although the District is a Federal jurisdiction, it is, after all, only one jurisdiction with which the problem of selectivity does not reflect any cross-section of American school systems. For that reason the bill was amended to base salary rates on those paid in urban school jurisdictions of cities of 100,000 or more.

I believe that if we wish to apply the principles of comparability more fairly for overseas teachers, we need to use a somewhat broader base.

Most American students are in school districts where there are fewer than 25,000 students. Nevertheless, using the 12,500 base would come closer to a national average for pay rates than the terms of the present bill.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that I have discussed this amendment with the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. John W. Macy. Mr. Macy concurs with its purposes and finds the proposed amendment preferable to the provisions of the legislation as proposed in this bill.

In testimony to our committee, the Honorable Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, said:

"The original bill makes the overseas schools recruited throughout the United States from all geographical areas and from

low, medium, and high pay areas. Accordingly, the committee should be essentially a national average.

Mr. Chairman, this is precisely what my amendment is intended to accomplish. A school district of 12,000 student enrollment is, according to the figures compiled by the National Education Association, roughly comparable to a census population of 50,000 or more. According to the same source, the difference between average salaries of teachers in school jurisdictions of over 100,000 or more and average salaries of teachers in school jurisdictions of over 100,000 population is slight.

However, there is a distinct advantage in using the formula I am proposing as a basis of comparison. There are an estimated 441 districts with enrollments of 12,000 or more. All information needed for the purposes of this amendment is available for all of 12,000.

Therefore, we can effectively utilize this information to provide the broader base we are seeking.

The use of school districts of 12,000 students or more obviously offers a better cross section of teachers' salaries and levels of responsibility, and so would be a more accurate reflection of school systems in the United States.

In addition to this, by designating school districts with a specific enrollment as a comparison base, we eliminate distortion that would enter into the generalized selection of population areas. By this I mean that a school district of 12,000 students or more is exactly what it says and we can pinpoint duties and levels of responsibility. On the other hand, a population area of a certain size may not necessarily represent a specific school system. We now have many re- treatment communities where urban population statistics do not reflect proportional school enrollment figures at all.

Enrollment figures of school districts are readily available so as to present no problem in defining them as a point of reference in salary comparability studies.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment more accurately establishes a basis for comparison. At the same time, the broadest reasonable base of school systems throughout the country upon which to compute these salaries.

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

Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, this is the only amendment about which there is any controversy, and as soon as we have settled this I think we can complete the business.

I think the gentleman's amendment ought to be defeated, and let me tell you briefly why.

I have come to a great respect and affection for the gentleman from North Carolina. He is a very able member of the committee.

The overseas teachers are now $1,000 behind per year in pay compared to teachers in the big cities such as the District of Columbia, Chicago, and St. Louis. If you take the middle-size cities, they are $785 a year behind. They have been behind for 6 years. They have had two $100 pay raises in 6 years. If we adopt this amendment, you cut it back $500. When they have been behind this long, and you are sticking the middle level—not the lowest level or the highest level but the middle level—I think we have achieved a balance that should be supported by the committee. This level of 100,000 was adopted in the committee on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina. The original bill had the District of Columbia salary, and they said that is too much. We agreed with him then, and I said that we will cut it down to cities over 100,000 to get a better cross section. Now they want us to back off to an even smaller level. I think we have a moderate middle ground compromise position under the committee amendment which we can stick with. You know, the hard fact of the matter is that the overseas schoolteachers between 1960 and 1965 have had pay raises amounting to 4 percent. That is all. This raises the average of $21. Of the Federal employees have averaged 21 percent.

Now, as I say, it is a friendly disagreement on this amendment. You can vote against it, and I hope you will, but I hope you will vote down the amendment to the committee amendment and will support the committee amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Arizona about the fringe benefits accruing to these overseas teachers. Do they not in some places get cost-of-living allowances that are rather substantial?

Mr. UDALL. Yes, they get them whenever the other Federal employees get them, such as in this country; when the technicians and people in the Classified Service get them, they get them, too.

Mr. GROSS. But they do get cost-of-living allowances?

Mr. UDALL. Yes, they do.

Mr. GROSS. And they also have the privileges of the PX; is that not true?

Mr. UDALL. In the same way that the military and every Federal civil employee gets the use of the PX, they have the privileges of the PX.

Mr. GROSS. So that when Congress makes their pay comparable to the highest levels of teacher pay in this country they are getting what amounts to additional compensation?

Mr. UDALL. In one sense they are, yes. But if you accept the gentleman's argument you have to say, if you are going to throw these people out of the PX or cut their pay over, or refuse them the privileges of the PX.

Mr. GROSS. I am not advocating that.

Mr. UDALL. You would also, in consistency, have to cut down the GS-4's and the GS-5's, and cut their pay, or refuse them the privileges of the PX.

Mr. GROSS. I am not advocating that. I am simply trying to point out
that there would be, I assume, some saving as between the formula which is presently in the bill and that under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from North Carolina. I assume there would be some saving to the taxpayers of this country. I am trying to point out that using the 12,000 formula instead of the 100,000 formula, plus the fringe benefits, overseas teachers would still be well compensated.

I would like to say something else to the gentleman and Members of the House. The only way we are really going to be able to get the troops to take care of the policing and defense of their own countries, and withdraw American troops. They are not putting their troops into Vietnam or anywhere else where we are having difficulty. It is long past the time when they should be doing that defense of their own countries and relieve American taxpayers of some of the bills of expense of this nature. Let the foreign governments take over and let us bring our troops and teachers back home. This is what I am more concerned about. It is not a question of continuing to supply troops and police forces for countries that are well able to take care of themselves.

Mr. UDALL. I would observe that there is much in what the gentleman has said. I hope we can bring our troops home. But our committee has not yet been given jurisdiction over that subject. Mr. GROSS. I understand that. But I say that we are continuing to pour out money for this purpose and many other purposes that we ought to be saving our own taxpayers.

Mr. UDALL. I should hope that we could. The gentleman has a point. Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has asked whether or not there would be a saving under this amendment. I have said that I would say that certainly there would be an average, I have been informed by my staff—an average saving to the taxpayers of over $800,000. I would add very quickly, for the benefit of the Members that with my amendment, under the maximum the teachers in the Overseas School System are going to receive a $1,200 increase above what they are presently receiving. Under the maximum, any teacher with a Master’s degree receive at present $6,015, and under my amendment they would receive under the maximum $7,200.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee realizes that the standards of competence of these teachers overseas are set by the Department of Defense and are not being set by the Department of Education, normally set by anyone having anything to do with an educational agency. I hope very much that the Committee on Education and Labor will undertake very shortly to see that, as we are now going to raise the remuneration of these teachers, proper educational competence be established not by the Department of Defense but by the proper educational agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

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:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL of NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina: Page 3, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(c) The Secretary of each military department shall fix the basic compensation for teachers and teaching positions in his military department, and the amendment made by the average of the range of rates of basic compensation for similar positions of a comparable level in urban and rural school jurisdictions in the United States of one hundred thousand or more population.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UDALL. The amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina: Page 5 of Act (73 Stat. 214; Public Law 85-91; 5 U.S.C. 2335) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

(e) A teacher shall not be eligible to hold any teaching position or positions for a period in excess of five consecutive years, except that—

(1) a teacher who has performed service in and bas been stationed in a provi­

sional overseas appointment, and has returned to the United States for a per­

iod of not less than one year shall be eligible to hold a teaching position or posi­

tions for an additional period of not to exceed five con­

secutive years, and

(2) The Secretary of each military department is authorized, when he deems it neces­

sary in the public interest in individual cases, to provide, in accordance with regulations which shall be promulga­

ted and issued by the Secretary of Defense, for the extension of any such period of five consecutive years to not more than eight consecutive years.

(a) (1) A teacher shall not be transferred without a break in service after a period of eight years.

(b) The Secretary of each military department is authorized, when he deems it necessary in the public interest in individual cases, to provide, in accordance with regulations which shall be promulgated and issued by the Secretary of Defense, for the extension of such period of five consecutive years to not more than eight consecutive years.

(c) A teacher shall not be eligible to hold any teaching position or positions for a period in excess of five consecutive years, except that—

(1) a teacher who has performed service in and bas been stationed in a provi­

sional overseas appointment, and has returned to the United States for a per­

iod of not less than one year shall be eligible to hold a teaching position or posi­

tions for an additional period of not to exceed five con­

secutive years, and

(2) The Secretary of each military department is authorized, when he deems it neces­

sary in the public interest in individual cases, to provide, in accordance with regulations which shall be promulga­

ted and issued by the Secretary of Defense, for the extension of any such period of five consecutive years to not more than eight consecutive years.

(a) (1) A teacher shall not be transferred without a break in service after a period of eight years.

(b) The Secretary of each military department is authorized, when he deems it necessary in the public interest in individual cases, to provide, in accordance with regulations which shall be promulgated and issued by the Secretary of Defense, for the extension of such period of five consecutive years to not more than eight consecutive years.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to fix a limit on the tour of overseas employment of those teachers who come into this program in the future.

The amendment would limit to 5 consecutive years, appointments made to overseas dependents school positions, with the exception that in certain cases necessary in the public interest, an additional period of up to 3 years may be authorized.

A teacher who returns to the United States for at least 1 year would then become eligible for another 5-year appointment overseas.

Testimony from Department of Defense and Civil Service Commission witnesses fully supports this proposal and they have strongly recommended that it be made a part of this bill. Also many of my colleagues have expressed interest in extending such a device to those overseas teaching appointments. I believe such a system of rotation would help improve the quality of these schools and would keep both teachers and students abreast with current events with the realities of day-to-day happenings in the United States. I suggest that a system whereby they return to the United States would be in order so that they may keep abreast with trends in American life as well as new trends in teaching methods and procedures.

Chairman Macy of the Civil Service Commission supports this idea. He told me in a committee meeting:

I would like to suggest that Congress, either in legislation or in legislative history, go on record as supporting the rotation of overseas teachers at least every five years. This is particularly desirable because these teaching staffs from becoming "provincial" or too far removed from American customs, beliefs, and way of life.

The Honorable Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower expressed a similar opinion. Said Mr. Paul:

"We are concerned that this continued and indefinite overseas employment is not generally in the best interest of the United States. It is not only a matter of how the Foreign Service finds it desirable to provide periodic rotation to the United States for its personnel.

Mr. Chairman, I am informed that this amendment would not present any administrative problem and that, in fact, the Department of Defense would welcome such instruction from Congress.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I want to simply repeat what I said earlier, that I believe this is an amendment which I can accept and support. I congratulate both the gentleman from North Carolina and the chairman for maintaining munificence on the part of the Michigan gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], for making this suggestion that we proceed in this fashion. There is a good argument for rotating the teachers and getting them familiar with living in this country.

Mr. Chairman, if the assumption is correct that these teachers in this program are of a superior quality and have had a unique experience, certainly they will be in demand in any school system. So there will not be any problem about them getting a job in any good school system in the United States.

From the point of view of the overseas dependent school system, I think it is very important that these teachers come back home occasionally and teach in an American school system in the United States. I think they could contribute to the local school systems in the United States, and I think it would be wholesome for some of them to get reacquainted with the United States after a 5-year period.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Frooon] and the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Andrews] and perhaps others who have been on the Subcommittee on Appropriations know that the school system that we have is a good one and that the teachers with few exceptions are above average, and that when they come back home they will still have that same quality. In fact, if they have been overseas for 5 years and have not lost their tenure in the system out of which they came, they will probably be placed in jobs better than the ones they have had overseas.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. Is it not true however that several States have State laws concerning certification of teachers and that teachers may be hired for overseas only by the Department of Defense who may not have the educational courses required by the various States back home. Therefore, no matter how qualified they might be, and I agree that as to teachers teaching overseas it would be very desirable to have the same standards in similar respects as in the United States, a local board of education no matter how much they might want to hire this particular teacher may not do so by law because the teacher may not at that time have those educational courses required from overseas be eligible for a teaching certificate in an individual State and this would put them at a disadvantage.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is my recollection that most, if not all States, have exceptions. They give temporary permits for teachers who come under these unusual circumstances. In addition, let me say this. If a teacher has been overseas for 5 years and has not been able to meet the necessary conditions to qualify him or her to teach in a good school system, then that person I think is lacking in the necessary initiative to qualify to teach overseas.

Mr. HOWARD, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. In the State of Pennsylvania for example, one must have taken a course entitled "The History of Pennsylvania." Such a course might not be available to the teacher who may be trying to improve his or her professional standing overseas and, therefore, that

We intend to look into it, and continue to have our eyes on this whole program. We are not only interested in it now, but we intend to follow it up.

Mr. KREBS. But the fact remains these people come back with no assurance there will be work available for them. I think it is incumbent upon us if we are insisting that they return to the United States periodically we should assume the responsibility of providing for them.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I may say to a gentleman that I respect his opinion, and I thank him for the statement he has made. If these teachers are valuable to the overseas department in the 5, 6, 7, or 8 years they have been associated with the overseas school system, if they have been capable of holding down that job, certainly their qualifications would be acceptable in any public school system in the United States.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. It is an established fact that the State of New York and the State of California pay the highest salaries in the United States, yet we are not able to get enough qualified teachers. I think it is safe to assume any qualified teacher in the overseas system can readily find employment here in the States.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment for this simple reason, and I will put it in the form of a question:

Where will the overseas teachers rotate to? I would like to quote from a statement of Dr. Lynn M. Bartlett, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense-Education—in testifying before the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, and this was his testimony on a similar bill, now before the Senate, S. 2228:

All dependent schools are in foreign countries and we do not have comparable positions in the United States to which we could rotate teachers after they have served several years overseas as we do with other employees.

For this reason, if for no other, the amendment should be defeated.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Let me point out also they cannot go into the public school systems, or many of them cannot, because they have been in their present jobs without qualifications which would disqualify them from public school systems of the United States. If they get a job they would have to start at the bottom, therefore they would be starting all over again. I really do not think this is a sound amendment.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I agree with the gentleman from California. Let us defeat this unsound amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Pucinski).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I believe the inquiry on this amendment has clearly demonstrated the lack of wisdom of adopting it at this time.

The gentleman from Hawaii read excerpts from the testimony indicating the difficulty these teachers would have in gaining employment in the States, because they were hired by the Defense Department in the first instance without the certificates which are normally required of teachers in the States.

The gentleman from New Mexico pointed out that the Secretary has indicated they are working on some form of voluntary rotation plan to get these teachers back to the States for refresher courses for some time.

To add to all this, I should like to advise the House that the very distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Education, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Dent) who is a ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor, has already announced previously that his committee is undertaking a full study of this whole program of American schools at overseas military installations.

It would appear to me, in light of all these activities, that no purpose would be served by accepting this amendment today, to force the rotation of these teachers, when I feel reasonably confident that we are going to have a proposal made to Congress to deal with this subject from the House Committee on Education and Labor.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. So that the other Members may understand this particular issue and get it in perspective, can anyone on the committee tell us the number of U.S. Government employees working at military installations, and the percentage who have certificates which would qualify them to teach in the school systems here and the percentage who do not? What percentages are we talking about in respect to this problem?

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct.

Mr. COLLIER. That is not exactly an answer to the question I asked. What percentage are qualified to teach in the school systems here, and what percentage are not?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman does not have the answer.

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to have the answer that there is no answer.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Broyles).

The question was taken; and the Committee, being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 74, noes 38.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Stratton, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Unions, Pay and Personnel Practices Act, pursuant to House Resolution 483, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the pending business is considered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to the House, was passed and read a third time and was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND
Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

Mr. Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?
There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION
Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute. There was no objection.

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL), has said that he may call upon certain privileged resolutions from the Committee on House Administration tomorrow.

SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT
Mr. GRIDER. 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 Tennessee?
There was no objection.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 28, I offered an amendment to H.R. 77. It was ruled out of order as not germane. I have no quarrel with the ruling, nor with H.R. 77 which I supported. I think repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is a step forward. At the same time, I do not think that any work should be required to support a union unless that union won recognition as the result of a free, secret election. Such was the purpose of my amendment. Today I am introducing a bill that would have the same effect, and I urge its prompt consideration.

USDA—CONSUMER FRIEND FOOD INSPECTION PROTECTS CONSUMERS
Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, no program of government touches more people every day than the U.S. Department of Agriculture's meat and poultry inspection service.

When we buy a hot dog at the ball park we eat it without a second thought. But do we realize that there are few other countries in the world where it would be safe to do that?

The Meat and Poultry Inspection Acts passed by Congress require that every meat animal and every bird slaughtered in plants which sell across State lines must pass the rigid examination of USDA inspectors. This is why we can buy meat and poultry almost anywhere in the country with perfect assurance that it is clean, safe, and wholesome.

But the USDA inspection service does more than examine the poultry and the meat. It supervises the whole slaughtering and processing operation to make sure that strict sanitary controls are exercised. Everything that touches the meat or poultry—every ingredient that goes into preparing a product—even in labeling—must be approved by the inspection service to make sure that the consumer is protected from anything that might in any way be unsafe.

Because this is a growing country, and our increasing population is also increasing its purchases of meat and poultry, the inspection service must grow to keep pace with the job. It now takes some 5,700 inspectors to safeguard our national supply of meat and poultry.

The USDA also conducts voluntary inspection programs—for which a fee is charged the user. These programs, which provide sanitary controls and make sure that only wholesome products are sold as fresh and frozen vegetable products, dairy products, and egg products. They are widely used by the food industry—another reason that our consumers are among the best protected in the world.

I submit that these and other consumer protection services of the U.S. Department of Agriculture make an immense contribution to the well-being of every person in this country. They are important to farmers and the food trade, as well as consumers, because only with services like these could the kind of modern food industry we now have be operated—and this is a $70 billion-a-year business.

NEGREOS URGED TO AVOID DRAFT, REFUSE TO FIGHT
Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I could hardly believe my eyes on reading in the press a few days ago of a command to young Negroes in my State to avoid the draft. I don't think I could have believed anything if called upon to do so by the President of the United States. This command has come from a group who have banded together in what they call the Freedom Democratic Party. They are Negroes from Mississippi who are affiliated with the movement. The responsible leadership among Mississippi Negroes refuse to have anything to do with the so-called party or its leaders.

Suggesting to the young colored people of my State, as well as other Southern States, that they decline to honor their draft calls, that they go on a hunger strike and tear up their draft cards has a very familiar ring. But the product was directed to another section of the country a few days ago by an irresponsible group who admit their disloyalty to our country at a time when our sons are dying in Vietnam for the preservation of our way of life and the survival of America. But, Mr. Speaker, as for the leaders of the so-called Freedom Democratic Party, I am not at all surprised.

We have known all along that this movement has been made up, as I believe, and supported by the Communist Party of America. Surely no one doubts it now.

Mr. Speaker, I am today communicating the disloyal acts of these people to the President of the United States and also to the Rev. Dr. King, in this hour of our selective service. I sincerely hope the disloyal acts of those who espouse such irresponsible conduct on the part of our draftees will have the appropriate attention of our President, the Head of Selective Service and the U.S. Department of Justice.

In connection with these remarks I include in the Record copies of press reports on the matter, an editorial from the Mississippi Sunday Press, and also copies of my telegrams to the President and General Hershey, as follows:

FREEDOM DEMOCRATIC PARTY URGES STATE'S NEGROES TO REFUSE THEIR UNCLE SAM'S VIETNAM DRAFT

(By James E. Bonney)
The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party circulated an appeal Friday urging Negro mothers to keep their sons from joining the draft and for Negroes in the armed services to stage hunger strikes.

The Freedom Democratic Party, a civil rights group that led recent civil demonstrations in the Mississippi Delta, printed the plea in a leaflet distributed in Negro communities throughout the State.

The appeal appeared in a monthly newsletter of the party and copies were placed on a bulletin board in the headquarters building in Jackson.

Governor Ross Barnett, a spokesman for the Freedom Democrats, said "the McComb Freedom Democratic Party initially published the letter and although the executive committee of the Freedom Democratic Party hadn't taken any action in it, we decided to reprint it in the official newsletter for distribution across the State.

CHALLENGING

The Freedom Democrats are challenging the seating of Mississippi's five Congressmen on grounds Negroes were not allowed to vote in the elections.

An editor's note in the newsletter said the appeal was authorized by Joe Martin of McComb and Clint Hopson, a law student from New Jersey.

"No Mississippi Negroes should be fighting in Vietnam until all the Negro people are free in Mississippi," the newsletter said.

"Negro boys should not honor the draft here in Mississippi. Mothers should encourage their sons not to go.

"We will gain respect and dignity as a race only by forcing the U.S. Government and the Mississippi government to come with guns,
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dogs, and trucks to take our sons away to fights and die without a cause. The white American can get richer. We will be looked upon as traitors by all the colored people of the world if the Negro people continue to fight and die without a cause.

"Last week a white soldier from New Jersey was discharged from the Army because he refused to fight in Vietnam; he went on a hunger strike, and the same thing. We can write and ask our sons if they know what they are fighting for. If he awakens a Negro, that's what we are fighting for here in Mississippi.

"And if he says democracy, tell him the truth—we don't know anything about communism, socialism, and all that, but we do know that Negroes have caught hell right here under the American democracy. But a Congressman who has supported the Freedom Democrats labeled the latest appeal as "ridiculous and completely irresponsible."

"Negroes Urged To Avoid Draft, Refuse To Fight—Freedom Democrats Ask Mothers To Encourage Sons To Talk"

CHAS. DIONE, Democrat, of Michigan, told a newsman, "I think that our domestic problem is separate from any conflict that this country has with any other country. Neither the President nor the American Negro been any such lack of patriotism. Negroes have always been proud to have fought and died despite imperfections of society."

Dizas is a Negro who, as a member of the credentials committee of the last Democratic National Convention, supported seating of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party delegates at the convention.

In event of any confrontation or conflict with outside groups," he said, referring to the urgings for a Negro draft protest, "any bombs sent over here will not be labeled for other colored people.

NEGROES URGED TO AVOID DRAFT, REFUSE TO FIGHT—FREEDOM DEMOCRATS ASK MOTHERS TO ENCOURAGE SONS TO TALK

"Last week a white soldier from New Jersey was discharged from the Army because he refused to fight in Vietnam; he went on a hunger strike, and the same thing. We can write and ask our sons if they know what they are fighting for. If he awakens a Negro, that's what we are fighting for here in Mississippi.

"And if he says democracy, tell him the truth—we don't know anything about communism, socialism, and all that, but we do know that Negroes have caught hell right here under the American democracy."

Thos. G. Abernathy, Member of Congress.

LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary resumes hearings tomorrow on the most important issue to be considered by the Congress during this session. As a matter of fact, in its implications for our Federal system of government—as we have known it up until June 15, 1964—the most important issue before the Congress during this session.

In the last session of the Congress and in this session, many Members of
this body, including the Representative of the Fourth District of Ohio, intro­duce bills, which must be allowed amendments designed to adjust what they felt was an overreaching decision of the Supreme Court. Many of those proposals—some 106 in number—are presented by the Subcommittee No. 5. Three days of hear­ings were conducted from June 23 to June 25. During this same period, hear­ings have been conducted in the other body. And, of course, the Congressional Record daily includes excerpts from the continuing de­bate in the press on this most important subject.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing to­day House Joint Resolution 600 which represents a refinement of House Joint Resolution 69, the resolution I introduced at the start of this session. I believe it more accurately reflects and technically defines the proper and desirable flexi­bility which several States must be allowed in selecting—as article IV, section 4 of the Constitution allows—a republican form of Government suited to their several needs and their widely differing resources. It is my judgment that no priori­vation—the language of this resolution comports with the language introduced by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DUNNEN] in the other body. I will claim confidence in its sponsorship, however, and I am anxious to submit it for the scrutiny of the very able and distin­guished members of the subcommittee, and for analysis by the many witnesses who have accepted invitations to present their views.

Mr. Speaker, it is not premature to read into the Record the thoughtful words of the distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary Committee as he opened the subcommittee hearings on the pro­posed constitutional amendments:

It * * * is my purpose now, not only to hear the sponsors of this legislation, but also all interested parties, so that this committee may continue its enlightened and understanding of the problem, of its rami­fications and the responsibility of all con­cerned in arriving at the best solu­tion to a very difficult problem.

It is my sincere hope that the Congress will study to achieve a clear objective understanding of this problem. To that end, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record a selected series of articles, editorials and statements, selected to outline the scope of the problem, to sug­gest some of its serious ramifications, and to present some of the considerations which are essential to the most practical solution compatible with the needs of our people, our Federal system and our Consti­tution. As a preface, I submit a sum­mary compiled by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress which describes the present status of reapportionment:

LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT SINCE RETROCEDENCE AGAINST COURT DECISIONS ON REAPPORTIONMENT

Since the decision in Baker v. Carr, on March 26, 1962, court cases have been filed in 44 States, seeking declarations of invalid­ity of the apportionment of one or both houses of State or federal legislatures in Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Ne­vada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Ten­nessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wash­ington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

In it: June 15, 1964, decisions? the United States Court of Appeals in three of these deci­sions in six states—Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia. On June 22, 1964, in a series of per curiam deci­sions, it invalidated the apportionment of eight additional States—Illinois (the sen­ate), Washington, Florida, Idaho, Connect­icut, Michigan, Oklahoma, and Ohio (the house).


Suits are presently pending involving vari­ous aspects of apportionments in Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Michi­gan, Nevada, and Wyoming.

A number of States have reapportioned in 1965 to date. Those presently known to us are Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Pennsyl­vania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming. Arkansas, Kan­sas, Missouri, and New Mexico have since January 1965.

The following article presents a clear, layman's analysis suggesting some of the philosophical and historical drawbacks to the Competitive Choice, as enunciated by the Supreme Court Reynolds against Sims:

[From Fortune magazine, August 1964]

THE SUPREME COURT AND THE REPUBLIC
(BY FELIX MORLEY)

(This is a layman's, not a lawyer's, dissent from the recent Supreme Court decisions on reapportionment. Mr. Morley is a journalist and educator, onetime editor of the Wash­ington Post, and formerly a member of the fac­tory flavor. The point is that the opposite con­trary is true. The effect of the apportionment is somehow un-American and undesirable.

The choice

The "competitive theories of political phil­osophy" to which Justice Frankfurter re­ferred are that of a federal republic, on the one hand, and that of a unitary democracy on the other. "Totalitarian" would be a more descriptive adjective than unitary, ex­cept that it has acquired a strongly derogatory flavor. The point is that the opposite to the division of governmental power essen­tial for a federal republic is the concentra­tion of state government, and that what is necessary to make a democracy operative.

Democracy, in its political sense of unequal­itarianism, is a rule of law that "winner takes all." Carried to a logical con­clusion it means that minorities have no rights which "the will of the people" may not override. Vox populi, vox del, as the old Romans said. The trouble there was that ambitious generals soon saw themselves as godlike rulers, thus seizing the power of the people, and thus creating the same phenomenon operating in Communist countries today, called "democratic people's
republics" by their dictators on the assumption that they are the only legitimate interpreters of the popular will.

The Greeks, for a brief but glorious period, were led to the Reign of Terror in the Constitution and became especially undemocratic. It had to take Federal decisions in favor of the republics.

But the movement to eliminate the States as sovereign entities is greatly impeded by the fact that local self-government, though often inefficient and not infrequently corrupt, is in many cases more practical and fearful of dictation by distant bureaucrats. At many points along the road to socialism the Congress has dug in its heels, showing strong skepticism toward the provisions of "bread and circuses." As the old Romans characterized the various new and fair deals by which the unquestionable empire was undermined from within.

THE MEANING OF FEDERALISM

In fact, it was impossible for the Government of the United States, in origin, to be really democratic. It had to take Federal form in a country of hundreds of distinct, originally independent States. The essence of federalism is the reservation to its component parts of the powers inherent in themselves. The Constitution and became especially mistrusted when the doctrine of absolute equality led to the Reign of Terror in France. This prompted the famous aphorism of John Adams, our second President: "There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide.

A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

There is, however, an infrequently used device by which the executive may overrule the collective desires of the people and legislate. It can summon the third arm of Government, which is the Judiciary, to its aid, and if the judges are compliant, giving Congress negative influence over the constitutional. This may be in effect be frustrated. Such a policy is dangerous and a great deal is at stake. Article III under the Constitution is the Judiciary. That King Charles I of England called on the judges to support the divine right of Kings, as did Louis XVI a century and a half later in France. In both cases the kings were decapitated for their palaces.

It is a more subtle and promising tactic to have the judges aid and legislative obstruction "undemocratic" since the charisms of democracy protects the executive against any charge of arrogance, seems favorable to the general sense of justice, in which the judicial profession is assumed to be expert. And though the Supreme Court is, ironically, the most undemocratic of our institutions, it is working assiduously in favor of more democratic representation.

Here, the vote freely for the candidate of one's choice is of the essence of a democratic society, and any restrictions on that right strike at the heart of representative government. Chief Justice Warren points out that "the last appointment of the Alabama Legislature was based on the 19th Federal census, despite the requirement of the State constitution that the legislature be reapportioned decennially." Few would deny that the Supreme Court has both the authority and the duty to request a State to observe its own constitutional provisions.

Unfortunately, the decision in regard to Alabama is far from the only case in which any such admirably. It rules that both houses must be apportioned strictly on the basis of population. As Chief Justice Warren says, the fundamental principle of representative government in this country is one of equal representation for equal numbers of people.

Each State has its "representation" in the Senate. It is because that body is a case apart, constituted not on the basis of logic but of compromise at the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

MORE THAN A CONVENIENCE

Compromise between the large and small States certainly played a part in the decision to make more ignorant and less easily suggested by representative government. When the Constitution was drafted many of the State legislatures already were based on a geographic basis. And it was this arrangement that made the eventual equivalence of two Senators from each State in the Senate possible. The basis is also constitutional. As Madison wrote, in No. 62 of the Federalist, "in a compound republic, partaking both of the National and Federal character, the Government ought to be founded on a mixture of the principles of proportional and equal representation." Nor is it convincing for the Court to say that there is no analogy between the Federal and State Governments, and therefore a State senate based on geographic consideration. The States do not have to represent the population. It is the basis of these on the organization of State government, except to say that they make the legislatures "secure," shall be "republican." But the record shows that the counties were generally regarded as having the same relation to the States as the States have to the Federal Government, with states in both sovereignties serving as "an anchor against popular fluctuations." This is particularly emphasized by Justice Burton in his dissent. The Court closes six arguments for a distinctive second chamber by saying: "it adds no small weight to the opinion that history informs us of no long-lived republic which had not a Senate."
for an upper house "distinct" and "dis-similar in genius" from the more numerically representative legislative chamber. Then comes a passage that is poignant reading in comprehensive perspective, with the resolution of June 15. "This (distinctive senate) is a precaution founded on such clear principles, and now so well understood in the 'United States, it will be more than superfluous to enlarge on it."

