the United Nations, vice Franklin H. Williams.

Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, of Minnesota, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, vice Mrs. Marietta P. Tree.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 25, 1965:

U.S. TAX COURT

Charles R. Simpson, of Illinois, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1956.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 25, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words of Scripture: Philippians 3: 1: *Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord.*

Almighty God, we humbly acknowledge that when we bow together in prayer the cares and burdens of life become easier to carry and the loneliness of our hearts, by a sense of Thy companionship, is possessed with a great peace.

May we have a keener awareness of Thy nearness and inspire us to make trial of a great trust in Thee. Help us feel that in all of our disappointments Thou art near us, in all our doubts and darkness Thou art ready to enlighten us, and in every temptation, sorrow, and weariness Thou art still loving us.

Give us a practical faith, one that toils in the love of God for the good of man. May we realize that our love and labors must extend to all humanity, changing it into a new world and urging mankind to reach out to goals that are worthy of its efforts and enterprises.

Grant that we may never lose hope in the bewildering medley of care and crime, and this tangled tumult, which we call the world, for Thou wilt not let humanity go until the law of love and good will rules in the hearts of men.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 7596. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove inequities in the active duty promotion opportunity of certain Air Force officers.

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

H.R. 4750. An act to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes.

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

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

S. 356. An act for the relief of Miloye M. Sokitch; and

S. 2263. An act to establish a Traffic Branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and to provide for the appointment to such court of five additional judges.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7750) entitled "An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8639) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 6927) entitled "An act to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. SIMPSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that Mr. JAVITS had been appointed a conferee on the bill (H.R. 6927) entitled "An act to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes," in place of Mr. MUNDT, excused.

EXEMPTIONS FROM THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H.R. 5280, to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws, to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States, together with the Senate amendment thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendment with amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That it is declared to be the policy of Congress to safeguard the position of the United States with respect to its international balance of payments. To effectuate this policy the President shall undertake continuous surveillance over the private flow of dollar funds from the United States to foreign countries, the solicitation of cooperation by banks, investment bankers and companies, securities brokers and dealers, insurance companies, finance companies, pension funds, charitable trusts and foundations, and educational institutions, to curtail expansion of such flow, and the authorization of such voluntary agreements or programs as may be necessary and appropriate to safeguard the position of the United States with respect to its international balance of payments.

"SEC. 2. (a) The President is authorized to consult with representatives of persons described in section 1 to stimulate voluntary efforts to aid in the improvement of the balance of payments of the United States.

"(b) When the President finds it necessary and appropriate to safeguard the United States balance-of-payments position, he may request persons described in section 1 to discuss the formulation of voluntary agreements or programs to achieve such objective. When such a request is made, a notice shall be promptly published by the President in the Federal Register, listing the persons invited to attend and the time and place at which the discussion is to be held. If the President makes such a request, no such discussion nor the formulation of any voluntary agreement or program in the course of such discussion shall be construed to be within the prohibitions of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act of the United States: *Provided*, That no act or omission to act in effectuation of such voluntary agreement or program is approved in accordance with the provisions of subsections (c) and (d) hereof: *And provided further*, That any meeting or discussion comply with the requirements of subsection (e).

"(c) The President may approve, subject to such conditions as he may wish to impose, any voluntary agreement or program among persons described in section 1 that he finds to be necessary and appropriate to safeguard the United States balance-of-payments position. No act or omission to act which occurs pursuant to any approved voluntary agreement or program by a person described in section 1 who has accepted a request of the President to participate shall be construed to be within the prohibitions of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act: *Provided*, That any meeting or discussion pursuant to any such agreement or program comply with the requirements of subsection (e).

"(d) No voluntary agreement or program shall be approved except after submission to the Attorney General for his reviews as to its effect on competition and a finding by the Attorney General after consultation with the delegate of the President that the actual or potential detriment to competition is outweighed by the benefits of such agreement or program to the safeguarding of the United States balance-of-payments position. The finding of the Attorney General, together with his reasons, shall be published in the Federal Register not later than the time required by section 3 for publication of any approved agreement or program: *Provided, however*, That where the President finds that the balance-of-payments position of the United States requires immediate approval of an agreement or program he may waive the requirement for a finding by the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Attorney General and may approve such agreement or program.

"(e) Any meeting of representatives of persons described in section 1 requested by the President pursuant to any approved voluntary agreement or program or meetings or discussions pursuant to a request made in accordance with subsection (b), shall comply with each of the following conditions: (1) The Attorney General shall be given reasonable notice prior to any meeting, with such notice to include a copy of the agenda, a list of the participants, and the time and place of the meeting; (2) meetings shall be held only at the call of a full-time salaried officer or employee of such department or agency as the President shall designate, and only with an agenda formulated by such officer or employee; (3) meetings shall be presided over by an officer or employee of the type mentioned in (2), who shall have the authority and be required to adjourn any meeting whenever he or a representative of the Attorney General considers adjournment to be in the public interest; (4) a verbatim transcript shall be kept of all proceedings at each meeting, including the names of all persons present, their affiliations, and the capacity in which they attend; and (5) a copy of each transcript shall be promptly provided for retention by the Attorney General.

"(f) The Attorney General shall continuously review the operation of any agreement or program approved pursuant to this Act, and shall recommend to the President the withdrawal or suspension of such approval if in his judgment after consultation with the delegate of the President its actual or potential detriment to competition outweighs its benefits to the safeguarding of the United States balance-of-payments position.

"(g) The Attorney General shall have the authority to require the production of such books, records, or other information as shall have a direct bearing upon such agreement or program and the implementation thereof from any participant in a voluntary agreement or program as he may determine reasonably necessary for the performance of his responsibilities under this Act.

"(h) The President may withdraw any request or finding made hereunder or approval granted hereunder, in which case, or upon termination of this Act, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any subsequent act or omission to act.

"SEC. 3. On or before January 1, 1966, and at least once every six months thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Congress and to the President reports on the performance of his responsibilities under this Act. In such reports the Attorney General shall indicate, among other things, the extent to which his review of approved agreements or programs has disclosed any actual or potential detriment to competition. The full text of each voluntary agreement or program approved pursuant to this Act shall be transmitted to the Attorney General immediately upon the approval thereof, and shall be published by the President in the Federal Register not less than three days prior to its effective date unless the President finds that publication of the full text of any agreement or program would be inconsistent with the national interest in which case only a summary need be published.

"SEC. 4. The President may require such reports as he deems necessary to carry out the policy of this Act from any person, firm, or corporation within the United States concerning any activities authorized by the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 5. The President may delegate the authority granted him by this Act, except that the authority granted may be delegated only to officials appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, whether acting singly or jointly or as a committee or board: *Provided, however,* That the President may not delegate his authority under section 2(d) to waive the requirements for a finding by the Attorney General and approve an agreement or program where he has found that the balance-of-payments position of the United States requires immediate approval.

"SEC. 6. This Act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate twenty months after it becomes law, or on such date prior thereto as the President shall find that the authority conferred by this Act is no longer necessary as a means of safeguarding the balance-of-payments position and shall by proclamation so declare.

"SEC. 7. As used in this Act the word 'person' includes corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as individuals, satisfying the description contained in section 1."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there only one Senate amendment?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, there is one Senate amendment, a substitute.

Mr. GROSS. That amendment, as read of course, is germane? And there are no other Senate amendments in the bill?

Mr. CELLER. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CELLER moves to concur in the Senate amendment with the following amendments:

Page 6, line 8, insert after "payments" the word "position".

Page 6, line 23, insert after "program" the words "is taken until after such voluntary agreement or program".

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

REHABILITATION OF PERSONS CONVICTED OF OFFENSES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6964) to amend section 4082 of title 18, United States Code, to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out all after line 22 over to and including line 14 on page 3 and insert:

"(2) work at paid employment or participate in a training program in the community on a voluntary basis while continuing as a prisoner of the institution or facility to which he is committed, provided that—

"(i) representatives of local union central bodies or similar labor union organizations are consulted;

"(ii) such paid employment will not result in the displacement of employed workers, or be applied in skills, crafts, or trades in which there is a surplus of available gainful labor in the locality, or impair existing contracts for services; and

"(iii) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will not be less than those paid or provided for work of similar nature in the locality in which the work is to be performed.

A prisoner authorized to work at paid employment in the community under this subsection may be required to pay, and the Attorney General is authorized to collect, such costs incident to the prisoner's confinement as the Attorney General deems appropriate and reasonable. Collections shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I inquire for the purposes of explanation if this is not the same bill which earlier passed the House by a vote of 323 to 0? If so, would the gentleman care to explain in more definitive detail the amendment adopted in the other body?

Mr. WILLIS. This bill did pass the House on August 2 by a vote of 323 to 0. The Senate amendment simply clarifies the intent of the bill as expressed in the House report that work or furlough releases shall not result in the displacement of employed workers, aggravate unemployment, or undercut local standards of wages and working conditions. In other words, the Senate language is virtually the same as the language in the House bill but more detailed.

Mr. POFF. Do I understand correctly, Mr. Speaker, that the language adopted in the other body has the approval of the Department of Justice?

Mr. WILLIS. I understand the language appearing in the Senate bill was either prepared by or certainly done in collaboration with the Attorney General.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECEDENTS' ESTATES AND FIDUCIARY RELATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4465) to enact part III of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Decedents' Estates and Fiduciary Relations," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to decedents' estates and fiduciary relations in the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 14, line 17, strike out all after "(a)" down to and including "marriage," in line 24 and insert: "The widow of a deceased man, with respect to parties who intermarried prior to November 29, 1957, or the widow or widower of a deceased person dying after March 15, 1962, is entitled to dower and its incidents as the rights thereto were known at common law with respect to widows, including the use, during her or his natural life, of one-third part of all the lands on which the deceased spouse was seized of an estate of inheritance at any time during the marriage."

Page 14, strike out all after line 36 over to and including line 2 on page 15 and insert:

"(c) The right of dower provided for by this section does not attach to lands held by two or more persons as joint tenants while the joint tenancy exists. A husband may not claim a right of dower in land which his wife, during the coverture, conveyed or transferred to another person by her sole deed prior to November 29, 1957."

Page 17, strike out line 5 and insert: "his or her share in the decedent's estate, and his or her dower rights."

Page 18, line 20, strike out "(b)" and insert "(d)".

Page 53, line 2, strike out "suit" and insert: "sued".

Page 54, line 23, strike out "suit" and insert: "sued".

Page 54, line 27, after "payment" insert: "shall".

Page 75, strike out lines 17 and 18, and insert: "In appointing a guardian of the estate of an infant, unless said infant be over 14 years of age as hereinafter directed in section".

Page 77, line 40, strike out "suit" and insert: "sued".

Page 78, lines 10 and 11, strike out "to be put in suit" and insert: "to be sued upon".

Page 97, line 32, strike out "certified or".

Page 103, line 16 after "jurisdiction" insert: ": *Provided, however,* That in those cases in which a committee has heretofore been appointed and the committeeship has not been terminated by court action, such committee shall continue to act under the supervision of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia under its equity powers".

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that this bill is simply a codification of existing laws and that the amendments adopted in the other body are technical and nonsubstantive. Am I correct?

Mr. WILLIS. That is correct; and I am happy to assure the gentleman that that is so. The gentleman serves on the subcommittee which considered this bill, the subcommittee which considers all codification bills, and he knows, of course, that we do not go into matters of substance.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement of yesterday, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 639) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of July 30, 1965 (Public Law 89-96), is hereby amended by striking out "August 31, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1965".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third continuing resolution of the session. It merely extends from August 31 through September 30, existing provisions of law to provide funds for the operation of those agencies of the Government for which the regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1966 have not yet been enacted. The terms and conditions of availability were described in House Report 553, which accompanied House Joint Resolution 553 at the time of its passage by the House. The resolution ceases to apply to an agency or activity concurrent with approval by the President of the applicable appropriation bill in which provision for such agency or activity is made. Thus the scope of the continuing resolution constricts as each regular bill is enacted; the resolution would be wholly inoperative after the last approval.

May I say that so far as I know, we have only two more appropriation bills to be reported to the House; namely, those for foreign assistance and the usual end-of-session supplementals. The foreign assistance bill has been awaiting clearance of the necessary authorization, just recently cleared to the President. We expect to report it very shortly. And we expect to handle the supplementals expeditiously once the President submits them.

For general information and under leave to extend, I include a tabulation of the original and revised committee reporting schedule for the regular appropriation bills for fiscal year 1966, and the dates actually reported and passed on the bills thus far processed:

The regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal year 1966 as of August 25, 1965

Bill	Original reporting schedule (Mar. 10, 1965)	Revised reporting schedule (May 18, 1965)	Reported to House	Passed House	Passed Senate	Final congressional action
District of Columbia	Mar. 18	----------	Mar. 18	Mar. 23	June 22	July 13
Interior	Mar. 25	----------	Mar. 25	Mar. 30	May 26	June 15
Treasury-Post office	Apr. 1	----------	Apr. 1	Apr. 5	June 8	June 28
Labor-HEW	Apr. 29	----------	Apr. 29	May 4	Aug. 5	Aug. 17
Independent offices	May 6	----------	May 6	May 11	July 13	Aug. 5
Defense	May 13	June 18	June 17	June 23	Aug. 25	----------
Agriculture	May 20	----------	May 20	May 26	July 13	----------
Legislative	May 20	June 3	June 3	June 8	July 12	July 21
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	May 27	----------	May 27	June 1	Aug. 12	Aug. 24
Military construction	June 3	June 10	Aug. 6	Aug. 10	Aug. 20	----------
Public works	June 10	June 17	June 17	June 22	Aug. 23	----------
Foreign assistance	June 17	June 24	(1)	----------	----------	----------

[1] Foreign assistance bill awaiting approval of authorizing legislation.

NOTE.—A special Labor-HEW supplemental, passed by the House on Aug. 24, and the usual "end-of-the session" supplemental, for which no dates were shown, are not listed.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority Member, [Mr. Bow] is on the floor, and I believe is in complete accord with this resolution. It has been reported with the approval of the full Committee on Appropriations.

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

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I should hope that this is our last continuing resolution of the session. It seems to me that there is no reason why we cannot finish these appropriation bills in less than the time specified in the pending resolution. I certainly feel that this is the last one we are going to have this year; that we will be out of here before the resolution expires. I am convinced that the committee, under the able direction of the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, will finish the appropriation bills so that we can, from our committee at least, say to the leadership of the House that insofar as the appropriations are concerned, we are ready to go home.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the foreign handout appropriation bill, as I recall it, there is still the conference report on the bill for military construction.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; there will be that conference report and of course several others. I was speaking of initial House action rather than the action of the whole Congress.

Mr. GROSS. And we will have to get a vote to override the veto on the authorization bill, the military construction authorization bill before we can deal with the conference report; is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. I am not familiar with the procedure which the Committee on Armed Services will recommend to the House with respect to that authorization bill. I would suppose that can be worked out, of course.