Since the Founding Fathers are practically ignoring the "dilution" and "debasement" values of the Senate, Mr. Warren opinion pays no attention to the arguments of John Stuart Mill, in his classic essay on "Representative Government." This, first published in 1861, the reasons for bicameral legislatures based on differing principles are set forth in universal terms. In its report to the House for the Warren court, Mills says: "It is important that no set of persons should, in great and important cases, ever make their see vote [thus I wish] prevail without asking anyone else for his consent." He then argues that the most effective check on legislative blundering is provided when the second chamber is organized on a wholly different principle from that of its opposite number. "It is a precaution founded on such clear principles, and now so well understood in the United States, it will be more than superfluous to enlarge on it."

That, of course, is the principle of check and balance underlying bi-crossalism in the State legislatures as well as in Congress. To strike a telling blow against "dilution" and "debasement" and make their see veto [thus I wish] prevail without asking anyone else for his consent, is to injure it for the Nation as a whole. With tiresome statistical details Chief Justice Warren emphasizes that in the Alabama State Senate "members representing 25.1 percent of the people of Alabama" can theoretically control that body. This the Congress, of course, discriminates. It is also true that Senators representing only 16.4 percent of the people of the United States form a majority of that body. What is individuates - if we are to use the word - is under the key concept of the Constitution. There can be few better examples of an anomaly where the source of confusion adorns its victims. But until or unless Congress submits - and three-fourths of the States approve - a constitutional amendment curbing the powers over reapportionment which the Supreme Court has asserted, there is nothing the innocent victims can do about it. Yet such an amendment, now being pressed in Congress by Senate Majority Leader Dirksen, is being hotly opposed by the Federal courts. The decision of the Senate, and the biggest surprise of this political year would be even indirect endorse­ments from the House.

Some of the liberal opposition is based on the conviction of the Supreme Court's assumption of jurisdiction over State reapportionment, and the liberal opposition is based on the observation of the American democratic system, however much it may lack the authority of the Constitution. For a last-ditch fight against the Dirksen plan because they believe that the Supreme Court's action enhances their personal political prospects.

As for the Supreme Court's lastest contributions to the confusion and inconsist­ency over reapportionment it has initiated, Justice Harlan observed alone in noting these political growths in the political thickets and he and Justice Frankfurter prophesied with remarkable clairvoyance at its original seeding by the ruling of March 26, 1962, in Baker v. Carr. In dissenting, Justice Frankfurter wrote: "Disregard of inherent limits in the effective exercise of the judicial power" presages the futility of judicial intervention in the essentially political con­flict of the States. Under principles of population and representation has been the function of the American democratic system, however much it may lack the authority of the Constitution. For a last-ditch fight against the Dirksen plan because they believe that the Supreme Court's action enhances their personal political prospects.

As for the Supreme Court's latest contributions to the confusion and inconsist­ency over reapportionment it has initiated, Justice Harlan observed alone in noting these political growths in the political thickets and he and Justice Frankfurter prophesied with remarkable clairvoyance at its original seeding by the ruling of March 26, 1962, in Baker v. Carr. In dissenting, Justice Frankfurter wrote: "Disregard of inherent limits in the effective exercise of the judicial power" presages the futility of judicial intervention in the essentially political con­flict of the States. Under principles of population and representation has been the function of the American democratic system, however much it may lack the authority of the Constitution. For a last-ditch fight against the Dirksen plan because they believe that the Supreme Court's action enhances their personal political prospects.

In commenting on yesterday's ruling concerning New York State reapportionment, Justice Harlan wrote: "I am wholly at a loss to understand the Court's casual way of disposing of * * * of matter [which] bristle with difficult and important questions that touch the nerve centers of the sound operation of Federal and State and political systems * * * [and] surely * * * deserve dis­cussion and reconsideration."

There can be few better examples of an anomaly where the source of confusion adorns its victims. But until or unless Congress submits - and three-fourths of the States approve — a constitutional amendment curbing the powers over reapportionment which the Supreme Court has asserted, there is nothing the innocent victims can do about it. Yet such an amendment, now being pressed in Congress by Senate Majority Leader Dirksen, is being hotly opposed by the Federal courts. The decision of the Senate, and the biggest surprise of this political year would be even indirect endorse­ments from the House.

The power of the judiciary of a State to require valid reapportionment, or to for­feit the plan that has been "invalid" under the key Supreme Court ruling. The highest State tribunal whose decision was reversed was the New York Court of Appeals, which ruled that the legislative reapportionment (plan A) enacted at the special session of the New York Legislature violated the State constitution. The New York Supreme Court before being showered with requests to take jurisdic­tion in disputes for which it said there is ample intrastate authority was stated in the identical ruling.

The power of the judiciary of a State to require valid reapportionment, or to for­feit the plan that has been "invalid" under the key Supreme Court ruling. The highest State tribunal whose decision was reversed was the New York Court of Appeals, which ruled that the legislative reapportionment (plan A) enacted at the special session of the New York Legislature violated the State constitution. The New York Supreme Court before being showered with requests to take jurisdic­tion in disputes for which it said there is ample intrastate authority was stated in the identical ruling.

The power of the judiciary of a State to require valid reapportionment, or to for­feit the plan that has been "invalid" under the key Supreme Court ruling. The highest State tribunal whose decision was reversed was the New York Court of Appeals, which ruled that the legislative reapportionment (plan A) enacted at the special session of the New York Legislature violated the State constitution. The New York Supreme Court before being showered with requests to take jurisdic­tion in disputes for which it said there is ample intrastate authority was stated in the identical ruling.
But if Justice Harlan refuses to stay the court of appeals ruling, then things could get rough. For instance, if next week the Federal District Court reaffirms its order for an election, and the Republicans do not then reverse its decision, what nobody wanted will have happened: a head-on collision between Federal and State courts.

If the New York situation on our eastern coast brings to the mind of a rational person a single description, a situation on our opposite coast brought similar upheaval. Despite the fact that the people of the State had long since agreed what form of legislation should be enacted, the High Court decisions denied their right to choose, and produced legislative chaos.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 9, 1964]

IN THE NATION—EFFECTS IN CALIFORNIA OF ONE PERSON, ONE VOTE

(By Arthur Eroek)

WASHINGTON, October 8.—Congress adjourned without taking any legislative notice at all of the Supreme Court's requirement that federal districts which elect members of each branch of State legislatures must be as "nearly equal as practicable." After many weeks of debate as Congress adjourned, the U.S. Supreme Court ordered new State elections in 1965.

But it died because the House, which had legislated intrastate reapportionment out of the Supreme Court's jurisdiction, rejected a Senate resolution in which acceptance of the Court's assertion of this jurisdiction was implicit, and therefore it is evident that a strong effort will be made in the next Congress to submit the issue to the States in the form of a constitutional amendment embodying the principle of the House bill.

In promoting this effort a current study of the effects the execution of the Supreme Court's decree would have in California un­doubtedly will be promptly cited. The study, endorsed by Chairman Edwin J. Re­gan and other members of the judiciary com­mittee of the state assembly, arrived in Washington too late for consideration before Congress adjourned. But meanwhile it will be widely circulated among those elected to Congress.

The limitations of this space prescribe the brevity of the following summary of the highlights of the study.

1. Beginning in 1928, the voters of California have three times approved the "Federal plan" (by which Members of Congress are chosen) in apportioning the districts which elect members of the State legislature: Those for the house based on population; for the senate, on geographic and county lines. The result has been that "a majority of the senate, no matter from which counties or districts, represents a major part of the State's economic and social resources and interests. No legislative measure, unduly favoring a small part of the State or a few limited interests, and conversely no measure affecting large parts, is likely to win a majority vote in the senate."

2. Problems of "serious magnitude" that could arise if equal population is the base for reapportionment include water development, taxation and ed­ucation—"in all of which California long has been a major stakeholder in the issue."
have more population than North and South Carolina combined and several times the population of North and South Dakota combined.

Nevertheless, the splitting of a State because of antagonism and conflicting interests was well summed up by Colorado Governor John A. Love, in his statement before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendment of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. LOVE, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Governor John A. Love, Chairman, members of the subcommittee. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the subcommittee and bring you some of my thoughts on these problems. It is important, to talk to you a little bit about Colorado's reapportionment history, which I think speaks to a common experience. Before the predication of California may serve to dramatize the case in Congress for some degree of flexibility in the distribution of seats in some States to serve large States of many diverse interests.

The requirements of fair representation of a large State containing areas of divergent and conflicting interests was well summed up by Colorado Governor John A. Love, in his statement before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendment of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. LOVE, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Governor John A. Love, Chairman, members of the subcommittee. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the subcommittee and bring you some of my thoughts on these problems. It is important, to talk to you a little bit about Colorado's reapportionment history, which I think speaks to a common experience. Before the predication of California may serve to dramatize the case in Congress for some degree of flexibility in the distribution of seats in some States to serve large States of many diverse interests.

The requirements of fair representation of a large State containing areas of divergent and conflicting interests was well summed up by Colorado Governor John A. Love, in his statement before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendment of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. LOVE, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Governor John A. Love, Chairman, members of the subcommittee. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the subcommittee and bring you some of my thoughts on these problems. It is important, to talk to you a little bit about Colorado's reapportionment history, which I think speaks to a common experience. Before the predication of California may serve to dramatize the case in Congress for some degree of flexibility in the distribution of seats in some States to serve large States of many diverse interests.

The requirements of fair representation of a large State containing areas of divergent and conflicting interests was well summed up by Colorado Governor John A. Love, in his statement before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendment of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. LOVE, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Governor John A. Love, Chairman, members of the subcommittee. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the subcommittee and bring you some of my thoughts on these problems. It is important, to talk to you a little bit about Colorado's reapportionment history, which I think speaks to a common experience. Before the predication of California may serve to dramatize the case in Congress for some degree of flexibility in the distribution of seats in some States to serve large States of many diverse interests.

The requirements of fair representation of a large State containing areas of divergent and conflicting interests was well summed up by Colorado Governor John A. Love, in his statement before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendment of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. LOVE, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Governor John A. Love, Chairman, members of the subcommittee. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the subcommittee and bring you some of my thoughts on these problems. It is important, to talk to you a little bit about Colorado's reapportionment history, which I think speaks to a common experience. Before the predication of California may serve to dramatize the case in Congress for some degree of flexibility in the distribution of seats in some States to serve large States of many diverse interests.
In Colorado, at least, there is always a possibility that in some areas of legislation the majority of the population may treat the minority unfairly. This can be illustrated in the case of the San Luis Valley, which is one of our most vital natural resources. If the populous portion of the State east of the Continental Divide were to make this region a separate and new State, it would be under its own interest, it might divert so much water from the less heavily populated western slope of the mountains that the development of its vast natural resources might be frustrated, thus preventing it from making its full contribution to the growth of the entire State of Colorado. Such a result can best be avoided by effective representation of western slope water interests in representation complying with the Supreme Court's ruling in the Lucas case. The contrast between the senate, as apportioned under the new bill and as apportioned under the plan adopted by the people in 1963, dramatizes the disadvantages of the rigid, nearly mathematical approach now required. An example of the problems created is in the new senate district 35, covering the northwestern part of the State. The district measures approximately 175 miles from north to south and 20 miles from east to west, over rugged mountainous terrain. It contains 10 counties covering 20,514 square miles, an area larger than the states of New Hampshire and Vermont. The district includes three major river basins, one to the east of the Continental Divide and two to the west. And yet, States smaller in area each have two Senators in the U.S. Senate, while the district in question has only one senator in the Colorado Senate.

Another example of the problems created by this new plan of apportionment is the treatment now accorded the San Luis Valley, in the south-central region of Colorado. The six counties in this valley are in the Rio Grande Basin, and are vitally concerned with water rights, due to Colorado's relationship with New Mexico, Texas, and Mexico, with respect to the Rio Grande River. San Luis Valley is an economically depressed area, and a relatively high State welfare load. This area, containing 38,000 persons according to the 1960 census, was formerly able to elect a senator to bring to the attention of the legislature its unique problems. But under the new per capita based apportionment, the legislature was forced to move the San Luis Valley in three separate senatorial districts, and the residents of this valley are in the minority, in each instance. In the case of denying a minority any representation at all in one branch of the legislature, it hardly fits our traditional concept of representation.

One of the districts into which part of the San Luis Valley, Saguache County, had to be placed was a kind of political suicide caused by per capita apportionment. District 30 consists of 9 counties, and extends over 196 miles from north to south, from Guernsey to Ophir, and contains gold and silver mining areas now rapidly becoming part of suburban Denver, to Saguache County in the San Luis Valley, which is primarily dependent on agriculture. This district straddles the Continental Divide, and it contains approximately 33 peaks over 14,000 feet in height. It is drained by four river basins, the South Platte, the Arkansas, the Rio Grande, and the Gunnison. These areas have large, diverse interests; the agricultural interests of the area, the mineral interests, and not by overwhelming them in legislatures where their voice is so small as to go unheard.

It has long been part of the American tradition to allow the several States to engage in experiments within the framework of the Constitution, with the falls, the adoption of a unicameral legislature. It is my personal belief that the framers of the 14th amendment, and certainly the States which ratified it, had no intention to disturb this freedom. Over the years, the systems of apportionment have varied from State to State in accordance with the political needs and development of the various States. I believe it would be appropriate to restore this freedom of State action now.

There are other feasible means of achieving this goal. Personally, I believe that at least one house of a bicameral legislature should be apportioned purely on a population basis, and that this would also always be sure of sufficient representation to protect their own interests. This, coupled with the growing ability of urban areas to control the election of Governors in many States should provide ample protection against "minority rule."

My overall approach to a remedy is a substantive amendment to the Constitution which would allow the States having bicameral legislatures to mean to limit it to that Senator Brooxa—to give reasonable consideration to factors other than population in apportioning seats for the legislature. In my opinion, we still prefer the phrase "reasonable consideration" because I believe that such language would do no justice to what the States thought governed the adoption of the 14th amendment. "Reasonable consideration" would, as I understand it, mean giving reasonable respect to factors such as history, geography, economic interests, and effective representation for one or more economic groups. It would be a little better to permit arbitrary or "crazy quilt" apportionment. Such a standard would strike down the majority, while accepting more variation from per capita representation than the Supreme Court would now allow.

The reason why I advocate such a modest amendment is that it would, I hope, allow the courts to protect the citizens of the States from any gross malapportionment of interest, by allowing the States maximum freedom to engage in the development of a variety of governmental machinery within the framework of the Constitution. Such an amendment, I hope, would incorporate the well-established standards which most of the people have long respected, namely, that any deviation from absolute equality should have a rational basis in perpetuating objectives and not be simply arbitrary, or related to invasions discrimination against any group.

It is not only the interests of individual voters who are affected by the new constitutional doctrine. The following article from Nation's Business presents a balanced analysis of some of the probable and demonstrated effects of the decision, in urging that final decision on their form of government be returned to the people of the several States.

[From the Nation's Business, December 1964]

How Reapportionment Threatens Business and Politics

As a result of a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court the courts have been forced to place the counties of the south-central region of Colorado in the State Senate. The issue is not minority versus majority rule. It is a blunt description of the reapportionment issue by Owyn Thomas, Governor of Colorado, reflected in these words: "If a political district is subject to the political expediency of the metropolitan New York area and entrenched political majorities in all bigger cities." Thus many businessmen are expected to support Senator Everett M. Dirksen's campaign to provide an amendment to the Constitution which would allow States to apportion the legislature as the people decide through a constitutional amendment.

Passage of the amendment would allow State voters to choose periodically whether to apportion one house on the basis of population and the other on additional factors such as geography, economic interest, and tradition.

The issue is not minority versus majority rule. It is a question of effective representation of a diverse interest versus "winner-take-all" domination by highly concentrated urban voting majorities.

Reapportionment expert William J. D. Boyd, a senior associate with the National Municipal League, foresees a political battle involving more than you've seen in a long time. Business and unions, especially in New York and Illinois are likely to line up on opposite sides of the case.

CASE OF POLITICS

Reapportionment, though decided in the courts, is pure politics. Robert G. Dixon, Jr., professor of constitutional law at George Washington University, says the issue is a simple one: "The political thicket has become no less political because the courts have entered ** and in politics no one is neutral."
A Supreme Court ruling in 1962, widely interpreted as requiring one house of each legislature to be based on one man, one vote, raised little uproar. Many concede the ruling reflects glaring inequities of years' standing.

Sharper criticism, however, followed a ruling last summer that the voters of Colorado could not be organized on a basis not of population and the other House on the basis of population, but the individual legislator's interest in both. The court said the same law which the State Constitution called for in establishing an exclusive economic and governmental activity giving a stable income tax and an individual income tax must also control over unemployment and workmen's compensation, with some of the proceeds used to provide a reapportioned legislature would pass the higher brackets.

HUGE URBAN ADVANTAGE

Thomas F. Moore, Jr., counsel to the New York Power Authority, has made estimates which indicate a reapportioned legislature basis of 2,100 square miles 95 assemblymen and 31 senators, compared with 55 representatives and 31 senators today. The remaining 47,000 square miles in the State.

A major force in the New York reapportionment campaign, Mrs. Florence L. Harrison of the New York State AFL-CIO's Women's Political Action Committee, has urged "establishment of an exclusive insurance tax, based on a firm's experience with layoffs, is a burden on small, unstable, seasonally fluctuating business operations. These taxes are hit with the highest taxes which they are least able to pay, he argues, in contrast to the New York State unemployment tax, which they can bear. Spokesmen for more stable industries counters that they are already subsidizing benefits for employees of high layoff operations.

The unions' long-time goal of a corporate tax, they say, is a way to effect greater tax revenues on small businesses which is better than creating a new tax. A corporation tax would include not only dividends but also profits. The New York State corporation tax was ten times greater than the corporate income tax.

Other authorities add that many business men are looking for a new, larger corporate income tax, with a broadened base that would be easier to collect. Some proposals call for an industry-wide profit tax, while others are for a new corporate theft, or "mammoth public spending, mammoth public works, corporate income versus sales taxes.

A number of these devices legislation in urban areas is designed to use the quick solution, the dramatic approach, the easy way. This has led the rural forces to throw up quick solutions to problems outside the legislative area.

Government spending, mammoth public works, corporate income versus sales taxes, these are devices legislation is used to keep in the public eye. Only one or two areas are nobody among anyone else, Mr. Skipton adds.

"This is not philosophical; this is the nuts and bolts of how a man gets elected in a metropolitan area."

These factors serve to strengthen the hand of the metropolitan news media, he adds, and that of organized pressure groups with pocketbook interests in specific legislative measures—groups needed to turn out the money and manpower to get a man elected in a city constituency.

"Others argue that the statehouse attracts a higher caliber of legislator from the rural areas, where a man gains more prestige from sitting in the legislature. Another way of looking at it is to know how among many long-term rural legislators would go down the drain if they were not re-elected for years."

Rural legislators are closer to their constituents, Mr. Boyd notes. "This is sometimes that's going to pass and this is lame-duck," he says.

Mr. Skipton says, however, that many members of the so-called cornstalk brigade in highly urbanized Ohio actually come from metropolitan areas.

Studies show that in Illinois and Missouri the failure of urban delegations to agree among themselves, rather than rural obstructionism, has blocked urban programs. This has led the rural forces to throw up quick solutions to problems outside the legislative area.

Some conservatives look to reapportionment as the route to revitalized State government, reversing or at least retarding the trend of urban legislation. The Ohio study, for example, found that urban seats in a legislature have been regarded not as steppingstones to political office but as "a vehicle for deserting the old boy and Joe. But he contends that the corrupt city machines have been cleaned up since World War II and that the caliber of urban legislators is improving.

"To me, the most significant thing is that in the State where I lived, I would fear it greatly." Mr. Boyd adds.

Voters have rejected all-out one man, one vote in several referendums, observes Prof. Boyd. "I am convinced that a political science department and a co-author of "Apportionment and Representation" of the "U.S. Apportionment Expert," Professor Lamb tells National Business that urban workers who oppose greater representation for their own areas seem dissatisfied with what they already have and don't want a whole lot more of the same.

City minimum wage above the statewide level—both actions were ruled unconstitutional—would raise the State minimum if in control in Albany. The unions' long-time goal of a corporate tax, they say, is a way to effect greater tax revenues on small businesses which is better than creating a new corporate income tax, with a broadened base that would be easier to collect.

Some proposals call for an industry-wide profit tax, while others are for a new corporate tax, or "mammoth public spending, mammoth public works, corporate income versus sales taxes, these are devices legislation is used to keep in the public eye. Only one or two areas are nobody among anyone else, Mr. Skipton adds.

"This is not philosophical; this is the nuts and bolts of how a man gets elected in a metropolitan area." These factors serve to strengthen the hand of the metropolitan news media, he adds, and that of organized pressure groups with pocketbook interests in specific legislative measures—groups needed to turn out the money and manpower to get a man elected in a city constituency.

"Others argue that the statehouse attracts a higher caliber of legislator from the rural areas, where a man gains more prestige from sitting in the legislature. Another way of looking at it is to know how among many long-term rural legislators would go down the drain if they were not re-elected for years."

Rural legislators are closer to their constituents, Mr. Boyd notes. "This is sometimes that's going to pass and this is lame-duck," he says.

Mr. Skipton says, however, that many members of the so-called cornstalk brigade in highly urbanized Ohio actually come from metropolitan areas. Studies show that in Illinois and Missouri the failure of urban delegations to agree among themselves, rather than rural obstructionism, has blocked urban programs. This has led the rural forces to throw up quick solutions to problems outside the legislative area. Some conservatives look to reapportionment as the route to revitalized State government, reversing or at least retarding the trend of urban legislation. The Ohio study, for example, found that urban seats in a legislature have been regarded not as steppingstones to political office but as "a vehicle for deserting the old boy and Joe. But he contends that the corrupt city machines have been cleaned up since World War II and that the caliber of urban legislators is improving.

"To me, the most significant thing is that in the State where I lived, I would fear it greatly." Mr. Boyd adds.

Voters have rejected all-out one man, one vote in several referendums, observes Prof. Boyd. "I am convinced that a political science department and a co-author of "Apportionment and Representation" of the "U.S. Apportionment Expert," Professor Lamb tells National Business that urban workers who oppose greater representation for their own areas seem dissatisfied with what they already have and don't want a whole lot more of the same.
urban liberals would prefer to see things done in Washington on a philosophical rather than pragmatic basis. Mr. Boyd says that reapportioned legislatures will be more sympathetic to business rather than pragmatic basis.

In the South, generally speaking, provincialism in the active and the passive interest groups is so strong that the possible exception of Michigan—and will probably gain strength in both parties, will be more sympathetic to business rather than to the control of urban blight and the preservation of values in the suburbs. How can that consent be won? What constitutes fair representation in the mind of the electorate? What electorates who might at least listen, or see that his letter gets answered. Beyond this, he may expect that his representative give due consideration to the claims of various organized groups to which, in our pluralist society, he gives his own allegiance. He may expect that his representative indicate familiarity with the problems of the district and community in which he resides. He may wish to "own" his own man, feeling that his own voice—or that of his race or his political party—is swallowed up in a large, heterogeneous district represented by several legislators.

All of these attitudes are but aspects of the broader question of legitimacy. This concept is not a new one. One of its expressions was a slogan of the American Revolution, "taxation without representation is tyranny." A citizen owes his allegiance to his state, to his country, to his government. This government is legitimate when he is assured that its nature and procedures are determined by a majority of the body. What are the sources of the legitimacy of American Government? Legitimacy is at heart a psychological assurance. A primary source of this assurance is the Constitution, a symbol of enduring majesty, interpreted by the Supreme Court, so that the rights of the individual may never be con- travened by his Government.

State constitutions do not share in this mystique. They tend to be long, complicated, and burdened with statutory material. Most of them, however, were adopted by direct popular vote, and all but 14 of them have been amended by direct popular vote through the initiative, the referendum, or both. Their constitutions are treated as quite malleable instruments by the people. Indeed, 57 constitutions of states have been amended 550 times since 1879. New Yorkers have changed their fundamental law on 138 occasions since 1846, twice since 1851; and Colorado, 64 times since 1873. The people of 19 States are granted direct influence upon the apportionment of State legislatures by their State constitutions.

These 19 States provide specific applications of a more general symbol buttressing the legitimacy of government to its citizens, we give allegiance to both Federal and State Governments because of our feeling that there are certain matters reserved to the Constitution of the United States to be administered by the Federal Government, or of any of its three branches, will not intervene. We know that the symbol of "States' rights" is often invoked for unwholesome purposes by squarrels. We know that many of the conditions...
The first of these devices is hopelessly inadequate as an indicator of the effectiveness of an entire system of representation. Comparing the most populous district with the least populous . . . that, in all probability, any one "man, one vote" standard applied to the 1960 distribution of population.
Governor Love has described some of the results of that compliance: Senate district 35, in the northwest Colorado mountains, is a single district containing 10 times the area of other districts, such as Massachusetts or New Jersey. Or consider the San Luis Valley, economically depressed, containing many Spanish-American citizens and with a high State welfare load. The 38,000 citizens of this geographically and economically homogeneous area formerly elected a single Senator. Now they are divided between three separate senatorial districts and are a minority in each.

This, I submit, is not the best way to maintain the popular will as a pillar of the legitimacy of government. The Supreme Court has decreed that these 38,000 citizens of the San Luis Valley ought not to enjoy an advantage over the million-plus residents of Denver. This fact confronts us with a mystery: how can the voters of Denver County, or those of Los Angeles County, vote—as they have done—against increasing their own influence in their respective legislatures?

A solution to this puzzle is suggested in the work of Professors John White and Norman C. Thomas. They begin by pointing out that any analysis of the apportionment decision stressed a major political victory of urban majorities over entrenched rural minorities. As such, we are told, the devices used by the Court do not measure the representation of rural or urban populations as such, nor can they "help us to evaluate the significance of a county's position in the 'gravity of the evil' of rural overrepresentation,"

the authors analyze every county in the United States and develop a device measuring the extent to which counties classified by the Census Bureau as "rural" and "urban" are represented in the legislatures. They conclude that the effect of rural overrepresentation is greatest in those States which have very few urban counties. In 11 States, the apportionment in existence before 1962 strengthened the legislative power of an exact rural majority; in 13 States, an urban majority was transmuted into an artificial rural majority in both houses of the legislature; and an artificial rural majority was created in one house in six States. Since many California citizens who wish to be made for "rural domination" are found in the South, a consideration of their nature is relevant to the claim advanced before this committee that every rural domination through the application of the Court's equal populations standard may significantly increase the political influence of the Negro. Of more relevance to the rhetoric of urban-rural conflict, however, is the fact that in the remaining 20 States, an urban population majority yielded an urban legislative majority.

All of the larger States are in this last category. These States are "more able to absorb rural over-representation without dis- astrous results to urban areas." The California Senate is the best example. In the California Senate, the rural population enjoys the greatest overrepresentation in the United States because California is less than 14 percent rural," only 29 percent of the California Senators may be said to represent rural interests. Similarly, in Colorado, a 28-percent rural minority won but 39 percent of the Senate, and in Ohio, a 27-percent rural minority was accorded a 38-percent representation in the upper house. The comparable figures for New York are 15 and 32 percent.

We now have a plausible explanation for the actions of the voters in Denver and Los Angeles. It seems reasonable to assume that they voted against increasing their own representation because they did not perceive themselves as being disadvantaged by the existing arrangements. And they were probably correct. But residents of the areas outside the principal urban area—as in northern California or in western Colorado—are likely to resent bitterly the granting to the urban residents of their constitutional entitlement of representation.

I believe that contemporary political science can offer supports the following contentions: 1. Apportionment in districts of equal population does not by itself guarantee fair representation. 2. The conventional wisdom regarding rural domination of State legislatures rests on shaky foundations. The rhetoric of rural-urban conflict may be loudest in the most populous States, such as California, New York, and Ohio. But these States will see the least shift in real political influence as a result of equal population apportionment.

Those who oppose the Dirksen amendment appeal to the symbol of the Constitution and the Supreme Court as the guarantors of personal and collective rights. If the Dirksen amendment appeal to the sovereignty of State populations within the Federal system. The application of those great symbols to this issue results in a direct conflict. That conflict creates a potential crisis in the legitimacy of American government.

The Constitution says it is. When the judgment of the Court does not result in wise public policy, the Constitution may be amended, provided there is an overwheming consensus in Congress and among the States that it be so amended.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, because of serious illness in my family I could not be here last week. I am reporting my position on the votes that were taken on major legislation.

I had been here I would have voted "aye."

The conference report on H.R. 6675, medicare and other social security amendments, was agreed to in the House July 27. Had I been here I would have voted "aye."

The conference report on H.R. 7884, Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, was agreed to in the House on July 27. Had I been here I would have voted "aye."

H.R. 77, repealing the right-to-work provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, passed the House July 28. Had I been here July 26, I would have voted "aye" on the rule. On July 28 I would have voted "nay" on final passage, and on final passage I would have voted "aye."

The conference reports on three health bills, S. 510—health program extensions; H.R. 2984—health research facilities; and H.R. 2985—mental health staffing, were agreed to in the House July 27. All actions were by voice vote except H.R. 2985—mental health staffing. Had I been here I would have voted "aye" in support of all three measures.

H.R. 8283, the Economic Opportunity Amendments Act of 1965, expanding the poverty program, passed the House July 22. Had I been here I would have voted "aye" on final passage.

H.R. 8656, amending section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1945, passed the House July 29, 1965. Had I been here I would have voted "aye."

H.R. 9028, amending the Peace Corps Act, passed the House by a voice vote July 29. Had I been here I would have voted in support of its passage.

H.R. 8310, amending the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, passed the House July 29 by a voice vote. Had I been here I would have voted in support of its passage.

HONORABLE JOSEPH CAMPBELL

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States since December 14, 1954, tendered his resignation to the President of the United States on June 30, 1965, to be effective July 31, 1965. His health has been poor for several months and the advice of physicians prompted his decision. With his resignation the American people have lost a loyal and most capable servant, a servant who worked unceasingly to bring to our attention those activities in the Government which indicated a need for congressional review, correction, or change.

He has done a job which was to the needs of the Congress as contemplated in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. This act called for:

The creation of an independent auditing department of the General Accounting Office.

The officers and employees of this department will at all times be going into the separate departments in the examinations of their financial statements. They discovered the very facts that Congress ought to be in possession of and can fearlessly and without fear of consequent changes of Congress. All reports and its committees. The independent audit will, therefore, serve to inform Congress at all times as to the actual conditions surrounding the expenditure of public funds in every department of the Government.

It has been well established that Congress intended that the Comptroller General should be a constructive critic, in his area of responsibility and something more than a bookkeeper or accountant. No matter which political party controls the Congress or the Executive, it is his responsibility to point to inefficiency so that it may be corrected.

The independently did not become a part of the law until 1945 when the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office were declared to be part of the legislative branch of the Government. Later the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 65) specifically designated the Comptroller General an agent of Congress. Prior to 1946, the audit concept was relatively simple and concerned mainly the onefold activity of the General Accounting Office. During fiscal year 1946, 43,872,282 vouchers were examined; and at June 30, 1946, 14,219 employees were on the payroll. This compares with a payroll of 4,350 on June 30, 1946.

The changed concept of how the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office would best serve Congress was started under Lindley C. War general Campbell has done a fearless job regardless of whether his reports criticize Democrats or Republicans. His leadership has been extremely demanding for him, his integrity and devotion has been an example to all. We all salute him on his retirement and hope for his prompt recovery. We hope further that his health will permit us to call upon his experience and wisdom for advice in the future.

VOTING RIGHTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my discussion on the floor of the House of a letter which was before the conferees, I sent the following wire to the Honorable Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Attorney General of the United States:


Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.:

As I stated on the floor of the House, and I understand you were present in the gallery, I was willing to demand of the writer of the letter which I referred to, dated July 29, 1965, and which was quoted in the conference on
the voting rights bill in toto last Thursday relating to a major matter before the conference and quoting one of the civil rights leaders, be made public. Since that time, the press has acquired some information concerning the letter. Although I believe it to be in the public domain, but in keeping with your request I have not made the entire letter be made public immediately. However, the press has acquired some information concerning the matter. The bar associations of California and their interrelationship to do so yourself. I am willing to give you a reasonable opportunity to do so yourself. If this is not done, then, of course, I will feel free to make the letter public. I believe it to be in the public domain and a matter concerning which the House should be fully advised. The press apparently has acquired from other sources certain selected quotes from the letter and I think it is imperative that the entire letter be made public.

Member of Congress, Florida.

MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. ROOSEVELT. 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 California?

There was no objection. Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the House General Labor Subcommittee will report tomorrow morning a minimum wage bill which I feel will probably affect nearly every Member in one way or another. I would, therefore, like to make the suggestion that if you have any questions from constituents or questions of your own, if you wish to set our explanation of the bill, we will be happy to give you such explanation directly and if enough of you wish to do so following consideration of the bill by the full committee, I would be delighted to obtain a special order for the purpose of answering as many questions as possible at that time if you would be good enough to let me know.

A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF MR. JUAN A. DEL REAL

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cur ris] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection. Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill in behalf of Mr. Juan A. del Real, a Cuban refugee who is graduating from St. Louis University Law School in February of 1966. Because of the dilemma of the requirements for admission to the Missouri Bar Association and their interrelationship with the naturalization laws, Mr. del Real finds that he could not practice law for a period of approximately 8 to 9 months.

Mr. del Real's case is one that has its counterpart in most of the States of our country. The bar associations of States like Missouri are in the process of enacting laws that would allow a person to be a citizen of the United States before he is admitted for membership.

After leaving Cuba in November of 1960 because of the existing political situation there, Mr. del Real declared himself a political refugee and married an American girl and lived in St. Louis until November of 1963. When he made inquiries about becoming an American citizen, he was told that the time he had spent in the Dominican Republic was not toward the 3-year period of time necessary for the spouse of an American citizen to become naturalized.

Due to this fact, he left the United States and returned to the Republic where he applied for and was granted a residence visa. He reentered the United States on November 7, 1963, as a permanent resident.

Although Mr. del Real has already spent over 3 years in the United States, most of the time did not count toward citizenship since he was a refugee; and he will not be entitled to U.S. citizenship and membership in the Missouri Bar Association until November 7, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason I am introducing a bill which would have the effect of offsetting the time he spent in the Dominican Republic. The press apparently has acquired from other sources certain selected quotes from the letter and I think it is imperative that the entire letter be made public.

Member of Congress, Florida.

THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD

Mr. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Barzres] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, August 4, 1965, will be the 175th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Coast Guard at Newburyport, Mass. Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to observe the 175th anniversary of the Coast Guard on August 4, 1965, with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

A PROCLAMATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY, JOHN A. VOLPE, GOVERNOR, 1965

Whereas the U.S. Coast Guard, our oldest continuous seagoing armed service, by its vigilance and alertness each year saves hundreds of lives and millions of dollars in property; and

Whereas the Coast Guard is our principal agency for maritime safety and marine law enforcement in all its phases, including the merchant marine as well as the hundreds of thousands of pleasure craft and pleasure craft operators who annually throng our waterways; and

Whereas the Coast Guard, as a member of the U.S. Armed Forces, maintaining itself in a state of constant military readiness to assist in the defense of our country, and
Whereas August 4, 1668 marks the 175th anniversary of the founding of the Coast Guard at Newburyport, Mass.; and
Whereas the U.S. Coast Guard depends upon the wholehearted support of all our people for the successful discharge of its many duties: Now, therefore,
I, JOHN A. VOLPE, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim the day of August 4, 1668, as U.S. Coast Guard Day and urge all citizens of the Commonwealth to take cognizance of this event, in commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the U.S. Coast Guard, and to appropriately participate in its observance.

By His Excellency the Governor,
JOHN A. VOLPE.

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Hansen] may extend remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 81 to increase the amount authorized for the Interstate Highway System for fiscal year 1967, I was called off the floor by a constituent and missed the rollcall vote. Had I been present I would have voted against the resolution. I favor the additional funds to continue the program and favor safety on the highways. However, I object to that section which gives the Secretary of Commerce final authority in this matter.

A SPECIAL BIRTHDAY

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to inform my colleagues of a very special birthday celebration this weekend. It will take place in a picturesque community in the northwest corner of Franklin County, Mass. It will be large—everyone in the town has been invited. It will be long—it begins on Friday and does not end until Sunday night. And, it will be significant—it marks the 200th anniversary of the incorporation of Charlemont, Mass.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, to share this historic occasion with my neighbors in Charlemont, Mass., but the legislative session will take me elsewhere, and so I want to spend a few minutes today taking note of some of the outstanding events in Charlemont's early history.

The story begins on June 27, 1735, when the House of Representatives of the Massachusetts Colony granted to the town of Boston three tracts of land in western Massachusetts, one of which, Boston Township No. 1, later became Checkley's Town and finally Charlemont. The grant stipulated that within 5 years the town must have at least 60 families in the township, build a meeting house and a school, and secure a minister to preach the Gospel. The land was surveyed in 1736, but no attempts at settlement were made. Instead, the selectmen sold the town the following year to John Read, Esq., for £1,020. Read sold it to John Checkley and Gersham Keyes, who in turn divided it up and sold parcels of it to others, and soon, large estates were divided into small plots for small parties of scouts engaged in their dangerous marches.

The first settler—the patriarch of the valley—was on his way. In the spring of 1743, if not before, Moses Rice of Rutland, in the County of Worcester, removed with his family to the town and settled upon the tract which he had previously purchased.

It is quite probable that Captain Rice and his sons had visited the place during the previous summer, and begun the work of preparation; had cleared portions of the meadow and prepared them for cultivation; had hewn the timber, and, perhaps, erected the house which was to be his future home. This supposition receives some support from the statement of his son, Sylvanus Rice, of Worcester, who, in the late 18th century, learned from his mother, Mrs. Fuller, that "he had slept under the buttonwood tree," standing by the roadside, "when there was not another white person in town."

Feebly, indeed, can we of the present generation conceive of, and, much less, adequately appreciate the difficult and exhausting labors, the privations and hardships experienced by the little band of hardy adventures who leveled the primeval forests and turned the first furrow in these peaceful fields, which now smile, in quiet beauty, beneath our eyes. Yet, with strong hands and resolute hearts, the father and his youthful sons went to their work. The forests retreated, the woods were cleared, the land was tilled; the earth was furrowed; the harvests gathered; comforts were multiplied; the signs of plenty increased; and a prosperous and smiling future seemed before them.

But in 1744 hostilities broke out between the English colonists and the savage Indians were incited by the French against the English colonists. They came down Lake Champlain to Crown Point, followed Otter Creek to the highlands of Vermont, whence they split up into small parties and proceeded along the Hoosic, Deerfield, and Connecticut River valleys until they reached the infant English settlements. The English defense consisted of a chain of forts along the northern border of Massachusetts, garrisoned by small parties of soldiers from the colony. The most important post, Fort Massachusetts, located on the banks of Saddle Mountain in the Hoosic Valley, was under the command of Col. Ephraim Williams, benefactor of the college in Williamstown which bears his name.

In order to this fort, the highroad to the north, Rice continued to cultivate his fields. Since his home was on the route from Deerfield to Fort Massachusetts, it was a frequent stopping place for colonial travelers, and a welcome refuge for small parties of scouts engaged in their dangerous marches.

Fort Massachusetts fell on August 20, 1746. The small garrison of 22 men fought bravely for 26 hours, after which they were forced to surrender from lack of ammunition. During the same week, Moses Rice moved his family to Deerfield. This prudent retreat saved their lives, for when Rice returned a few days later, the place was burned to the ground. His provisions were gone, his cattle slaughtered, his hay, grain, and farming tools destroyed. With a broken heart he took his wife and children home to town, where they remained for the duration of the war.

But such was the courage and resolve of that sturdy pioneer that he eventually returned to his desolate homestead. A new house erected on the site of the old one, and a separate dwelling was built nearby for his son Samuel, who by then had three sons—Moses, Asa, and Martin. This time two other families joined the Rices. Othniel Taylor and his brother Jonathan arrived about 1749; Gershom, Joshua, and Seth Hawks, probably with their father Eleazer, came in 1750.

In the summer of 1752, the three families sent Captain Rice to Boston to petition the general assembly for relief. Rice's petition stated in part:

He and several others, knowing the conditions of the grant, and expecting it would be completed with public funds and not by sale, and became obliged to settle the same agreeable to the conditions of the grant, and have made considerable improvements; but, by reason of the negligence of the other proprietors, are brought under great and insuperable difficulties and hardships, not being able to support the ministry, build mills, or even the roads and make suitable bridges (the nearest mill being 20 miles distant). Your petitioner, therefore, in behalf of himself and his family, humbly pray that your honor and honors would take their case into your wise and compassionate consideration, and appropriate the money, in the hands of the nonresident proprietors, in order to carry on the settlement; or relieve the said inhabitants in such way as your honor and majesty shall think reasonable. And as in duty bound will ever pray.

The general court hastened to assist the settlers. A tax of 1 penny per acre was levied, the proceeds of which would build a meeting house, support preaching, and the encouragement of roads and mills. Moses Rice was designated to call a town meeting, at which a clerk, treasurer, assessors, and other necessary officers would be chosen. Rice was also granted 100 acres of land at
the south end of the township "in consideration of his services for the Government, and the losses he sustained."

On the 7th day of June 1755, Mr. Joseph Wilder, who had recently purchased all of the unsold land in the township, moved to Charlemont from Lancaster, and settled in the northern end of the township. Around him grew up a group of men mostly from Lancaster and Leominster, and Mr. White's narrative reports that "in the proprietary and town meetings of subsequent years—"they were designated by the river men as the Lancaster party."

Mr. White goes on to tell of the early town meetings, at which Captain Rice presided as moderator. Committees were formed to collect taxes, lay out roads, and secure a preacher. At one meeting it was voted to pay "Mr. Aaron Rice, who hath built a corn mill in said town, which is allowed by the proprietors to be of public use for the town, £170 old tenor, in part for the building and erecting said mill provided the said Aaron Rice will give a sufficient obligation to the proprietors to keep said mill in repair, and grind at all convenient times for the proprietors, taking the old tenor, £170, and £100 for more; and to keep said mill in repair for the space of 10 years from this day."

Thus the little settlement, so long in getting its start, began to prosper under its organized institutions and population or organization. But it was destined to receive one more serious blow before its success could be firmly established. In 1754, the smoldering conflict between the French and English burst into flames again. It was the final struggle for possession of a rich new land, made more intense by the conflict between Catholic and Protestant religious backgrounds and opposing nationalities. The French cemented their relations with the Indians of the Northeast in preparation for a massive and deadly assault, while the English settlers repaired their old defenses and stood ready for war.

Charlemont took measures to protect herself and her inhabitants. Captain Rice fortified his home, and his sons fortified their homes, and other residents moved their dwellings together and enclosed them with pickets. The defenses were made at the settlers' own cost, and no soldiers were furnished to provide additional protection. The settlers kept a constant vigil, and worked with muskets in hand, while women and children never left their homes unguarded. One day, tragedy struck. Mr. White's narrative reports that "Captain Rice received a severe wound in the thigh and was taken prisoner, together with the lad Asa upon the horse, and Titus King, a young man, and a relation of Captain Rice. Artemas Rice escaped from the pursuers. At the party were near to Millbrook and farthest from their firearms, when they suddenly fired and rushed upon the defenseless party."

Arms fell dead in the cornfield; Captain Rice received a severe wound in the thigh and was taken prisoner, together with the lad Asa upon the horse, and Titus King, a young man, and a relation of Captain Rice. Artemas Rice escaped from the pursuers. At the party were near to Millbrook and farthest from their firearms, when they suddenly fired and rushed upon the defenseless party.

On receiving the alarm, Mr. Taylor hastened to Deerfield for succor, and returned the same night with 25 men. They proceeded to the fort, but only to witness the dejections of the preceding day, and to render their kind offices to the stricken family in the burial of the dead. Sad, indeed, was this the first burial day in Charlemont; sad, when sons and daughters, and their little ones, looked for the last time into the mangled face of the aged sire, and buried him in silence and gloom beneath his own soil. His grave was made upon the slope of the hill near his dwelling; and here also, by his side, they buried the young man, Phineas Arms, who had fallen with him in the field.

Fortunately, this was the last time that Charlemont was exposed to the horrors of the war. By the treaty of Paris, France lost forever her foothold on American soil.

For the next 3 years Charlemont grew and began to prosper. There were new town meetings, and the projects begun before the war were resumed and completed. On June 21, 1765, in response to the petitions of the settlers, Charlemont was incorporated as an independent township.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the story behind the birthday celebration this weekend. It is a fine story, and I think you will agree that there is much to celebrate. So, on behalf of all the folks here, I will join with me in sending our warmest wishes to Charlemont on this, her proud and historic 200th birthday.

EMPLOYEE PENSION AND WELFARE FUNDS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill along with others from New York [Mr. Halpern] to provide for more effective regulation of employee pension and welfare funds. A similar bill has been introduced in the other body by Senator Pate.

This bill will not affect those unions and/or companies which are administering welfare and pension funds in accordance with customary fiduciary standards—it is aimed solely at those unscrupulous persons who would deprive employees and union members of the benefits earned by long years of service.

The bill would amend the Taft-Hartley Act:

First. Prohibit any officer of a firm or a union from receiving, directly or indirectly, any money other than normal pension benefits from an employee benefit fund.

Second. Insure that all fund assets will ultimately be distributed to the beneficiaries of the fund and not diverted for any other purpose, or to the personal use of those in control of the fund and prohibit the transfer of fund assets outside the United States.

Third. Extend existing Federal law and regulations so that they cover all employee benefit funds, whether or not established jointly by labor and management.

Fourth. Authorize the Secretary of Labor to sue in Federal court to restrain illegally diverted assets for the fund, to refrain such diversions or to compel payment of benefits, and to put the fund into receivership if necessary.

Fifth. Allow individual beneficiaries to sue in Federal court to recover illegally diverted assets for the fund, to restrain such diversions or to compel payment of benefits, and to put the fund into receivership if necessary.

The bill, I propose, would close these loopholes and in addition would provide a battery of procedural avenues of enforcement.

First, an individual beneficiary could sue in Federal district court to recover illegally diverted assets for the fund, to restrain such diversions or to compel payment of benefits, and to put the fund into receivership if necessary.

The bill, I propose, would close these loopholes and provide a battery of procedural avenues of enforcement.

First, an individual beneficiary could sue in Federal district court to recover illegally diverted assets for the fund, to restrain such diversions or to compel payment of benefits, and to put the fund into receivership if necessary.
moved and unemployment has fallen below the national average. Through Congressman Weaver's efforts, progress was made in securing funds for both continuing useful projects and initiating new projects of importance to his district. Mr. Speaker, he has always been attentive to the needs of his constituents and conscientious in his efforts to secure prompt action.

During the second session of the 88th Congress, Jim Weaver was appointed to the important and powerful House Committee on Appropriations, a signal honor for a freshman Member of Congress. As a member of this important committee for 14 years I was pleased to have a person of Jim's outstanding ability and dedication assigned to this group that has the responsibility to critically scrutinize the Federal budget.

Jim Weaver's concern for his district includes his longstanding opposition to the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, he would have been in a strong position to exert his influence in awarding necessary funds for this billion-dollar boondoggle. I am proud to have a man of Jim Weaver's stature and high sense of duty to country. His record as a Member of Congress serves as a tribute to his dedication and diligent efforts on behalf of those principles which make America a great republic.

UNIFORM DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

The SPEAKER. Before any other order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that from time to time we take note of the efforts of those who by their service in Congress have made a lasting contribution to the welfare of our country and its people. In this regard, I would like at this time to give recognition to the work of our former colleague, the Honorable James D. Weaver, of Pennsylvania, during his tenure in the House of Representatives.

During the past 88th Congress, Jim Weaver, who in private life had been a physician in Erie, Pa., until 1948, served as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, which considers the budget for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. He was active in the work of the Subcommittees on Research and Development and Space Sciences and Applications. In this capacity, Congressman Weaver was a zealous guardian of the interest of the American taxpayer. At the same time he recognized the paramount importance of maintaining the superiority of the United States in the areas of science and technology. Along with other House Members, he strongly urged formation of a special congressional group to help shift emphasis of the space program toward meeting the Soviet threat for military domination of inner space.

Along with his concern for our country's defensive posture in space, Congressman Weaver was a strong advocate of a new U.S. foreign policy in dealing with the Communist threat in Latin America and other areas of the world. Under his guidance a bipartisan group of Congressmen was formed to explore and consider the complex problems involved. He was among the foremost in understanding the continuing need for policies and programs to protect the free world's vital interests against the aggressive nature of the present Communism.

Jim Weaver served the 24th Congressional District of Pennsylvania faithfully and well. During his term of office the three counties which comprise the northwestern corner of the Keystone State reaped the benefits of his efforts.

As an example, the employment picture improved to the extent that the label of "distressed area" has finally been re-
Mr. Speaker, I now turn to the situation in my own State of Minnesota. The situation there, which has been called "confusion compounded with chaos," typifies in many ways the problem we are trying to correct.

Minnesota observes daylight saving time on a nonstatewide basis from the fourth Sunday in May to Labor Day.

This year several cities in the eastern part of the State jumped the gun and began daylight saving time on the same date that Wisconsin, our eastern neighbor, started daylight saving time. This prompted one Minnesota paper to write:

Convicts do time. Soldiers do double time. Minnesotans do triple time.

For a while we had central standard time, daylight saving time, and extended daylight saving time. Minnesotans do triple time.

Some examples of this situation show the humor and the confusion:

Students at the University of Minnesota-Duluth were on standard time but ate and slept at home on daylight saving time.

A person could lose an entire hour by walking the 120 feet from the Duluth City Hall to the St. Louis County Courthouse but get it back as he or she was in another 100 feet of the same building.

On April 30, the town council of Hibbing, Minn., voted to go on daylight saving time on May 2. On May 1, they voted to stay on central standard time, and later on the same day voted to begin daylight saving time on May 10.

I would like to recall for my colleagues our worst experience with time confusion—a real "tale of two cities." Quoting Charles Dickens, on May 9 of this year our capital city of St. Paul decided to go on daylight saving time 2 weeks ahead of the statewide changeover date. The confusion that resulted is almost indescribable.

All the State offices located in St. Paul remained on central standard time.

The St. Paul police were writing out parking tickets on standard time while the firemen were fighting fires on daylight saving time.

The city council which had voted daylight saving time convened for its regular meeting under a clock that was on standard time because all the courthouse clocks remained on central standard time.

This confusion was compounded by the fact that the Twin City of Minneapolis which I represent remained on standard time. For a while you could lose an hour by crossing the bridge. If you were not careful, you could get caught in two 5 o'clock rush hour traffic jams instead of the usual one.

This was made worse by the fact that some of the suburbs went on daylight saving time in their own time with St. Paul while some remained on standard time.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert several articles reporting this confusion at this point in the Record:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, May 10, 1965]

CONFUSION REIGNS AS ST. PAUL GOES ON DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

St. Paul was on "wrist watch" time today. That was really the only way you could be sure of the time in this city, which went on daylight saving time (d.s.t.) Sunday morning 2 weeks ahead of Minneapolis and much of the rest of Minnesota.

Most banks moved their clocks ahead 1 hour, but some remained on standard time and moved the starting times of those employees ahead 1 hour.

All State and Federal agencies, however, were on standard time. The Ramsey County board opened its regular weekly meeting at 10 a.m., standard time.

The telephone company was still giving out standard time in its recorded time-of-day message.

Minnesota was rolled into the Minneapolis-St. Paul Sanitary District plant from St. Paul on daylight time, but left on standard time.

If you called a plumber, he showed up on daylight time.

Two St. Paul policemen arrived for work wearing a wrist watch on each arm, one for standard time and one for daylight time.

Mail arrived an hour earlier at St. Paul homes because the post office is on standard time.

STAGGERED SHIFTS

All city and county offices in which records with deadline times are filed, staggered the shifts of some employees to remain open from 7:30 a.m. standard time to 4:30 p.m. daylight time.

Most St. Paul business firms reported little confusion with employees arriving late—or early.

Two clocks were set up at the Northwest Orient Airlines registration desk to aid employees in informing passengers about flight times. Warren Phillips of the United Airlines desk said, "We just ask people what time it shows on their watch and give them directions from there.

Al Olson, St. Paul City Council recorder, probably had the best solution. "I don't have any watch," he said. "I'm going to lunch when I'm hungry."

[From the St. Paul, Minn. Pioneer Press, May 10, 1965]

TIME TROUBLES: CLOCK CONFUSION

CONFounds CITIES

Mother had time on her hands—or at least on her mind—Sunday as the Twin Cities area's fast and slow clock situation became more and more confusing.

St. Paulites had been instructed to set their clocks back 1 hour at 2 a.m. Sunday. But some forgot.

Many families arrived for church services just as the rest of the congregation was leaving. Pupils were minus a teacher who still was operating on central standard time.

Of calls received in the St. Paul Pioneer Press newsroom, some were irate. All were confused.

One man complained that he had missed his favorite television program. It seems he tuned in an hour too early and then forgot to tune back an hour later. Confusing?

But some were not. Most Twin Cities television stations are on central standard time. To create as little additional confusion as possible, this newspaper's television and radio logs were all set in central standard time as will television highlights. If you live in a daylight saving time community, just remember 7 p.m. is 8 p.m. on your radio or television.

The clock-switching also has caused some headaches for local on-sale and off-sale liquor store owners who will have to decide for themselves whether or not they will operate according to central standard time or daylight saving time.

St. Paul on-sale bars will operate on daylight saving time starting today.

We have moved our clocks ahead to comply with the decision of our city council, the local governing body," said Frank J. Einck, executive secretary of the St. Paul On-Sale Liquor Dealers Association. "Daylight saving time hours will be from 9 a.m. until 2 a.m., effective May 23.

All of Minnesota goes on daylight saving time May 23.

But there are still confused about what time it is in various suburbs. Here's a list of communities on daylight saving time: Bayport, Birchwood, East Oakdale township, Gem Lake, Lake Elmo, Northwood, Landfall, Lauderdale, Lincoln township, Mahtomedi, Newport (unofficially), Roseville, St. Croix Beach, Shoreview, Stillwater, sunny lake, Vadnais Heights, West St. Paul and White Bear township.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, May 6, 1965]

BIGGEST PROBLEM: STATE 3 WEEKS BEHIND OTHERS IN DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME START

(By Dick Caldwell)

In the up-tempo rush of an hour's time differential that is to come to the Twin Cities Sunday, the problems of business and industry apparently will be merely nuisances.

The really big problem, Minnesota's 3-week lag behind the Nation's major metropolitan centers in starting daylight saving time (d.s.t.), will be an hour's difference between St. Paul and Minneapolis will affect most businesses only to the extent it will affect their employees in the same town.

Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., for instance, will keep Minneapolis time in its Minneapolis business office and change the clock to daylight saving time in the St. Paul business office.

Honeywell, Inc., will keep its Roseville Plant on standard time and Minneapolis on daylight time.

Northern States Power Co., will operate its St. Paul and Minneapolis divisions according to the prevailing time in each city.

Most of the juggling will be done by transportation companies, especially Twin City Lines.

John L. Dahll, assistant to the executive vice president of that firm, said bus schedules will be set ahead 1 hour in St. Paul and suburbs.

BIG CITY TIME

"This will mean that people in areas adjacent to St. Paul, such as St. Paul and Minneapolis subdivisions, will not be required to go on daylight saving time," said Dahll.

"In Minneapolis and the communities adjacent thereto, there will be no change in the schedule of the buses," Dahll said. "In St. Paul and Minneapolis at the peak hours of travel, adjustment in the service will be made at the limits to provide the least inconvenience to the traveling public."

Greyhound Bus Lines still operates on standard time throughout Minnesota, even though Duluth and some other communities already are on daylight saving time.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, May 9, 1965]

NOW IS THE HOUR—PICK ONE

St. Paul residents lost 1 hour's sleep Saturday night and may lose a few more in the confusion of the next few days, thanks to daylight saving time (d.s.t.).

D.s.t. (wherein you set your clock 1 hour ahead) began in St. Paul and several suburbs at 2 a.m. today. That is, it began in most of St. Paul.

The municipal court has announced that a violation of central standard time (c.s.t.) until May 23, and since the courts are on c.s.t., the St. Paul police have decided to ignore them.

Then there are the Minnesota legislature and State office buildings. Naturally, they'll abide by State law that provides for Minnesota to go on d.s.t. officially at 2 a.m. May 23.
A spokesperson for Gov. Karl Rolvaag said the legislature has "torn up its work schedule and will be working around the clock any way."

Minneapolis and most of its suburbs also will wait two weeks before starting d.s.t., as will both campuses of the University of Minnesota.

Attempts by Minneapolis Mayor Arthur Naftulin and others to effect a change in State law, at least as far as so far in the Minnesota legislative session.

Meanwhile, those who divide their time between communities are in some state of a bind. To accommodate 50 to 75 part-time school bus drivers who live or work in d.s.t. areas, the Mounds View Independent School District (located entirely in d.s.t.) will start all activities 1 hour early Monday.

Parents who are still on CST will have to get their youngsters going on d.s.t. School board member George Hanszik admitted that this might be a hardship, but he said the decision was a "compelling one."

The St. Paul area communities now on fast time include Roseville, Lauderdale, Shoreview, Vadnais Heights, Birchwood, Mahomed, Shore Acres, Sunfish, West St. Paul, East Oakdale Township, Stillwater, and Newport. In the later case the move is unofficial, through community wide agreement.

Hibbing and Rochester also began d.s.t. today. Many other communities, most of them near the Wisconsin border, went on d.s.t. a week ago.

North St. Paul will try to stand divided. The village council voted to remain on CST until next Sunday, but the North St. Paul Businessman's Association decided to start d.s.t. Monday.

District courts in St. Paul will stick to C.S.T., but will start 1 hour earlier, as will most offices in the St. Paul City Hall-Courthouse.

The first question in the State session of the legislative today was whether 6 minutes must be added to the daylight saving time in the city of St. Paul, as the city hall session yesterday.

H.R. 6134 which I introduced on May 11, 1965 after I saw that our legislature would not act, provides that daylight time begin each year on the last Sunday in April or in late May, but a majority of State residents think it would be better if Congress set uniform dates for daylight saving time.

Mr. Speaker, through this entire episode our State legislature was unable to approve a bill which would have resolved these problems. I am told by some of my State colleagues, that Minnesota residents have had the same experience in their States. It is for this reason that I strongly believe that we need Federal legislation to provide a uniform period for daylight saving time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would not impose any unwanted changes to daylight saving time on those sections of our country which prefer standard time. It would only amend the existing Standard Time Act of 1918 to provide for a uniform period for those areas who use daylight saving time.

I think the proposals that have been made by myself and others are not an undue intrusion on local autonomy. The virtues of local autonomy are many, but to the businessman or the tourist, the varying dates of time changeover must seem to be mere idle caprice. There seems to be no good reason for all this variance. Undoubtedly many States and communities would have added a real awareness of the need for uniform.
Lloyd Brandt, manager of the legislative department, Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, appeared as a witness. Under unanimous consent I insert Mr. Lloyd Brandt, manager of the legislative Commerce, appeared as a witness.

Mr. Brandt: I am happy to have the opportunity to read a short statement from our organization. The Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce by resolution of its board of directors, supports S. 1404.

After years of experience in our State legislature, it is our conclusion that a national bill is the only way to bring order out of chaos. This bill has definite limitations, but it is a step in the right direction.

This is the situation in Minnesota. The time statute in Minnesota orders daylight saving time from the fourth Sunday in May to the last Sunday in October, and communities along the Wisconsin border such as Duluth, Wisconsin, and a host of smaller towns move their clocks forward the last Sunday in April, conforming to the daylight saving time being observed in Wisconsin. On the fourth Sunday in May, the rest of the State will go on fast time, starting the earliest communities and the Dakotas border. The same procedure will be followed in the fall—some cities remaining on daylight saving time while the State goes back to central standard time.

As a result of this confusion, for 6 months all Minnesota clocks are the same. During the remaining 6 months various combinations of time can be found in the State, depending on what month or day it happens to be.