Mr. GROSS. Let us hope that they will recommend a vote to overriding the veto.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, and for general information of Members and others who may be interested, I am including a summary comparative tabulation of the appropriation bills of the session and the President's related budget requests.

The House has thus far considered requests of $96,909,293,255 for the session and has approved $94,687,559,390, a reduction, overall, of $2,221,733,865, including the special supplemental adopted here yesterday. Foreign aid and the closing supplementals will add several additional billions. There are in addition, of course, some $12,300 million, tentatively, in so-called permanent appropriations—principally for interest on the public debt—that figure in the total appropriation picture for the year but which are not tabulated here for the reason that they arise from previously enacted permanent law and thus do not show up in the annual bills being processed this session.

The other body has now passed all of the appropriation bills sent to it, except the special supplemental passed by the House yesterday, making some changes as usual. The totals are shown in the tabulation.

The amounts in the appropriation bills sent to the president are at this point somewhat inconclusive as to the probable total change in the President's requests for the whole session. But in the bills sent to him this session, appropriations total $37,960,958,794, a net reduction of $1,030,977,250 from his budget requests considered in connection with those bills.

The summary tabulation follows:

The appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess., as of Aug. 25, 1965

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

Title and bill No.	House			
	Budget estimates to House	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with budget estimates
1965 SUPPLEMENTALS				
Agriculture, CCC (H.J. Res. 234)	$1,742,209,000	Jan. 26	$1,600,000,000	−$142,209,000
Second supplemental bill, 1965 (H.R. 7091)	2,226,456,933	Apr. 6	2,118,333,083	−108,123,850
Defense (H.J. Res. 447)	700,000,000	May 5	700,000,000	
Total, 1965 supplementals	4,668,665,933		4,418,333,083	−250,332,850
1966 APPROPRIATIONS				
District of Columbia	(387,467,800)	Mar. 23	(356,300,500)	(−31,167,300)
Federal payment	53,122,000		44,122,000	−9,000,000
Loan authorization	(26,311,900)		(26,311,900)	
Interior	1,240,849,500	Mar. 30	1,184,090,300	−56,759,200
Loan authorization	(16,780,000)		(16,000,000)	(−780,000)
Treasury-Post Office	6,708,510,000	Apr. 5	6,604,404,000	−104,106,000
Labor-HEW	8,293,814,000	May 4	7,964,034,000	−329,780,000
Independent offices	14,531,023,000	May 11	14,109,908,000	−421,115,000
Agriculture	5,815,134,000	May 26	5,717,832,000	−97,302,000
Loan authorizations	(787,000,000)		(787,000,000)	
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary	2,167,735,600	June 1	2,085,689,900	−82,045,700
Legislative	204,872,222	June 8	150,589,107	−54,283,115
Public Works	4,373,805,000	June 22	4,241,636,500	−132,168,500
Defense	45,248,844,000	June 23	45,188,244,000	−60,600,000
Military Construction	2,049,000,000	Aug. 10	1,755,495,000	−293,505,000
Labor-HEW Supplemental, 1966	1,553,918,000	Aug. 24	1,223,181,500	−330,736,500
Total, 1966 bills to date	92,240,627,322		90,269,226,307	−1,971,401,015
Total, all appropriations to date	96,909,293,255		94,687,559,390	−2,221,733,865
Total, loan authorizations	(830,091,900)		(829,311,900)	(−780,000)

Title and bill No.	Senate			Senate action compared with—		Final appropriation		Date approved
	Budget estimates to Senate	Date passed	Amount as passed	Budget estimates	House action	Amount as approved	Final action compared with budget estimates	
1965 SUPPLEMENTALS								
Agriculture, CCC (H.J. Res. 234)	$1,742,209,000	Feb. 3	$1,600,000,000	−$142,209,000		$1,600,000,000	−$142,209,000	Feb. 11
Second supplemental bill, 1965 (H.R. 7091)	2,280,251,327	Apr. 27	2,257,869,415	−22,381,912	+$139,536,332	2,227,563,977	−52,687,350	Apr. 30
Defense (H.J. Res. 447)	700,000,000	May 6	700,000,000			700,000,000		May 7
Total, 1965 supplementals	4,722,460,327		4,557,869,415	−164,590,912	+139,536,332	4,527,563,977	−194,896,350	
1966 APPROPRIATIONS								
District of Columbia	(389,346,800)	June 22	(364,358,347)	(−24,988,453)	(+8,057,847)	(360,228,500)	(−29,118,300)	July 16
Federal payment	53,122,000		49,122,000	−4,000,000	+5,000,000	46,122,000	−7,000,000	
Loan authorization	(26,311,900)		(26,311,900)			(26,311,900)		
Interior	1,241,549,500	May 26	1,230,802,770	−10,746,730	+46,712,470	1,212,739,070	−28,810,430	June 28
Loan authorization	(16,780,000)		(16,000,000)	(−780,000)		(16,000,000)	(−780,000)	
Treasury-Post Office	[2] 7,749,770,000	June 8	[2] 7,698,669,000	−51,101,000	[2] +1,094,265,000	[2] 7,669,444,000	−80,326,000	June 30
Labor-HEW	8,293,814,000	Aug. 5	8,023,101,500	−270,712,500	+59,067,500	8,011,331,500	−282,482,500	
Independent offices	14,566,023,000	July 13	14,299,897,980	−266,125,020	+189,989,980	14,246,167,800	−319,855,200	Aug. 16
Agriculture	5,782,634,000	July 13	6,713,983,800	+931,349,800	+996,151,800			
Loan authorizations	(787,000,000)		(852,000,000)	(+65,000,000)	(+65,000,000)			
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary	2,171,935,600	Aug. 12	2,052,471,800	−119,463,800	−33,218,100	2,057,597,150	−114,338,450	
Legislative	243,261,617	July 12	190,840,167	−52,421,450	+40,251,060	189,993,297	−53,268,320	July 27
Public Works	4,387,616,000	Aug. 23	4,327,589,000	−60,027,000	+85,952,500			

See footnotes at end of table.

The appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess., as of Aug. 25, 1965—Continued

Title and bill No.	Senate			Senate action compared with—		Final appropriation		Date approved
	Budget estimates to Senate	Date passed	Amount as passed	Budget estimates	House action	Amount as approved	Final action compared with budget estimates	
1966 APPROPRIATIONS—continued								
Defense	$46,972,844,000	Aug. 25	$46,877,063,000	−$95,781,000	+$1,688,819,000			
Military Construction	2,049,000,000	Aug. 20	1,759,504,000	−289,496,000	+4,009,000			
Labor-HEW Supplemental, 1966								
Total, 1966 bills to date	93,511,569,717		93,223,045,017	−288,524,700	+4,177,000,210	$33,433,394,817	−$886,080,900	
Total, all appropriations to date	98,234,030,044		97,780,914,432	−453,115,612	−4,316,536,542	37,960,958,794	−1,080,977,250	
Total, loan authorizations	(830,091,900)		(894,311,900)	(+64,220,000)	(+65,000,000)	(42,311,900)	(−780,000)	

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $12,300,000,000 for fiscal year 1966.
[2] Includes $1,035,000,000 supplemental estimate for 1965 (S. Doc. No. 31).

NOTE.—Bills yet to be reported to the House: foreign assistance; and final supplemental.

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, FURTHER EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND INQUIRIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 516 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 133, Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, not to exceed $235,500 in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such investigations and studies, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of attorneys, accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming within the jurisdiction of such committee or subcommittee, including, but not limited to, (1) the status and adequacy of mortgage credit in the United States, (2) the terms and availability of conventional mortgage financing, (3) the flow of savings in relation to home financing needs, (4) the operation of the various Government-assisted housing programs, (5) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands (6) the role of housing construction in the national economy, (7) the requirement of and demand for Federal assistance in the development of community facilities, including mass transportation and other related facilities, (8) urban and suburban problems, including transportation facilities, as they affect the availability of adequate housing, (9) the operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, and (10) rural housing and the adequacy of rural housing credit, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "$235,500" and insert "$97,000".

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

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

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Are there copies of the resolution and the report or the hearings available? The distinguished gentleman from Maryland showed me a copy of the resolution for a fleeting moment beforehand.

I just wonder if they are available for the general membership? If not, what is the need for haste in regard to this item?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Well, some of these subcommittees are out of funds and they need additional funds to conduct their investigations. Several of the full committees and some subcommittees do not have any more funds.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, are there copies of the resolution that the House has under consideration available for all of the Members?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, there are.

Mr. HALL. I have inquired at the desks and the book rooms and I cannot find one, although, as I say, the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts did show me a copy ahead of time.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I can give the gentleman my copy. It is available.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, will the distinguished Chairman tell us—I understand that there is a need for haste and that the committee is out of money. I furthermore understand that, by the committee amendment, they have cut the request from $325,000 down to $97,000; is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The request for the Banking and Currency's Subcommittee on Housing was reduced from the $235,500 requested to $97,000.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. HAYS. I do not know exactly what the reason for haste is. The committee is not out of money. They have over half of the money they were allocated. We have given them just this morning money enough to run them until March. This could wait until later this evening or tomorrow or next week, I would think.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, that really was in anticipation of my next question. I wondered if the distinguished Chairman would tell us how much money was allocated in the beginning to this particular Committee on Banking and Currency and how much they have remaining?

And the third question is, does this go through the balance of the 89th Congress, or the first session or the calendar year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This provides additional funds through March 31, 1966. By providing these funds now, the subcommittee should have enough money to carry on its investigations through the first 3 months of the next session. Our committee will then have sufficient time to review the subcommittee's needs for the balance of the 89th Congress and approve any additional funds required.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the action of the committee. Does the gentleman know how much they have on hand, and what the original request was, the original request at the beginning of the year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The subcommittee has a balance of $33,000, which is not sufficient for the balance of this year and the early part of next year while they are waiting for additional funds to be approved by our committee.

Mr. HALL. This is the amount on hand. How much did they receive from the gentleman's committee at the beginning of the year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. $150,000.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 247]

Andrews, George W.	Cramer	Resnick
	Dawson	Roosevelt
Andrews, Glenn	Fascell	Rumsfeld
	Holifield	Sisk
Ashley	Ichord	Talcott
Baring	Karth	Thomas
Bonner	Kee	Thompson, N.J.
Burton, Utah	Kornegay	Toll
Cabell	Landrum	Vigorito
Craley	Murray	Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 403 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 133

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 517 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expense of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 133, Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the committee, not to exceed $325,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such investigations and studies, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$325,000" and insert "$60,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND HOUSE RESOLUTION 142 RELATING TO EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS CONDUCTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 514 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the first section of H. Res. 142 of the Eighty-ninth Congress is amended by striking out "$450,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$465,000".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

"That, the further expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 141 by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $130,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, as the chairman deems necessary, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

"SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 141."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 118

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 526 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 118, by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of special counsel, consultants, investigators, attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, or subcommittee, signed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 94

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 537 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of an investigation authorized by H. Res. 94, Eighty-ninth Congress, for the purpose of making a complete evaluation and study of the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, incurred by the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Poverty War Program of the Committee on Education and Labor, not to exceed $100,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees who will be engaged in the activities of the subcommittee, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. This would provide another $100,000 for the Committee on Education and Labor; is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. How much money has this committee received since January? I am talking about the full committee.

Mr. FRIEDEL. It has received $440,000.

Mr. GROSS. Did I hear the gentleman correctly—$440,000?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And now it is proposed to provide another $100,000.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, and they justified it.

Mr. GROSS. What does the committee do with all this money?

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

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

Mr. DENT. The situation in this particular instance has compelled the Com-

mittee on Accounts to approve this appropriation, and it is one that every Member of the Congress is cognizant of. We have passed legislation appropriating millions of dollars to the poverty program. Every Member of Congress addresses himself to the Committee on Education and Labor in reference to problems arising out of the poverty program. We ourselves cannot make the necessary investigation and studies of these particular questions.

Therefore, we are asking that this Congress support this committee in its efforts to be able to answer the questions that he and other Members of the Congress have with reference to the poverty program. The money is earmarked for that purpose, and to show the good faith of this committee in endeavoring to do this job on a bipartisan basis so that we can arrive at the proper administration of this tremendous program, there has been complete unanimity on this by the minority and the majority as to how this money is to be spent and how it is to be allocated.

Mr. GROSS. This simply means that the Committee on Education and Labor is going to have available for spending in less than 9 months the sum of $540,000 or well over a half million dollars. For the life of me I cannot understand what you do with all the money that is appropriated for this committee in such a short space of time.

Mr. DENT. You are in complete error on your figures and on the purposes of the appropriation. The gentleman who has acted in the operation of the poverty program is the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] who will answer your question.

Mr. GIBBONS. If you add the $440,000 to $100,000, you get $540,000 of course, but that amount of money has not been spent I would point out to the gentleman from Iowa. I have a detailed breakdown here of the money that has been actually spent by the Committee on Education and Labor. The purpose of asking for this additional authorization is so that the Committee on Education and Labor ad hoc subcommittee on the war on poverty program can tool up specifically for this one investigation that must be made to make sure that the program is being carried out correctly. We have discussed this in the Committee on House Administration. We have discussed in the Committee on Education and Labor and we are all agreed that the money is needed and the work will be done. We are not going to throw this money away, of course.

Mr. GROSS. I have only this to add: If this committee is going to continue spending money at the present rate, the entire country will be impoverished, and not just a comparatively few million citizens.

Mr. GIBBONS. I beg to disagree with the gentleman but that is not happening. I have a breakdown of the figures here and, of course, they are available to the gentleman as well as to every Member of the Congress and to the press as well as to exactly how this money has been spent.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2580, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] had 1 hour 40 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] had 1 hour 50 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, as I indicated yesterday, over the years I have made many speeches against the so-called national origins theory of immigration, but my speeches apparently fell on deaf ears. My efforts were about as useless as trying to make a tiger eat grass or a cow eat meat. The result was a purely abortive effort.

But patience is bitter but yields rich fruit.

The dawn of the national origins theory has set, and it will be cast into midnight of darkness by this bill, which I am sure will have an overwhelmingly favorable vote.

Why did I speak against the national origins theory? Why will this Chamber vote overwhelmingly to cast it out? Because it says that one man is better than another. It says, in effect, that an Englishman is better than a Spaniard, that a German is better than a Russian, that an Irishman is better than a Frenchman, that a Swede is better than a Pole.

Apparently the architects of our immigration policy in 1921, 1922, and 1923, knowing that our Nation had, in point of time, been first peopled by immigrants from Northern and Western Europe—namely, English, German, and Irish—and only subsequently by those of the Latin and Slavic races—Italians, Greeks, Poles, Czechs, Spaniards, and Russians—sought to keep immigrants coming in after 1924 as near as possible like the early settlers. They then set up the quota system, handsomely favoring with large quotas the so-called Nordics and Aryans—that is, the English, Irish and Germans—and gave small, tiny quotas to all the rest of the nations of the world.