I don't need to tell you what kind of problems are presented to the transportation companies, radio and television, and others by this confusion. These are isolated industries, however, and if only they were affected, it might be a tolerable situation.

Such is not the case; the efficiency of every major company is affected. We are a grain, finance, and electronics center and for the most part, our community of interest is with the East. The situation is shown in the map attached. Fifty percent of long-distance telephone calls originated in Minnesota communities have switched to daylight saving time. The situation is further compounded when different combinations of dates when communities begin and end daylight saving time. Any law-abiding Minnesotan who keeps his watch set on standard time, must remember that events start and stop an hour earlier these days in Duluth.

Daylight saving time is a popular move throughout most of the larger communities. The hour more of daylight after regular working hours is appreciated by most people. Eventually, however, some means must be found to make a switch uniform throughout the country. There is no sense in having Wisconsin on one time and Minnesota on another, even for a month or two in spring and fall.

Some people would argue that the Minnesota Legislature should get into the question of daylight time and make our law conform to that of the Eastern States. But it was exceedingly difficult to obtain agreement even on the present compromise. The legislature could spend days in debating daylight saving and still end up without a satisfactory arrangement. The legislature could not agree on the basic purpose of daylight saving time and it could not afford to spend little time on daylight saving.

Congress is finally taking up the question of daylight saving time seriously. It will consider laws to establish daylight uniform throughout the Nation. There is a natural reluctance for Congress to move into the field because some States are strongly for it and some are bitterly opposed. But there are also other reasons. The costs, uncertainties and inconvenience produced by lack of uniformity in time should not be allowed to continue longer than necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks today by referring to the results of a Minnesota poll which just arrived in my office today.

That poll conducted by the highly respected Minneapolis Tribune shows that 63 percent of people polled feel strongly about the extension of daylight saving time, 36 percent do not feel strongly and only 1 percent had no opinion.

The poll also showed that 58 percent of the people like daylight saving time while only 35 percent disliked it.

These figures are significant, I believe, and point out the importance the citizens of Minnesota attach to the daylight saving time issue.

I hope the 89th Congress will be able to resolve this problem by enacting a law to provide uniform dates for daylight saving time.

EXTENT OF OBSERVANCE IN 1965 OF DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME IN THE UNITED STATES


Not statewide: Alabama, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, and Virginia.

States not observing daylight saving time:

Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wisconsin.

[From the Grand Rapids (Minn), Herald-Review, Apr. 28, 1965]

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME CONFUSES FEDERAL ATTENTION

Daylight saving time started on Sunday in 16 States and a federal law makes the switch during the next month or so. States in the South and in the Farm Belt will now observe standard time instead of daylight time. The situation is shown in the map below which appeared in the Minneapolis Star (not printed in the Record).

A real possibility is that we will end up with as simple a map as it looks on the map. A number of Minnesota communities have switched to daylight time in spite of a State law which forbids the change until the whole State makes the change on May 23.

Among the Minnesota maverick cities are Duluth, Two Harbors, Winona and a number of smaller towns. Any law-abiding Minnesotan who keeps his watch set on standard time, must remember that events start and stop an hour earlier these days in Duluth.

Daylight saving time is a popular move throughout most of the larger communities. The hour more of daylight after regular working hours is appreciated by most people. Eventually, however, some means must be found to make a switch uniform throughout the country. There is no sense in having Wisconsin on one time and Minnesota on another, even for a month or two in spring and fall.

Some people would argue that the Minnesota Legislature should get into the question of daylight time and make our law conform to that of the Eastern States. But it was exceedingly difficult to obtain agreement even on the present compromise. The legislature could spend days in debating daylight saving and still end up without a satisfactory arrangement. The legislature could not agree on the basic purpose of daylight saving time and it could not afford to spend little time on daylight saving.

Congress is finally taking up the question of daylight saving time seriously. It will consider laws to establish daylight uniform throughout the Nation. There is a natural reluctance for Congress to move into the field because some States are strongly for it and some are bitterly opposed. But there are also other reasons. The costs, uncertainties and inconvenience produced by lack of uniformity in time should not be allowed to continue longer than necessary.

(From Rochester (Minn) Post Bulletin, May 1965)

UNIFORM DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME BILL MEETS SUPPORT

(From Charles Withers)

America's annual "time bomb" has exploded again, spreading prescheduled confusion throughout the land. Something like 100 million citizens advanced their clocks 1 hour last Sunday, leaving 65 million fellow Americans out of phase with each other.

Only 15 States now schedule daylight saving time simultaneously. In the 16 others the shift has been spread over a 4 to 5 week period, so the whole business is mighty confused. In our own Minnesota, for example, there are three sets of d.s.t. periods—one for Wisconsin border communities, another for bordering the Dakotas, and one for all the rest of the State. It is just plain silly.

It's just as bad or worse elsewhere. A driver at 7 a.m. out of Cleveland, Ohio, to Moundsville, W. Va., now passes through seven time zone switches. Pennsylvanians can't tell what times on standard time but resident of more than 600 communities in that State are on daylight saving time. The situation is further complicated by different combinations of dates when communities begin and end d.s.t.
In the 16 States, including Minnesota, that observe some daylight time but not on the April-October regular schedule, there are 11 different starting times and terminal dates. And in States where d.s.t. is permitted on a local-option basis the situation is completely snafu.

FEDERAL, NOT STATE MATTER

Although this newspaper favors extension of daylight saving time in Minnesota from the last Sunday in April to last Sunday in October, as observed in the East and in the more populous States, we observe with consternation that we can think of. (The first is the dragging of railroad time. The four standard time zones in America were created in 1883 to eliminate confusion that existed with each railroad running on its own "standard time." There were more than 100 railroad systems in existence, eight different ones in Pittsburgh alone.

Officially, standard time went into effect in 1867, but the "19th century's" best unsung hero except for the labor movement, in this let's have not any more of this "God's time" nonsense.

Let's have daylight saving time from the end of March to the end of October. There should be those dates uniform in every State and locality that wants d.s.t.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star Tribune, May 9, 1965]

TIME'S A DEMOCRATIC ELEMENT

Time is the most democratic element in existence...everyone from the mightiest to the humblest has 24 hours in a day, a month, no less. It's the division of the hours that cause all the consternation in our State today.

Contrary to popular belief the Lord did not establish time zones. There's no such thing as "natural times." There are many schools of thought of how time zones were established. Some say it was God, others say, established divisions of time in this country to regulate schedules more sensibly.

Credits for the original idea of daylight saving time go to Benjamin Franklin. Always a careful man with pennies, Mr. Franklin awoke one morning at 6 a.m. in Paris in 1785. Sunlight streaming into his room while most of the city still slept. Being a logical man he figured thatFabians have thought up candles so early at night if they started their day an hour earlier to take advantage of early sunrise. Being the son of a candlemaker be figured Parisians could save 60 million livre in candle overhead by just moving their clocks ahead 1 hour.

This is one of the 31 States observing daylight saving time. Of this number 20 move their clocks ahead on May 1, the others, including our State, move ahead later and end day saving time the last Sunday in October.

Surely this proposal to unmask the crazy-quilt now in effect makes sense—not only for every industry and business but for the man in the street also. It is scarcely an invasion of a State's rights or a community's rights, to have it observe a standardized time.

The truth is that standard time confusion is long overdue. More than 100 million Americans will advance their clocks to daylight saving time, while 90 million people will not change.

"This annual time scramble complicates all operations and scheduling of the transportation industry. It confounds the television viewer, bewilders the traveling traveler and aggravates the businessman," Senator Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire, said. "A flood of missed appointments, and late arrivals will plague many a man and woman." Let's see what happens:

Fifteen States start daylight saving time the last Sunday in April and end the last Sunday in October.

Of the 31 States, 15 observe it on a State-wide basis, while others have local option.

And across the country isolated areas observe "wintent" d.s.t. without official sanction. Some States do not observe it at all. This legislation to have time and date uniformity, wherever daylight saving time is adopted should be encouraged.

[From the Cambridge (Minn.) Gazette, April 15, 1965]

Any change in Minnesota's daylight saving time schedule seems to be a dead issue in the session. The situation is completely snafu.

Contrary to popular belief the Lord did not establish time zones. There's no such thing as "natural times." There are many schools of thought of how time zones were established. Some say it was God, others say it was established divisions of time in this country to regulate schedules more sensibly.

Credits for the original idea of daylight saving time go to Benjamin Franklin. Always a careful man with pennies, Mr. Franklin awoke one morning at 6 a.m. in Paris in 1785. Sunlight streaming into his room while most of the city still slept. Being a logical man he figured that Fabians have thought up candles so early at night if they started their day an hour earlier to take advantage of early sunrise. Being the son of a candlemaker be figured Parisians could save 60 million livre in candle overhead by just moving their clocks ahead 1 hour.

This is one of the 31 States observing daylight saving time. Of this number 20 move their clocks ahead on May 1, the others, including our State, move ahead later and end daylight saving time the last Sunday in October.

Surely this proposal to unmask the crazy-quilt now in effect makes sense—not only for every industry and business but for the man in the street also. It is scarcely an invasion of a State's rights or a community's rights, to have it observe a standardized time.

The truth is that standard time confusion is long overdue. More than 100 million Americans will advance their clocks to daylight saving time, while 90 million people will not change.

"This annual time scramble complicates all operations and scheduling of the transportation industry. It confounds the television viewer, bewilders the traveling traveler and aggravates the businessman," Senator Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire, said. "A flood of missed appointments, and late arrivals will plague many a man and woman." Let's see what happens:

Fifteen States start daylight saving time the last Sunday in April and end the last Sunday in October.

Of the 31 States, 15 observe it on a State-wide basis, while others have local option.

And across the country isolated areas observe "wintent" d.s.t. without official sanction. Some States do not observe it at all. This legislation to have time and date uniformity, wherever daylight saving time is adopted should be encouraged.

[From the Cambridge (Minn.) Gazette, April 28, 1965]

TIMELY CONFUSION

In the wee hours of Monday, the 26th of April, 20 States and a scattering of adjacent communities went on daylight saving time. Later in the day, bills for permitting legislation to bring some order out of the daylight saving time chaos were started by Congressmen from various States.

The situation Congress proposes to wrestle with has taken some rather fancy wrestling. Not all the 30 States that so unanimously changed their clocks on April 26 will revert to ordinary time on the same day; the switch back will be made on various dates, ranging from sometime in August to the last Sunday in October. Furthermore, 11 other States will go on and off of daylight time on a variety of dates. Nor is the fast time law the same in all States; many areas own their own local time. Areas in other States observe it without official sanction, and other States do not observe it at all.

A uniform system is badly needed.

[From the Stillwater (Minn.) Gazette, April 28, 1965]

IT'S TIME TO UNSCRAMBLE TIME

As the accompanying editorial cartoon indicates, the Nation is now living on "scrambled time." More than 100 million Americans will advance their clocks to daylight saving time, while 90 million people will not change.

This annual time scramble complicates all operations and scheduling of the transportation industry. It confounds the television viewer, bewilders the traveling traveler and aggravates the businessman," Senator Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire, said. "A flood of missed appointments, and late arrivals will plague many a man and woman." Let's see what happens:

Fifteen States start daylight saving time the last Sunday in April and end the last Sunday in October.

Of the 31 States, 15 observe it on a State-wide basis, while others have local option.

And across the country isolated areas observe "wintent" d.s.t. without official sanction. Some States do not observe it at all. This legislation to have time and date uniformity, wherever daylight saving time is adopted should be encouraged.

[From the Owatonna (Minn.) Photo News, April 29, 1965]
in October. Sixteen other States either start or end daylight saving time on different dates. Of these 31 States, 15 observe it on a statewide basis, while the others have local option. And across the country, the count of ‘wildcats’—daylight saving time without official sanction—some States do not observe it at all.

The chief purpose designed to end daylight saving time was introduced in both Houses of Congress, and I am all for it. How about you?

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

Mr. Speaker. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I read my colleague, and good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRAZER), in an effort to better call to the attention of the House the need for early action on any one of a number of daylight saving situations, and to urge the Congress to take whatever steps are necessary to end the haphazard and often confusing state of affairs. Our states, in too many instances, are left to their own devices to handle what is a national problem. It is time that Congress, which has the power to regulate commerce among the States, has the duty to make better sense between the time zones than currently exists when daylight saving time is in effect for varying periods in the United States.

I am pleased to sponsor legislation of this kind, especially since the City Council of St. Paul, Minn., and a number of business, civic, and labor organizations favor the passage of a uniform daylight saving time law.

[From the Minneapolis Star, July 27, 1965]

ST. PAUL TO CONCUR WITH DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME STATUTE

BY JIM SHOOP

St. Paul Mayor George Vavoulis announced today that St. Paul will not remain on daylight saving time this fall beyond the date specified by State law.

St. Paul Council passed a resolution May 5 placing the city on daylight saving time May 9 until the last Sunday in October.

State law limits fast time to the period between the fourth Sunday in May (May 23 this year) and the last Sunday after Labor Day (September 7).

At the time, Vavoulis contended that Minnesota time dates conflicted with those in the East and made it difficult for businessmen to conduct their operations.

ACTING ON ADVICE

A statement issued by the mayor’s office today said Vavoulis was acting on the advice of a committee that studied daylight saving time and determined that daylight saving time could be operated successfully on a metropolitan area basis.

(Vavoulis is attending the National League of Cities convention this week in Detroit, Mich., and could not be reached for comment.)

The committee was composed of Robert C. Eckhardt, chamber of commerce; Priscilla Bugg, St. Paul public schools; Russell Runzheimer, Downtown Retailers; and Richard Radman, Trades and Labor Assembly. They said daylight time in the metropolitan area “cannot be voluntarily achieved.”

The committee report said the St. Paul action this spring “has been instrumental in making the Congress of the United States aware of the necessity of a national daylight saving time law.”

The mayor’s statement said he is hopeful Congress will pass a bill introduced by representatives Joseph Karth, St. Paul, and Donald Fraser, Minneapolis, both DFLers which would create a uniform daylight time period of 6 months.

Minneapolis Mayor Arthur Nafthalin vigorously opposed the St. Paul action but could do nothing about it. He announced May 1 that Minneapolis and St. Paul would observe daylight saving time without official sanction.

The enactment of my bill and/or similar legislation would not disturb the rights of the States to impose daylight saving time but would only set forth a uniform period when daylight saving time would be in effect; namely, from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in September of each year.

I believe that Congress, which has the power to regulate commerce among the several States, has the duty to make better sense between the time zones than currently exists when daylight saving time is in effect for varying periods in the United States.

The legislature took no action on daylight time.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch, July 27, 1965]

GOVT MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

Mayor George Vavoulis has asked the city council to rescind a resolution that put St. Paul on extended daylight saving time. It is a request to the city council, with the mayor, at whose urging the resolution was passed this spring. It put St. Paul on fast time 2 weeks ahead of Minneapolis and it would have extended this city’s daylight time 8 more weeks this fall.

Vavoulis now feels that the mission has been accomplished. The only question is how to ask the action so that action is not done. The action did look at St. Paul’s fine fast time law and those in other States. He is hoping now for passage of legislation introduced again this session by Representative Joseph KARTH, of St. Paul, which would require uniformity. The Karth bill doesn’t force daylight time on anyone, but it does set forth that States which go on it would have to start and stop together.

We felt the mayor was somewhat impulsive when he put St. Paul on an independent time base. There was confusion and it would have been compounded this fall. But he says he is a champion of the city folk over the cow, with all her fussiness at changes in working hours, and her stanch champions in the legislature.

St. Paul’s city time, occasionally referred to as George A. Vavoulis Time, or GAVT, or merely GVT, was good for a few laughs, more than a few headaches (the police, for example, spent a few days on standard time to the regret of motorists parking in timed no-parking zones) and lots treated debate in regard to lawmaking by public officials.

There was, however, less confusion than had been expected. St. Paul has the therapeutic benefit of clocking the city’s snoot at the chaps on our Capitol Hill.

We can hope the cause has been dramatized enough at this point to help passage of the Karth bill. There has been enough insanity on the issue and apparently the cure is beyond the capabilities of many State legislatures, including our own.

[From the St. Paul Dispatch, July 27, 1965]

MAYOR ASKS REPEAL OF FAST-TIME DECREES

St. Paul is expected to restore the Minnesota on Labor Day in respect to daylight saving and standard time.

St. Paul Mayor George Vavoulis announced today, through his secretary, Duane Gratz, that he will ask the city council to rescind a resolution, adopted last May 4, at his urging, which put St. Paul on its own independent daylight saving time.

Vavoulis, attending a municipal conference in Detroit, sent word back that he is taking the action in great measure because he hopes the Karth-Frazier bill, now in Congress, will pass. If it does, it will require the city council to rescind the resolution and the city will have to start and end such time change on specific dates that will encompass a 6-month period.

In the mayor’s request for cancellation of the council resolution is adopted—and that is expected—St. Paul will drop daylight saving time at 2 a.m. Tuesday, September 7, the official end of the daylight time period.

If the council refuses to go along, St. Paul would continue on daylight saving time until September 7. The council meeting will provide nearly 3 more weeks of the double standard that prevailed here from May 9 to May 23.

The change would put St. Paul in line with the other States and would establish a national standard time the day after Labor Day.

Mayor Vavoulis and Mayor Arthur Nafthalin of Minneapolis, who had set up joint
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efforts to win a metropolitan time schedule for the Twin Cities, were reportedly submitting a resolution to the National League of Cities in a special session urging Congress to adopt the Kahr-Flaxer bill.

Also helping the mayor make up his mind to drop the original longer daylight time period was a printed statement given to him by a four-citizen committee which made a special study of the situation.

It reported that St. Paul's early start on daylight saving time further to Congress and a copy of this resolution.

Joseph E. Kahr on his submission of a bill in the Congress of the United States aimed at standardizing the dates on which States will observe daylight saving time, which I am sure is given wholeheartedly to Congressman Kahr in his efforts, through such proposed legislation, to solve the confusion and problems which arise in States which adopt daylight saving time do not do so uniformly and for the same periods of time; be it further resolved, that the city council be and hereby is directed to forward to Congressman Kahr a copy of this resolution.

Stephen L. Maxwell,

Corporation Counsel.

VILLAGE OF NEWPORT, MINN.,
May 19, 1965.

Hon. Joseph Kahr,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Kahr:
The problem of setting the beginning and ending dates for daylight saving time has caused a good deal of confusion in Minnesota and in other States. As you know, the situation in Minnesota was especially confused and it promises to be even worse this fall. As an organization of municipal officials, we feel that a feasible solution to the problem is a nationwide daylight saving time act which would set a uniform beginning and ending date.

The enclosed resolution was adopted by the Ramsey County League of Municipalities as an expression of our desire to see this kind of legislation passed by the Congress. We ask your support for a national daylight saving time act. We realize the problems of securing passage of such a bill in the Congress are as difficult as they are of securing passage of a daylight saving bill in the Minnesota Legislature. Nevertheless, this is a national problem, affecting interstate commerce and we feel a nationwide solution is the only reasonable answer to the problem.

Sincerely yours,

Byron Holm,
President.

RAMSEY COUNTY LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES

DEGREE OF RESOLUTION ON DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

Whereas the different beginning and ending dates for daylight saving time in the several States of the United States create confusion among neighboring States and municipalities; and

Whereas the Minnesota Legislature has repeatedly failed to pass legislation which would make the beginning and ending date for daylight saving time in Minnesota conform with that of the majority of other States; be it therefore

Resolved, That the Ramsey County League of Municipalities does hereby go on record in support of Federal legislation for a uniform daylight saving time act; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the Minnesota congressional delegation be so notified and urged to support such legislation.

Byron Holm,
President.

RESOLUTION BY CITY OF ST. PAUL

Resolved, That the council of the city of St. Paul hereby commends Congressman

Obviously, the charter commission would not want to call a special election on the subject if the matter is going to be taken over on the Federal level; but it looks as though the Federal proposal was not going to go through. Then I think the charter commission would want to take the initiative, or at least consider doing so, so as to eliminate the intolerable situation which exists on the conflicting dates during the periods when most of the Nation is, but Minnesota is not, on daylight saving time.

I would appreciate word from you that I could pass on to the charter commission at the meeting of July 15, as to the status and probability of enactment of the bill in Congress setting daylight saving dates on a national basis, and if you could give me word on such action in a peremptory meeting of July 15, I would appreciate it very much and I am sure the other members of the charter commission will also.

Cordially yours,

Philip Stringer.

NORTH CENTRAL COMMERCIAL AGGREGATE AND READY-MIXED CONCRETE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,


Hon. Joseph Kahr,
Fourth District, Minnesota, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Kahr:
I am the executive officer of this association, which believes that the charter commission of Ramsey County would like you to know that we support the bill which you introduced on behalf of legislation on a uniform daylight saving time.

We believe this is an excellent, bill, not only for our industry, but for an expanded economy in Minnesota in the areas of industry and recreation.

Yours truly,

Alfred C. Fulton,
President.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WORKMEN & HELPERS OF AMERICA,


Hon. Joseph Kahr,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Joe:
I wish to compliment you on your introducing legislation which will standardize daylight saving time nationally.

Our State legislature is studying whether or not to add an additional 2 months to our present daylight saving time which would conform with the State of Wisconsin. I am advised that the proposed legislation will not pass. As a matter of fact, we shall no doubt wind up keeping what we have.

I have read in the paper that Wisconsin has introduced legislation to extend their daylight saving time further, which will throw us 4 months out of balance, if it is passed.

It is my opinion that leaving this problem up to the State is not the answer, as you know the condition of our legislature in Minnesota. Ramsey County has already gone on record in support of legislation which would standardize with us with Wisconsin. Evidently, this will not receive any consideration in the State legislature.

There is but one answer to the problem of daylight saving and that is through Federal legislation.

Very truly yours,

Gordon R. Conklin,
Vice President.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN


Hon. Joseph Kahr,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Kahr:
The members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen,
Lodge 804, St. Paul, Minn., have instructed this secretary to write you to have you take steps to put daylight saving time in effect on a national basis, rather than at State option.

The reason for this request is that now, with railroads running through the various States, it is not possible to negotiate work-hour rulings that would not conflict with other areas. If the Nation was to change uniformly, as it did during World War II, it would be very easy to adjust standard time to daylight time.

Trust me that this will receive your prompt attention. Yours truly,

Secretary Lodge 804.

St. Paul, Minn.
February 5, 1965.

Hon. Joseph E. Karth,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Karth: I wish to offer some information relative to your bill to standardize daylight saving time. As you recall, I appeared before the St. Paul division headquarters and have talked to you on a number of occasions in the twin cities at various Democratic functions.

The present system of administering daylight saving time by the various States and communities is inexact. It is common knowledge that the Post Office Department millions of dollars a year to cover the cost of printing all the air mail changes, railroad changes, star route changes, and other material directly connected with effecting such changes. Every first- and second-class post office must maintain their individual copies of transportation schedules up to date. At the larger post offices, individual distributors are required to maintain current distribution schedules.

In addition, just consider the other mediums of transportation such as the airlines, railroads, bus lines, and telegraph companies that are required to print new schedules because of the lack of standardization of daylight saving time.

Attached is a news item out of last night’s St. Paul Dispatch which presents another picture—the loss to business because of the inexact changes.

Besides the Post Office Department, there are a large number of other governmental agencies affected. It has been estimated that this costs them a considerable amount of the taxpayers’ money and their budget for these obsolete practices.

It was a pleasure to attend the dinner in your honor at the Venetian Inn last fall. Best wishes for your continued success.

Sincerely yours,

Harry R. Hintzen,
Postal Inspector.

The Pilsbury Co.,
Minneapolis, Minn., June 11, 1965.

Hon. Joseph E. Karth,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Karth: As a new resident of the Fourth District, I have received the first of your bills from Washington.

I note with great interest that you have a bill to impose uniform daylight saving time by itself. I am strongly in favor of this bill.

The Pilsbury Co. favors this legislation because of the extreme inconvenience occasioned by daylight saving time to business by telephone and other communications devices. The non-uniform status of our daylight time in Minnesota is a major inconvenience to our merchandising and communications operations. As you know, this will be particularly serious for 2 months this fall owing to the action of some communities and the failure of the State legislature to act.

We earnestly urge the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to give favorable consideration to your bill.

Very truly yours,

Tom R. Mulcahy.

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

Mr. FRASER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Fraser), for taking this special order to point out the difficulty which exists in many areas as a result of the differences in the calendar date on which they go on daylight saving time.

Mr. Speaker, we who go home on occasional weekends surely have found this to be the case in Minnesota. In my own congressional district it is next to impossible, with some communities being on daylight saving time and another one not, sometimes within the same county, to get to one area an hour early and to another an hour late. Also, there is no chance of making this up on the road. It has caused a great deal of confusion.

There also seems to be a pattern as to time when many areas go on daylight saving time which interferes with the television programs, the world communications and transportation being fitted into this pattern.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it would greatly facilitate matters if the Congress would take action and set a date when daylight saving time would go into effect. If communities or States are to have daylight saving time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Hart), will hold hearings to which we can testify to the effect in our own communities as to this pattern of daylight saving time and another one which we can testify to the effect in our community.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. If communities or States are to have daylight saving time.

Mr. QUES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for his continuing efforts on behalf of establishing a uniform daylight saving time throughout our 50 States.

Furthermore, since January 1963, I have spoken several times from the floor of the House in support of uniform daylight saving time. I have testified before the Interstate Commerce Subcommittee which is chaired by the able Rep­resentative, the gentleman from West Virginia, Harley O. Staggers, and frequently I have discussed the problem of the lack of time uniformity with the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable Oren Harris.

Welcome is this opportunity to again speak for needed meaningful legislation in the regulation of our Nation’s timekeeping.

Mr. Speaker, I will not rejoin in my efforts to bring some synchronization to our keepers of time—the clock and the watch. I remind those opponents of a recent day in October, the standard time chaos that sundials are virtually extinct.

Let us not work for time but rather let time work for us.

Each spring, some 29 States representing over 100 million Americans ranging from Maine to California change their clocks by 1 hour. In only 16 of these States, however, is daylight saving time observed statewide, with the other 13 observing it in various sections of the State. Twenty-one States do not observe it at all. Among those that do favor fast time during the summer, there is no uniformity as to length or limits of duration.

Now, it would be ideal if there were no necessity for uniformity of time, if one area could observe one time and one area another time, with no effect on institutions outside its borders.

I want to illustrate how the 35-mile stretch from Steubenville, Ohio, to Moundsville, W. Va., where travelers until recently were obliged to change their watches seven times in order to observe various local times, and the situation becomes increasingly detrimental to business, commerce, and communications when, for example, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, and Chicago must observe daylight saving time independently of each other.

The transportation industry is particularly affected by the annual time-change disparities between areas. The motorbus industry estimates that it loses $250,000 a year just in printing costs necessitated by the annual scramble.

Mr. Speaker, do you realize that Cin­cinnati possible would have returned home in a beautiful horse-drawn carriage rather than a pumpkin-drawn by mice had she not become confused as to whether her community was observing standard or daylight time.

Or you may have this conversation:

Lord Elgin: “Dinner at 8?”

Lady Elgin: “That daylight time?”

Lord Elgin: “Oh no, I am on standard time.”

Lady Elgin: “Sorry, our movements are not together. My bill, H.R. 76, is an attempt to effect a solution to this chaotic situation. This bill would vest in the Congress the responsibility for regulation of the Nation’s time. Beginning on the last Sunday in April and ending the last Sunday in October, the standard time of each zone would be advanced 1 hour. This complete uniformity would eliminate situations such as that existing in Pennsylvania. Here, the State law requires that official business be conducted on eastern standard time but more than 600 localities observe daylight savings time. Similar interstate discrepancies, such as those existing between my own State and several others
in the central time belt, would be re­solved.

In essence, then, H.R. 76 would end the time confusion in this country by establishing a uniform schedule of savings time to be observed in every locality for 6 months. Control would be vested in the Congress to keep our national activity at its maximum.

This, to my thinking, is the most effective and comprehensive solution to the problem.

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

Mr. FRASER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at this point that I wholeheartedly support this effort to get uniformity and some sense into this current time situation and in the confusion which exists.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to be essential that Congress step into this picture. This is one area in my opinion where the Congress has a real responsibility in an effort to get rid of the confusion that now exists and plague our people all over the country.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman in his statements and in his proposal for obtaining uniformity of time nationwide.

I am reading into the Record the provisions of my bill H.R. 9023, introduced on June 14, 1965, a bill to provide a uniform period for daylight saving time. These are the provisions:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to save daylight and to provide for time changes for 1965," approved March 19, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 450; 15 U.S.C. 261-264), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6. Whenever the standard time in any time zone, or any part thereof, is advanced, a 1-hour standard day, the time of which shall be such as to give the greatest advantage to the interests of commerce, industry, and the public, shall be observed in the State, or States, wherein such standard time is in use, or in the State or States in such time zone, as the Secretary of Commerce may, by order, designate. The standard time shall be observed in the State, or States, wherein such standard time is in use, or in the State or States in such time zone, as the Secretary of Commerce may, by order, designate, at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in April of each year, and shall end at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday in October of each year."

The observance of time is of high national priority. Correct and easily calculated, uniform time in broad areas is essential for modern civilization.

The overriding national interest in time in all periods, but especially in times of emergency, is shown clearly by what happened during both World War I and World War II. Because of those conflicts, the U.S. Congress wisely decided that the war effort deserved the highest economic efficiency. If therefore legislated war time, which was in effect national daylight saving time. This not only eliminated time confusions—it helped to conserve fuel and other resources and eased the strain on our power system by shifting the consumer peak load demand and later in the evening.

My proposal and that of other Mem­bers does not assert that national day­light saving time in effect was not saved, but that the pend­ing legislation would not have that effect. Our proposal is for uniformity in time nationally, to avoid confusion. But I believe the time decisions made by Con­gress in previous years were so impres­sive that time confusion should not be tolerated for reasons high in the national interest. The pending legislation would wipe out the confusion now caused by daylight saving time and would permit states to enjoy that remarkable device without causing ourselves grave problems at the same time.

As a Pennsylvanian, I am proud that the institution of daylight saving time—a great idea—had saving time came—as did so many other progressive ideas—from Ben­jamin Franklin. While Franklin was our Minister to France, he conceived of the idea of advancing clocks 1 hour in order to make more daylight available. Franklin even calculated how many cand­les this would save the people of Paris. But the idea did not sell them.