Out of an immigration pie of about 150,000 authorized immigrants a year, they sliced that pie into huge pieces and tiny minuscule pieces. England got 65,000 of the 150,000. Germany got 25,000. Ireland got 17,000. All the rest of the nations, over 100 nations throughout the world, got only 49,000.

The result was that the Greeks got only 308. Hungary got 865, Poland got 6,488, Spain got 250, and Portugal got 438.

Naturally, these countries with small quota numbers rebelled. They often inveighed against the immigration policy of the United States. They complained bitterly that they were discriminated against.

As was indicated in the debate yesterday, we ourselves realized inherently that there was something wrong in this national origins theory. As conditions arose requiring changes, we chipped away here and we chiseled there and cut away in another direction from the theory of national origins, so that finally only one out of every three immigrants coming into the land came under the national origins theory.

Forty years of testing have proven that the rigid pattern of discrimination has not only produced imbalances that have irritated many nations, but Congress itself, through a long series of enactments forced by the realities of a changing world saw fit to modify this unworkable formula so that today it remains on the books primarily as an expression of gratuitous condescension.

In fact, the condemned formula applies now to only 33 percent of our total annual immigration and even with regard to that 33 percent it is splintered time and time again by legislative patchwork attempting to prop up a crumbling structure.

Congress recognized well what it was doing when it adopted those one-shot acts. This committee is well aware of how Congress shattered the national origins pattern, but for whatever the reason, we chose not to call a spade a spade. We never admitted the truth of what we were doing. Each act, I am about to enumerate, in a sense has been an act of redemption—the slow retreat from the fears and failures of 1921 and 1924 and an open recognition of the unworkability of this basic principle of our immigration fabric.

As soon as the Nazis surrendered and the guns were silenced the free world awoke to face the overwhelming task of resettling over 1.5 million victims of Nazi and Communist terror, the liberated inmates of concentration camps and Hitler's slave laborers, the mass of humanity stamped "displaced persons." We offered hospitality and took a fair share of these victims. The 1924 act with the national origins principle had to be bypassed. We skirted around it and passed in the 81st Congress the first Displaced Persons Act in 1948 and permitted entrance of 200,000 displaced persons outside of the national origins quota limitation. These displaced persons involved a miscellany of nationals and races.

We then passed a second Displaced Persons Act in the 81st Congress sponsored by myself—once again we disregarded the national origins quota system.

In 1953 a new refugee admission law was passed, known as the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. It brought refugees into our land outside the quota formula. Again national origins was disregarded.

Since 1957 every Congress through the 87th has been called upon to pass and did pass laws further bending, chipping off, whittling away the national origins idea.

In 1958, the Hungarian emergency caught the United States again unprepared to cope with the crying need for offering asylum to victims of Soviet terror. We opened our doors to these unfortunate ones fleeing Soviet violence and persecution, and accepted 40,000 refugees by special enactment—another body blow to national origins. The Hungarian quota is only 865 annually.

In 1958 we passed special laws, despite the national-origins pattern, to admit Portuguese victims of the earthquake in the Azores and many Hollanders expelled from Indonesia. The quotas for Portugal and Holland are pitifully small. The quota for Portugal is 438, and the Dutch quota 3,136. Congress again took a slam at national origins.

The 86th Congress in 1959, granted nonquota status to relatives and permanent residents who had been waiting anxiously at consular offices for visas for from 10 to 15 years.

Thus, year after year, Congress continued to tear away bits and pieces of the national-origins system until now only one out of every three immigrants are admitted under that national-origins system.

Any system that has caused all this patchwork—caused our immigration structure to be so jerry-built—should be repealed.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the RECORD to contain the legislative history of immigration.

First. The Alien Act of June 25, 1798, was the first Federal legislation. It dealt with the expulsion of aliens in the United States. This act authorized the President to deport any alien whom he deemed dangerous to the United States. The act expired after 2 years and was never reenacted.

Second. Other than enacting legislation designed to protect the immigrant, no Federal legislation was enacted until 1875. The act of March 3, 1875, excluded criminals and prostitutes, and provided for inspection of immigrants. The act of August 3, 1882, included in the classes of inadmissible aliens, lunatics, idiots, and persons liable to become a public charge.

Third. In 1885 and 1887 Congress passed the so-called contract-labor laws which made it unlawful to import aliens into the United States under contract for the performance of labor or services of any kind, and provided for the expulsion of aliens who violated the contract-labor laws. Many exceptions were made to this expulsion, such as artists, lecturers, servants, and skilled aliens.

Fourth. In 1891 the inadmissible classes included persons suffering from dangerous contagious diseases, felons, persons convicted of infamous crimes, those involving moral turpitude, and polygamists.

Fifth. The act of March 3, 1903, included in the inadmissible classes epileptics, persons who had been insane within 5 years prior to application, professional beggars, anarchists, or persons who believe in, or advocate, the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States.

Sixth. The act of February 20, 1907, increased the head tax to $4 and added to the excludable classes imbeciles, feebleminded persons, persons with physical or mental defects which may affect their ability to earn a living, persons afflicted with tuberculosis, children unaccompanied by their parents, persons who admitted the commission of a crime involving moral turpitude, and women coming to the United States for immoral purposes. Professional actors, artists, singers, ministers, professors, and domestic servants were exempted from the provisions of the contract labor law. Authority to deport an alien who had become a public charge from causes which existed before the alien's entry was extended to cover a 3-year period after entry.

Seventh. The Immigration Act of 1907 also authorized the President to refuse admission to certain persons on the ground that their immigration was detrimental to labor conditions. On the basis of the 1907 act, the President excluded from the continental United States "Japanese and Korean laborers, skilled or unskilled, who had received passports to go to Mexico, Canada, or Hawaii and come therefrom."

In 1907 and 1908, a gentleman's agreement was reached between the United States and Japan, whereby the Japanese Government would exercise control over the immigration of laborers to the United States.

Eighth. The act of May 6, 1882 was the first of the so-called Chinese Exclusion Acts. This provided for suspension of immigration of Chinese laborers for a period of 10 years. The 1904 act remained in effect until December 17, 1943, when all Chinese exclusion laws were repealed and Chinese persons were made eligible for immigration and naturalization.

Ninth. The Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, passed as a result of the growing demand for more effective restrictions on immigration, codified all previously enacted exclusion provisions and added to the inadmissible classes illiterate aliens, persons of constitutional psychopathic inferiority, men as well as women entering for immoral purposes, chronic alcoholics, stowaways, vagrants, and persons who had a previous attack of insanity. The most controversial provision of the 1917 act was the so-called literacy requirement excluding aliens over 16 years of age who were unable to read. A bill providing for a literacy test for immigrants was first passed by Congress in 1897 but was vetoed by President Cleveland, and similar bills were subsequently vetoed by Presidents Taft and Wilson. The 1917 act which was passed over President Wilson's veto placed the literacy requirement on the statute book. In addition, it laid down further restrictions on the immigration of Asian persons by creating the so-called barred zone, natives of which were declared inadmissible to the United States. The barred zone roughly included parts of China, all of India, Burma, Siam, the Malay States, the Asian part of Russia, part of Arabia, part of Afghanistan, most of the Polynesian Islands and the East Indian Islands.

The 1917 act broadened considerably the classes of aliens deportable from the United States and introduced the requirement of deportation without statute of limitation in more serious cases.

Tenth. On October 16, 1918, Congress passed a law excluding alien anarchists and others believing in or advocating the overthrow of the government. On May 10, 1920, an act was passed calling for the deportation of alien enemies and aliens convicted of violating or conspiracy to violate various war acts.

The act of May 22, 1918, the so-called Entry and Departure Controls Act, authorized the President to control the departure from, and entry into, the United States in times of war or national emergency, of any person whose presence was deemed contrary to public safety. The act of March 2, 1921, provided that those provisions of the Entry and Departure Controls Act relating to passport and visa requirements of aliens seeking to come to the United States should continue in force until otherwise provided by law.

Eleventh. The quota law of 1921: The first quota law was enacted May 19, 1921. This limited the number of aliens entering the United States to 3 percent of foreign-born persons of that nationality who lived in the United States in 1910. Under this law approximately 350,000 aliens were permitted to enter each year as quota immigrants, mostly from Northern and Western Europe.

Twelfth. Then came the national Immigration Act of 1924, which was the first permanent Immigration Quota Act.

The 1924 act, as amended, contained two quota provisions. The first one, in effect until June 30, 1929, set the annual quota of any quota nationality at 2 percent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in continental United States in 1890. The total quota under this provision was 164,667. The second provision regulating quotas from July 1, 1929, to December 31, 1952, introduced the much-debated national origins quota system. Under it the annual quota for any country or nationality had the same relation to 150,000 as the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 having that national origin had to the total number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920. Since no quota was to be smaller than 100, the total quotas prior to January 1, 1953, amounted annually to 154,277.

By various provisions of the 1924 act Congress expressed an intent not to separate families by migration, and to facilitate the reunion of separated families. To achieve this end nonquota status was accorded to the wives and children of American citizens, and preference quota status to husbands and par-

ents of American citizens, and to wives and children of permanent resident aliens. The law, however, discriminated against women in that an alien wife preceding her husband could not confer preference quota status on him, and an American citizen wife, under the original version of the act, could only confer preference quota status on her alien husband. Subsequent amendments permitted the American citizen wife to confer nonquota status on her alien husband if marriage was contracted prior to the enactment of the respective amendments. These and other provisions of law discriminating against women remained in effect until the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Many, many have been the tragedies and cruelties and hardships of anxious immigrants waiting months and years and years at the consular offices throughout the world for visas to bring them to their dear ones in the United States—wives to husbands, husbands to wives, children to parents, parents to children, brothers to sisters, and sisters to brothers.

The families remained divided for indefinite periods all during these 40-odd years that we have had this national-origins theory of immigration on our books.

Now consider the irony of those so-called unused quotas. Britain, for example, as I said before, got some 65,000. Did she use all 65,000? Emphatically no. Last year Britain used 29,108. What happened to the unused quota numbers? Well, they were just as worthless as last year's ticket to the world's series. Those unused numbers just went down the drain. What a boon those unused numbers would have been to those who, as I indicated before, were anxiously waiting for quota numbers at the various consular offices but, because of the minuscule quotas of their respective countries, could not get visas. Ireland, allotted 17,756, last year only used 6,307. The rest of the numbers? They went down the drain. The total unused quotas last year were 55,665. They could not be used.

This bill, H.R. 2580, nullifies the cruelty resulting from these unused quotas. All unused quotas are to be placed in a pool during the period of the phaseout of the national origins theory, that is, for 3 years, and are to be made available primarily to unite families and for the purpose of bringing in skilled and unskilled labor.

Under the present national origins theory, for example, if the Dutch quota is filled and a Dutchman of the type of Erasmus, the great intellectual who sparkplugged the Renaissance, would desire to enter, he would be confronted with a sign that said, "Verboten. You cannot enter. It is forbidden—quota is filled."

Madame Curie was born in Poland. Despite the fact that she became a French subject, Madame Curie, the inventor of radium out of pitchblende, one of the greatest inventors in the whole world and of all time—if the Polish quota were filled, as it usually always is filled, she could not come into this country. A woman of that marvelous stature would be denied entrance.

Albert Einstein, Enrico Fermi, Nils Bohr, who ushered us into the atomic age—if the quotas of their respective countries were filled, they could not enter as immigrants into this fair land of ours despite their wondrous achievements and attainments. Even Pablo Casals, the famous cellist, who was born in Spain, because the quota of Spain is only 250 and is always filled, could not enter the United States as an immigrant.

Let me tell you something strange. The grandfather of Barry Goldwater and the grandfather of Douglas Dillon were born in Poland. They came over to this country, those grandfathers did, as pack peddlers. Luckily they came over before 1924. If they had come over after 1924, they might not have been able to gain entrance. Then the history of this country might have been differently written. We might not have had a Senator Goldwater and we might not have had a Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon.

We have become a great nation. We have the greatest gross national product of any nation that ever existed. Our gross national product is approaching almost $700 billion. One of the reasons therefore, I think, is that we have siphoned off the best of the brain and brawn of nations all over the world, of all races and climes and origins. We are a nation of nations. Our immigrants, as Harry Golden says, constitute the gulf-stream of our vitality.

If you go to my district you will find people of all nationalities. And to give you an idea of the pluralistic character of my district, which is symptomatic of many, many districts in the Nation, I would like to tell you a story.

A man goes into a Chinese restaurant, and there, to his amazement, he sees a Negro waiter—a Negro waiter in a Chinese restaurant. And he says to the waiter, "What is the specialty of the house?" And the Negro waiter says, "Pizza pie."

"Pizza pie in a Chinese restaurant?"

And he said, "Yes, this is the Yiddish neighborhood."

That gives you some idea of what is happening in this country and what is happening is good for the land because all those races are amalgamated and they are here for a good, common purpose, the weal and the welfare of our Nation, to which all these diverse races make contribution.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of all the prosperity that this country is wallowing in, and referred to the gross national product which, of course, is pretty much of a phony standard of economic measurement. Can the gentleman tell me, since he thinks this country is wallowing in prosperity, why this Government is spending hundreds of millions of dollars in a so-called war on poverty?

Mr. CELLER. Of course, I do not think that has anything to do with the bill at hand, and I hope the gentleman will reserve that question for those who are specialists and who have an expertise on the antipoverty program.

Mr. GROSS. I only raise the question because the gentleman referred to the alleged prosperity and said we could afford all of this immigration and the importation of all of this foreign labor in this country under the circumstances.

Mr. CELLER. I would be glad to answer the gentleman, but I do not want to take up the time that would be necessary; it would take a considerable period of time adequately to answer the gentleman on the question of expenditures of money for the antipoverty program. I think our Nation wants to help those who cannot fend for themselves, those who are helpless and hopeless, those who live in the ghettos under various conditions that do not make for the prosperity of the land. We try to lift them up, but that is all quite beside the point of the debate.

Mr. GROSS. I suppose there are about 200 million of them in India alone, are there not?

Mr. CELLER. May I ask a question? Do we appreciably increase our population, as it were, by the passage of this bill? The answer is emphatically "No." The thrust of this bill is no appreciable increase in numbers. But we provide for a fair, decent, equitable distribution of the numbers that are permissible. The bill places a limit of authorized yearly immigration at 170,000, inclusive of 10,200 refugees; no more than a maximum of 20,000 will be allotted to any 1 country. To this may be added the spouses and children and parents of the U.S. citizens. In that latter category there were something like 35,000 last year.

The State Department, the Labor Department, the Department of Justice, all exercise rigid control over those immigrants who may come in. Excluding relatives entitled to a preference no one can be admitted unless the Secretary of Labor issues an individual certificate that there will be no displacement of an American from his job, that there will be no adverse effect on working conditions, and that there will be no deleterious effect upon American labor in general.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has the support of our labor organizations, the support of the Lutheran Conference, the Friends, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. It also has the support of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Tolstoy Foundation, the Church World Service, International Social Services, B'nai B'rith, AHEPA, and a host of other organizations.

Mr. Chairman, claim has been made that the bill would bring in hordes of Africans and Asians. This is the answer to that false charge: Persons from

African and Asian countries would continue to come in as heretofore, but would be treated like everyone else. With the end of discrimination due to place of birth, there will be shifts to countries other than those of northern and western Europe. Immigrants from Asia and Africa will have to compete and qualify in order to get in, quantitatively and qualitatively, which, itself, will hold the numbers down. There will not be, comparatively, many Asians or Africans entering this country.

Mr. Chairman, there are many factors that would limit immigration from these sources. Many countries in Africa do not even use their present quota of 100. Under this bill those who have preference would come in first; that is, those coming to fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, sons, daughters, brothers and sisters, and so forth. These preferences would practically use up most of the numbers authorized from those countries.

Mr. Chairman, since the peoples of Africa and Asia have very few relatives here, comparatively few could immigrate from those countries, because they have no family ties in the United States.

Also, Mr. Chairman, no one can come in without the individual certificate from the Secretary of Labor guaranteeing that the American workman will not be displaced. They must also prove that they will not become public charges. As a matter of fact, few of the people from these areas can even pay the cost of the ticket to come here. There is no danger whatsoever of an influx from the countries of Asia and Africa. If there were, the AFL–CIO would breathe their hot breath down our necks, we the members of the Judiciary Committee, but they have no objections to the terms under which Asians and Africans can come in. They fear no hordes of people from such countries.

Mr. Chairman, it is claimed that the bill would lead to an increase in unemployment. There is no evidence to support this claim, and there is much evidence to dispute it. Labor organizations, I repeat, approve the bill, as does the Secretary of Labor. There will be practically no increase in authorized immigration. Therefore, there would be practically no workers coming in beyond the number that now come in.

Mr. Chairman, we have a work force today in the United States of over 80 million. Under the present law, the number of additional workers that now come in is microscopic in relation to the U.S. work force; that is, about 24,000 as against 80 million. That is less than 1 for each 3,000 workers, hardly a drop in the bucket, as a practical matter.

Mr. Chairman, the population will not be disturbed as it were, by the pending bill and also——

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I was interested in the comments of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary about respective immigrants from one country having to compete with others. I assume reference was made to competing on the basis of skill. Is that correct?

Mr. CELLER. That is one factor.

Mr. JONAS. Would the gentleman explain to the committee exactly how that competition would be brought about? This is not an unfriendly question. I am seeking guidance.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JONAS. John Smith in X country applies to become an immigrant. He applies to the office of the consulate in that country. Will the applications on file in all of the consulates be sent to Washington and simply screened here?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. Notice of the application will be sent to the Department of State.

Mr. JONAS. That would be the only way there could be any competition.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. Numbers will be allotted from Washington to the consulates on a first-come, first-served basis. No country gets preference.

Mr. JONAS. The petition to which reference was made would be decided by officials in the United States and not in the offices of the respective consulates around the world?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. The Attorney General will decide if the requirements for a preference have been satisfied. Also, the Secretary of Labor must certify that no American worker will be displaced if the immigrant is coming to the United States for gainful employment, and that is a decided change we make in this present act.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I think it must be said to the gentleman from North Carolina that the statements of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary are entirely correct if you exclude the Western Hemisphere. The Western Hemisphere countries and the citizens thereof will not be obliged to participate in this competition which will face natives of all of the rest of the countries of the world.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; but those who come in from the Western Hemisphere must satisfy all of the qualitative tests in the bill, and the law.

For example, let me read what those from Latin American countries must comply with. I am reading from page 14 of the report with reference to the certificate to be issued by the Secretary of Labor:

> The amended section 212(a)(14) represents a substantial departure from existing law. Presently, the provisions of section 212(a)(14) operate only when the Secretary of Labor invokes them by certification which has the effect of excluding any intending immigrant, within the scope of the certification, who would likely displace a qualified American worker, or whose employment in the United States would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers similarly employed in the United States. This procedure is reversed under the amendment. Responsibility is placed upon the intending immigrant to obtain the Secretary of Labor's clearance prior to issuance of a visa. This provision is applicable to immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, nonpreference immigrants, as well as those preference immigrants who seek entrance into the United States for the primary purpose of gainful employment whether it be in a skilled or semiskilled category or as a member of the professions or the arts.

The responsibility is placed upon the intending immigrant to obtain the clearance of the Secretary of Labor prior to the issuance of a visa. Heretofore and presently the Secretary of Labor would issue categories of labor that might involve surplus labor. Under this bill each individual must obtain a certificate from the Secretary of Labor which he presents to the consular officer.

If he does not have that certificate the blame is on him for not getting that certificate, and he cannot get a visa to come into this country. In that respect there is a decided break upon the free flow of immigrants from any part of the world, particularly from the Western Hemisphere into the United States. The admission of additional workers will benefit our national economy because they will have dependents; namely, elderly parents, grandchildren, and so forth. These children would not weaken the employment situation. They would, on the contrary, strengthen the demands for goods and services and thus create more jobs.

The bill provides for regulatory discretion which resides with the Secretary of Labor in imposing conditions to keep out immigrants who would take the work away from Americans or depress wages and working conditions. The restrictions are more severe than in the present law.

Every immigrant would have to satisfy the public charge test of the present law before he could get a visa. This test was proven to be effective during the depression in keeping out those persons who were likely to become public charges, and it will continue to be so effective.

There can be no fear of Communists or subversives entering this country. The same safeguards that are in the law with reference to internal security are maintained. They are not changed one iota; therefore, there should be no fear in that connection.

Finally, the improved preference structure of the bill would help to stimulate business and should thus reduce unemployment and bring about a better selection of immigrants with outstanding talents. Think of immigrants like Steinmetz, the electrical genius; Giannini, the banker; Sikorsky, the inventor; Fermi, the atomic pioneer. Such immigrants instead of taking jobs away from Americans helped to create whole new industries that created thousands and thousands of new jobs for our people.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this bill is a bill that provides for the establishment of a system of immigration based on principles of justice—principles that will redound to the benefit of America and its people. It is the execution of a principle and not a mere exercise in numbers. The aboli-

tion of the national origins system would signify to all our maturity and the casting off of unreasoning fear.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I urge that prompt and favorable action be taken by the House today on H.R. 2580, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

I wholeheartedly support this bill because it would repeal the outdated national origins quota system now in the existing law. It would end discrimination among our minority groups who have every right to U.S. citizenship.

Our late President Kennedy advocated this change in our immigration laws. President Johnson and his administration favors a more liberalized policy. A majority of the citizens support such legislation because they, like I, share the belief that families in America should be united.

During my 20 years in Congress I have sponsored many immigration bills designed specifically to unite families. I have been particularly interested in legislation that would alleviate the quota restrictions in Italy because many of my very close friends in South Philadelphia have come to me pleading for help for their relatives now living in Italy. It is heartbreaking to listen to their pleas and not be able to offer them immediate help. They cannot understand why their husbands and wives; their sons and daughters or their brothers and sisters are barred from entering the United States when they have been registered on the quota waiting list for many, many years. These applicants are not criminals or Communists or undesirables, but fine and honorable human beings.

Mr. Chairman, according to the latest figures I just received from the Department of State, 249,583 Italian nationals are waiting to come to the United States for permanent residence. There are 4,722 spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of lawful permanent resident aliens waiting to join their families. There are over 114,000 brothers, sisters, and married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens waiting to come to America. It is wrong to deny these people the right to be with their loved ones here simply because of an outdated law. To block the reunification of families is criminal.

The bill before us today will destroy such discrimination. It will remove obsolete statutes from the books and provide new ones to help these families, who only wish to live together in this wonderful country of ours.

I humbly pray to God that this body of humanitarians will see fit to approve H.R. 2580 today.

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

Mr. Chairman, the immigration policy of the United States is of great importance and of much concern to many people. The economic health of our country, the orderliness of our society, the general well-being of the Nation, our national security—all are deeply involved. The object of our immigration policy is to preserve and maintain the United States as a land of liberty and opportunity and to provide a haven, consistent with our economic and political philosophy, for qualified people from other nations of the world.

The record of the United States has been most generous in the admission of immigrants. In the decade 1955–64, a total of 2,619,246 residents from foreign lands were taken in. The annual average of immigrants admitted to the United States has been approximately 300,000 for the last 5 years. Among those so admitted have been over 700,000 refugees and displaced persons. The generous and compassionate heart of the United States was made evident to the world when over 32,000 Hungarian victims of Communist tyranny were given refuge during the administration of President Eisenhower following the 1956 uprising in Budapest.

The Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, complimented the Congress for its record, since World War II, in the field of immigration legislation. However, he pointed out that only one-third of the immigrants who came to the United States in the last decade were quota immigrants—that is, about two-thirds of our immigrants since the passage of the Walter-McCarran Act have been admitted outside of the national origins quota system established by that act. Nonetheless it was Mr. Rusk's contention that many people both at home and abroad erroneously believed our immigration policy to be one of discrimination, which selects prospective immigrants strictly on their national origin.

Whether the present law discriminates depends upon what is meant by discrimination. It is my position that discrimination, as applied to our immigration policy, means selection, and the only question is whether the selection should be made by the legislative or the executive department of Government. I am of the opinion that the Congress must retain its historic responsibility for the immigration policy of the United States. H.R. 2580 as originally drafted, surrendered, at least in part, that responsibility to the executive department. The amended bill now before us retains that responsibility in the Congress, where it should be.

Because the bulk of our immigration since World War II has not been related to national origins, it is now time to reexamine that system. This bill, as amended, recognizes that our immigration policy should be selective—with emphasis upon qualitative and quantitative controls.

In 1960 the Republican platform declared that the guidelines for our immigration policy should be based upon the individual merit of each applicant for admission and citizenship. This bill, H.R. 2580, as amended, does that.

In 1964 the Republican platform urged that our immigration policy should place first emphasis upon the reuniting of families and the continuation of a humanitarian refugee program. This bill does just that.

H.R. 2580, as amended, will, first, eliminate discrimination based upon race; second, establish more restrictive provisions upon the admission of aliens seeking employment in the United States, to safeguard the American workingman from unfair competition and a lowering of wages and working standards; third, replace the national origin system with a new immigration system emphasizing the reuniting of families and the individual merit of each applicant; fourth, remove from an international organization and restore to the Congress control over the selection and number of refugees to be admitted; and, fifth, set a numerical limitation upon the number of immigrants to be admitted each year—except for the Western Hemisphere, from which aliens may be admitted without numerical limitation.

It is this exception to our numerical control over immigration that gives me much concern. It is illogical and inconsistent to retain a form of discrimination by not including the Western Hemisphere under a numerical ceiling concept. Despite our close and continuing ties with our friends in the Western Hemisphere, I do not believe that the citizens of the 24 independent countries of the Western Hemisphere should remain in a highly preferred position to that of the citizens of the more than 100 countries in the rest of the world. If immigration from the Western Hemisphere should grow sharply, and every sign indicates that it will, we will be faced with great pressures to halt the sudden flow of immigrants. We should place the Western Hemisphere under a fair, just, and reasonable numerical limitation now as a logical part of this comprehensive revision of our immigration laws. It will be more difficult to place a numerical ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigrants in 5 or 10 years than it would be now.

My able colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] will offer such an amendment at the proper time. I expect to support it. It should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] 15 minutes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the rationale for the abolition of the national origins quota system is that that system deliberately discriminates against many of the peoples of the world. Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear from the outset that I strongly support the abolition of the national origins quota system in the context in which that system is abolished in the bill, H.R. 2580.

The trouble is that in the bill as reported by the committee we will be perpetuating and even increasing a new form of discrimination—discrimination based not upon race, which we eliminate in this bill and rightly so—but discrimination based upon national origin and the location of one's birth. The President in his immigration message to the Congress on January 13 of this year stated that our national origins quota system is incompatible with our basic American tradition, that is, the fundamental American attitude to ask not where a person comes from, or to prejudge a person on the basis of his place of birth, but to evaluate his personal qualities.

President Johnson, as did three of his predecessors, asked that our immigration law be amended to bring it in line with our basic American principle of nondiscrimination.

The committee bill accomplishes only half of the task outlined by four Presidents. It does provide for the abolition of the national-origins quota system, but it fails to end discrimination based upon national origin. Under its operation a total ceiling and a maximum numerical limitation for any country would affect all who come or who seek to come to America from beyond the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, but natives of the Western Hemisphere and the Caribbean area would be admitted to the United States without numerical limitation. Natives of the 24 independent countries of the Western Hemisphere and any who subsequently acquire their independence would thus be placed in a highly preferred position to that of the natives of the more than 100 countries in the rest of the world who would be subjected to a limited numerical ceiling and a rigid system of qualifications called preferences. This result would be illogical, unwise, shortsighted, and inconsistent.

To allow unlimited immigration from the Western Hemisphere and the Caribbean while imposing rigid ceilings on the number who could come in from the rest of the world, including our traditional friends and allies across both oceans, and this in the name of ending a quota system labeled as "discriminatory" and "racially prejudicial," is highly contradictory.

A few examples will demonstrate this inconsistency. Under H.R. 2580, total immigration from the United Kingdom would be limited, after June 30, 1968, to a maximum of 20,000 people per year. However, in 1964 and in earlier years, immigration from that country was considerably greater than 20,000. Western Germany has also consistently exceeded the annual limit which would now be imposed upon West Germany, a close friend of the United States.

At the same time, immigration from countries such as El Salvador, Nicaragua, Jamaica, and Paraguay would be subject to no numerical limitation whatsoever.

Furthermore, H.R. 2580 would require that a doctor, a lawyer, or a teacher from Dublin or Milan or Tel Aviv would have to compete for admission to the United States with his counterparts in Bonn, Stockholm, and Tokyo, while the natives of North, Central, and South America and the Caribbean island nations would be completely exempt from such competition.

If the United States is to reform its immigration system, and reform is needed, let the new system be one that is truly nondiscriminatory, a system that judges all men on the basis of individual merit and worth without regard to place of birth.

It is with these principles in mind that I proposed in the subcommittee and again in the full committee a numerical ceiling of 115,000 immigrants per year from the Western Hemisphere. Such a limitation would complement the committee's recommendation that we set a ceiling of 170,000 to cover all of the countries of the world external to the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, it must be emphasized that both limitations—both the 170,000 recommended by the committee and the complementary ceiling of 115,000 which I will offer in an amendment—are exclusive of immediate family members of U.S. citizens. This needs to be highlighted. Many of the gentlemen of the press have said that the 170,000 limit is highly restrictive, or that the proposed 115,000 limit for the Western Hemisphere is highly restrictive.