In the United States, an early crusader for daylight saving time was Penn­sylvanian—Robert Garland, longtime Republican councilman of Philadelphia, whom I admired and respected, and re­member well. In one attempt to get day­light saving time, Garland declared that only man, of all living things, "is so stupid as to deprive himself of an extra hour of sun by sticking to a rigid system of time."

Pennsylvania thus has a historic stake in daylight saving time and consequently a great interest to see that daylight saving time is wisely utilized as a bene­fit—rather than a problem—for our country. The pending legislation would have precisely that effect—it would per­mit States and localities desiring it to enjoy the advantages of daylight saving time without permitting our present problems of confusion and uncertainty to arise.

I urge the House to act this year to guarantee that 1965 will go down in the history books as the last year of the great battle for day­light saving time. Let us at least start on uniformity where daylight saving time is desired and initiated in the United States.

I call attention to the following good newspaper articles.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Times, April 21, 1965]

TOWARD SENSIBLE TIME

A U.S. Naval Observatory scientist con­ttemporating the nationwide miasmash of fast time and slow time in the good old summer­time, was moved to remark that "the United States is the worst timekeeper in the world."

This view is amply documented. When America starts shifting Sunday to so-called daylight saving time—or not shifting, as the case may be—the chaos is enough to drive a President's 发狂. We have old-fashioned—"

There are examples galore. In Iowa, which has local option on time changes, daylight saving time is advanced for 23 different periods last year. Carriers from Chicago to Milwaukee to Minneapolis-St. Paul and back will encounter five time shifts and schedule changes in 6 months. Before
move to d.s.t. at a future date. In any event, the day that begins once more. The transportation services, railroads, airlines, buses, will figuratively speaking, go slightly crazier when they suddenly change one kind of time to another, to the consternation of travelers who aren’t sure which is which. Tourists, driving in and out of d.s.t. and standard time zones, will find themselves off schedule, often with expired reservations. And the confusions are not limited to those concerned with mobility. In some where local option is the rule, one town may broadcast, communications, farming, etc., distinguished support from to do something about it. The efforts of the committee for time uniformity to avoid our clocks to daylight time, like the present “scrambled time” problems. May it succeed.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader News, Apr. 20, 1965]

**SWITCH TO DAYLIGHT SAVING BEGINS**

**NEW YORK, April 20.—The United States is about to enter into an annual period of confusion.**

Daylight saving time will soon be here for much of the country.

This yearly clock juggling will affect business, transportation, and ordinary citizens. Next Sunday 162 million Americans in 20 States will advance clocks 1 hour and thus get out of step with the other 85 million Americans. This latter 85 million will either remain on the old time or be forced to jump two time zones or will remain on standard time.

Thus, the country will become a patchwork of time zones.

Benjamin Franklin is credited, or blamed, for daylight time. It’s said that, when he advanced the clock 1 hour, the city slept.

This “wasted” sunlight annoyed the frugal and industrious. An Almanac and Richard’s Almanac and he arrived at his destination before it took its journey. The travel and communications industries as well as manufacturers and producers are especially concerned with this problem.

Mr. Multer: Mr. Speaker, the city of New York has been observing daylight saving time continuously for over 35 years, and this observance has been widespread for many years. However, the time situation around the country, and in many States and localities, is not quite so simple. Thirty-one of the fifty States observe some form of daylight-saving time, but only fifteen States have uniform beginning and ending dates; sixteen States have it at a matter of local option, and nineteen States do not observe it at all. Additional confusion results from time variations between different localities and communities within a single State.

This lack of time uniformity is more than an annoyance. It represents a substantial and unnecessary waste in money and resources. The travel and communications industries as well as manufacturers and producers are especially concerned with this problem.

A strong argument can be made for the desirability of a shift to daylight saving time, winter as well as summer. Such a move would be especially favorable in New York and New England. However, it would be unwise to confuse the situation with further proposals while Congress is considering Federal legislation in this area.
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Daylight saving time achieved its first wide observance in World War II when it was adopted throughout the country to give farmers more daylight hours.

Except for during the two World Wars, observance of d.s.t. has been optional. As a result, there have been periods when the country was in two time zones and there was confusion about which observance and nonobservance. This is what has created the confusion.

For example, in 1961, 15 States started d.s.t. the last Sunday in April and ended it the last Sunday in October. Another 16 States either started or ended d.s.t.—or both—whereas the remaining States didn't observe d.s.t. at all.

Now there's a move on foot to get some uniformity to d.s.t.

Next Monday Congress is due to begin action on legislation that would eliminate the snarl now involved in observing d.s.t. The Senate Commerce Committee will hold a hearing on a bill proposed by the Committee on Time Uniformity, which was formed by the Transportation Association of America.

The bill would fix the last Sunday of April and the last Sunday of October as the mandatory starting and closing dates for daylight saving time. Those jurisdictions which do not observe d.s.t. would be revised four times in 6 months each.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with remarks of my colleagues who are interested in the question of time uniformity. It is not necessary to recount here the great inconveniences caused by the crazy-quilt pattern of time being observed throughout the United States. I am sure that more than a few Members of this House have arrived an hour early or late for speaking engagements because of this chaos in time-keeping practices. As one Member of the Senate categorized it, "Americans are plagued with missed appointments and baffled by timetable dis­torions." The neighboring State of Virginia is an example of the expense involved. In this State bus schedules must be revised four times in 6 months each.

In the State of New Mexico, with the exception of the city of Los Alamos, standard time is observed throughout the year. The time may come when the citizens in the land of enchantment may wish to observe "fast time" as is done in the majorities of our States. Until then, however, I would hope that no requirement would be imposed upon them to observe daylight saving time.

It is my understanding that the U.S. Senate early in June, passed by vote, legislation which would help immeasurably in clearing up the present confusion. This bill would not affect those States which do not observe daylight saving time. Those jurisdictions which do advance their clocks 1 hour would, however, be required to do so on a uniform basis, beginning on the last Sunday in April and ending on the last Sunday in October. In my judgment this is the most useful and realistic approach to a difficult problem.

Substantially identical bills have been introduced in the House and await consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I realize that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has been burdened with an extremely heavy workload at this session of Congress. However, I hope that before we leave Washington in a few weeks, the Committee will find it possible to schedule hearings on these bills. I understand that at least two committee members oppose them and the hearings could be completed in the course of one-half day.

In conclusion let me insert for the Record an editorial in the Albuquerque, New Mexico Statesman which sets forth very clearly the problems involved and the hope for at least a partial solution:

TIME MIXUP AGAIN

The popular attitude toward the summertime mismatch that plagues this country resembles that of the man who worried about his leaky roof when it rained but did nothing about it on fine days. Americans fret a good deal when the summertime chaos is upon them and nothing immediately effective can be done about it, but in winter they tend to put off consideration of the matter.

The present state of affairs is a classic illustration of this. There was a big hue and cry for uniformity, but there is no clamor for a modern country not to have a reasonably uniform time setup. There was a lot of publicity at the start of daylight saving time, not only between States but within States and sometimes from community to community. All this led to demands for congressional action. At least there is a bill.

American's Daylight Saving Time Act which would professionalize the federal responsibility. Since Congress last acted on this issue, it has been busy with a heavy workload at this session of Congress. It seems to me that this year is a good time for consideration of this legislative matter. There is a great deal more to be done.

The popular attitude toward the summer-time mismatch that plagues this country resembles that of the man who worried about his leaky roof when it rained but did nothing about it on fine days. Americans fret a good deal when the summertime chaos is upon them and nothing immediately effective can be done about it, but in winter they tend to put off consideration of the matter.

The present state of affairs is a classic illustration of this. There was a big hue and cry for uniformity, but there is no clamor for a modern country not to have a reasonably uniform time setup. There was a lot of publicity at the start of daylight saving time, not only between States but within States and sometimes from community to community. All this led to demands for congressional action. At least there is a bill.

American's Daylight Saving Time Act which would professionalize the federal responsibility. Since Congress last acted on this issue, it has been busy with a heavy workload at this session of Congress. It seems to me that this year is a good time for consideration of this legislative matter. There is a great deal more to be done.
leave to each State the choice of adopting daylight saving time or not. It would accomplish the purpose of standardizing the dates on which it would begin and end for all areas choosing to adopt it.

The time confusion which we now face results from the fact that there is no uniform system of changing schedules to our railroads and airlines and causes considerable inconvenience to persons who travel from one area to another during the time when various States have different communities are changing to and from daylight saving time.

I hope that Congress will act this session to end this expensive and inconvenient system and adopt a standard period for daylight saving time.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, although the State of Maine, located in the extreme northeast corner of the country, has always been in the eastern time zone, it has a standard of time which is relatively the slowest in the country—that is in relation to local sun time. With daylight saving added, the time in the eastern part of the State is only 28 minutes fast in New York. Even in our rural dwellers—about half the population—have grown accustomed to daylight saving time.

Our situation is complicated in that our eastern and part of our northern boundary is shared by our Canadian neighbors in New Brunswick, who observe Atlantic time, with daylight saving added in the summer months, making their time an hour faster than ours all year long.

Recently, the State legislature tentatively adopted a proposal to establish statewide, year-round daylight saving time. This measure has not become effective, but is awaiting the acceptance of similar proposals in other Eastern States. However, this move reflects a trend which could build up into another rash of time changes in the near future, unless Congress promptly fulfills its duty to fix a uniform system of time standards for the United States.

For years Congress has been urged to preempt the field of time standards, thus preventing the exercise of local option, which has led to the present chaotic situation. The conflict between two or more standards of time affecting public affairs and activities in the same community at the same time, or the change from one to the other at the whim of local authorities is against the public interest, and the resulting widespread confusion is becoming intolerable. Sooner or later Congress will have to act.

Maine citizens have not always enjoyed unanimity in their time arrangements; but in the early days of daylight saving time they learned the lesson that uniformity, at least on a regional basis, gives the benefits of daylight saving to be realized.

The pending bills would require a uniform period during which daylight saving would be allowed. While they would not completely occupy the field, they would provide a valuable step toward over the existing lack of consistency, and such legislation has my support.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the people of California recommend making our time observance uniform. They have done so themselves with an overwhelming vote at the polls—a vote which gives strong testimony to the fact that the majority and we are sick and tired of time confusion.

The question came up directly on the California ballot in November of 1962, at a time when California went off daylight saving time in September of each year— 1 hour earlier than the majority of the other daylight saving time States, including the east coast States which observe daylight saving time.

The result of the vote was that, during that month, there was a 4-hour rather than a 3-hour difference between the coasts. The east coast was shutting down when people were still at lunch in California.

A referendum was ordered held in November of 1962, and the results were overwhelming. By a vote of 2,836,050 to 1,687,408 the people of California ratified their use of daylight saving time and extended it to the entire State. Today, 80 percent of the voters approved uniform time.

The trend of such votes in California adds an interesting commentary on a change in public opinion over the past 35 years with regard to daylight saving time itself and, then, uniformity of daylight saving time observance.

The people of California rejected any use of daylight saving time in 1930 and again in 1940. In 1948, however, daylight saving time was approved by a margin of 238,000 votes—the tally was 1,405,297 to 1,167,846.

And then came the 1962 landslide.

California enjoys its uniform daylight saving time thanks to the initiative of Mr. FRIEDEL and I strongly support the pending bill, H.R. 6781. Congress should act this year.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the concept of daylight saving time has been credited to one of the most renowned of all America's statesmen, Benjamin Franklin, before 1807. As phenomenally prophetic as Ben Franklin was, however, I think it is safe to say that he could never have foreseen the involvement that the current lack of time uniformity in the United States would produce.

In many areas of this Nation today the situation in this regard is nothing less than chaotic.

We have towns where banks open on daylight saving time and close on standard time, and where the citizen goes to bed on standard time and gets up by daylight-long standard time variations.

More confusion reigns in families with members living in different local time areas to different time zones. And there are the particular problems faced by the broadcasting agencies in trying to maintain some continuity of timing across the country.

The list of examples of clock juggling and resulting mixups is literally endless—adding up to one of the greatest public inconveniences in America.

Nor is my own State of Maryland separated from the confusion. I can assure you that we have our share of mixups and the result of this annual scrambling of time.

There is much to be said for the principle of daylight saving time. There's much more to be said, however, for establishing and maintaining an orderly system of time changes. In a society as modern and progressive as America's, there is simply no place for the monumental mishmash of time that has been allowed to get so far ahead of us.

As I see it, a reasonable and realistic step in the right direction would be the adoption of standard starting and cutting-off dates, on a statewide basis, across the land, for daylight saving time. The dates I have in mind are the last Sunday of April and the last Sunday of October.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to visualize that the activities of mankind in the past few hundred years have been more affected by any one event or decision more important than our system of timekeeping. It applies to all of us as public officials, professional persons, businessmen, travelers, and citizens alike. I am sure that hardly anyone has not at some time or another not suffered confusion or inconvenience by the differences in time observance. A Wheaton, Minn., resident recently complained that daylight saving time in Minnesota resulted in an "extreme hour of sunshine which turned my grass brown."

And then there was the elderly lady in New England who felt tired all summer until she got her hour back when standard time resumed in the fall.

Seriously, the practices across the country have during peace-time periods created a crazy-quilt of timekeeping. This has been a real problem for the banking and financial interests in particular. Our stock exchange firms serve 18 million stockholders; a system of rapid and efficient communication is a vitally essential element for conducting a nation-wide securities market. This need for speed applies to all areas of our fiscal structure. Being a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee I can speak with familiarity about this problem of this important segment of our economy.

I am also convinced that the American people want us in Congress to act. The Nation has been blanketed with extensive news accounts of time schizophrenia which need correction. It would be a constructive step forward if we at least get those areas observing daylight saving time to do so for the same period of time each year and Congress should so legislate.

The Senate passed a bill to this effect in June and I hope the House will soon follow suit.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that Henry Austin Dobson, an English poet and man of letters whose career bridged from mid-18th century through the 19th, recognized the various countries of the world first experimented with daylight saving time, wrote these lines:

"Time goes, you say? Ah no. Alias, Time stays we go."
If Mr. Dobson were still living, he would certainly want to revise that philosophical expression, for there are times during the summer months when we cannot be certain whether we are coming or going. I believe that H.R. 9066, or the "1964 Interstate Commerce Act," will ameliorate some of the confusion that plagues just about everyone when some—not all—clocks are advanced an hour in the spring and again when hands are turned back 1 hour in the fall.

The idea of saving a working hour each day during the summer months originated as early as 1906 in England, but it was not until World War I was underway that most nations on the Continent as well as Britain put the plan into practice. Less than a year after the United States entered the conflict, we too turned to daylight savings time and have found it generally advantageous in peacetime as well as in wartime.

Some areas still rebel at the thought of this artificial means of lengthening the working day, and I have no quarrel with this battle. After all, I am convinced, however, that there needs to be some form arrangement whereby all States and areas desiring to adopt daylight savings time will do so on a stipulated date. Inasmuch as the Federal Government has the past 47 years provided by statute the opportunity to use daylight savings time where desired, it would seem only reasonable to specify the respective dates for turning clocks ahead or back. The Committee feels this arrangement especially important during a period when the world is beset with hostility and America is involved with men and guns. With defense research and production facilities scattered across the land, there is no excuse for making possible any avenue of delay that may be costly to the war effort. Yet, under conditions that allow for flexibility in time changes, a breakdown in communications and a general disarray of our lives could easily develop to the detriment of the military program.

I urge that such legislation be enacted at this session of Congress, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the House will consider the urgent passage of legislation to achieve a greater nationwide time uniformity. Our country, which can boast of many outstanding accomplishments in the scientific field, is long overdue for uniform time legislation. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been aware of this problem for many years, and the moment is now at hand that Congress turn the Commission's recommendations into actuality.

The present lack of enforcement provisions, leaving the determination to each community as to what time it should observe, has resulted in considerable variations. It has anachronistically, and in some cases, the operations and public schedules of the transportation industry, and as many of us here may have experienced, it often bewilders travelers, television viewers, and many others. It means that the time is advanced 1 hour. Then on the Monday following Memorial Day—June 6—Richmond caught up with Alexandria but was then 1 hour faster than Bristol and the eight counties. In just 3 months, Richmond will rejoin Bristol but will then be 1 hour behind Alexandria. On the last Sunday in October Alexandria will lose an hour and rejoin the rest of the State until the cycle begins all over again next spring.

To further complicate matters this year, Bluefield and Pocahontas, Va., on the West Virginia border ignored State law and went on daylight time the last Sunday of April. The Virginia-Tennessee border, being in the Eastern Time Zone, is adjusted one hour. Thus, when Alexandria reverts to standard time, Bluefield and Pocahontas stay on daylight time. Again, in May, Alexandria reverts to daylight time, and Bluefield and Pocahontas stay on standard time. The other resolution urged adjoining States to join in requesting Congress to take such action as to ensure uniform time. This resolution requested the Congress to legislate the beginning of daylight saving time during the spring and again when hands are turned back 1 hour in the fall.

The Virginia State Legislature in early 1962 adopted two resolutions. One resolution requested Congress to prescribe what time shall be applicable in the eastern standard time zone of the United States, and, if different times are to prevail at different times of the year, then to establish the periods during which such different times shall be observed. The other resolution urged adjoining States to join in requesting Congress to take such action as to ensure uniform time. This resolution requested the Congress to legislate the beginning and ending of daylight saving time during the spring and again when hands are turned back 1 hour in the fall.
Mr. Frost also appeared in a similar Senate hearing earlier this year to support the uniform time legislation, since adopted by the Senate. He presented a letter from Governor Harrison, dated April 23, 1965, which included the following statement:

Enactment of such legislation, in my judgment, would be in the best interest of the Nation and I trust that the Congress will act favorably during this session. As you know, the Virginia General Assembly has advocated such an approach, and I am confident that the legislation would meet with the approval of the great majority of citizens.

How much more proof of clock chaos is needed?

First, An airplane takes off in Washington and, according to the clocks, lands at Newport News, Va., 5 minutes before it was airborne.

Second, A high foreign dignitary early in 1963 arrived in the United States an hour early near Williamsburg because someone failed to note that this particular area of Virginia had not yet joined the rest of the State in daylight saving time.

Third, In Virginia, bus schedules must be revised and reprinted four times in 6 months each year.

Fourth, Due to the Virginia State law the Greyhound Bus Guide this year, effective May 28, used two different systems of telling time for our citizens, one by Trailways and the other by Greyhound. Think of how this would confuse not only the central judges which also the 25,000 travel agents trying to serve the public. Congress has much to do but it also "has time on its hands." Let us help to straighten out this crazy quilt of time once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial from the Newport News Daily Press in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. It is persuasive evidence of the need for some corrective action.

SCHEDULES: TIME ARRIVES

Two events of the past few days make it more certain than ever that many Americans will be toting scorecards in their pockets. Basesball season opened and that's one reason.

The other is that daylight saving time is more certain than ever that many Americans will change their scorecards. This little fiction, I suppose, preserves the sanctity of our laws. What it really does, however, is expose the horse-and-buggy means by which we observe time.

While Pennsylvania has no uniformity problem itself, the national time confusion does affect our people as they travel or communicate to other parts of the country. If the pending legislation became law, one could at least be certain as to whether or not daylight saving time was being observed anywhere on a certain date. This would contribute a lot to public convenience and national efficiency.

It is time for a real national overhaul of our time observances and I strongly support the pending legislation as a significant step toward time sanity.

If Congress approves the following Wednesday articles to the House for consideration. They well point up the time dilemma we find anywhere on a certain date.

[From the Greensburg (Pa.) Tribune Review]  

TIME TINKERING

Congress, so it would appear, is moving a step forward to end the perennial confusion of some of the Nation's habit of going on daylight summer time.

Legislation to establish uniform effective dates for the summer time has passed the House and now goes to the Senate, where similar approval is expected.

This legislation would standardize start of daylight time as of 2 a.m., the last Sunday in March, and would go out of effect at the same time the last Sunday in October. As the procedure stands today the start and finish dates for the summer time are left to the states and individual communities, which has caused considerable confusion in the country.

Over the years there have been many advocates of some sort of standardization in summer recreation hours. As the situation is today the transportation media has rather a difficult time attempting to relate its schedules to the whims of States and municipalities.

It might be wiser, therefore, for Congress to go a step further in its time tinkering and come up with a universal pattern. At least this would end the annual confusion that now prevails.

[From the New Kensington, Pa., Dispatch]  

MANY U.S. AREAS TURN CLOCKS AHEAD

More than half the American people will have to turn their clocks ahead an hour Sunday to conform with daylight saving time. The change goes into effect at 2 a.m. (local time).

In 16 States, the change will be statewide. In others, one or more areas of the State who go on their clocks ahead an hour Sunday stay on standard time, while other areas stay on standard time.

Some States remaining on standard time next week will shift to daylight saving time the first Saturday they can.

Latest reports indicate a slight gain for the daylight saving time advocates, many of
whom would like to see the whole country on daylight saving time all year as some sections in Indiana are now. Nonetheless, Colorado, which will turn the clocks Sunday for the first time, will have it only from Memorial Day to Labor Day. Wisconsin will begin daylight saving time as usual Sunday, but by legislative action will have an extra month of it, going back to standard time at the end of October, rather than as previously, in late September.

Daylight saving time is favored by populous States—New England, the Middle Atlantic States, Illinois and California. For this reason, according to observers, all daylight saving time will be extended beyond October 31 in much of the East.

AMENDING THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Collister) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, the time for the consideration of the amendments to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is long overdue. Today I wish to join the other Members who also believe that urgent action must be taken. When this act reached the floor directly from the executive branch of Government, it was under a closed rule, which prevented it from being justly amended. The House therefore, had little choice but to adopt this overly liberal and damaging bill. Existing tariff rates were cut by 50 percent for the first time since 1934, and the items with less than 5 percent duty, were placed on the free list, and the more cautious "peril point" provision which had been in force for 10 years was abolished.

In April 1955, for the first time since 1927, imports began to register a serious increase. Imports began to register a serious increase. Imports were increased threefold in the other areas of consumer goods. In 1954, imports of consumer goods were only $17.2 million in 1958, increased steadily to $153 million in 1963 and were estimated to exceed the 1963 figure by 15 percent in 1964. The consumer sector was 101,000 in 1954, fell to 66,500 in 1958, and after the recession rose again to 83,000 in 1962, without ever reaching the 100,000 level again. Employment in the military, governmental, and industrial areas continued at 1958 levels in 1954 to 282,000 in 1962. Employment increased threefold in the other areas of electronics, while it declined some 17 percent in the consumer electronic field. Employment in the consumer sector will operate at a kilometer pace with the other areas, it would have reached close to 300,000 in 1962, instead of only 83,000. The nonconsumer segment is five times as large in the domestic sales as in the consumer division, yet the imports are less than a fourth of those in consumer goods. The result has been a heavy contribution to employment by the nonconsumer sector and a considerable unemployment by the consumer sector. That is one can see the sensitivity of the consumer sector to imports.

Growing import competition forced our manufacturers to purchase component parts from foreign sources at a smaller cost, leaving our small parts manufacturers in the cold. These lower levels of domestic income suffered as a consequence and were without employment, along with the small manufacturer, who lost his contracts. Our producers may be able to lower their prices over the longer period of years, as they did with television, but foreign competition remains to wait, for they are ready now with their low cost and high production levels.

Great expansion of investment in the consumer electronic field is dubious under the present national trade policy. Additional investment in automation would lower the cost, but would be advisable if it didn’t have such a negative effect on employment. If industry could be assured that further tariff reduction wasn’t imminent, industry could move judiciously, yet swiftly toward a realistic program of cost reduction as a solution to the employment problem.
The electronic industry is but one example of the situation faced by many of the consumer industries today. Its features are common enough to be shared by all of those concerned with consumer goods. We should take heed of the grave need to provide corrective measures so that America's industries continue their innovations and provide jobs for our growing labor force. If we do not face up to the problem today, we will find ourselves buried in imports tomorrow. The need will continue to increase for more comprehensive retraining programs, higher antipoverty measures, and larger area redevelopment projects.

With this mind in mind a bill should be passed that provides that any product whose imports have risen 75 percent since 1958 and now occupies 7½ percent of domestic production, should be taken off the list of products to be considered for further tariff reductions. By holding the particular import to a proportionate share of the expanding market, the existing damage by unlimited imports would not continually be reintro­duced into its market share. The U.S. trade policies should be subjected to congressional review every year. They should be considered in the light of their overall economic and our world trade goals. This is not an easy assignment, but must be done to insure a favorable balance for our home Industries. The Ways and Means Committee should therefore place this bill high on its list, for immediate consideration.

THE FEDERAL WATER COMMISSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle­man from New York (Mr. RYAN) is rec­ognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 457 expressing the sense of the Congress that the Delaware River Basin Com­mission should immediately investigate the feasibility of relocating Philadelphia's drinking water intake on the Delaware River. The ex­isting intake is vulnerable to saltwater incursion, and to protect it from this threat New York City is presently re­quired by Commission, or forgo to fores­ee daily 155 million gallons of drinking wa­ter to which it is entitled under a U.S. Supreme Court decree. This water is spilled over into the Delaware from the city's reservoirs for the purpose of hold­ing back the salt front at Philadelphia's intake, although very little of it is ac­tually withdrawn for use by any city.

House Concurrent Resolution 457 is de­signed to spur action by a regional com­mission where New York will be one of the few remaining approaches which holds any promise of enlarging the usable wa­ter supply in the New York-Philadelphia area. Since such an approach is possible only through regional, multi­state authority such as the Delaware River Basin Commission, I want to ac­knowledge the importance of the concept and practice of regional water regul­ation in the present drought crisis.

However, the present philosophy of re­gional water control is inadequate to the challenge which we face today and will surely face again. Only 3 weeks ago the House and Senate passed the Water Re­sources Planning Act of 1965. This measure, involving the expenditure of at least $120 million over the next 10 years, would set the direction of our water resource planning for the coming decade. Yet there is little comfort in this law for most people living in the Maine-Wash­ington, D.C., area, who are losing suf­fering acute drought conditions. The rea­son, as I pointed out on July 13 at page 16554 of the Record, lies in a provision added to the bill for the first time in con­ference. The provision, section 3(d) of the act, expressly forbids the Federal Water Resources Commission or any river basin com­mission acting under the law to "study, plan, or recommend" the transfer of waters between areas under the jurisdiction of more than one com­mission.

This limitation was apparently tailored to the demands of Columbia River Basin residents less concerned with diversion of Columbia River water to the Southwest. The actual effect of the provision is, however, far broader, and its impact on other areas dramatically illustrates the total inadequacy of basin­by-basin water resource control as the governing premise of our national water policy.

New York City's present plans for coping with its pressing water shortage is a clear case in point. New York City has extensive water recovery and storage facilities on the upper Delaware. These have proved insufficient to meet simultane­ously the needs of both New York City and Philadelphia. Conse­quently, New York City plans to recon­struct a water intake project on the Hud­son River which it once started and foolishly abandoned. This intake, un­der the present plan, projects the Dela­ware, is located near the conduits carry­ing water from the Delaware reservoirs to New York City. This will permit New York to either use Hudson River waters or draw Delaware withdrawals or mix waters from the two sources for the city's water supply.

Mr. Speaker, the river basin planning concept of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 stands foursquare against this proposed project. None of the $15 million in Federal and matching funds which the Delaware River Basin Com­mission might receive in the next decade could be used to support project 7 of a Hudson River Basin Commission comes into being as it surely will, in response to the availability of $15 million under the act.

Instead of addressing itself to the ef­fect of this prohibition on the North­east, the brief Senate debate on the Water Resources Planning Act conference report centered on a just-released Presi­dential directive to the Water Resources Council, calling for a report within 7 days on the Northeast water crisis with recommendations for Federal measures to alleviate it.

This report, which was transmitted to the President on July 21, must be a shock as well as a disappointment to many of those in the Northeast. The shock is due to the Council's commendable candor in concluding that the water emergency will become increasingly serious during the next year, possibly resulting in out­right disaster conditions in several States. The disappointment stems from the failure of the local governments, state relief for the farm economy, and omissions in plans for formation of water resource agencies as well as the Office of Emergency Planning.

Now and say that the Council's report indicate that it considered its mandate in section 102 of the act to "maintain a constant study of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of water and related land resource policies." Instead the Council prefaced its recommendations to the warning that "The paramount re­sponsibility for providing local water supplies traditionally and properly rests with local jurisdictional authorities."

Mr. Speaker, to say the least, it is ironic to assert flatly, in the course of a report foretelling disaster, that the tradi­tional way is the proper one. I would also say that the Council's reason for the present crisis is the very lack of coordination of our basic water policies which the council declined to consider. While we accept national coordination in the development of our electric power system, still harbor the anachronistic view that our water resource management should reflect virtually every theory of water use control ever con­ceived by the mind of man. In keeping with this we honor the law of capture or prescription on the one hand, and virtual socialization on the other. There is a special water commission in one State, while in another claimants must proceed case by case through Federal courts. We exalt the geological integrity of the river basin and at the same time construct reservoirs and conduits which establish the preeminence of demo­cratic considerations.

In short, our water economy is not so much mixed as it is scrambled. The ab­sence of nationally applicable standards and the failure to coordinate water pol­icymaking with water use regulations has resulted in chronic misallocation of this vital resource throughout the country. Now the water problem which lies under the surface everywhere is plain­ly one faced in this nation's territory which has been most inclined to take water for granted and least receptive to the changes which must come sooner or later. Within the next year, while the water shortage continues, there is an uncertainty of agricultural produc­tion. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a measure entitled the Federal Water Commission Act, based in large part on the Model Water Use Act adopted in 1958 by the National Conference of Com­missioners on Uniform State Laws. The act would cover all water use or water­polluting activity affecting any naviga­ble, interstate, or coastal water in the United States.
Taking or pollution of these waters would be governed by uniform Federal standards aimed at insuring that they are being administered for beneficial uses. A five man Federal Water Commission, modeled after the Federal Power Commission, would administer and enforce the law.

The key provision of the bill authorizes the Commission to require and issue permits for all uses of water resources covered by the bill, including any activity which results in water pollution. The bill specifically protects existing uses so long as they remain beneficial and serve the public interest. Householders taking water directly from wells or streams for nor­mally domestic use are exempted from the permit procedure.