The press has failed to note that we are excluding from these limitations minor children, husbands and wives, and parents of U.S. citizens. It was one of the prime objectives of the Committee on the Judiciary to reemphasize our desire to make it easy for families to be reunited in this country. So we broadened existing law by making infant children, spouses, and parents of U.S. citizens free of any numerical limitation whatever.

Now, the figure of 115,000 was selected, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of two factors. First, the recent pattern or flow of immigration into the United States from this hemisphere and the Caribbean area. Second, we considered the changed status of the newly independent republics of the Caribbean. Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago are in this group. There are others who are moving toward independence, and it was in consideration of this development that the figure of 115,000 was selected.

Again let me emphasize that the suggested figure of 115,000 is a ceiling on the Western Hemisphere to complement the 170,000 ceiling recommended for the rest of the world. Let me repeat that to this figure of 115,000 annually must be added the anticipated number of infant children, spouses, and parents. The best estimate of this number is somewhere between 20,000 and 25,000. Thus the numerical limitation which I propose, to complement the numerical limitation recommended by the committee, will not require a reduction of the recent flow but will provide in fact for an annual limit somewhere between 135,000 and 140,000. It will provide for a reasonable increase from the Western Hemisphere to accommodate our historic friends and in deference to hemispheric solidarity. It will also make provision for a reasonable increase in immigration from the newly independent republics of the Caribbean.

Now, it is important to note what the Secretary of State had to say when he testified at great length and with refreshing candor before the Immigration Subcommittee. He was asked repeatedly about the numerical ceiling concept. Those of you who would like to examine his testimony will find it on pages 94 through 107 of the printed hearings for 1965. He testified at great length about the foreign policy impact as he then saw it of a numerical ceiling concept applicable throughout the world. He was asked if the adoption of a generous ceiling to also cover the Western Hemisphere would be harmful, and he replied:

> I can't, this morning, tell you through direct contact with our colleagues in this hemisphere that they would object to a change on this particular point.

Strict adherence to a policy of nondiscrimination would require the imposition of a single worldwide ceiling applicable to all countries of the world. Many of us on the subcommittee originally pursued this objective in our questioning. We took that line of progress without regard to any party affiliation. Republicans and Democrats alike thoroughly explored the possibility of a worldwide numerical ceiling that would treat every single country exactly alike. This proposal, however, met with opposition from the Department of State because they said that we have treated Western Hemisphere nations in a special category and we think we should continue to treat them in a special category.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I will offer later will in fact treat them in a favorable way in relationship to the rest of the countries of the world. It will show favoritism to the Western Hemisphere in three important respects. First, a ceiling of 115,000-plus immediate family members for the 24 independent nations of the Western Hemisphere will be far more generous than the ceiling of 170,000-plus for the more than 100 countries beyond the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Second, the 20,000-per-country limitation which the committee has recommend to apply to all countries outside the Western Hemisphere will not be applicable to the Western Hemisphere. Many of you have asked me, What would be the effect, Mr. MacGregor, of your amendment on Canada? And the answer is, Canada will not be affected.

Canada has been sending to this country a little more than 30,000 per year. My amendment would not cut them back to 20,000 as the committee proposes to do with the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Each country of the Western Hemisphere under my amendment would be entitled to send to this country more than 20,000, indeed as many as reasonably could be fitted in an equitable fashion into the overall requirements of the ceiling.

And third, the Western Hemisphere would be favored under my amendment because the rigid preference system would not apply to those seeking admittance to America.

There is another important point. Several people have said to me, Did you take into consideration the Secretary of State's desire that nothing be done now to upset the applecart in the Dominican Republic, that nothing be done now to stir up possible objections in the Organization of American States? The answer is yes, we did take that into consideration. The amendment which I propose, to set a numerical ceiling generous in nature on the Western Hemisphere, will not take effect until the date at which we eliminate the national origins quota system, and that date is July 1, 1968.

We are not arbitrarily proposing that a numerical ceiling be imposed at this time. We are respecting the Secretary of State's wish that it be postponed.

We are taking action now because the demographic studies and the desire to eliminate discrimination impel us to do so. But it would not take effect for 3 years.

I have referred to demographic studies, and perhaps we should heed the words of the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Thomas Mann, in a statement made in December of last year. Here are the words of Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann. He was talking about the population explosion, and he said:

Nearly every part of the world is affected. Here in the United States, for example, our population growth rate is said to be 1.6 percent this year. Because our population has been increasing for some time, more than a million additional people will be looking for jobs this year in our country alone.

In Latin America the demographers say that the annual population increase is somewhere near 3 percent per annum. It is predicted that if this average is maintained, the population of the area which now stands about 200 million will reach about 600 million in 35 years. To use a different span of time, the population of Latin America will have increased in this century from some 69 million to some 600 million people.

Members of the committee also questioned Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach on this question of a numerical ceiling concept applicable throughout the world.

When he was asked to comment on this subject and on the remarks of the Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Mr. Katzenbach said:

I think it could conceivably mean that you would have to establish at some time an overall restriction on immigrants into the United States.

In order further to clarify the Attorney General's views, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] said to Mr. Katzenbach:

Are you suggesting, sir, that Congress wait until nonquota immigration from Latin America reaches floodgate proportions before acting?

And Mr. Katzenbach replied as follows:

No, of course not, Congressman. What I am suggesting, and it is much simpler than that, I am suggesting that Congress wait until there is a need to do it. That might be next year. It might be 5 years from now, it might be 15 years from now.

I suggest meeting the problem now with legislation that will take effect 3 years hence.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Does the gentleman from Minnesota, after his long and conscientious study of this problem, feel that it will be more difficult or less difficult to impose a ceiling in a year or 2 years, or 3 years, or 5 years?

Mr. MACGREGOR. It will be almost impossible from a foreign policy standpoint to take action 3, or 5, or 7 years hence. If we later take action with regard to only one area of the world; namely, the Caribbean, it will stick out like a sore thumb. If, however, we make this change now in a spirit of nondiscrimination toward all peoples throughout the world, still recognizing the favored position of Western Hemisphere countries, I think it cannot reasonably be criticized.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman further believe, in view of the great increase in recent years in the population in the Western Hemisphere, which figures have been furnished by the gentleman from Minnesota, that the difficulty of imposing a ceiling for the Western Hemisphere will be greater in 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10 years than it would be now?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Indeed, and I am reminded of the very, very drastic step taken by the Labor Party, the Socialist government of Britain, in singling out their Commonwealth countries and particularly the Caribbean. They cut back on entries on work permits from 20,000 per year to 8,500 per year. This was a step taken in the direst of extremities by the Labor government of Britain, and it was an extremely difficult thing to do because it struck at just one particular area.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, will the gentleman answer one more question? And were not those people Commonwealth citizens?

Mr. MACGREGOR. They were, may I say to the gentleman from Ohio, with the same rights to enter the United Kingdom, the mother country of Britain, that present citizens of Puerto Rico feel they have to enter into this country, a condition which we would surely not want to change.

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

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

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Along the line of this discussion of Western Hemisphere immigration, I note on page 39 of the bill a provision to the effect that, in the event Western Hemisphere immigration shall exceed 10 percent of the average of the prior 5-year period, the President shall report that fact to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in order that I may complete my question?

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

Mr. McCLORY. The President shall report that fact to the Congress with his recommendations. Now, it seems to me that what we are doing in this legislation, and in that provision particularly, is recognizing that there is going to be an increase in Western Hemisphere immigration, or the threat of it, and that recommendations will be coming to the Congress.

What recommendations would we expect to come from the President except one to later—and perhaps next year or the year after—place a ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration, which would at that time present a most sensitive and difficult subject, which could be dealt with much more easily now at a time when we are providing the comprehensive and general overhaul of the immigration laws which we are considering now?

Mr. MACGREGOR. That certainly is a reasonable expectation in light of this particular provision.

Mr. Chairman, in further consideration of the comments of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY], we might take a look at current immigration from our hemisphere. Let us go back first to 1959—just 5 years ago—when 91,700 came to the United States from the Western Hemisphere countries. Five years later, in 1964, the figure was almost 140,000 for an increase of almost 50,000 in a 5-year period.

These figures are most interesting in light of the reference made to this "warning" provision that the President notify us when we reached the danger point of 137,500. That is what this provision at the bottom of page 25 means. It says when emigration from the Western Hemisphere shall reach 10 percent more than 125,000, the President shall recognize a danger point and call our attention to this fact and make recommendation if he sees fit. We have probably exceeded the danger point for the fiscal year 1965. Seventy-five thousand people came in in the first 6 months. If the figures, which are not yet available, show that 75,000 more came in during the period January 1, 1965 to June 30, 1965, we will be at a level of 150,000 or 12,500 above the danger point spelled out in the committee bill.

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

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

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I understand it the average over the last 10 years was about 110,000; is that right?

Mr. MACGREGOR. During the last 10-year period the annual average was about 111,000. If we take the 5-year period, 1955 through 1959, the annual average is 97,000. If you take the second 5-year period, 1960 to 1964, the average is slightly more than 125,000.

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. I believe it is important to emphasize that the 110,000 figure includes children, spouses, and parents.

Mr. MACGREGOR. All of these figures that we give you here from past experience are total figures, and they include everyone. Our proposed ceiling in this bill would be exclusive of immediate family members.

Mr. McCLORY. Is it not a fact that the figures for the first half of this year show there are 75,000 who have emigrated from the Western Hemisphere, which would mean an annual total, if that continued, of 150,000, and we may

be faced with the 10-percent increase immediately unless we take some action in regard to enacting a ceiling on the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman is correct. The warning provision of the bill requiring that the President notify us of the danger point will probably have to be utilized by the President this year.

Mr. McCLORY. That will be of immediate application even before the signature on the bill dries?

Mr. MACGREGOR. That is my information based on the actual immigration figures.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to pass this bill by not including the Western Hemisphere under the concept of a numerical limitation, we would be extending an unjustifiable and obvious discrimination and an unjustified and unnecessary favoritism.

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

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. Any immigrant from the Western Hemisphere, regardless of his station in life, will enjoy a preferential position for admission over his counterpart across the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans. This, Mr. Chairman, would be a far cry from our declared policy of equal treatment for every immigrant. Without a generous numerical limitation upon immigration from the Western Hemisphere, the full objectives of H.R. 2580 are not achieved, the desirable and necessary reform of our immigration laws is incomplete, and a most essential change is postponed—postponed until the inevitable day when its accomplishment will be very difficult indeed and extremely painful.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes only to answer some of the arguments made by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The gentleman suggested an amendment admitting 110,000 a year, but that does not include what are known as the "immediate relatives," the spouses, parents and children of citizens.

That later category conceivably could go up to 25,000 or 50,000. It is interesting to note that the total immigration of the Western Hemisphere last year, 1964, was 135,000—incidentally, 6 percent less than the year before.

Now, it may be that even under the MacGregor amendment you might admit 135,000 or even more. We do not know how many spouses, parents, and children there would be of American citizens. These "immediate relations" would be added to his 115,000. So his amendment is utterly unrealistic.

But it would have very serious repercussions. This is no time to muddy the waters of foreign affairs. The times are critical. We need all the friends we can muster—particularly at this time. We cannot afford to have any nations turn against us, particularly our neighbors to the south of us.

The so-called MacGregor amendment would alienate Latin America. Let us never forget that. That fear has been reiterated by the Secretary of State—this is what he fears most, that we would irritate them and cause ill will. We cannot afford that ill will especially with the difficulties under which we are now living—Cuba—Santo Domingo—and especially in Vietnam.

Why should we suddenly—and I say suddenly—after 40 years, impose a ceiling of the character involved in the MacGregor amendment. This restriction would be utterly misconstrued. We would gain nothing, as I have indicated, except ill will from our neighbors to the south of us.

During the period of extreme isolationism—during those so-called 40 years from 1924 onward when we sort of crept into a hole and tried to pull our skin in after us, we never placed any kind of a barrier on immigration from Canada or Mexico or Brazil or from the Argentine or from Chile or any country in the Western Hemisphere. Why should we do it now? Why pick out this time of—shall I say—peril? Indeed we are in a time of peril.

Further, Mr. Chairman, no problem would be eliminated because no problem exists today with reference to the Western Hemisphere. We have no great influx of a disturbing nature. The Secretary of State testified before the subcommittee to the effect that over a 10-year period, the average number that came in from the Western Hemisphere was but 110,000. That included—mind you that figure included spouses, parents, and children—who are left out of the MacGregor amendment. About 30,000 to 40,000 come in from Canada and a similar number from Mexico. The balance of 50,000-odd usually comes in from all the other countries.

Indeed, I deem the MacGregor amendment ill advised, improvident, and utterly unnecessary. It is unnecessary because as I said the average of 10 years of immigration from the Western Hemisphere was but 110,000, even less than the ceiling that the gentleman would place, namely, 115,000 which as I repeat does not include the spouses, children, and the parents of those who are citizens, which group conceivably could run up to 25,000 and thus make his figure 140,000.

It is unnecessary in my opinion to bargain for trouble. That is what we are doing—bargaining for trouble. It is unnecessary because we irritate needlessly our friends and it is unnecessary because by this amendment we are bound to wound Spanish-American pride.

This amendment would be ill-advised because it would make the conduct of our foreign policy more difficult and more arduous.

Our Secretary of State has strongly expressed opposition, and in effect said the amendment would be such as to put harmful obstacles in his path leading to cordial and harmonious relations with Latin America.

The MacGregor amendment is improvident because the 115,000 has no conditions attached. For example, any one country could preempt it and enter into our country the whole 115,000. Canada or Mexico might wish to do this. There is no obstacle in the amendment to prevent it, and that would be to the great disadvantage of all other Western Hemisphere nations.

The warning has been referred to. Let me read it. It does not mean that the warning is necessary because there is going to be a tremendous avalanche of people coming to the United States from the Western Hemisphere. The warning was put in, as I understand it, as a compromise. The ceiling was taken out after being voted on in the subcommittee. This compromise was substituted.

What does this warning say? Let me read it:

> In the event that the number of immigrants admitted pursuant to the provisions of section 101(a)(27)(A) in any one fiscal year exceeds by 10 per centum or more the average number of immigrants admitted from the Western Hemisphere in the previous five fiscal years, the President shall so notify the Congress by January 15 of the following year with such recommendations as he may have, if any.

That will give us plenty of time. In the event of any danger we will be able to forefend that danger. If the thermometer indicates there is a tremendous upsurge in the number, we can take suitable action. We do not have to remain supine. This is an active body. The minute there is any indication of any fever, as it were, we can proceed to allay that fever, to reduce that fever of tremendous influx from the Western Hemisphere.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to set the record straight with respect to the observation made by the chairman concerning the fact that the reporting requirements in this bill on Western Hemisphere immigration, as the chairman has suggested, were a compromise.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman suggested that it represented a compromise in lieu of what we were discussing as the MacGregor amendment.

May I say to my chairman that these particular sections concerning control of Western Hemisphere immigration went into the bill in successive amendments, and in no sense of the word was the cited provision considered to have been a compromise. It was the third step of a four-step approach to the problem of control of Western Hemisphere immigration.