Permits issued by the Commission would continue in effect for a minimum period of 5 years. This provision, although not models the procedure for a regional, state, or local government which quickly corrected the shortcomings in its own laws, would remove the market-depressing element of uncertainty which results in water pollution. The bill provides scrupulous procedural safeguards and unqualified right of appeal in connection with a decision to invoke the Federal licensing procedure.

Another major provision of the bill authorizes the Commission to suspend the application of Federal licensing procedures when it finds, after a hearing, that regional, state, or local regulations are inadequate to protect water resources. Further, the bill provides scrupulous procedural safeguards and unqualified right of appeal in connection with a decision to invoke the Federal licensing procedure.

The bill also provides the Commission with the powers to develop water supply for all citizens of the United States in the years to come.

IN ORDER THAT THE UNITED NATIONS MAY BE EFFECTIVE IN VIETNAM, WE MUST REHABILITATE IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEP­PER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) made the following statement.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the body of the Record in connection with my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the President deserves high praise for his action last week in invoking the United Nations role in Vietnam. It is in­conceivable and, in view of the present crisis, intolerable to reject the principle of Federal coordination for water resources when we now embrace it actively in our national power grid. Water is quite obviously a scarcer resource and far more vulnerable to the devastating caprices of nature. The Federal Water Commission bill I have introduced today would close this glaring gap in our nation's resource policy in a way consistent with both existing re­gional differences and the paramount necessity of securing an ample, constant water supply for all citizens of the United States.

The key provision of the bill authorizes the Commission to require and issue permits for all uses of water resources covered by the bill, including any activity which results in water pollution. The bill specifically protects existing uses so long as they remain beneficial and serve the public interest. Householders taking water directly from wells or streams for nor­mally domestic use are exempted from the permit procedure.

Permits issued by the Commission would continue in effect for a minimum period of 5 years. This provision, although not models the procedure for a regional, state, or local government which quickly corrected the shortcomings in its own laws, would remove the market-depressing element of uncertainty which results in water pollution. The bill provides scrupulous procedural safeguards and unqualified right of appeal in connection with a decision to invoke the Federal licensing procedure.

Another major provision of the bill authorizes the Commission to suspend the application of Federal licensing procedures when it finds, after a hearing, that regional, state, or local regulations are inadequate to protect water resources. Further, the bill provides scrupulous procedural safeguards and unqualified right of appeal in connection with a decision to invoke the Federal licensing procedure.

The bill also provides the Commission with the powers to develop water supply for all citizens of the United States in the years to come.
to United Nation action in 1950. Certainly, it was never intended that the aggressor should decide whether he would be subject to United Nations peacekeeping action.

Equally, it is irrelevant that North Vietnam and Communist China are not members of the United Nations. Article 66 of the U.N. Charter expressly states:

The organization shall insure that states which are not members act in accordance with United Nations principles.

It is said that our invoking the United Nations would lead to acrimonious debate in the Security Council and the General Assembly on the U.S. position. But such debate, in and out of the United Nations, is sure to occur anyway. It will have infinitely less foundation if we show our respect for article I of the United Nations Charter, which defines its purpose as "to maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace."

It is said that invocation of the United Nations would force the Soviet Union into a confrontation with the United States. I do not believe that there is any particular action that will change the Soviet Union's desire to act unilaterally in this instance. The United States and our allies cannot even hope to ease the situation. We shall certainly have to allow the situation to be handled by our allies. The United States will not shirk its responsibility, but it is also true that we cannot foresee the outcome of this action.

I cannot see her intervening militarily if the United States, as well as the United Nations, indicate their willingness to abide by our commitment under the Charter. But as a matter of the first urgency, we must overcome the present paralysis in the United Nations caused by the year-old dispute about the financing of prior United Nations peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and in the Congo. The Soviet Union and France are members of the United Nations and are willing to pay their assessments on peacekeeping forces which they opposed. Under the letter of article 19, they are thus subject to the loss of their votes in the General Assembly. The Soviet Union threatened to withdraw if denied its vote, and there was a good chance that France would do likewise. This result was that the last session of the General Assembly ended in paralysis, with no votes allowed to be taken.

The confrontation in the United Nations stemming from our concurrent resolution of last summer, if it is still in effect when the General Assembly convenes next month, will result either in our defeat or in the withdrawal of the Soviet Union and France from the world organization. For that reason, I introduced last April House Concurrent Resolution 336, which permits the permanent member of the United Nations to exercise the article 19 problem, and not compel him to torpedo the United Nations when it meets. For the purpose of this proposition that General Assembly peacekeeping operations be financed by voluntary contributions. For the past, the United States, while remaining zealous to invoke article 19 against the countries in arms in their regular United Nations dues, should not press article 19 on the Middle East and Congo special assessments.

Congress has just a few weeks to act before September 1. I hope that the State Department will act upon House Concurrent Resolution 336, or some similar resolution, to end the United Nations Impasse. When the United Nations is revived, it will be able to play a meaningful role in bringing peace to Vietnam.

Of one thing I am sure—that the American people wholeheartedly support a united Nations peacekeeping force in Vietnam. In an opinion poll conducted by the Milwaukee Sentinel, and reported in the Sentinel for August 2, 1965, 70 percent of those asked, "Do you feel it is time for the United Nations to step in and find ways to halt this aggression and bring peace to Vietnam?" answered "Yes;" 7 percent said "No," while 18 percent said "Don't know," and 5 percent not answering. I include the Milwaukee Sentinel poll data in the table.

**Table: Poll Findings for the United Nations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is despite the fact that almost one-half of those polled feel that the President's decision to double the draft call and to increase the U.S. fighting strength is risking a major war with the Soviet Union.

More than 6 out of 10 persons agree with President Johnson's order to double the monthly draft calls from 17,000 to 35,000, in the conviction that this will send 50,000 more men to South Vietnam.

This compares with only about 1 in 5 (20 percent), who have the idea, or (18 percent) who don't know.

One hundred persons were interviewed by the Sentinel for the research department of the Milwaukee Poll, of those who participated in the poll, 59 percent were women and 41 percent were men.

The Milwaukee Sentinel surveys throughout the metropolitan Milwaukee area for their opinions on the statement last Wednesday on Vietnam by President Johnson.

Almost, half—47 percent—said that they read about it in the newspaper while almost one-third—26 percent—listened to or wanted to read the opinion on radio or television.

The results revealed that 40 percent agree that this action on the part of the United States will bring peace eventually. Twenty-two percent believe the United States will not bring peace. Thirty-three percent replied didn't know and 5 percent did not answer.

"We don't know now it would lead to total war," said Howard Bruchhauser, 2700 East Whittaker Avenue, St. Francis, Wis.

Also in agreement was Thomas K. Anderson, 3435 South 104th Street, Greenfield. He said, "I like the forwardness in the President's stand. It's time we show them that we mean business and we will fight to protect our freedom."

Walter Wessel, 4853 North 66th Street, insisted with the same way when he replied, "It's the old Teddy Roosevelt theory of 'carry a big stick.' We've been nursing around too long."

**SAME AS KOREA**

There were some who disagreed. In the opinion of John H. Ebbe, 3339 South 82nd Street, "It's the same as Korea—fighting to establish a status quo."

Forty-eight percent of those polled felt the action by the United States is risking a major war with Red China. Twenty-nine percent said they didn't think so, while 19 percent believed the United States is risking a major war with Red China.

The women (almost 50 percent) were more apprehensive than the men (46 percent) about the possibility of this country getting into a war with Communist China.

Seven out of ten of the participants in the survey said that it was time for the United Nations to step in to find ways to halt this aggression and bring peace to Vietnam.

Among those who felt this was Eldon Zich, 16032 Riviera Drive, New Berlin, who said, "We mean business, and we will fight to keep peace."

**EASIER THAN FORCE**

John Kelnas, 3574 South 38th Street, said, "I believe we can settle problems easier than brute force."

Donald Weber, 5856 North 61st Street, said, "It's part of United Nations business to do this. They have made no noticeable effort as yet."

Oscar Murphy, Jr., 2658-A North 12th Street, said, "The United States got themselves into it, so they should get themselves out."

William Anderson, 3702 West Saroch Street, said, "I believe the United Nations. They don't have too much power. They're too far to the left."

MRS. Ray Wotta, 2346 South 66th Street, said, "I do not think the United Nations will ever settle anything."
Here are the Sentinel poll questions and the results:

Did you happen to listen or watch President Johnson's speech Wednesday on Vietnam?

Yes... 69
No... 31
No answer... 3

"Did you read in the newspaper about President Johnson's statement on Vietnam?"

Yes... 47
No... 50
No answer... 3

I ask the gentleman, bringing the war to the conference table some months now. I also have been en­ late the gentleman for the very impor­

myself with his remarks. this morning that North Vietnam has

the comments he has made about the

Union. Johnson's decision to double the monthly draft calls from 17,000 to 35,000 and to send 60,000 more men to South Vietnam?

Agree... 61
Disagree... 19
Do not know... 18
No answer... 2

"Do you agree or disagree that this action on the part of the United States will bring peace eventually?"

Agree... 40
Disagree... 20
Don't know... 5
No answer... 6

"Do you feel it is time for the United Na­tions to step in to find ways to halt this aggression and bring peace to Vietnam?"

Agree... 19
Disagree... 70
Do not know... 7
No answer... 18

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

Mr. REUSS. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I want to congrat­

ate the gentleman for the very impor­tant statement he is making to the House this afternoon. I should like to associate myself with his remarks.

I am very pleased that the President in his press conference last Wednesday stated that he had sent Amb­assador Goldberg with a special mes­sage to Secretary General U Thant urg­ing him to make full use of the resources of the U.N. in bringing the war from the battlefield to the conference table. I have been urging that this be done for some months now. I also have been en­couraging every official of our admin­istra­tion with whom I have talked to make every effort to include the United Nations in every step and that it be en­couraged to play a larger role in this effort.

However, my question to the gentle­man at this point, in light of some of the comments he has made about the prospects of the United Nations perhaps being turned down, is that I notice in the United Press International dispatch this morning that North Vietnam has ruled out any United Nations role in bringing the war to the conference table or for any international settlement. So I ask the gentleman, Do you really think it is possible we can get the other party to the conference table or to the United Nations in light of what they have had to say?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. Hanoi in the past has shown its contempt for the United Nations, and it has done so again in the last 24 hours. However, I remind the gentleman that the United Nations Charter, article 2, expressly states, and I quote:

The organization shall insure that States which are not members act in accordance with United Nations principles.

So the mere fact that North Vietnam resists United Nations action, and is not a member of the United Nations, is irrelevant.

Equally in 1950, North Korea resisted the U.N. action and was not a member of the U.N. Yet that did not stop the U.N. from assuming what I think history will regard as an important role in damping down that threat to world peace. I do not want to minimize the difficulties of the situation, but I do not think that the intransigence of North Vietnam offers the slightest excuse for the U.N. to shirk its responsibilities.

Mr. COHELAN. If the gentleman will yield further, did I understand him clearly in respect to the parties with whom we should negotiate? Did I understand that the gentleman includes any and all parties that might properly be associated with an honorable settlement? By this I mean the National Liberation Front, the Vietcong, or any other party, that may be acceptable and available to negotiate. Is that not correct?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I said all parties and I mean all parties, including those who are now most responsible for carry­ing on the conflict, that is, the Vietcong. President Johnson in his press confer­ence last week indicated if the North Vietnamese wished to bring along the Vietcong or the National Liberation Front, it would be acceptable, and that statement speaks for itself. Speaking for myself, I would think we have to negotiate with whom­ever our opponents are, and we can leave jurisdic­tional considerations as to whether we are dealing in one party or not to one side. They are the people who are firing at us, and they will have to be dealt with.

Mr. COHELAN. Now, if the gentle­man will yield further at this point on just one other matter before he com­pletes his comprehensive statement.

As the gentleman well knows from our own discussions, from discussions with very distinguished colleagues of the Vietcong in­cluding the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] who at one time was a delegate to the United Nations, and with members of the administration, there has been concern expressed about us going within the next few weeks, prefer­ably in the next few days, to the Security Council, that the United Nations may not be ready for such an initial step taken, of having Ambassador Goldberg simply lodge the matter informally before the 11 members of the Security Council, is a good initial pro­ceeding. I well recognize that to take a frozen formal position at the outset might not be the most productive way to proceed. So my first answer to the gentleman's question is that the impor­tant thing is that we are now before the Security Council, and I believe that the United Nations is ready to turn its attention to the conflict at this point, in light of some of the details and facts of our foreign policy. Thus I do not call this afternoon for any particular resolu­tion to be presented before any particu­lar body of the United Nations at any particular time. It may very well be that the initial step taken, of having Ambassador Goldberg simply lodge the matter informally before the 11 members of the Security Council, is a good initial pro­ceeding. I well recognize that to take a frozen formal position at the outset might not be the most productive way to proceed.

The second point I would make has to do with article 19; and that is that whatever we do with the United Nations is totally dependent upon our putting the United Nations back on its feet again. It is now in a state of paralysis owing to the assessments dispute, and we must move fast to see that some sort of a work­able compromise can be arrived at on that, so that the United Nations when it meets in New York next month may be once again a going institution.

I point out to the gentleman that this will require action by the U.S. Congress, because the United Nations has speci­fied our permanent representative at the United Nations with a rather inflexible resolution which in effect requires that on opening day of the new General As­sembly, that the United States have the right to vote on both the French and of the Soviet Union to vote, and both countries, if that challenge were upheld, would be highly likely to leave the United Nations and thus start the crucial course toward a repetition of the last days of the ill-fated League of Nations.

There, therefore, is in my judgment vital that the State Department and Congress move within the next few weeks, prefer­ably within the next 30 to 60 days, to take some directive of last summer which was made in good faith—I voted for it, and so, I be­lieve, did the gentleman from California, with all other Members—but, in effect, our confrontation strategy of last year regrettably did not work, and we are now confronted with a larger question of whether we wish the United Nations to continue.

I believe the American people want the United Nations to continue. In a poll conducted in my own community of Mil­waukee over the weekend by the Mil­waukee Sentinel, 70 percent of the per­sons queried on whether they wished the
U.N. participation in Vietnam said yes, they did; only 7 percent said no; 18 percent said they did not know, and 5 percent said thinks it would not.

So that I think the American people share the faith of the gentleman from California and myself and so many other Members that the United Nations does have an inspiring role to play in world peace. If it doesn't, will we do our part in putting it on its feet again.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for amplifying this point, and again I want to express my complete agreement with what he has had to say.

I shall have further questions of the gentleman as the gentleman proceeds.

Mr. REUSS. Speaker, because of the lateness of the hour I am going to exercise my permission to insert materials in the Record and conclude my formal remarks by expressing the deep hope that the State Department will shortly act on the question of the United Nations and itself for support in meeting that agreement. There are moral questions raised by those who say the elections of the area should decide by the ballot box rather than by bullets what kind of leadership the people of a given area want. But I do not see how that line was drawn up and the decision is to be made.

Mr. REUSS. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his timely discussion of a most urgent question, a question which is of vital concern to the security of our Nation as well as to the future of the world.

Particularly, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is worth noting the point which the gentleman has developed, which is that before we can return to the United Nations for assistance in settling the Vietnam problem, we must first work out the problems that have kept the General Assembly from functioning over the past year. Because most of the small nations do not want to see in the General Assembly a confrontation between the United States, the United Nations, and France on the question of paying these assessments for the peacekeeping costs, we are going to have to recognize this as a reality and proceed to find other ways to move ahead so that the General Assembly can continue to act and function in dealing with problems around the world.

I might say, if the gentleman will yield further for a moment, that there is one point that I believe the gentleman touched upon which I very much concur. That is the argument that by taking the issue of Vietnam to the Security Council, we would force the Soviet Union into a position of representing North Vietnam therewithout the U.N. Common Security Council to a firmer and harder line than that by which it is presently committed.

It seems to me that while this question or consideration once had validity, today we find the Soviet Union furnishing not only economic aid but substantial military assistance, including surface-to-air missiles for North Vietnam, and warning our Government about the grave risks that we face in our course of conduct over there and demanding the withdrawal of American forces from South Vietnam.

It would seem to me that it would be hard to get the Soviet Union more deeply committed to a defensive posture on behalf of the South Vietnamese, which it is already committed as a result of its common interest with North Vietnam as a member of the Communist group of nations.

I do not know if the gentleman from Wisconsin has pursued that point to the degree that we have discussed earlier, but I do believe that this consideration which, as I say, once had validity, no longer has the validity that it may have had in the earlier months.

Mr. REUSS. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota that while the question of the involvement of the Soviet Union in the question of the U.N. presence in South Vietnam is a serious one, it deserves a fair discussion.

I believe, on balance, that the case is overwhelmingly in favor of going to the U.N., and letting the chips fall where they may. The Soviet Union has not done anything to improve its position in the Communist world, to take very considerable steps to align itself with North Vietnam.

I do not see how that line was drawn up and the decision is to be made. There is another consideration which might be worth discussing, that is that the worst that the Soviet Union can do to us in the United Nations, if it comes to that—I hope it will not—is to veto such resolutions as have been offered in the Security Council by us, or any other member. There is then available to us the General Assembly, under a procedure invented because of the Soviet Union's veto power. There is that great forum, with its 114 member nations, where we can, if the precedent is justly conceived and stated American case can attract the majority of votes.

Mr. FRASER. There is another consideration which might be worth developing. In the earlier years many people had in mind asking the United Nations to declare the actions of the United Nations on the part of North Vietnam to be acts of aggression and calling upon the United Nations to condemn acts of aggression. It is true we could go to the United Nations today and ask the Security Council or the General Assembly to declare that aggression is being waged by Communist forces in South Vietnam for help. That is one course of action that is open, but it seems to me in light of recent developments and in the changing complexities of the situation we are more likely to urge the United Nations to take action, if at all.

Mr. REUSS. Rather than in a police role?

Mr. FRASER. Yes. Leaving aside the question of aggression, you could go to the Security Council or to the General Assembly and seek the right to decide how to find a resolution to this conflict. In such a case the Soviet Union would not find itself pressured to defend NorthVietnam and thereby become more deeply committed to such a war which has been established since the United Nations has been in business is that they will recognize overt aggression and will act to meet such aggression. That was demonstrated in the case of Korea, although it is true Russia was not in the Security Council at that time; nevertheless, the other nations all recognized North Korea was invading South Korea, and they did authorize the United Nations to take action in support of South Korea.

But here we have a war in which there are arguments about the nature of the war. Some call it a civil war just as we had a civil war in Korea and the North and South here in the United States. Others say the moral issues are obscured because the United States did not support the elections provided under the Geneva agreement. There are moral questions raised by those who say the elections furnished by the United Nations can play an extremely useful role.

The value of moving in this direction is that if we advocate self-determination and if we say we are prepared to accept a vote by the people of South Vietnam, and I was happy to see that the President took that position the other day in his speech—then it seems to me that puts us clearly on the moral side, on the side of the angels. What ever disputes there are about the origins of this war or the morality of it, if we can go to the United Nations and say we are prepared to ask their good offices and their help in creating machinery to carry out some kind of a political decision process such as the use of the ballot box with a referendum or by an election of some kind, this would be consistent with the highest purposes of the United Nations. It would be consistent with the spirit of the small new nations for which self-determination stands as perhaps the highest political principle of any that are abroad in the world today.

Before I ask the gentleman to comment on this point, I might say, for example, to the United Nations that we are prepared to support the spirit of the small new nations in South Vietnam on the question of the political leadership that the people de-
sire—with the questions to be framed under United Nations jurisdiction.

Further, he could suggest that a cease-fire in Vietnam would give the United Nations representatives the opportunity to determine the future of Vietnam and/or of South Vietnam in carrying out such an election.

Third, he could say that if these steps were agreed upon, this would involve, I think, a direct contact by the United Nations with the Vietcong or with the national liberation front, if these steps could be agreed upon, then of course we would suspend bombing in the North and agree to abide by the outcome of the election, as we would expect all other nations to do.

Now I recognize the many problems that exist in this proposal. I recognize that the United Nations really has not done this before. But necessity is the mother of invention and if there should be some willingness to proceed to allow the people of South Vietnam, who are the people whose interests are ultimately at stake, to control their own destiny, then we could say to the people of Myanmar, and to the American people and to the world, that what has happened in the United States on behalf of the people of Vietnam was not in any way inconsistent with the observations of President Johnson at his press conference last week. Indeed, it simply carries out and makes a little more definite what was said then by the President.

The gentleman has well said that, while these things have not been done in exactly this way by the United Nations before, the fact is the United Nations Charter, like the great Constitution of this country and like the British Common-Law Constitution, is capable of infinite adjustment, within its four corners, to the turn of events.

Specifically, I think a combination of a United Nations-directed cease-fire which of course could then be enforced on our bombers and would operate on the Vietcong and on North Vietnam and on the Saigon government; the suggestion for United Nations-sponsored negotiations; and the suggestion, which I think is perhaps the most important of all, for United Nations supervised elections in South Vietnam—this is the essence of a proposal which, if made a little more formally by our President and if we are reaching in that direction now, will appeal to the sense of justice of people the world over. After all, that is our only refuge and strength. I think the gentleman has made a real contribution.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman has catalogued the points that are important in any kind of United Nations proposal which would lead to free election machinery to determine the future of Vietnam and/or of South Vietnam.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. I have one more thing to say. I think organization of the United Nations is very nearly complete. It is clear that this is the essence of a proposal which, I think, is perhaps the most important of all, for United Nations supervised elections in South Vietnam—this is the essence of a proposal which, if made a little more formally by our President and if we are reaching in that direction now, will appeal to the sense of justice of people the world over. After all, that is our only refuge and strength. I think the gentleman has made a real contribution.

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. REUSS. I think a direct contact by the United Nations with the Vietcong or with the national liberation front, if these steps could be agreed upon, then of course we would suspend bombing in the North and agree to abide by the outcome of the election, as we would expect all other nations to do.

My question to the gentleman is: What do we propose? What can we propose? What techniques and methods will be suggested or can be suggested to arrange for the peacekeeping forces? Obviously, if there is a cease-fire it is highly desirable to have an enforceable cease-fire under U.N. supervision. Given some of the difficulties of which we are aware, what do the gentlemen envision as the means for sorting this one out?

Mr. REUSS. Of course, the costs of a United Nations-supervised election would be negligible and could be borne out of regular United Nations dues, and there would be no problem, because there has been no disposition on the part of members generally to refuse to pay their dues.

If, however, a United Nations peacekeeping force were necessary, a United Nations police force—bear in mind that in my collogy with the gentleman from Minnesota just a moment ago I agreed that there were obligations under the charter which seemed to be more significant right now—in Vietnam or anywhere else in the world. I should think in the future, to the extent that the General Assembly of the United Nations set up a police force for financing voluntary.

So, with respect to future General Assembly peacekeeping forces, because of their exacerbating nature on some of the members, it would not hurt to make their financing voluntary.

If it be said that then the United States may shoulder the lion's share of the burden, I would answer by saying, first, only if the United States agreed, and second, how much better it would be if we were today bearing the lion's share and more than the lion's share of the burden in South Vietnam under the banner of the United Nations, and with the help of numerous other members of the United Nations. How much ahead, both financially and morally, we would be.

In answer to the question of the gentleman from California, there are ways of working out even expensive peacekeeping forces without wrenching the United Nations apart.

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. COHELAN. I was interested in the question of the gentleman from California and the response by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There is an additional procedure which could be followed by the United Nations which would also, I believe, provide additional flexibility. I refer to creating a peacekeeping fund in advance, in a predetermined amount—it might be $500 million or some other figure—which would be needed in the event of insulating a particular peacekeeping operation from the request for support of that fund. One cannot insulate it entirely, and it may depend on the magnitude of the peacekeeping operation involved.

I might say that one of the objections raised to the idea of having a peacekeeping fund established in advance is the possibility that the smaller nations, who control the General Assembly, might undertake to go ahead and initiate some kind of action which we would not feel was in the interest of the United States. I mention this because it is a common objection. On that point, it seems to me we have so many other things to fear which are more real and more immediate that such a remote contingency could not seriously impair our national security. I believe we should look at the possibility of establishing such a fund as a way of providing the United Nations with the flexibility which I very strongly feel it needs.

Mr. REUSS. I would certainly agree that this is an idea worthy of exploring. If it ever could be achieved, it would certainly be a most helpful addition to the United Nations arsenal of peaceful weapons.

I return, however, to my theme, which is that immediately we are confronted with the stubborn fact that the U.N. has fallen apart and that our most immediate urgent task is to move heaven and earth to put it back together again.

There is no reason under the sun why in about 5 weeks from now the United Nations could not be on its feet, financially sound once again, with hope for the future and, I would think, with the gratitude ringing in our ears of about 80 small nations for the initiative of the United States in trying to get the United Na­tions back on its feet, if we will but do what has to be done in the Halls of Cong­ress, and in the executive branch in the 3 or 4 vital weeks to come.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. speaker, I always listen carefully to our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]. He is truly one of the outstanding scholars in the Congress and a thoughtful and knowledgeable internationalist. I read with appreciation in his recent article on the U.N. in Common­wealth magazine. I compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin on his continuing efforts in support of the U.N. and thank him for taking this time today to discuss the U.N. and its vital role in this modern world.

Mr. Speaker, I emphatically deny that fate decrees that wars are inevitable. As Schnepfenauer said, what people com­monly call fate is nothing but their own stupid and foolish con­duct, and if wickedness is atoned for in another world, stupidity gets its reward here.

I am convinced that there is a proper and well defined path we can and must take in our foreign policy. I say that the ground rules are existing and have been
enumerated by wise leaders, living and dead. Sir Isaac Newton said:

If I have seen farther than other men it is because I have stood on the shoulders of giants.

I ask only that we stand open eyed, on the shoulders of our giants.

I suppose that I realized that the day of world wars was over and done with on August 6, 1945, when our aircraft dropped the first atomic bomb and in a few seconds leveled a great city and killed 77,000 people.

You will recall that this was a few months after the Germans had started using the V-2 rocket, which was fired from hidden sites, which flew so fast that the sound of the missile did not catch up until after the explosion.

It seemed apparent on that day that substitutes would have to be found for warfare, that it would not be too many years before any reasonably modern nation would have the missiles and the nuclear warheads capable of destroying any other country or combination of countries. Any new Toto, Hitler, Kaiser, Napoleon, or Genghis Khan now had the means not only of making clean and economic the violent deaths of a hundred million people, in hunger and poverty for two-thirds of the world's population, and in a breakdown of governments permitting Communist rule over half the world's population.

Even in the brief periods between wars, the preparations for the next conflict so imperish the world community economically and spiritually, that long-range success in the development of the underdeveloped is impossible.

World expenditures for armaments per year total over $120 billions, of which the United States spends 42 percent. In late May it was announced that our Nation has the destructive power of the biggest arms merchant in the world, with sales of 1.5 billion this year and a special arms sales promotion program in Western Europe costing $500,000 a year.

With the nations of the world spending $120 billion a year on arms, it is clear that there is not enough money left over for aid to the underdeveloped countries.

As Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn have pointed out, there must be an annual flow of capital from the industrialized nations to the low-income countries of not less than $50 billion per year—or $25 per capita. The current flow of $8.5 billion is only one-sixth of what is required to make any real impression on the problem.

Unless the developed nations allocate a larger sum of capital to the low-income nations, we should not be surprised if they develop monolithic economic and political systems. Communist revolutions and anti-imperialist activities are not caused by the Communist doctrine, they are caused by disease and the lack of the decencies of life. These revolutions will continue even if communism evaporates, as it almost certainly will after 2 months ago that President Kennedy made his immortal speech on world peace at American University here in Washington. It seemed to me at that time, and I have not since changed my mind, that his words signified a new direction in American foreign policy.

He said that world peace is the most important topic on earth. He said that war is not inevitable—that mankind is not doomed forever to be gripped by forces we cannot control.

He said:

Our problems are man-made—therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants.

That:

World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together in mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement.

President Kennedy said:

We seek to strengthen the United Nations to develop it into a genuine world security agency that can take the place of the U.N. and of creating conditions under which arms can be finally abolished.

You will recall that within a few short weeks the Soviet Union and our own country have signed the treaty preventing atmospheric atomic testing. At the time of his death we appeared to be close to an extension of the treaty to include underground explosions. President Kennedy had traveled to England, Ireland, and to Europe. He was looked upon as the leader who might fulfill Tennyson's dream of a time "when all men's good be each man's rule, and universal peace lie like a shaft of light across the land."

It seems to me that our commitment to build world law and order is being weakened by our actions. We appear to be disassociating ourselves from a foreign policy whose matrix is the U.N. and instead giving increasing importance to unilateral power actions.

I say that this course can only lead to disaster—that man's only hope for world peace is through constant honest efforts toward world organization—that we cannot say it won't work until we have tried. And that to date have been timid and unenthusiastic.

It is my position that support of the U.N. must be the core of our foreign policy. I believe that the United States can lead its sister states on the road to a world community where disputes are settled not by war but by conciliation and arbitration.

Where the United Nations has been allowed by its members to operate, its successes have been solid and satisfying. Through its efforts, the U.N. is the rule in the World Health Organization, UNESCO, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the Monetary Fund, the World Bank, GATT, the exchange of technical assistance, and many, many more.

The first and primary purpose, however, of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security. The charter specifically requires that member States shall use no force except in self-defense—that the use of self-defense must be reported to the Security Council, and that members must settle their disputes peacefully.

We believe that any states that nations in dispute shall first seek a solution through peaceful means of their own choosing. Then, if a solution is not found, the dispute must be referred to the U.N. before it erupts into war.

The first few years considerable respect was paid to this commitment. Russia withdrew its troops from Iran and France hers from Syria to avoid charges of charter violation. The U.N. helped restore peace in Greece, Kashmir, and Korea. But all too often this commitment has been maintained when the state was first established and again during the Suez crisis.
But this pattern of generally responsible conduct has degenerated during the past decade into the practice of nations taking the law into their own hands and using force without first submitting the case to the U.N. There was Britain and France invading Suez in 1956, Russia in Hungary, the United States in Vietnam. It might possibly be argued that the use of force would be legitimate where a member in good faith first seeks assistance through the U.N. and fails to receive it. There is no excuse for bypassing the U.N.

More and more we have been reversing the proper order of conduct in international affairs. Our charter obligation is to first not allowing a dispute to the international governmental authority and only thereafter back up its decision with force. There is no authority to move militarily first, seeking conciliation later.

In recent years it is said more and more that the charter does not forbid one nation from helping another quell a rebellion. This is certainly an imaginative but unsupported conclusion. There is no authority in the charter for one nation to intervene militarily in another country whether there exists a civil war, a war of liberation, or a war in the defense of freedom.

No state has the right to intervene in another state's civil war. If the civil war constitutes a threat to international peace, then the U.N. may intervene to deal with this threat.

There is nothing in the charter to justify the actions of the small powers rejecting or ignoring conciliation, mediation or the other peacekeeping processes of the U.N. The law of the charter, its very heart, outlaws the use of force, or the threat of force.

Russia's refusal to pay certain peacekeeping assessments or that action by the Security Council will be frustrated by a Soviet veto. In Selma last winter I talked to Sheriff Jim Clark who wore a big badge on his chest that said "Never", and I think it clear now that the integration referred to on Clark's badge will arrive sooner than he thinks.

To follow this course of compliance with the charter, nations must be willing to submit disputes to the U.N. Charter. NATO provides no machinery or means for settling disputes, except the use of force, or the threat of force. We are taking the law into our own hands in an area of arms control proposals. Indeed, NATO historically has looked with a jaundiced eye on any plans for disarmament, disarmament or the establishment of arms-free areas in Europe.

My position is that there is a single path to peace and that it consists of a more faithful adherence to the rules of the charter. There still would remain many intractable problems requiring additional machinery. The U.N. must, of course, be open to every nation including China. There must be giant steps toward disarmament and the formation of an international police force. The World Court's jurisdiction must be enlarged and strengthened. There must be in the General Assembly a more realistic distribution of voting power.

But these are difficult, perhaps impossible achievements in the hostile atmosphere of today. The greatest is that one step is possible—one is immediately achievable—and that is for the member nations to cease forthwith their neglect of the U.N. and their soliloquies on national interests under the charter. Regardless of whether or not there are defects in the charter, it is up to its signatories to make faithful and diligent efforts to comply with its provisions.

A constitution, any set of rules or laws, any charter, is only as effective as the good faith of its members. There are a number of totalitarian nations whose governments have been formed only in the past 20 years. There is England which has no written constitution, but the long tradition of observance of the law by its citizens creates a law-abiding community.

Where law is treated with contempt by powerful and influential segments of the society, the rule of law itself is endangered.

For the past 100 years in certain areas of our country, white men in the South, the leaders of leadership have said that continuation of the creed of racism is more important than the law. And to this day it is virtually impossible to enforce ordinary criminal codes against Negroes who assault or murder Negroes.

A respectable and powerful political leader such as the senior Senator from Virginia will declare that the preservation of segregated schools is more important than respect for Federal law as enunciated in the 1954 school desegregation decisions.

In the community of nations we see the destruction of the international law which is the foundation of their nation. Many members who, like white Mississipians viewing race, find that the particular conflicts between nations are more important than the preservation of the international machinery for dealing with the conflict.

Russia's refusal in Hungary is more important than its contract to submit the dispute to the U.N. The United States finds its stake in Vietnam more important than its treaty obligations under the U.N. Charter.

During the past few months we have witnessed a budding respect for law and order in our South and an increasing compliance with the law. Amongst the causes are the three civil rights bills and the Western economic pressures exerted by the Federal Government. But important amongst the causes is the emergence of business and Government leaders who say that the quality of civilization that results from compliance with the law is now more important to them than illegal apartheid.

I would suggest that the United States as the world's most powerful and influential nation declare to the world its resolution to comply hereafter with its written contracts—most importantly its obligations under the Charter of the United Nation.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 2 provide:

All members shall settle their international disputes by negotiation in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

And further in article 33:

The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

And article 37 continues:

Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that Article, they shall refer it to the Security Council. If the Security Council determines that the continuation of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under Article 36, or to order immediately, with a view to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures, the use of armed force in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

I am not impressed with objections that the United Nations for Peace Resolution is something new and untried and that the long tradition of power has not been emasculated by France's and Russia's refusal to pay certain peacekeeping assessments or that action by the Security Council will be frustrated by a Soviet veto. In Selma last winter I talked to Sheriff Jim Clark who wore a big badge on his chest that said "Never", and I think it clear now that the integration referred to on Clark's badge will arrive sooner than he thinks.

To follow this course of compliance with the charter, nations must be willing to submit disputes to the U.N. Charter. And I am not impressed with objections that the United Nations for Peace Resolution is something new and untried and that the long tradition of power has not been emasculated by France's and Russia's refusal to pay certain peacekeeping assessments or that action by the Security Council will be frustrated by a Soviet veto. In Selma last winter I talked to Sheriff Jim Clark who wore a big badge on his chest that said "Never", and I think it clear now that the integration referred to on Clark's badge will arrive sooner than he thinks.

To follow this course of compliance with the charter, nations must be willing to submit disputes to the U.N. Charter. And I am not impressed with objections that the United Nations for Peace Resolution is something new and untried and that the long tradition of power has not been emasculated by France's and Russia's refusal to pay certain peacekeeping assessments or that action by the Security Council will be frustrated by a Soviet veto. In Selma last winter I talked to Sheriff Jim Clark who wore a big badge on his chest that said "Never", and I think it clear now that the integration referred to on Clark's badge will arrive sooner than he thinks.
We must be more interested in solving problems than in proving theories. All the great powers must learn that their ideologies are as great a source of danger as they are of strength.

I do not pretend to have proposed today a logical first step. Much of the solution lies in the recognition that implementation will magically produce a world of independent states adequate for international machinery for the peaceful settling of disputes. I suggest, however, that what I have proposed is a logical first move.

As Benjamin V. Cohen recently pointed out, at least the referral of disputes to the U.N. would cause delay so that by the time any effort could be taken to eradicate, our generation will be wise enough to find ways of leaving to the solvent of time and the wisdom of succeeding generations problems which we of our generation are unable to solve.

Let us not forget that the most aggressive ideologies undergo change over the years. Even the most fanatical faiths balk at self-destruction and mellow with time. As Justice Holmes summed it up, "Time anneals the most iron-hard of animosities." A few weeks ago I was in Los Angeles. Automobile after automobile carried bumper stickers. Some read "Impeach Earl Warren." Two read "Register Committee." Not one read "The War on Poverty Means Poverty for All." And another read "Get the U.S. Out of the U.N." I saw no cars with bumper stickers urging support for the cause of peace and is seeking with every skill at his command a formula that can result in an honorable peace in Vietnam.

The foreign policy of the United Nations might prove a useful step toward the establishment of an authority equipped to handle the difficult job of supervising peace in Vietnam. The United Nations might also be the mechanism for a gradual disengagement of American and North Vietnamese forces following a ceasefire. And, eventually, the United Nations might be given to a new Geneva Convention, with the participation of all relevant parties, whether or not they are members of the United Nations.

I hope we should be equally aware of the importance Vietnam can have on the United Nations. Peacekeeping activities by an international body are now generally looked upon with disfavor and suspicion. There is nothing the United Nations needs more than a success. This country can help bring that about, with subtlety and prudence, by seeking to involve the United Nations in every diplomatic initiative and policy which has any chance of succeeding. There is no reason why we cannot be generous in peace.

This, of course, is a matter of some delicacy, which is why we are so fortunate to represent the United Nations by Ambassador Goldberg. I have faith that the solution will eventually be found through the U.N.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks, many of us have heard in Congress have urged a greater United Nations role in searching for a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam. We were all, therefore, deeply gratified by President Johnson's remarks last week affirming this country's decision to involve the United Nations in new diplomatic initiatives. Ambassador Goldberg's appointment signaled such a renewed dedication so hoped for by people of goodwill throughout the world.

But the United Nations was the auspices under which the nonaligned countries whose good will should be a major goal of his country's foreign policy. And, since any eventual settlement should include a guarantor role for the United Nations, it is important that the organization be involved in the quest for peace as early as possible.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. MULTRA) may extend his remarks at this point in the Recom and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTRA. Mr. Speaker, the following article deals with efforts to implement the poverty program in New York and is part of the series on New York City in Crisis.
On April 7, city officials met with the OEO staff and agreed to modify their proposal. They suggested instead an Economic Opportunity Corporation composed of 11 city officials, 4 community representatives. The OEO called this unacceptable.

When the city's proposal went before Adam Clayton Powell Jr. and the Mayor's Economic Opportunity labor subcommittee on April 15, it called for a corporation composed of 11 city officials and five or six community representatives.

Even then, Representative Powell challenged the city's position and said that the proposed corporation was "monopolistic" and that the"maximum feasible participation" of the residents was required. The corporation was created by the Economic Opportunity Act, which called for "the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."

On May 11, Mayor Wagner released plans for a completely new arrangement for the city's anti-poverty program. He would create two corporations—an Economic Opportunity Corporation and a Council Against Poverty.

The Economic Opportunity Corporation would still consist of the 11 city officials and five community representatives. The new Council Against Poverty would have a 62-man board of directors, composed of 16 city officials, 40 representatives of community groups and agencies, and six members of the poor.

While the Mayor was releasing his new proposal, the OEO said that the inclusion of only six members of the indigenous poor—the target population—was insufficient and that it would not be coming. It called for a new formula which would have greater representation by the poor.

Resolution in the community also spelled doom for the city's plan. Mass meetings were held in which the poor and members of the already existing community action agencies visited the city. They called for a greater voice in the anti-poverty movement.

Finally on May 24 Mayor Wagner issued an executive order which called for the creation of the Council Against Poverty composed of not more than 100 members. The proposal called for a 16-member council from the poor—two from each of the 16 designated pockets of poverty in the city—and 10 members from other groups. The city would have only 16 officials on the Council. The rest would come from social welfare agencies and community leaders.

This new formula was acceptable to the OEO only when the Mayor included a promissory letter pledging that the Council would include 32 representatives of the poor and 32 representatives of community action groups "within a month—surely not longer than 60 days."

New York City in Crisis—Shriver Policy Linked to Haryou-Act Charges

Community Action Gives Poor a Say

(By Marshall Peck)

There were some 200 persons in the auditorium at PS 11 on 21st Street, Thursday night, well-dressed and attentive, men and women, young and old. The few nuns in a row, gathered for a community meeting. They were told that this was where a democratic program starts.

"What you are about to establish is the anti-poverty program itself," said the Reverend John H. Wilson, chairman of the evening. "This meeting will be held up and actually constitutes the program. For this program involves getting the people together and hearing their thoughts and suggestions, and planning this project.

As Father Wilson finished, a woman translated his remarks into Spanish.

Discussion

Then Father Wilson moved the microphone down to the auditorium floor and opened the discussion on proposals presented in mimeographed leaflets. They were how the directors of the local antipoverty board would be chosen, and what would be its composition.

The meeting started at 8 p.m. What followed was a spirited debate, heated exchanges, charges of divisiveness, pleas for unity action—may well typify the hundreds of meetings that will be held across the city.

For there, in Chelsea, at the grassroots, people—within considered judgment by some, as rough, vigorous, noisy, un­nerved, shyness—were articulating the views and demands of the poor.

Objective

The object of the meeting in Public School 11 was to study a guide to a group level of a structure representative of the poor, which would help coordinate anti-poverty programs, and help select representatives to sit on the 16-man Council Against Poverty. Duces of similar groups are gearing up the same way. The Chelsea meeting conveyed some of the impact of the project of the poor, which would help coordinate anti-poverty programs. He would create a concept of a block of representatives of poverty that would help coordinate anti-poverty programs. He would create a concept of a structure representative of the poor, which would help coordinate anti-poverty programs. He would create a concept of a block of representatives of poverty that would help coordinate anti-poverty programs.

The meeting started at 8 p.m. What followed was a spirited debate, heated exchanges, charges of divisiveness, pleas for unity action—may well typify the hundreds of meetings that will be held across the city.

For there, in Chelsea, at the grassroots, people—within considered judgment by some, as rough, vigorous, noisy, un­nerved, shyness—were articulating the views and demands of the poor.

First, despite distribution of 15,000 leaflets (allegedly delivered the day of the meeting), it was a sparsely attended audience. Did the purpose of the meeting make up and actually constitute the program? For there, in Chelsea, at the grassroots, people—within considered judgment by some, as rough, vigorous, noisy, un­nerved, shyness—were articulating the views and demands of the poor.

Third, of out all the evidence that, with responsible assistance, a community can organize such a meeting, get a lower income people to attend, and the poor can, indeed, speak effectively for themselves.

There are still uncertainties about the Chelsea program, but the results of this meeting on May 11, were decisions to allow the entire community to vote for two states, selecting representatives of community action groups.

For there, in Chelsea, at the grassroots, people—within considered judgment by some, as rough, vigorous, noisy, un­nerved, shyness—were articulating the views and demands of the poor.

New York City Council Against Poverty has promised the Office of Economic Opportunity $50,000 to have 12 people of low income to constitute a new program’s "decentralization and representation." The office of Economic Opportunity has promised the Office of Economic Opportunity Community Development Corporation $50,000 to have 12 people of low income to constitute a new program’s "decentralization and representation." The office of Economic Opportunity has promised the Office of Economic Opportunity Community Development Corporation $50,000 to have 12 people of low income to constitute a new program’s "decentralization and representation." The office of Economic Opportunity has promised the Office of Economic Opportunity Community Development Corporation $50,000 to have 12 people of low income to constitute a new program’s "decentralization and representation."
a procedures manual put out by the Anti-Poverty Operations Board. But the city wishes, quite properly, to give full rein to the communities in the final choice of its delegates.

So confusion, lack of information, antagonism and all the trimmings of the stoning of the "poor" on the council. In effect, the program is going on, and the people who are supposed to be having a say, aren't. They are out of the picture.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF BOOKS DEMANDED

(Barry Gotttheir and Alfonzo Narvaez)

WASHINGTON—Sargent Shriver, head of the Office of Economic Opportunity, announced yesterday that all OEO's, both private and private, receiving Federal anti-poverty funds must respond fully to reasonable requests for information concerning programs and finances.

If these agencies, after being funded by OEO anti-poverty grants, it was learned that Mr. Shriver said his office would make this information available under his agency's full-disclosure policy.

Though a spokesman maintained that the full-disclosure policy is standard in all OEO anti-poverty grants, it was learned that this statement of policy was attached—along with other special conditions—to New York's §1 million anti-poverty grant. Under the refusal of Livingston Wingate, executive director of Haryou-ACT, to respond to information requests in order to refute the charges. However when Mr. Wingate failed to produce the records by early May, Shriver maintained that a series of Federal officials, Mr. Shriver presented the issue to the Federal agencies funding the project.

Their reply was that the "information concerning the expenditure of public funds is public information and should be available to the greatest extent possible in response to legitimate reasonable requests.

Under prodding from Federal officials, Mr. Wingate agreed to open his records.

Recently, when the day of reckoning came, Mr. Wingate denied a request from the OEO, which has segments of its program strewn throughout Harlem—and said that he would allow the records to be inspected only 4 more hours.

Reneged

Appeals were again made to Federal officials, who suggested that photographs be taken of the records. Mr. Wingate refused to allow this, and on a television program last Tuesday, he transferred to Public School 115, the agency—has been hanging on a post by a rusty chain. The article appeared in the New York Times, which has made a gift to the board of education.

The outhouse, about 6 feet high, was built in 1912. Both toilets—located in the basement. The reason the parents from Public Schools 28 and 128 were among the sponsors was that Public School 115, now a junior high school, is scheduled to become an elementary school this fall. Some children attending Public Schools 28 and 128 will be transferred to Public School 115.

DEMONSTRATORS

Among the demonstrators were representatives from the Parents Association of Public Schools 28 and 128, by the Riverside-Kidscombe Neighborhood Association. By 10:00 a.m. about 25 men and women were in front of the school. Some had baby carriages, and some brought rolls of toilet paper and scrub brushes.

The reason the parents from Public Schools 28 and 128 were among the sponsors was that Public School 115, now a junior high school, is scheduled to become an elementary school this fall. Some children attending Public Schools 28 and 128 will be transferred to Public School 115.
NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—
PART CL

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. MULDER) may extend his remarks at this point in the Recom and include Exclusive matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULDER. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the last in the series on "New York City in Crisis."

As any New Yorker will tell you New York is the greatest city in the world and everything is wrong with it. We who love New York want to see its problems solved.

The following article gives a résumé of some of the crises faced by our largest city and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune June 21, 1965.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: THE GREATEST CITY IN THE WORLD—AND EVERYTHING IS WRONG WITH IT

POVERTY

It is a city in which poverty is everywhere and the gulf between the rich and poor grows greater and more innumerable every day. It is a city where the untrained and unskilled whites, who know the killing effects of poverty, are crammed, inadequately heated, unsanitary, rat-infested apartments. It is a city where the Department of Economic Opportunity finally approved a $9.1 million community-action-poverty grant for New York in June. Struggle for control of the program has hamstringing the job for the past 12 months and the white official said that the white officials have given "maximum feasible participation" to the Negroes who have applied for jobs.

The city's poverty problem is not new. The Department of Economic Opportunity has drawn up the requirements for the renovation. The cost of the job, estimated at $300,000, will be paid by the city and Federal officials.

The first 2 weeks city and Federal officials have spent their time on the rehabilitation of the building. The city has spent $270,000 on the renovation.

In the following article given a résumé of some of the crises faced by our largest city and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune June 21, 1965. [From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, June 21, 1965]
It is a city in which the problems of auto­
mation and urbanization, which threaten the
future of cities all over the world, are multi­
plied a thousand times. In the past 5 years, a
wave of new businesses has poured into New
York. They have deserted the city—and there
appears to be no way and little effort on the part
of the city to attract them back. It is a persist­
ent fear of the city's leaders that a temporary com­
mercial building boom brought on by a change in the zoning code
and by the World's Fair, construction is now
worsening, while income from property taxes is cur­
rently reporting more than 15-percent unem­
ployment. What makes this problem even
more critical is that the city is losing not only
the employers of the unskilled and the semi­skilled
who are deserting the city in frightening
numbers. More than 80,000 manufacturing
workers have been lost in the past 5 years. "Taxes, labor costs, insurance, and the city government's attitude have made
Manhattan a nightmare for small business­
mens," says one disgruntled dress manufac­
turer. "This is becoming a city with white­
collar jobs and blue-collar people."

Business

The financial crisis: New York's factory job loss has amounted to more than the equivalent of the Brooklyn Navy Yard (some 10,000 jobs due to be lost sometime soon) for each of the
last 17 years—12,000 jobs a year, a total of
204,000; Negroes and Puerto Ricans, who are
increasing at so rapid a rate that 60 percent of
youths between 15 and 24 years of age in New
York City 5 years from now will be minorities; and
State unemployment area, heralded as the first
test case of the city administration's human
rehabilitation program, has been the most
amazing of all. Taxes, sewer rate increases, the "impractical,
administratively, and contributes nothing."

Housing

It is a city in which the problems of poverty, but, because of limited
funds, unlimited red tape, and little dir­
ec­tion from the top, it seems to have
created almost as many problems as it has
solved. There are currently 290,000 people
living in public housing. More than 600,000
others are waiting to get in. At the rate that public housing has been
constructed over the last 2 years (12,000 units or
approximately 500 units a week), it would take
more than 10 years to get admittance
to a public housing project if he applied
today. There are still more than 600,000 people
waiting to get into public housing. These people—kept in deteriorating tenements by the
state—have been promised by the city's housing author­
y's strict eligibility requirements
which keep out most of the people who need rehabilitation the most. They have found little
relief in public housing. The phone was sup­
pended by the city administration with considerable
fanfare last February. The phone was sup­
pended to speed up the process of repairing
POLITICS

It is a city in which the mayor wants to act decisively on several major issues he feels are in need of urgent action. There are several good reasons why he may be considering the introduction of legislation to make it easier for him to act. First, he is running out of time. Mayor Wagner's term is approaching its end, and the winning of re-election by Mayor Wagner, if it is possible at all, is looking increasingly unlikely.

Second, the city's budget problems are expected to continue for many years to come. The city's finances are in a critical state, and the mayor's ability to deal effectively with these problems is threatened by the lack of a strong mayor and a weak city council. The mayor's withdrawal from the race is also expected to produce an attempted return to power by Tammany and the emergence of a Democratic leader in the city. The most likely successor is Senator Robert Kennedy, who has given no indication of whom he will support for the mayoralty.

The mayor's decision not to run for re-election has complicated the city's political picture. More than a dozen names are being bandied about by Democrat, with many people running for office as independents. This has been a major factor in the growing discontent in the city, which is running out of patience with the mayor's inability to deal effectively with the city's problems. The mayor's withdrawal is also expected to produce an attempted return to power by Tammany and the emergence of a Democratic leader in the city. The most likely successor is Senator Robert Kennedy, who has given no indication of whom he will support for the mayoralty.

SCHOOLS

It is a city in which a gigantic school system is torn by overcrowding and substandard facilities. The city's schools are not able to cope with the growing problems of poverty, crime, and racism. The schools are underfunded, and the teachers are overworked.

The mayor's withdrawal is also expected to produce an attempted return to power by Tammany and the emergence of a Democratic leader in the city. The most likely successor is Senator Robert Kennedy, who has given no indication of whom he will support for the mayoralty.
It is a city in which big businessmen complain about civic apathy and the way the city is run, but rarely do more than talk and lend their names to concerned associations and city commissions. When they do become actively involved (and this does not include lending their names to concerned associations and city commissions), as in the struggle for midtown parking garages, the trade center, and the Wall Street redevelopment, it has generally been in an individual capacity, certainly not in a self-interest as it has been out of a love for the city. They prefer instead to complain that, even if New York could organize a Wall Street, their names to civic organizations and city commissions would have been an involvement born as much out of a love for this city as it has been out of self-interest. And when civic leaders suddenly be­come interested in something, they too, perhaps through the formation of an industrial development corporation. Initial enthusiasm diminished, however, when Mayor Wagner announced his massive deficit budget and his plan to boost the real estate tax, the city's business leaders suddenly be­came interested in a real estate tax. The committee of 14 is a noticeable step for­ward for the city's power elite, called by one non-New York redevelopment expert the most self-interested of any in the world, it still is a million miles behind citizens' groups in San Francisco, Philadelphia, Detroit, and a dozen other U.S. cities.

STUDIES

It is a city in which the foundations, the universitites, thousands of civic groups, and the city government itself spend together to form two blue-ribbon committees aimed to meet critical issues on their own—without waiting any longer for leadership from city hall. For example, a recently elected board chairmen of the city's greatest corpora­tions organized the committee of 14 early in 1960. These blue-chips, perhaps through the formation of an industrial development corporation. Initial enthusiasm diminished, however, when Mayor Wagner announced his massive deficit budget and his plan to boost the real estate tax, the city's business leaders suddenly be­came interested in a real estate tax. The committee of 14 is a noticeable step for­ward for the city's power elite, called by one non-New York redevelopment expert the most self-interested of any in the world, it still is a million miles behind citizens' groups in San Francisco, Philadelphia, Detroit, and a dozen other U.S. cities.
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DO NEW YORKERS CARE? FACTS, REACTION, ACTION

(By Barry Gottehrer)

"New York is the greatest city in the world—and everything is wrong with it."

With those opening words, Dr. Kenneth R. Denlinger, on January 26, launched his investigative series—"New York City in Crisis."

Over the last 5 months, this daily series has presented a documented and sweeping indictment of a city, the greatest city in the world, in serious trouble.

It has pointed up an indictment of a city government which, through inefficiency and indifference, has lost touch with its people. Yet it has also been an indictment of the city's 8 million people who, through fear, frustration, and bewilderment, have come to accept conditions and services that grow increasingly intolerable. People of New York city have spoken—by phone and by mail during the last 5 months, the expanded coverage of the Herald Tribune can offer. The answers given by New Yorkers to telephone and mail surveys, as well as to newspaper mailers, have been the start of sweeping municipal reform as it has been in Philadelphia, St. Louis, Detroit, and dozens of other cities.

While city hall has failed to act, the New York County District Attorney's office has pressed investigations of the women's house of detention and the housing authority. And the State investigation commission is determined to get to the root of the city's slum housing problem.

The plight of these slum dwellers has been helped by the people of New York who have kept up a special housing complaint telephone, through which many people feel this has merely added another layer of bureaucracy. The community coordinating council's one department, the buildings department as called for in the series, figures to help even more.

The people of the city, increasingly frightened by the rapidly soaring crime rate in the streets, in the parks, and in the subway, have made up a special housing complaint telephone, through which many people feel this has merely added another layer of bureaucracy. The community coordinating council's one department, the buildings department as called for in the series, figures to help even more.
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The people of the city, increasingly frightened by the rapidly soaring crime rate in the streets, in the parks, and in the subway, have made up a special housing compl
Nation has lost a great citizen, Theobald Dengler, to whom it was a pleasure and privilege to work with Mr. Dengler in connection with the Annual Steuben Day Parade which has become an annual attraction in New York City in September. To work with him and to know him was to like him, respect him, and admire him for his unfailing devotion to many worthy causes.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which briefly outlines his devotion to the public welfare which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune:

DENGLER, LAWYER AND CIVIC LEADER
Theobald J. Dengler, 68, a lawyer here since 1922 and for many years a leading figure in German-American civic, philanthropic and patriotic activities in the country, died Saturday night at his summer home in Long Beach, Long Island. He lived at 2809 Morris Avenue, the Bronx.

Mr. Dengler, a native of New York, completed his education Fordham Law School and began to practice law in 1922 after serving with the U.S. Navy in World War I as an enlisted man. At the time of his death, he was the senior partner in Dengler, Dengler & Dengler, New York.

He was active for many years in the Roman Catholic Church, and at the conclusion of World War II, he was designated by the suggestion of Francis Cardinal Spellman as chief of the Catholic section of the Religious Affairs Division of the Military Government in Germany. Upon his return to the United States, Mr. Dengler delivered lectures in many cities, describing the plight of the people in the defeated nations and enlisting aid. As a result of this work, he received the Officers Cross of the Government of West Germany and the golden medal of the Royal Order of the Red Eagle.

During the war, he headed the national German-language division of the war bond drives and received official recognition for his work.

Mr. Dengler was chairman of the executive committee of the Catholic Kolping Society of America, which operates hostels and similar services, and he also was head of the German-American Committee of Greater New York, which supported the Steuben Day Parade and many other activities.

For many years, Mr. Dengler was a member of the executive committee and of the board of directors of Steuben's House, a public welfare institution, the German Society of the City of New York, which figured in the establishment of the U.S. Travelers Aid Society, the Travelers Aid Society, and Lenox Hill Hospital since it was established in 1784.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Hilda Schweiger Dengler, five sons, Theobald J., Dengler, Jr., the Reverend Ralph Dengler, S.J.; Norbert, Bernard M. and Lawrence G. Dengler, and a daughter, Mrs. Hilda S. McGraw.

THE D.A. IS SUPPOSED TO PROSECRATE, NOT PERSECUTE
Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. Gonzalez. Mr. Speaker, last week stories appeared in the Washington Post and the Evening Star which created the impression that a colleague had attempted to influence the handling of a local criminal case. These stories quoted the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia and in bold black headlines implied that a member of this House had done something wrong in writing two letters and making a phone call in behalf of a boy who was accused of a crime.

I deeply resent and protest the implications left by these stories. It appears to me that the office of the U.S. attorney has done our colleague an injustice.

If a Congressman makes an inquiry to a Federal office in behalf of a constituent or in behalf of any person, he is not acting improperly. He is doing his job.

For a U.S. attorney to complain because a Congressman has contacted him borders on a violation by the executive branch of the rights and prerogatives of the legislative branch.

If the U.S. attorney's office intentionally "leaked" the stories casting aspersions on a colleague last week for the purpose of intimidating other Members of Congress or making them afraid of making inquiries on behalf of other persons, it is mistaken. Members of Congress will not be so easily intimidated.

As an example of the damage and the distortions that can result from mis-guided efforts such as those that apparently were made last week by the U.S. attorney's office, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Record at the close of my remarks a newspaper story that was carried on one of the wire services and printed in one of my hometown newspapers, the San Antonio Express, July 30, 1965.

The U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia owes the gentleman from Texas a public apology.

The article follows:

The REPS. CASEY ACCUSED OF TRYING TO INFLUENCE IN THEFT CASE
WASHINGTON.—The U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, Robert B. Casey, Democrat of Texas, attempted to influence the handling of a petty larceny case in which a constituent was involved.

David C. Acheson said Wednesday that Casey wrote two letters, made one visit and
to at least one telephone call to Acheson or members of his staff in an effort to get favorable consideration in a case involving a young man charged with shoplifting a pair of Bermuda shorts.

Casey, a former assistant district attorney, acknowledged he had interested himself in the case, but said he was "very careful not to attempt to influence the handling of the case." He emphasized: "I haven't done anything to be ashamed of. I've known this boy's folks for 15 years. It was just a case of doing something for a constituent. This boy didn't have anybody up here to help him, and I hope that someone would do the same for one of my young men if he got in trouble.

The youth, whose parents live in Houston, was acquitted in a trial on Tuesday in the course of general sessions.

A store detective said the youth took three pairs of shorts into a dressing room, put one pair on, then put his trousers on over them and returned the other two pairs to the display counter.

The youth contended in the trial that it was an unconscious act on his part. He said he was afraid of making inquiries on behalf of other persons, it is mistaken. Members of Congress — often to sit down and consider the cases of constituents. It is just as proper for a Congressman to write or telephone a Federal office in behalf of a constituent as it is for the Federal office in behalf of a constituent to be angry if a Congressman has contacted him.

There was no objection. — Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. Purcell. Mr. Speaker, more than $2 out of every $3 expended by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in fiscal 1965 were spent for services of primary benefit to the general public. In terms of man-years of work over 90 percent of USDA activity was devoted to programs that provided far more benefits to the consumer, labor, business and the general public than to farmers.

I cite these facts because they are too little known—because in the public mind the Department of Agriculture exists to serve farmers—or even to subsidize farmers.

Even when it was first established over 100 years ago—in an era when our Nation was predominantly agricultural—the USDA was known as the "people's department."

Today when less than 7 percent of our people live on farms, the USDA provides a bigger and more varied catalog of services to consumers in general than any other agency of Government anywhere in the world.

We have USDA research to thank for the first cheap commercial method of making penicillin—for the development of dextran, a blood plasma extender—for improved paints—for detergents made from animal fats—and for the aerosol spray cans in which we now buy a multitude of products from car wax to whipped cream.
These developments may seem far afield from agriculture but they are very close to the people—and therefore highly appropriate activities for the people's department.