May I say that the gentleman is eminently correct with respect to these provisions and the manner in which he has set them forth, but in no sense are these controls which are in the bill with respect to Western Hemisphere immigration a compromise or substitute, in any sense of the word, for the amendment the gentleman from Minnesota is suggesting.

Mr. CELLER. I am happy to get the gentleman's explanation.

The gentleman from Minnesota seemed to imply there was a complaint about our treating more favorably the countries of

the Western Hemisphere than other countries. No country, so far as I know, has ever complained concerning this freedom of accessibility of those intended immigrants from the Western Hemisphere.

This distinction was made in the act of 1924. It was not based upon race or ethnic origin or religion. It was simply an expression of Western Hemisphere solidarity that goes back to the Monroe Doctrine—a solidarity that is exemplified in the Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress. We dare not, therefore, cause any breaking of or damage to that solidarity.

This MacGregor amendment would hurt this firm union.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to have a little clarification of the chairman's attitude on this subject. Do I understand that the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, would not recommend any kind of a ceiling at any time, or is it just that the chairman feels he is opposed to one now but he may be in favor of a Western Hemisphere ceiling sometime in the future?

Mr. CELLER. Pardon my using the expression I have used before. You do not roll up your pants until you get to the river. When we get to that "river" I will be very glad to formulate a conclusion. I do not want to foreclose my mind from any ceiling at some future time. It all depends on the circumstances. But this is no time now to do this.

Mr. McCLORY. As the chairman has noted, we have in the bill already a provision that if there is a 10-percent increase in Western Hemisphere immigration over the average of the last 5 years, the President will report that fact to the Congress. Does the chairman feel that if there is a 10-percent increase, that would require action by the Congress, or does he feel there is some additional percentage of increase that would have to occur before such action by the Congress would be required?

Mr. CELLER. I am not a fortune teller and I cannot read a crystal ball. I cannot tell what will happen 5 or 10 years from now or what will happen in the next minute.

Mr. McCLORY. Does the chairman feel that it is going to be more diplomatic and it is going to be easier insofar as our foreign relations are concerned to place a ceiling on the Western Hemisphere immigration in the future than it is today when we are making a comprehensive overhaul of our immigration laws?

Mr. CELLER. I wish I could answer that question, but I am afraid I do not have the knowledge of what will happen 5 or 10 years hence, nor has the gentleman who asked the question. So that question is rather impossible of a real, genuine answer.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the chairman.

Mr. CELLER. Finally, it is significant that at a time when immigration from the Western Hemisphere totaled 190,000, way back in 1923, when our population was less than 100 million and the gross national product approximated $85.9 billion, the Congress was not disposed to set a numerical limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. As contrasted with 1924, nonquota immigration from the Western Hemisphere has averaged 125,000 over the past 5 years and 110,000 over the past 10 years. If the earlier larger volume of nonquota immigration from the Western Hemisphere did not cause the Congress to take countermeasures way back in 1924, there would seem to be less reason for doing so today, particularly when we view the situation in the context of our population of 190 million and a gross national product of $670 billion, which soon will reach $700 billion.

For those reasons I do hope that when the time comes we will decisively vote down the MacGregor amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to propound a couple of questions to the chairman of the full committee. He made the point a minute ago that Secretary Rusk was concerned how this would affect our foreign affairs. One of his statements a minute ago was that this would disrupt our foreign affairs, particularly with Latin America and the relationships that we have had. I do not remember hearing those same words spoken on this floor when one of the agencies of the Government disrupted our relationship with Mexico that had been very favorable, with regard to the bracero program, until it was cut off.

I do not follow the logic of what the gentleman said.

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

Mr. BATTIN. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. The Secretary of State sent me a personal letter—I think he sent it also to some of the other members of the Committee on the Judiciary emphatically opposing the so-called MacGregor amendment, that it would create very serious difficulties for him in the conduct of our relations with the states of the Western Hemisphere. For that reason he urged us not to accept the MacGregor amendment.

Mr. BATTIN. The Secretary of State has said that, but has the gentleman had any communication from the countries of Latin America themselves indicating that they are objecting to any ceiling being placed on immigration from those countries?

Mr. CELLER. I have no direct contact with representatives from any South American governments. I think the Logan Act would preclude my having any such contact. I simply have to rely on what the Secretary of State indicates with reference to the attitude of the Western Hemisphere states. He was very emphatic in his opposition.

Mr. BATTIN. A newspaper from the gentleman's own hometown, the New York Times, on July 17, stated in an editorial even before the MacGregor amendment was proposed the best attitude on this question. I do not agree with them very often, but I am sure that the thinking that went into this in treating everybody fairly is certainly what the gentleman from New York wants. I find great merit in this New York Times editorial.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman want me to answer that?

Mr. BATTIN. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. I have great respect for the New York Times and its editorial staff, but that staff is not infallible.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House Judiciary Committee, I rise to support the pending bill, H.R. 2580.

Yesterday the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], described in detail the important changes that will be made in the immigration laws of the United States if this legislation is enacted. Ever since the adoption of the national origins quota system in 1924, there has been justifiable criticism directed at that discriminatory feature of our immigration laws. Since the membership of this House is undoubtedly thoroughly familiar with the contents of this legislation, I shall not take the time of the committee to discuss in detail and in depth the provisions of the bill. The heart of the legislation is, of course, the removal, over a 3-year period, of the national origins quota system. The other changes that will be effected by this legislation will, in my judgment, bring an enlightened approach to modern-day immigration.

The pending bill seeks in the first instance to unite families and thus emphasis is placed on preferences that will bring about the uniting of the family group. I am also pleased at the safeguards that have been placed in this legislation to protect the American worker and I am confident that properly implemented these safeguards will accomplish the objectives sought by the subcommittee.

As a member of the subcommittee, I am proud of the work that has been done on this historic legislation. While all members of the subcommittee of both parties contributed to the overall legislation, there is little doubt in my mind and I am sure in the minds of all members of the committee that the dominant force and the greatest contribution was supplied by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] whose knowledge, industry, and experience played a vital role in adjusting the differences that originally existed and prepared the way for a truly bipartisan legislative accomplishment. Let me for a moment discuss why this legislation is important.

It was, I believe, Oscar Handlin, one of the leading scholars of the history of immigration who said:

Once I thought to write a history of immigrants in America. Then I discovered that the immigrants were American history.

It would, therefore be in order, I think, for all of us in the committee to contemplate and consider for a few moments the contributions that have been made by immigrants to the development of our country. It would be impossible for me to single out any particular nationality or to suggest individuals of immigrant stock who have made lasting contributions to this land. All nationalities—the English, Irish, Italian, Spanish, German, Polish, Greek, and others—have in one way or another made a real contribution to the development and the greatness of the United States. Immigrants not only produced leaders in government, medicine, law, and every other field of the human endeavor but they truly are the ones who cleared acre after acre of forest and stone-strewn field to build the mighty farmlands. They, too, lent their muscle to the task of laying the endless ribbons of steel that connected our developing centers of commerce. They toiled in the mills and factories which helped to evolve our present industrial strength. Walt Whitman truly captured the immigrant's role in this country when he said:

These States are the amplest poem—here is not merely a nation but a teeming nation of nations.

All of us in this House of Representatives are aware of the contributions made by the immigrant and the son of the immigrant. Many, if not all of us, in the House of Representatives need look no further than their own parents or their own grandparents to find the blood of an immigrant.

It is, therefore, a significant day and an historical day, in my judgment when we in the Congress modernize and make truly nondiscriminatory, just and fair the immigration laws of our country.

I hope, therefore, that this legislation will receive, as it did in the subcommittee and in the full committee, bipartisan support and that it will pass in this House by an overwhelming majority.

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

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this time very briefly to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that we are delighted to have him back. He has been a valued and hard working member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality without whose contributions I doubt we would have accomplished what we have done in bringing before the House H.R. 2580.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute, to say that I, too, want to welcome back to our fold the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] who, unfortunately, was ill for a spell. He is an able, efficient and dedicated member of our committee and has always done well on the floor. I say to him—"Welcome back, BILL."

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI].

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, today and yesterday we have engaged in historic debate. And shortly we will make the decision as to whether the national origins quota system—the underlying rule for this Nation's immigration policy for the past 40 years—shall be discontinued.

This policy has been in existence since 1924 despite the vigorous opposition of those who know its faults. And this includes the last four Presidents of the United States. Now, in an era when we are increasing our attention to matters of equality and justice for all under the law, it is fitting that we are giving serious consideration to this system and to the means by which it may be improved.

The national origins quota system was adopted during a time which I hope we never duplicate in our way of life. It was a time when we were striving to make a return to normalcy after the horrors of World War I. It was a time when we turned with disgust from the problems of the world and wished not to be bothered by them. It was a time when we turned blindly into ourselves and ignored the seemingly alien problems of the rest of the world until they finally boiled over into the caldron of the Second World War.

During all these years the quota system was the basis for our immigration policy. And I will state unequivocally that this is one of the most unfair examples of U.S. policy toward other nations and other peoples that I have seen.

Under this policy, nations of the world with burgeoning populations and with difficulties in employing and feeding their peoples, have the severest restrictions placed on their emigration to the United States. For example, India, with all her problems in coping with her population, can send only 200 people per year to this Nation. And this does not take into account what these people might have to offer.

At the same time, severe restrictions are placed on European nations with whom we can cooperate in this area. Italy, the land of artists and craftsmen and now coming to the fore in industrialization, can send only 5,666 persons to the United States each year. A few more come in under special provisions of the immigration laws. But by and large this means that a father can come to the United States but must leave his wife and sons and daughters behind. Or in some cases, his mother and father. Or brothers and sisters. And it will take years under the current system to find a place for these people on the quota, if we ever find a place.

At the same time a nation such as Great Britain has a quota of more than 65,000. And if it uses even half of this quota, it is an unusual year. So on the one hand we have cases such as in Italy where families must be separated for years and sometimes even for a lifetime because of a law passed during a time of fear and indifference. And at the same time nations such as England can qualify to send entire families at one time and anyone wishing to come to the United States, unless they are disqualified for specified reasons, can do so.

We are now considering a significant change in this system. We are considering the enactment of a new immigration law which will do more than voice the U.S. traditional belief in the worth of the individual. The proposed system will abolish the national origins method of choosing immigrants to this Nation and will substitute a plan based on the worth and integrity of each individual without regard to his country or religion. There will still be a system of preferences, but they will not be based on the color of someone's skin or where he was born. Instead they will be based on what skills a person has to offer and whether he already has close relatives in this country.

Under the existing system, a nonpreference immigrant can often gain easier access to our shores, if he is from England or another similar country, than a highly qualified, preference immigrant from a country such as Italy.

Since the original enactment of the national origins system in 1924, we have had many amendments trying to solve the surface problems of this plan. It is time that we go to the heart of the problem and root out the basic trouble once and for all.

It is time that we adopt the policy of keeping families together when we admit immigrants to our shores. It is time that we start to consider what an individual has to contribute, not whether those of his same nationality are preponderate in this country.

It is time that we enact the Immigration Act of 1965.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the pending bill because I consider our present immigration laws to be both cruel and discriminatory.

The laws presently in existence are cruel because they needlessly separate families, and they are discriminatory because they establish quotas aimed against the people of certain nations.

As the laws now exist, there is an annual quota of 65,361 for persons who wish to come to the United States from Great Britain, whereas the annual quota for Italy is 5,666. As a result, there is no waiting list at all for immigrants from Great Britain, but a huge waiting list for Italian nationals.

The assignment of quotas is discriminatory and un-American because it writes into law the unfortunate and undemocratic theory that people from one country are more decent and desirable than people from another country.

I do, of course, realize that we cannot simply let down the gates entirely, and flood the United States with as many people as wish to come here. Because of recurrent unemployment, I understand and appreciate the fact that workingmen and working standards in the United States must be protected. However, I

think that this can be accomplished without the use of the discriminatory quota system.

I further believe that persons of bad moral background or extremist totalitarian political beliefs should be denied entry. What I do support is the President's position that discrimination and favoritism have no place in the laws of the United States of America.

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in support of H.R. 2580.

Mr. Chairman, the consideration by the House of Representatives on H.R. 2580 concerning amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act is being heralded throughout America as an historic occasion. Soon the frustrations of our people will be soothed and soon long overdue amendments as set forth in the bill will be enacted into law.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that had the public been fully aware of the discriminatory features of our present immigration law, these long overdue changes would have been accomplished during the years passed.

Since the adoption of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1952, the unfair system of choosing immigrants we will allow to enter our country has been under vigorous attack. The national origins quota system is truly an unfair standard and has been in existence for altogether too long; to wit, 1924. This is truly an indefensible effort to maintain the racial and ethnic composition of our population that existed in this Nation over four or five decades ago.

It was discriminatory in its tone and operated to the obvious detriment of the southern European. An Italian or a Greek or a Pole or a Chinese artisan found it obviously more difficult to gain entrance in this land of opportunity in contrast to a northern European prospective immigrant; and in all too many instances, the skilled were left behind under this unfair system and an unskilled immigrant from northern Europe enjoyed priority above those from southern and eastern Europe and all Asian countries.

It is important, Mr. Chairman, that there be corrected as well the situation of separation which keeps parents from children and brothers from sisters for years upon years, and which commits prospective immigrants to long, impossible waiting lists for a lifetime.

These wonderful amendments end once and for all, in this land of equality, the inference that one kind of ancestry is better than another. It is important in my view that America's image abroad be free of conflict, that we truly frame an immigration policy which says to the world, "We walk as we talk, and we choose immigrants not on the basis of where they or their ancestors happened to be born, but we choose immigrants for what they truly can contribute to our society."

Equally abhorrent to our American tradition is the so-called Asian-Pacific triangle which states that persons of Asian stock be assigned to quota areas not by their place of birth, but according to their racial ancestry. This provision requires that a person of Asian ancestry is still to be charged to the Asian quota, even if born halfway around the globe.

Mr. Chairman, I would consider the amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act to be as important as the landmark legislation of this Congress relating to the Civil Rights Act. The central purpose of the administration's immigration bill is to once again undo discrimination and to revise the standards by which we choose potential Americans in order to be fairer to them and which will certainly be more beneficial to us.

A major step in the right direction is the elimination of the national origins quota system.

I wish to commend the members of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives who labored so long and so well and under such trying conditions of pressure, who have succeeded in bringing forth this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to add my support of H.R. 2580 and to urge my colleagues to support the bill as written and to avoid the minority's attempt to recommit this important piece of legislation and thereby forestall action by this Congress on this vital issue.

I hold to the view that the House would be well advised to take heed of the advice of the distinguished Secretary of State with regard to the retention of the nonquota status for western hemispheric regions. Congress was well advised in 1952 to treat these western hemispheric nations on a nonquota basis in recognition of the common bond which united the Americas.