There are other services, perhaps even more spectacular. The Department has established more than 5,700 radio-monitoring stations throughout the United States, and has trained 18,000 employees to measure radiation levels. Why? Because in case of a nuclear attack upon this country the USDA would have the responsibility for producing, processing, storing, and distributing food through the wholesale level. It must guard against fire damage in country areas. It must determine when it is safe to resume farming operations.

USDA inspectors at ports and borders keep foreign pests, insects, and diseases from entering this country. Sometimes the nation gets an unexpected dividend. For example, the last shipment of pure heroin ever intercepted in the United States was stopped at the Mexican border in October 1963 by an alert USDA plant quarantine inspector making a routine inspection.

These activities are for the benefit of all of us—194 million Americans—not primarily for the less than 13 million people who now live on U.S. farms. So are the meat and poultry inspection programs, the grading of food and fiber, the protection and improvement of the Nation's resources of soil, water, and timber. Such activities as the school lunch, special milk, food stamp, and direct distribution programs reach far more urban than farm people.

At this time, I can only scratch the surface of the Department's services to the general consuming public. But the list includes how to stretch consumer dollars through information on how to buy, store, and prepare food; how to purchase, clean, and conserve clothing; how to put in and take care of a lawn and shrubbery; how to plant and nurture home gardens. The home gardener produces for his own product is indeterminates and can not be foreseen by either the farmer or an agency of the Government. In recent years, potato farmers have guessed wrong about how much to plant. They have planted too much and low prices have been the result.

The gentleman from Connecticut has made the statement that Maine farmers had in some way cut back their planting in 1964 so they would get higher prices this year. The facts are in direct opposition to the primary production of potatoes. In 1964, Maine farmers increased it! If it were not for the frost that hit their potato crop, they would have had too many potatoes.

The Maine potato farmer has nothing against competition. He plants as much as he thinks can sell to get a reasonable return on his investment. More often than not he has guessed wrong—the lean years have far outnumbered the fat ones.

It is this that makes the U.S. Department of Agriculture truly the people's department.

POTTAOES

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine (Mr. Hathaway) 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Moynihan) in a recent speech—Record, July 27, 1965, page 18467—continued in his series of attacks on the current price of potatoes. His basic argument comes down to this: The Maine farmer should look into the future, see what the weather will be in the coming months, determine the future demand conditions, determine the price that should be charged for potatoes, and finally, if he still has any remaining time, plant his crop accordingly.

It is, of course, impossible for a farmer to do these things. The weather conditions, the growing season, and the market for his product are indeterminates and can not be foreseen by either the farmer or an agency of the Government. In recent years, potato farmers have guessed wrong about how much to plant. They have planted too much and low prices have been the result.

The gentleman from Connecticut has made the statement that Maine farmers had in some way cut back their planting in 1964 so they would get higher prices this year. The facts are in direct opposition to this statement. In 1963, Maine farmers planted 142,000 acres of potatoes. The resulting prices were far too high. Last year, in 1964, Maine farmers planted more, not less, potatoes. Instead of 142,000 acres, they planted 145,000 acres of potatoes. These figures clearly show that Maine farmers did not cut back their planting, but if anything, increased it! If it were not for the frost in Idaho, we would have had too many potatoes, but as I said before, no man can look that far into the future and determine what the weather will be.

The 1964 crop was easily understood. A short supply coupled with a large demand will cause a higher price. That is the way the law of supply and demand operates. Several years ago a frost in Florida destroyed a part of the citrus crop. Even before the remainder of the crop was harvested, commodity buyers knew there would be higher prices on orange juice the next year. They were correct. The law of demand determines the limited supply of a commodity to those that value that commodity enough to spend the extra money to purchase it.

The Maine potato farmer has nothing for which to apologize. His crop is not subsidized, and his Government does not guarantee him a market. He plants as much as he thinks can sell to get a reasonable return on his investment. More often than not he has guessed wrong—the lean years have far outnumbered the fat ones.
The Johnstown based utility is an operating company of General Public Utilities Corp., and its generating operations are integrated with those of its subsidiaries: Pennsylvania Edison Co. (Pa.), New Jersey Power & Light Co., and Jersey Central Power & Light Co.

GPU, through the Jersey Central company, is a part owner of the Keystone project and Penelec is constructing and will own portions of the east-west EHV transmission lines emanating from Keystone. The GPU companies' power production operations are further coordinated with other eastern utilities through the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland Interconnection (PJM)—the world's oldest and one of the largest power pools.

Mr. Roddis noted that Penelec's forecast of increased demand for electricity by its customers and the planned retirement of old and less efficient generating units would require Penelec to have substantial additional generating capability and that the coordinated installation of a mine-mouth EHV system would meet the requirements of both utilities in 1970.

Although this project would create the first transmission tie of EHV level (120,000 volts) between western Pennsylvania and upstate New York, Penelec, and NYSE&G have maintained transmission connections at 12,000 volts for many years. In addition NYSE&G has 11 major transmission ties with 4 other utilities including Penelec interconnected with 7 other companies at 13 other locations.

Design details for the plant are still to be developed but would be similar in concept to the neighboring mine-mouth stations. Cooling water for the plant will be continuously recycled from huge storage basins outside the plant, sent in to the station's condensers, heated up, returned outside and into 380-foot tall hyperbolic concrete shell natural draft cooling towers and dropped back down to the storage basins.

Additional supplies of water to make up for the amounts being evaporated in the cooling process will be withdrawn from Two Lick Creek and pumped uphill to the plant site about a mile away. The creek's flow will be maintained at an adequate rate all year through the use of the construction of a reservoir further upstream with 19,000 acre-feet of water storage impounded by a concrete dam.

The site of the plant in the central western Pennsylvania soft coal region will allow the companies to take advantage of the substantial economies associated with using readily available sub-bituminous coal, with an average heat rate of 12,000 British thermal units per pound and requiring minimal preparation and transportation. Studies have shown about 125 million recoverable tons of coal within a few miles of the site. The officials reported that no contracts have as yet been entered upon with coal companies.

Part of the economic impact of the project would be to create the mining of the coal in the area, while suitable for this plant, is less in demand for other uses and much of it might not otherwise ever be mined. It is predicted that operation of the plant at full capacity would mean 500 or more mining jobs and a large number of trucking and other associated jobs. Installation, which includes the building of the plant and the construction of the transmission lines, will provide temporary jobs and substantial local purchases of materials, supplies, and services. The construction is expected to create 13,000 jobs which of which should inject several million dollars a year of additional purchasing power into this region's economy.

An economic analysis of the site is its proximity to Penelec's network of 250,000-volt and 115,000-volt transmission lines leading to major local electric load centers and to existing interconnections.

Mr. Roddis noted that consumers in Pennsylvania have already reduced their consumption of the relatively new technology of EHV transmission and the development of large-scale generating units. "This has been so," he said, "because of the advantages of the economic impact of siting mine-mouth plants in our State and in the action of Pennsylvania as a State corporation the companies are desirous of "intended to help us assure our customers that electric service will remain the best bargain in Pennsylvania in the years to come."

Mr. Roddis and Mr. Bell stated also that, "our project illustrates the intention and ability of investor-owned utilities to meet the Nation's growing electric power requirements and to work toward further reduction in power costs—and to achieve these ends without placing a burden on the taxpayer."

SERVICE CONTRACTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) and I have introduced identical bills, H.R. 10238 and H.R. 10239. This legislation, which will be known as the Service Contracts Act of 1965, represents an attempt to close a serious gap in our Nation's labor standards laws.

Both the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) and I have previously sponsored legislation similar to that which we have introduced today. In the 86th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Labor Problems urged the consideration of proposals to provide labor standards on Federal service contracts, and the full Committee on Education and Labor reported a bill, H.R. 11532. This bill, however, was not acted upon by the full House before the adjournment last fall.

H.R. 10238 and H.R. 10239, the bills introduced today by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) and myself, would provide much needed labor standards protection for employees of contractors and subcontractors furnishing to or performing maintenance service for Federal agencies. The service contract is now the only remaining category of Federal contracts to which no labor standards protection applies. Construction contracts, including many which are partially financed with Federal funds but to which the Federal Government is not a party, require compliance with minimum labor standards under the Davis-Bacon Act and related statutes. Supply contracts of the Federal Government also provide labor standards protection pursuant to the Walsh-Healey Act.

The officials reported that no contracts have as yet been entered upon with coal companies.

Mr. Roddis noted that consumers in Pennsylvania have already reduced their consumption of the relatively new technology of EHV transmission and the development of large-scale generating units. "This has been so," he said, "because of the advantages of the economic impact of siting mine-mouth plants in our State and in the action of Pennsylvania as a State corporation the companies are desirous of "intended to help us assure our customers that electric service will remain the best bargain in Pennsylvania in the years to come."

Mr. Roddis and Mr. Bell stated also that, "our project illustrates the intention and ability of investor-owned utilities to meet the Nation's growing electric power requirements and to work toward further reduction in power costs—and to achieve these ends without placing a burden on the taxpayer."

SERVICE CONTRACTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) and I have introduced identical bills, H.R. 10238 and H.R. 10239. This legislation, which will be known as the Service Contracts Act of 1965, represents an attempt to close a serious gap in our Nation's labor standards laws.

Both the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) and I have previously sponsored legislation similar to that which we have introduced today. In the 86th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Labor Problems urged the consideration of proposals to provide labor standards on Federal service contracts, and the full Committee on Education and Labor reported a bill, H.R. 11532. This bill, however, was not acted upon by the full House before the adjournment last fall.

H.R. 10238 and H.R. 10239, the bills introduced today by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) and myself, would provide much needed labor standards protection for employees of contractors and subcontractors furnishing to or performing maintenance service for Federal agencies. The service contract is now the only remaining category of Federal contracts to which no labor standards protection applies. Construction contracts, including many which are partially financed with Federal funds but to which the Federal Government is not a party, require compliance with minimum labor standards under the Davis-Bacon Act and related statutes. Supply contracts of the Federal Government also provide labor standards protection pursuant to the Walsh-Healey Act.

The bill is applicable to advertised or negotiated contracts, in excess of $2,500, the principal purpose of which is for the furnishing of services through the use of service employees, as defined in the bill. Thus, for example, contracts made by the District of Columbia government with local hospitals for the care of indigent patients would not be covered, since "service employees" as defined in the bill would be performing only incidental functions. Similarly, contracts entered into by the Atomic Energy Commission for the management and operation of Government-owned plants would not be service contracts within the meaning of the bill.

Provisions regarding wages and working conditions must be included in these contracts and bid specifications. Service employees must be paid no less than the rate determined by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing in the locality.
The bill also recognizes the growing importance of fringe benefits as an element of wages in today's society. It therefore requires inclusion in the contract of an agreement to provide service employees benefits determined by the Secretary to be prevailing in the locality. This obligation may be discharged by furnishing any equivalent combinations of benefits or cash payments in accordance with regulations of the Secretary.

The bill also provides the payment on any Government service contract of wages less than the minimum wages required under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In addition to the wage and fringe benefits requirements of the bill, additional stipulations require that service or maintenance work shall not be performed under unsafe or unsanitary working conditions where those working conditions are under the control of the contractor or subcontractor. Contractors or subcontractors are also required to notify employees of the benefits due them under the act.

In the event of violation, the bill authorizes the Secretary to bring court action against the contractor, subcontractor, or surety to recover the remaining amount of the underpayment. The contract may be terminated because of violation of the Walsh-Healey Act's provisions for health insurance.

The bill also provides a procedure for blacklisting, for a period up to 3 years, those who violate the act, with authority in the Secretary to recommend removal from the blacklist upon assurance of compliance. The Secretary is given the same authority to make rules, regulations, issue orders, and take other appropriate action to enforce the act.

The bill also provides for the health needs and care of the American people. This legislation has a long history with which I have been intimately connected. It has evolved in the following fashion:

First, the Social Security Act of 1935 sponsored chiefly by Senator Wagner, of New York, marked the first small beginnings through Federal grants-in-aid to the States for general public health work and maternal and child health services.

Second, in 1939 President Franklin D. Roosevelt transmitted to Congress the first Presidential message on health security. In the same year Senator Wagner introduced the first comprehensive national health bill upon which a sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor chaired by Senator Murray held hearings and issued a favorable interim report upon which no action was taken by the full committee or by the Senate.

Third, in 1940 Senator Wagner and Senator George introduced a hospital construction bill which was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and passed by the Senate. It died in the House Labor Committee.

Fourth, in 1943 Senator Wagner and Senator Murray introduced in the 78th Congress S. 1161 which died in the Senate Labor Committee. It included provisions for health insurance.

Fifth, in 1943 the Senate authorized under Senate Resolution 74 the establishment of a Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor to investigate the educational and physical fitness of the civilian population as reported by the Subcommittee on Education and Labor and by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. It died in the House Labor Committee.

Sixth, in 1944 Senator Wagner and Senator Murray introduced in the 79th Congress a hospital insurance bill which was favorably reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means. It died in the House Labor Committee.

Seventh, in 1945, title II of which provided for a reorganization plan to provide for the distribution of medical facilities, hospitals, and health centers to meet the health needs of the American people. The report No. 3 made a special study of the problem of payment for adequate medical care and it disclosed that the actual care received varied with the income of families. It pointed out:

Evidence such as this leads the subcommittee to conclude that the 'pay-as-you-go' or 'fee-for-service' system, which is now the predominant method of payment for medical services, is not well suited to the needs of the most people or to the widest possible distribution of high-quality medical care.

The solution of this problem will not be easy. The American Medical Association and other voluntary or compulsory health insurance, by use of general tax funds, or by a combination of these may become in some degree a national proposition for which alone would not be enough because they are not applicable to the unemployed or to those in the lowest income groups. At this stage of its investigations the subcommittee is not prepared to pass judgment on these differing opinions. It is in agreement, however, with those who feel that remedial action is overdue and should not be long delayed.

The American Medical Association commented editorially upon this report in the following language:

The report, in general, would seem to be more scientific, carefully considered documents, which was heretofore unusual as a result of previous hearings in the field.

Sixth, in May 1945, Senator Wagner and Senator Murray introduced S. 1059 on the same subject. November 1945, President Truman in a special health message to Congress, proposed a broad legislative program for national health administration which was incorporated in S. 1161, the legislation of August 3, 1945, title II of which provided for a system of personal health services to be developed on a social insurance basis.
The report also expressed dissatisfaction with the prevailing pay-as-you-go or fee-for-service method of payment for medical services but withheld judgment with regard to the merits of other types of health insurance. The plans offer a satisfactory solution to the problem. This report summarizes the results of the work done on this subject and sets forth the conclusion we have reached.

The report continued to point out that the burdens of sickness and medical care fall unevenly on the people:

There is an inverse relationship between the amount of sickness and the amount of medical care. The more prosperous and better insured groups in our country at the present time, People with low incomes have more sickness, more accidents, and more medical care, and they receive less than those in the upper income groups.

The report further pointed out:

In 1945 approximately 75 percent of the population had no medical care insurance whatsoever, while 20 percent had insurance against one or more items of medical care costs. Only about 2.5 percent of the population had what might be called comprehensive coverage; i.e., at least doctor’s care in hospital, home, and office, and hospital service for illnesses other than those covered by insurance policies (such as mental disease and tuberculosis)

Another 10 percent of the population had part of their doctor’s fees covered, usually the surgeon’s or obstetrician’s fees in hospitalised illness only. The other 12.5 percent of insured persons had only their hospital bills covered; i.e., bed, board, nursing, operating room, laboratory fees, etc., while in the hospital. Related to acute costs of medical care, the average cost of medical care is at least 10 percent of the national income. However, the majority of people are not as well off as the figures may indicate a good deal of overlap.

It appears probable that any voluntary plan can be devised which will fulfill them. The voluntary plans have served and are serving a valuable purpose, even though they do not provide any final answer to the problem of prepaid medical care for all the people. They have developed useful data on the use of medical costs, and have educated the public to a realization of the value of medical care insurance. Furthermore, they have trained sizable numbers of doctors in the techniques of prepaid medical care. There is no reason why such plans should not continue to perform useful functions within the framework of a national health insurance system.

However, to cover everyone, the average as well as the good risks, the young and the old, the sick and the well, the rural and the city dwellers, the low- and the high-income groups, the poor and the rich, all takes an efficient and inclusive as a national health program, built around a system of prepaid medical care. This is the heart of the voluntary plans, it is evident to us that none of them meets all of these requirements. Neither can appear probable that any voluntary plan can be devised which will fulfill them.

To meet such problems, the subcommittee recommended Federal action with regard to education and research in outpatient clinics, including Federal grants for hospital and health center construction, sanitation, public health, medical research, education, and medical care for the needy.

The need for health insurance has become clear. The well-tried American way of meeting the hazards of life by spreading risks and by prepaying costs is applicable to health services.

For a century and a half the American people have been experimenting with various ways of insuring themselves against the costs of medical care. Voluntary group prepaid plans offer a satisfactory solution to the need for certain occupational or other selected groups, and for certain types of medical service.

In the last 20 years, the growth of these plans has accelerated, and plans devised for only 3 or 4 percent of the population with relatively complete medical services. Some say that this is temporary. Presumably, ultimately they can meet the need. We do not deny that they are growing. Those who think as we do helped build them, are on committees with them, and those who 15 years ago were attempting to block their growth and labeling even such voluntary systems socialized medicine have come to agree that they have certain potentials for further growth.

However, we are firmly convinced, for reasons we have given in this report, that they can never meet the total need.

In its third interim report this subcommittee has again a defined the public and of the professional groups concerned, any method (of health insurance) designed to provide a reasonable and adequate medical care, should be reasonable but not out rate in cost, should include substantially all the people, should afford the highest quality of care, should not stand-patice of physician or group of physicians, should allow democratic participation in policymak­ ing by consumers and producers of the serv­ ice, should be adaptable to local conditions and needs, and should provide for continuous experimentation and improvement,

"In order to meet the requirements of the public and the professional groups concerned, any method (of health insurance) designed to provide a reasonable and ade­quate medical care, should be reasonable but not out-in cost, should include substantially all the people, should afford the highest quality of care, should not stand-patice of physician or group of physicians, should allow democratic participation in policymak­ ing by consumers and producers of the serv­ice, should be adaptable to local conditions and needs, and should provide for continuous experimentation and improvement," was the conclusion of this subcommittee.

As a nation, we cannot afford to gamble with our health. Some say that we are the healthiest nation in the world, and that nothing need be done. There is little evidence that we are the healthiest country in the world. We do not rank at the head of the list in any of the major health indexes—crude or age­specific death rates, life-expectancy rates, infant and maternal mortality, or even of some of these rates when age-adjusted are the best. But even if we were, it would not excurse our health failings.

Even before modern medicine had reached its present peak of complexity and specialisation, the fee-for-service, individual prac­ tice method of providing medical care did not meet the need. Now, however, it is a complete anachronism. It results in barriers to good health care which keep not only low-income people, but most middle­income and some high-income groups from modern medical science. It inhibits the full use of modern preventive medicine since it forces most people to wait until they are actually ill before going to a doctor. And it leaves any family the prey of unexpected crippling costs from medical bills and wage loss. On top of the natural tragedy of illness may be heaped economic catastrophe.

The need for health insurance has become clear. The well-tried American way of meet­
Ninth. As a result Senator Murray and Senator Wagner, Senator Pepper and Congressman Dingell Introduced S. 1320.

Tenth. When the pressure for national health insurance became very strong in the 1940's, the American Medical Association forced through the Congress as a substitute and palliative for health insurance the Kerr-Mills bill as an amendment to title I of the Social Security Act in 1950. Thereafter, Congress gradually increased the appropriations under the Kerr-Mills Act but as the hearings disclosed before the House Ways and Means Committee during the last session of Congress under the Kerr-Mills Act failed to meet the problem of the health needs of the aged.

The medicaid bill which has passed the Congress and which has been signed by the President of the law of the land will be an important step in any direction. We must look forward to the days when we may have to expand the act to meet the growing needs of the American people.

DR. RALPH E. KNUTTI, DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Fogarty) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the retirement on July 31 of Dr. Ralph E. Knutti, Director of the National Heart Institute.

For the past 14 years, Dr. Knutti has used his vast knowledge and remarkable skill as a scientist and administrator for the benefit of the Public Health Service. Soon after joining the Service Commissioned Corps in 1951, he came to the National Institutes of Health to help in the research effort to combat the ravages of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases develop its extramural programs. Ten years later, Dr. Knutti took over the directorship of the National Heart Institute, initiating bold new programs and strengthening the links of the Institute with other related public and private agencies.

Dr. Knutti came to the NIH after long experience as a pathologist, medical educator, and medical investigator. As chief of extramural programs and later as Associate Director for extramural programs at the NIAMD, Dr. Knutti abandoned the role of research scientist in order to aid in building the NIAMD research grant program. At that time, comparatively few scientists in this country were interested in studying arthritis and its related disorders. As a direct result of Dr. Knutti's able efforts, the NIAID now accounts for one of the largest research grant programs within NIH.

The Institute is widely recognized and respected among specialists in the field. Under Dr. Knutti's direction, the NIAMD has become a leader in research on heart and vascular diseases. This program is now spreading into related fields of medicine and surgery.

As Director of the National Heart Institute, Dr. Knutti began several new programs—the program projects grants which broadened the concept of the research grant which enables long-term multidisciplinary projects to be organized and executed with maximum flexibility; the collaborative studies program which is designed to make elite health needs of the Nation and recommended the enactment of a broad national health program.

The concern of the Federal Government in this matter is clear. If only the national defense were involved, this would be reason enough to adopt a sound national health program. The costly lessons of the selective service rejections and of the Armed Forces medical discharges have made this apparent. We owe it, therefore, to the Nation, and to her people are healthy and full of strength, to open the way to the future. We do not advocate this. National health insurance is often erroneously called socialized medicine or state medicine. Indeed, free choice will be extended, and free choice of hospital by the doctors and free choice of hospital by the patient, and free choice of patient by the doctor, are goals which can be excluded, because current financial barriers to the actual exercise of free choice will be broken down.

Some aspects of a national health insurance program can be set up on a voluntary or administrative framework or administrative plan can be perfect at first. Shortcomings will undoubtedly be encountered. But new ideas, new organizations, will overcome as we learn from experience. None of these shortcomings, however, will be any nearer as costly as the toll of lives and health now being exacted by our failure to have a national health program providing good medical care for all. The need for it is urgent.

August 5, 1965

The President in his budget message of January 3, 1947, and in the annual budget message of August 4, on account of official business, August 5, 1963, as a request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford, for August 7, 1965, as a request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford, for August 4, on account of official business. On May 19, 1947, in a special message to Congress the President recommended the enactment of the Congress to the health needs of the Nation and recommended the enactment of a broad national health program.

The President in his budget message of January 3, 1947, and in the annual budget message of August 4, on account of official business. On May 19, 1947, in a special message to Congress the President recommended the enactment of a broad national health program.
EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FINO.

Mr. SIKES.

Mr. HARMON of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. Rem of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GROVER.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. BURKHARDT.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Reuss) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. PEPPER.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7994. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to conform to the conventional for the Safety of Life at Sea (Ree, London (1960));

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution to provide for the payment of compensation for obtaining deposits and interest thereon, to limit the payment of compensation for obtaining deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.J. Res. 1407. Joint resolution to provide labor standards for certain persons covered by orders entered into in certain cases, pursuant to section 212(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to the Committee on the Judiciary.


H.J. Res. 1413. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of all claims adjudicated and paid for the period July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 221(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 1415. A letter from the Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report of no grants made during fiscal year 1965, pursuant to Public Law 85-853; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 1417. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Defense, transmitting annual report of the American National Red Cross for the year ending June 30, 1964, pursuant to the act of July 17, 1953, (67 Stat. 173); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 10066. A bill to provide for the relief of Lawrence F. Bachman, to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 10067. An act to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program (Rept. No. 720). Referred to the House Agriculture Committee.

H.R. 10068. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, father of the Committee, to appropriate funds for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen; with amendment (Rept. No. 712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

H.R. 10069. A bill to authorize any executive department or independent establishment of the Government, or any bureau or office thereof, to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to such departments and establishments, or any bureau or office thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 721). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

H.R. 10124. A bill to establish a U.S. Capitol page system for needy and deserving students of a college, university, or other advance educational institution, to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENIOR ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles: S. 579. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire; and S.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the occasion of the bicentennial celebration of the birth of James Smithson.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 4, 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:

1407. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 30, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Cape Fear River, N.C., above Wilmington, requested by resolutions of the committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representa

1408. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the payment of deposits and interest thereon, to limit the payment of compensation for obtaining deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1409. A letter from the Acting Comptroller-General, GSA, transmitting a report of excessive procurement of equipment and supplies for packaged disaster relief, to the Committee on Government Operations.

1410. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report of orders entered into in certain cases, pursuant to section 212(e)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1411. A letter from the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation in certain cases, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1414. A letter from the Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report of no grants made during fiscal year 1965, pursuant to Public Law 85-853; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1416. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1418. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting additional recommendations relative to home rule for the District of Columbia (H.R. Doc. 294); to the Committee of the Whole House.

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. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee of conference. H.R. 8439. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, for public works, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 713). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10068. An act to provide for the relief of Lawrence F. Bachman; without amendment (Rept. No. 720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. S. 24. An act to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 721). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8646. A bill to authorize any executive department or independent establishment of the Government, or any bureau or office thereof, to make appropriate reimbursement between the respective appropriations available to such departments and establishments, or any bureau or office thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DEALDENOY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 498. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4780, a bill to provide a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax (Rept. No. 719). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McCLOY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8706. A bill for the relief of Mr. John Allen; with amendment (Rept. No. 712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8646. A bill for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8654. A bill for the relief of A. T. Leary; without amendment (Rept. No. 715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.


Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2694. A bill for the relief of John Allen; with amendment (Rept. No. 717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. MURPHY of New York. H.R. 10224. A bill to establish a U.S. Capitol page system for needy and deserving students of a college, university, or other advance educational institution, to the Committee on Appropriations.
institution of higher education, to the Committee on House Administration.
By Mr. Farnsley:
H.R. 10255. A bill to provide for the payment of interest on valid claims under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
By Mr. NOLAN of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 10226. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable by the Federal agencies for service or disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
By Mr. Gridder:
H.R. 10293. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to assure majority representation by secret ballot; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
By Mr. Harley:
H.R. 10233. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, so as to provide for the regulation of certain employees benefit funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
By Mr. Jesse E. MOORE:
H.R. 10299. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred for the support and education of their dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
By Mr. Michel:
H.R. 10230. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1936 to authorize the appropriation of $6,000 for the repair and modification of certain structures along the Illinois River; to the Committee on Public Works.
By Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts:
H.R. 10301. A bill to coordinate and consolidate the major civilian marine and atmospheric functions of the Federal Government through the establishment of a Department of Marine and Atmospheric Affairs, to enunciate national policies pertinent to the marine and atmospheric interests of the United States, to further the expanded exploration of and development of the marine resources, to encourage research and development in the marine and atmospheric sciences and technologies, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Government Operations.
By Mr. Poage:
H.R. 10302. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to nonprofit rural and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply, water systems, and waste disposal systems and to provide that such amounts may be used to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.
By Mr. Ryan:
H.R. 10303. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, so as to provide for the regulation of certain employees benefit funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
By Mr. Rivers of South Carolina:
H.R. 10304. An amendment to section 1058 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the reimbursement procedure required among the executive departments of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.
By Mr. Murphy of New York:
H.R. 10305. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emissions of nitrogen oxides or diesel-powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
H.R. 10306. A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the rate of duty on parts of geared temperature and pressure gages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
By Mrs. Reid of Illinois:
H.R. 10327. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, to the Committee on Ways and Means.
By Mr. O'Hara of Michigan:
H.R. 10328. A bill to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by the Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
By Mr. Pelley:
H.R. 10329. A bill to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
By Mr. Fascell:
H.R. 10340. A bill to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.
By Mr. Harvey of Indiana:
H.R. 10241. A bill to amend the Water Pollution and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.
By Mr. Murphy of New York:
H.R. 10342. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of the act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
By Mr. O'Konski:
H.R. 10243. A bill to require the U.S. military establishments and installations to purchase wines and distilled spirits in compliance with and conformity to systems, procedures and requirements established in the several States, and to limit the quantities of such beverages to be sold, distributed or acquired within Federal enclaves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
By Mr. Ryan:
H.R. 10344. A bill to establish a Federal Water Commission to provide for the development, utilization, and control of the water resources of the United States for beneficial uses and for their protection in the interest of the health, safety, and welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.
By Mr. Rosenthal:
H.R. 10345. A bill to establish a Federal Water Commission to provide for the development, utilization, and control of the water resources of the United States for beneficial uses and for their protection in the interest of the health, safety, and welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.
By Mr. Fisher:
H.J. Res. 596. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. Donohue:
H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry, to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.
By Mr. Marsh:
H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the 200th anniversary of the Stamp Act Congress, held at New York, in the Colony of New York, October 7-25, 1765; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. King of New York:
H.J. Res. 599. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion its legislature on limited factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McCulloch:
H.J. Res. 600. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion its legislature on limited factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS
Under clause 4 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:
By Mr. Addabbo:
H.R. 10246. A bill for the relief of Gaetana Valentini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 10247. A bill for the relief of Cleopatra E. Beckett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 10248. A bill for the relief of Sharlotta and Wolf Onizadzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. Clevenger:
H.R. 10249. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth Manninen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. Curtis:
H.R. 10250. A bill for the relief of Juan A. del Real; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. Fino:
H.R. 10251. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Maurelio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 10252. A bill for the relief of Rosco Recine and Santa Recine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. H. Johnsons:
H.R. 10253. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Bencomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. Hagen of California:
H.R. 10254. A bill for the relief of Maria de Jesus Benitez Cessares Hyett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. Herlong:
H.R. 10255. A bill for the relief of Jack B. Carpenter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. McCormack:
H.R. 10256. A bill for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter Penelope Jean Blyth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. Michel:
H.R. 10257. A bill for the relief of James N. Thomson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. Murphy of New York:
H.R. 10258. A bill for the relief of Chang Heung An; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. Pepper:
H.R. 10259. A bill for the relief of Dr. Allan Baumal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. Ryan:
H.R. 10260. A bill for the relief of Qosay S. Emam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. Tuck:
H.R. 10261. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan F. Chavez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.