This unison in the hemisphere could easily be adversely affected if we were to reverse and withdraw this nonquota status and subject these countries to numerical limitation.

I urge those flirting with the temptation of supporting the MacGregor amendment to this bill to bear in mind that the qualitative restrictions in this bill still apply insofar as countries in the Western Hemisphere are concerned, and that there is reasonable and justifiable cause for the retaining of these countries on a continuing, nonquota basis as presently provided.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2580.

As an attorney I have represented many families attempting to bring their relatives to the United States and later as a U.S. district attorney, I was forced to struggle with the present immigration law, I want to say this is a very worthwhile and forward-looking piece of legislation. I compliment the committee, and particularly the chairman, for proposing a bill that should solve a great many problems which I believe have long needed solution.

This bill, H.R. 2580, will write a bright new chapter of progress and humanitarianism into the U.S. immigration system. America will now truly follow the message of the Statue of Liberty:

> Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

The United States has drawn its strength from the people of all of the nations of the world, and this bill will help assure that America's greatness will continue through the contributions of immigrants from throughout the entire world.

This bill is necessary because since 1924 America has followed a policy which closed the door to certain nationalities by an arbitrary system which gave large immigration quotas to some favored nations and almost none to others. Nations, such as England, having large quotas have not used them, and other nations, such as Italy, Greece, Poland, China, Japan, and the Philippines, have been heavily oversubscribed.

I support this proposed law and hope it will pass quickly. Its purpose is to reunite the families of American citizens with their close relatives and loved ones who have been left in foreign lands because they are not citizens. The bill will also admit those who will contribute to the economic and cultural life of the United States. It will not significantly increase the total number of immigrants admitted to the United States in any year, but now the system of admitting immigrants will be a reasonable one.

The first group to be admitted will be the close relatives of U.S. citizens, and the next group will be other relatives of U.S. citizens. Then preference quotas will be given to other groups having skills to contribute to America.

The Seventh District of Washington is a very good example of the wonderful contribution that all people of the world can make to America. Many of those people living in the Seventh District belong to the groups that have been most discriminated against under past immigration policy. This law should remove the necessity of many private bills which have been an unnecessary burden on the Government machinery and very unsatisfactory to the people involved. As a former U.S. attorney, I often had the unpleasant duty of explaining to families that they could not bring their loved ones to the United States for many years because of oversubscribed quotas. Since being elected to Congress, I have introduced many private bills in an attempt to relieve some of these heartaches. This new bill would solve many of these problems.

I am very proud of the people who live in the Seventh District who have been patient for many years in the face of America's inadequate immigration policies. They number among our finest citizens, and a look at the people this bill will help the most shows they are among the best people of our community. This is shown by the warm affection they enjoy in the community and by such statistical factors as the low school dropout rate, low crime rate, low incidence of welfare, and a high degree of participation in all civic endeavors.

ANALYSIS OF BILL

The bill sounds complicated and I know many people in my district will

want to know specifically what it will do. Let us briefly examine some of the details of the bill:

The new law only slightly increases the total possible immigration to the United States since a top limit of 170,000 persons, including 10,200 political refugees, is established. The new law, however, provides for a fair distribution of the available immigration quotas to all the nations of the world.

In order to provide a transition from present policy, the new bill will create a 3-year interim period during which existing quotas will continue, with the unused quota numbers—from countries which have never used their full quotas—being placed in an immigration pool. The pool numbers will then be divided among the countries with oversubscribed quotas in accordance with the new system of nonquota and preference quota allowances. This new system will be the same one that will be used for all countries after June 30, 1968. The total quota system and pool visas will be limited to 170,000, and during this 3-year period there will be a 20,000 limitation on each individual country, except that this 20,000 ceiling will not apply where a country has an existing quota over 20,000. For example, Great Britain would continue to have her total quota of 65,000 even though it is over 20,000. Quota numbers not used by Great Britain would go into a pool. In 1965 Great Britain only used 29,000 numbers. Under the pool system the extra 31,000 numbers would go into a pool to be divided among those countries which need quota numbers up to a total of 20,000 per country.

The discrimination against the Asia-Pacific Triangle—China, Japan and the Philippines—will be abolished.

The new system of preferences which will operate during the 3-year period for the immigration pool and on the entire 170,000 after 3 years will work as follows:

First. The system will be based on a first-come, first-served method within the preference categories.

Second. There is a total limitation of 170,000 on the number of immigrants to be admitted to the United States in any one year, but in addition there will be admitted as nonquota immigrants the immediate relatives—parent, spouse, minor unmarried children—of U.S. citizens. Natives of independent Western Hemisphere nations will also be admitted on a special nonlimitation basis.

Third. There will be a limit of 20,000 on immigration from any one foreign country in any one year so that one or two countries cannot completely exhaust the total immigration quota.

Fourth. The following people will be admitted on worldwide preference priorities within the 170,000 limitation. This means that the preference will go to all countries, with each country sharing according to the number of people applying in that category. The qualified petitions from all over the world will be sent to Washington, D.C., and the preference applicants will be approved on a first-come, first-served basis. The order of preference and percentage is as follows:

First. Twenty percent of 170,000—for the unmarried, adult children of U.S. citizens.

Second. The next 20 percent plus any unused part of item 1—to spouses and unmarried children of aliens permanently in residence in the United States.

Third. The next 10 percent plus the unused parts of 1 and 2 above—to members of professions, scientists and artists.

Fourth. The next 10 percent plus the unused parts of the three items listed above—to married children of U.S. citizens.

Fifth. The next 24 percent plus the unused parts of the items listed above—to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

Sixth. The next 10 percent plus the unused parts of the items listed above—to skilled or unskilled persons capable of filling U.S. labor shortages—but these individuals must also obtain a certificate from the Secretary of Labor that they will not injure the labor market.

Seventh. The next 6 percent plus the unused parts of the items listed above—political refugees—these are limited to 10,200 persons per year.

Eighth. Any part of the 170,000 total that is not used above will go to qualified immigrants in the order of their qualifications on a first-come, first-served basis. Persons coming in as workers will be required to establish by a certificate from the Secretary of Labor that they will not harm the labor market at their destination. They also will have to establish that they can obtain a job.

CONCLUSION

I have supported this bill not only because it is necessary to correct the injustices suffered by thousands of our citizens, but also because it will strengthen our country by bringing fine new people to our shores who will contribute to our culture and economy through their skills, knowledge, and talents. It also will benefit those citizens who now have to support close relatives overseas, who are waiting out the years before they can come here.

This bill will also demonstrate to the nations of the world that we recognize each nation as sovereign, with its citizens entitled to equal standing before our laws. I believe this will greatly benefit our relations with our friends and allies, particularly those in the Orient.

This bill will not solve all of our immigration problems, but it will do much to improve present policy. The people of the United States, and in particular, many in the Seventh District of Washington will benefit from the passage of this logical, humanitarian immigration bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH].

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, when the ledger of the 89th Congress is written one of the many entries it will contain, I am sure, will record the enactment of legislation reforming the basic principles of our immigration quota system. It is most gratifying to me to support the immigration reform bill now before the House that, as President Johnson stated recently, "will wash away a stain on our national conscience and in its place engrave the mark of a just and hopeful country."

Basic immigration reform has been an issue facing Congress for many years. The attempts to enact these reforms have gotten nowhere. There has been an abundance of talk but a complete absence of action. As a result the issues and the arguments have become somewhat shopworn. It is unfortunately true that any issue can become somewhat tarnished after many years of futile discussion. This should not result in its being relegated to the status of the hackneyed.

The archives of history are stored with many great issues of the past which underwent their periods in the limbo of procrastination and dilatory debate. They may have been delayed but they were not stopped. The undercurrents of truth and justice were working for them, cutting through the soggy marshes of error and opposition, to open up new pathways for the streams and rivers of progress.

This country in its infancy traveled through many troubled decades and was nearly torn asunder over the question of whether one human being should be the chattel of another. From our present vantage point, it appears that the institution of slavery had to go because truth and justice, the inexorable forces that must in the end shape the rules by which men govern themselves, were, however unhurriedly, to prevail.

The present Congress has faced several of these issues. The need for action has become more apparent with each year it has been forestalled. We had extended debate concerning the medical care needs for our older population and the educational needs of our youth. I am proud that this House has acted in a meaningful way to meet our obligations to these sectors of the population by the approval of the Medicare-Social Security Amendments of 1965 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and, hopefully later this week, the Higher Education Act. Future students of history will wonder at the amount of fuss and bother that had to be raised before these things could be done.

It will be the same with immigration. For over 40 years this country has been saddled with an immigration quota system that is an aberration from the steady progress we have experienced in our national traditions and institutions.

Enacted during the period of isolationist hysteria following World War I, this quota system is completely out of step with our standards of today. Unfortunately, its hoary age alone has helped to clothe it with some of the trappings of a solid institution which it does not deserve. There are some who believe that it alone can safeguard the country from an avalanche of undesirable immigration. Tamper with it and you will open the floodgates, they ominously proclaim.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. The quota system is, after all, primarily a means for limiting the num-

ber of aliens who will be allowed to enter the United States for permanent residence. Surely the human mind is capable of conceiving more than one method of accomplishing this purpose. In my judgment, the most sensible, just, and practicable method is embodied in the bill that is now before this body. This sets up a system of preferences in these broad categories: First, close relatives of United States citizens; second, scientists, artists, and other professionals; third, workers needed to fill specific domestic labor shortages; fourth, refugees from communism. This policy will end the tragic separation of families occasioned by the harsh quota restrictions and will admit applicants on the basis of their talents and skills instead of on the fact that they were born in certain countries.

The national origins quota system is based upon a belief that the people of one nationality or race are superior to those of another. Most Americans would agree, I am sure, that such a belief, however popular it once might have been, has no place in the laws of our Nation today.

It is no secret that when the first permanent immigration quota law was adopted in 1924 it was purposely designed to curtail the new immigration from southern and eastern Europe while not interfering with the old immigration from northern and western Europe. This is apparent when one merely examines what the quotas are.

Great Britain, for example, has an annual quota of over 65,000—more than one-third of the total quotas of all the countries of the world, most of which goes unused every year. Germany and Ireland also have liberal quotas, reflecting the many early settlers from those countries. At the same time, a country like Greece whose immigration quota is oversubscribed by some 105,000 visa applications, has a quota of 308. Italy, with 51 million people, has a quota of 5,666 annually. A citizen of the United States who has, say, a Swiss brother can obtain his admission promptly. But his neighbors must wait an indefinite number of years before they can be joined by their brothers from Greece and Italy. Surely, equity demands that American citizens be accorded equal consideration in bringing their loved ones here. A nation of immigrants should make no such jarring distinctions among its own people.

We have a situation in which the immigration quotas allotted to certain countries are larger than they can use, while other countries are given quotas which are paltry in relation to their needs. And all of this is determined by the accidents of history—which countries had contributed the most stock to the U.S. population as it existed in the year 1920. The pending bill affords us an opportunity to improve the method of controlling immigration numerically, without substantially increasing it in numbers. This bill would establish a more realistic and integral system than we now have under the national origins formula. The present system has necessitated the enactment of numerous special laws to allow many thousands of worthy individuals to enter the country since the end of World War II. These have included the Displaced Persons Act, the Refugee Relief Act, and other laws granting nonquota admission to special groups, not to mention the great number of private immigration bills that have been enacted. Were it not for the lack of sound reason in the national origins formula, few of these special laws would have been necessary.

The national origins quota system is as foreign to our national ideals today as is the once accepted institution of slavery. It has made its appearance on the national scene and has stubbornly refused to make its exit. I suggest that we finally take action where it has been postponed for too long and remove this anachronism from our laws this year. I urge passage of H.R. 2580.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I consider it a special honor to rise today in favor of H.R. 2580, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. For the past 5 years I have been active in efforts to amend our discriminatory and unfair immigration policy. In 1961, 1963, and again in 1965, I introduced bills to achieve the purposes presently sought by H.R. 2580. It is indeed a pleasure to speak once again in favor of such legislation.

My reason for supporting and introducing immigration bills throughout the years is a simple and straightforward one: I believe that the national origins quota system is incompatible with our basic American ideals and traditions. To quote President Johnson:

> Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to these shores. The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities. On this basis men and women migrated from every quarter of the globe. By their hard work and their enormously varied talents they hewed a great nation out of a wilderness. By their dedication to liberty and equality, they created a society reflecting man's most cherished ideals.

The present immigration law frustrates this basic American tradition. It assigns large quotas to countries that in many cases do not want or need them. At the same time, other countries are given very small quotas and hence have very long waiting lists. These unjust quotas, which are based on nothing but the geographical location of the country, deprive America of people whose skills and abilities may be urgently needed in this country. This policy quite unfairly asks where a person was born, not what can he contribute to this country.

However unfair this may be, it is not the most unfair and inhumane aspect of the present system of national origins. The worst aspect of this system is the fact that it often prohibits the reuniting of families. Though Congress has been most generous and sympathetic in enacting special legislation to correct these problems, the fact remains that the immigration policy of the United States creates human pressures and personal hardships which need not be created. Under the present system, mothers are separated from children and husbands are separated from wives, all because we refuse to abolish our archaic quota restrictions on immigration.

H.R. 2580 will correct both of these injustices. It will eliminate the discriminatory national origins system by June 30, 1968. In its place a new preference system will be created which will both reunite separated families and make possible increased admittance of those who can contribute to the U.S. economic and cultural interests.

The proposed legislation places a ceiling of 170,000 on the number of immigrants to be admitted to the United States in any 1 given year. Excluded from this total figure are immediate relatives of U.S. citizens, and natives of independent Western Hemisphere nations. It also establishes an order of preference priorities within the 170,000 limitation. These priorities are designed to bring other relatives of U.S. citizens to this country, and to insure that there will never be a shortage of professional men, scientists, and artists in America. Thus, H.R. 2580 serves the dual purpose of reuniting separated families, and making possible the immigration of needed skilled persons to our Nation.

This new selection system will operate on a first-come, first-served basis within the respective preference categories. No regard will be given to place of birth, although no country will be allowed more than 20,000 immigrants in any 1 year in order to prevent an unreasonable number of persons from one foreign state. Finally, the new bill will repeal the discriminatory Asia-Pacific triangle provision of the present law.

It is important to note that this new law will not open the floodgates of immigration as charged by opponents of the bill. The new limitation on admissions means an increase of only about 2,000 persons over the presently authorized annual total. I should point out also that H.R. 2580 has been designed to protect the status of the American worker and the national economy. Under this law responsibility will be placed upon the intending immigrant to obtain clearance from the Secretary of Labor prior to issuance of a visa. The Secretary would, of course, clear no one who would be likely to displace a qualified American worker or whose employment in this country would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of persons similarly employed in the United States.

During the 12 years which have elapsed since President Truman called upon the public conscience to demand a fair immigration policy, the suffering of those separated from their loved ones, suppressed politically, intellectually, and spiritually, oppressed economically and socially, has not been abated. At the same time, the country has sorely missed the contributions which many who were denied entrance might have made.

The continued development and greatness of our Nation depends heavily on the decisions we make today. This country has taken to its shores the abandoned

and the oppressed of many nations in years past. These immigrants have made their contributions to our culture and our industrial and economic progress. Many of them have gone on to lead our Nation in its times of crisis. It is, indeed, the diversity of origin, the intellectual and cultural exchange, that constitutes our strength. We cannot turn our backs on our heritage and our history; neither can we turn deaf ears toward those who are today seeking our shores and are being turned away by our inequitous policy.

Over a century ago America's first truly great poet wrote these words:

We are not merely a nation, but a nation of nations.

For the last few decades we have not been a nation of nations; we have been rather a nation of a few select nations. Our immigration policy has clearly and unashamedly discriminated against persons born in certain parts of the world. This Congress has recently enacted legislation aimed at the final elimination of the vestiges of slavery and discrimination within our shores. I urge that my distinguished colleagues unite once again in bipartisan support of this bill which would end another example of discrimination and extend a sound promise of freedom to those throughout the world who wish to contribute to the ideals and goals and national well-being of our country.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO].

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill before us, H.R. 2580, and I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the full committee on the many hard hours of work which have gone into this bill and their getting it before the House after so many years of waiting. We have long sought a revision of our present discriminatory immigration laws, and I know that we are now well on our way to the passage of equitable legislation.

In my opinion, this legislation has been misunderstood by great numbers of our citizens. I have found that many people believe that this legislation will greatly increase the annual overall quota which, of course, is not true. Basically this bill provides for the gradual elimination of the national origins system and establishes a new system for the distribution of quota numbers.

This proposed legislation would only permit that portion of the total quota which is unused to be reallocated to those countries which have long waiting lists. Preference would be given first to those people of skills needed in this country and other preference would be given with a view toward reuniting families—all of this within the overall quota of 170,000. Certainly this is the fair and equitable way to choose those who wish to enter our country.

Under this system, one can easily see that the immigrants would not be burdens upon our economy, as some charge, but they will be assets, bringing needed skills, and we must remember that they will become consumers. I firmly believe that the majority of immigrants will in some way add to the greatness of this Nation just as our ancestors, and all past immigrants, have.

The national origins system is discriminatory, and it gives a bad image to our friends overseas. The elimination of this system is long overdue, and the system which has been worked out by the administration and our Committee on the Judiciary is a good one. I urge my colleagues to join in approving this bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2580, as reported out by the Judiciary Committee. This bill is bipartisan in character; it properly ends the discriminatory national origins quota system; it provides for the reuniting of families; and it makes parents of U.S. citizens nonquota.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, these immigration reforms are long overdue. In the 88th Congress I introduced H.R. 11437 on May 28, 1964; and reintroduced legislation which embodied a comprehensive revision of our immigration laws in the 89th Congress—H.R. 5324 on February 23, 1965.

I firmly believe our immigration laws should be based on principle and be made a matter of clear and progressive law—equally applicable to all; not subject to caprice and winds of political pressure which can affect administrative judgment. I am happy to say that the bill we are considering today is consonant with these objectives.

Specifically, I testified on April 6, 1965 before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality that our selection of those who are to become future Americans should be guided by—

First. The reuniting of families, and the preservation of the home as the fundamental unit of our society.

Second. The attraction of those with special skills and talents to enrich our society, our economy, our culture and the whole fabric of our national life.

Third. The welcoming of a generous number of refugees from persecution and tyranny in order that they may share our freedom; and that we, seeing it anew through their eyes, will not forget how it is to defend.

All those in Westchester and throughout the country who have close relatives unable to enter the United States because of heavily oversubscribed quota lists will be particularly pleased to know that the Department of States anticipates the entry of those on waiting lists within 3 years, many within the first year. This will be accomplished in part by a feature of this bill which allows the pooling of unused quota numbers to countries which do not have enough quota numbers to satisfy the need for eligible immigrants.

Equally important is the fact that this bill will revise our discriminatory and outdated laws without substantially increasing the number of immigrants we welcome to the United States each year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge every Member of the House to support H.R. 2580. An American is a hybrid of many breeds and has the vigor of that high heritage. What began with an Italian, sailing in a Spanish ship, has seen, in our own time, an immigrant's grandson reach the White House—and so the grand story goes on. We are truly a nation of immigrants. If we would honor our heritage we must put an end—here and now—to discriminatory national origins quotas and divided families.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, H.R. 2580.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today to ratify that which has begged ratification for a long, long time. I am referring to changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act as largely encompassed in H.R. 2580, eliminating the so-called "national origins" limitations upon immigrants into the United States. As Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson all have said, discrimination against certain peoples of the world by failing to welcome them equally with others is in direct variance with our American ideals.

I share with my colleagues on both sides of the asile pride in representing Americans of diverse national origins. That pride, in part, has led us to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reject the national origins limitations and replace them with a system authorizing equal numbers of immigrants from the various countries.

It is pertinent to point out, however, Mr. Chairman, that a considerable amount of my constituent mail expresses strong opposition to any changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act. Most of these objections express fears that floods of immigrants from various depressed countries will swarm across this land of opportunity and take away jobs and other opportunities which our present citizens might otherwise have. I think it is time to explain in detail that this is not the case in this bill so that their fears may be calmed.

To clarify the situation, it may simplify things to understand that our immigration laws largely effect two general areas of the world in two widely different ways. The first of these is the Americas—the Western Hemisphere. Under present immigration laws, there is no limitation on the number of immigrants into the United States from other countries of the Western Hemisphere. During the last 10 years, total annual immigration from the Western Hemisphere has averaged about 111,000. For the past 5 years, the average has been 125,000.

Under the changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act as proposed in H.R. 2580, as it first came before us today, this lack of a numerical limitation from Western Hemispheric countries was not proposed to be changed. However, because of the great amount of concern, at

least by my constituents, I am supporting the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] which would place a generous limitation of 115,000 immigrants from other countries in this hemisphere.

As to the immigrants from other areas of the world, these have been limited to 158,561, plus the political and other refugees who have fled to the United States without being charged to any particular quota. Under this bill, a limitation of 170,000, including up to 10,200 of such refugees, will be permitted to enter this country. It is estimated that these limitations, in addition to other controls on the immigration of workers, should cause immigration under the new system to be maintained at about the present level.

It has been my longstanding opinion that there was room for considerable improvement in the present immigration laws. I feel that, realistically, we must continue to recognize an annual limitation on the number of immigrants we can absorb. This bill, plus the amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota, provides this limitation.

It is equally clear that limiting immigration on the basis of national origin is completely out of keeping with the historic and continuing concepts on which this Nation is based. I do feel, however, that priorities must be set up to show our special concern in accomplishing the following purposes:

First. To emphasize the importance of reuniting families by giving high priority to those abroad who have close relatives already in the United States. We should give every consideration to uniting families of U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens.

Second. Applicants with needed skills, talents and special training should be given high priority. While this will welcome needed professional people and persons of exceptional ability in the sciences and the arts, the bill also includes adequate checks against "pirating" of leadership and professional talents from developing countries as not in the best interest of this Nation.

Third. To provide a sanctuary for victims of religious and political persecution and national catastrophes seeking total freedom and total religious liberty.

Mr. Chairman, I think this special emphasis on reuniting families and in continuing our longstanding policy as a haven for political and religious refugees without regard to national origin is one of the finest things we have done this year.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], 10 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, the House can take pride in the passage of the immigration reform bill before us today, for it will serve a national principle of equality and human dignity. Our existing immigration law does not. It betrays both our national and international aspirations.

I refer, of course, to the antiquated and discriminatory national-origins quota system, which for more than 40 years has judged new Americans not on their individual worth, but almost solely on the basis of their nationality. The system is degrading and inflammatory. It reflects a sad and unnecessary conflict with our ideals. This bill, at long last, gives us the opportunity to abolish the system.

I have favored repeal of the quota system since I first introduced a bill to reform the immigration law in 1959. The bill, which I reintroduced in each succeeding Congress, has been incorporated into the measure, H.R. 2580, to be voted on today.

In common with my bill, H.R. 93, the measure moves toward the elimination of the quota system. The system would end July 1, 1968. In the meantime, the unused quota numbers will be redistributed among oversubscribed countries.

To use just one illustration, Italy has an annual quota of 5,666. More than a quarter million Italians are waiting to use these numbers, including more than 140,000 relatives of U.S. citizens.

Great Britain's quota is 65,361. It has never been filled. Yet under existing law the excess numbers cannot be awarded to Italy or any other country. The interim provision quite properly removes this silly inflexibility.

More importantly, of course, the bill dooms the anachronistic, prejudicial quota system. Only a few statistics are needed to show the vitiating effect of this system upon the foreign relations of the United States:

India, with a population of more than 450 million, is the largest English-speaking country in the world. Its annual quota is 100—the same as Iceland's.

Ireland uses only about 35 percent of its quota of 17,756. Yet it receives more quota numbers than all of Asia and Africa combined.

Greece, where this country instituted the Marshall plan, has a population of almost 10 million. Its quota is exactly 308. More than 100,000 persons are waiting for those visas.

Lastly, this Nation has committed itself to the defense of the independence of South Vietnam. Yet the quota for that country of 15 million is exactly 100. Apparently we are willing to risk a major war for the right of the Vietnamese people to live in freedom at the same time our quota system makes it clear we do not want very great numbers of them to live with us.

The bill establishes an annual limitation of 170,000 immigrants from outside the Western Hemisphere, and I hope the firm ceiling will encourage favorable votes from Members of Congress who in the past have expressed reservations about immigration law reform. Since the total includes 10,200 refugees, the increased immigration will be only a token figure of about 2,000 a year.

In addition, quota immigration from any one country will be restricted to 20,000.

The bill makes it clear, I think, that the abandonment of the quota system will not open this country to a flood of immigrants. The law, obviously, must be geared to this country's absorptive capacity. What we are concerned with is not increased immigration, but equitable immigration.

Another provision of the bill which should win widespread support—not only in this body, but from the general public—is the stricter regulation of immigrants entering the American labor market.

The bill provides that aliens coming here for employment must be cleared by the Secretary of Labor, who must certify that the immigrant will not usurp job opportunities in our labor market or upset competitive wage scales. The provision, significantly covers all immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, who have not, and will not, be subject to quotas.

The bill improves upon the existing system of giving preference to immigrants according to family ties and special skills and talents which will benefit the United States.

I am happy, also, that the measure will remove the quota restrictions on the parents of U.S. citizens. The admission of parents was one of the key objectives of my immigration bill.

Another major provision of H.R. 93 was to set definite limits on the admission of world refugees and escapees from Communist countries. In placing an annual quota of 10,200 upon refugees, the bill under debate today closely corresponds to the measure I introduced 6 years ago.

I believe the Judiciary Committee was wise in eliminating the section of the original administration bill giving the Attorney General almost unlimited authority to admit refugees and escapees. The limitation in this bill is both explicit and fixed, and retains congressional control over the Nation's immigration policies.

Two provisions of my bill have not been included in the administration measure, and I think the omissions are regrettable.

The first would have revised the existing provision which deprives any U.S. citizen of his citizenship if he votes in a foreign election. My bill would have permitted citizenship revocation only if such voting was done with the intent to renounce U.S. nationality or to acquire the nationality of a foreign state.

The second would have struck from the Immigration and Nationality Act a section permitting the Government to cancel the citizenship of a naturalized citizen for living in a foreign country for a substantial period of time. The section has been found unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court and should be expunged.

Despite the omissions in the bill before us today, I believe the bill contains much of the spirit and most of the substance of the immigration law reforms I have fought for during my service in Congress.

My interest in this legislation stems from the role of New York City, part of which I represent, as the port of entry for most of the immigrants to the United States. I have long felt that our immigration law was unworthy of the symbolism of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor.

The bill we vote on today, in my judgment, will bring to our immigration law an honesty and flexibility it presently lacks, and will give real meaning to the

world-famed inscription at the base of that statue.

The bill will reunite families, many of them in New York City, who are now separated by an arbitrary and outmoded immigration policy. It will give even greater preference to persons of special abilities. And it will insure that immigrants be capable of supporting themselves without endangering the livelihoods of American working people.

It should be emphasized that all of this will be accomplished with only a minimal increase in the actual number of immigrants coming to this country. As I indicated earlier, reform does not necessarily entail more immigration; we are concerned here, not with statistics, but with a philosophy. That philosophy is that the American concept of reason and justice applies equally to all men. It is on trial today.

For all of these reasons, then, I shall vote for this bill. I hope that those who may be a son—or, like myself, a grandson—of an immigrant will join in approving this legislation. I think that perhaps many of us have ancestors looking over our shoulders.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

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

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep conviction that I urge my colleagues from both parties to support the measure to reform the Nation's immigration laws that is currently before Congress. The last three Presidents of the United States have urged the enactment of such a measure. I myself have worked vigorously since I have been in Congress in behalf of this legislation. The bill that is now before us is the product of the tireless efforts of Chairman CELLER, of the Judiciary Committee, Chairman FEIGHAN, of the Immigration Subcommittee, and the subcommittee members from both of our parties.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration, I have been impressed by the nonpartisan spirit in which it has been drawn up. So faithfully does it represent the thinking of committee members that it must indeed reflect the sentiments of the Nation with equal fidelity.

This bill is long overdue. We have recognized its need since the end of World War II, and even before. I am delighted that we have the opportunity now to make it into law. I ask my colleagues to approve it by an overwhelming majority as a message that the United States, through its freely elected representatives, continues to stand for the great principles of human freedom and equality on which the Nation was founded almost two centuries ago.

The most dramatic feature of the immigration bill is the provision abolishing the national origins quota system. The quotas under this system, said President Johnson, "imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way."

Forty years ago, the national origins quota system was first enacted into law. It was a time of fright when Americans, having recently emerged from World War I, seemed uncertain of themselves. Their reaction was to isolate themselves from the world, close their gates to new blood and new ideas, withdraw to the humdrum and the conventional. The repeal of the national origins quota system is a reaffirmation of our sturdy faith in human equality, of our enthusiasm for setting democratic standards for the rest of the world, of our willingness to lead a global community of peoples toward universal recognition of human dignity.

Under the outgoing system—which will terminate in a 3-year period—immigration quotas were assigned to countries in ratio to the number of Americans of that country's origin in the total American population. As a consequence, northern Europe—the region from which most Americans came during this Nation's first century—was assigned a disproportionate share of the total annual quota. Though northern Europe frequently did not exhaust its quota, other countries were forbidden to take up the slack. It was easier to bring in an English maid than a Greek doctor, to say nothing of a Japanese physicist, despite the contrasting contribution they could make to the United States. Large waiting lists built up in countries like Greece and Italy, but by statute, there was no way to take into account the value of individuals on these lists. Meanwhile, the ugly shadow of racial discrimination lay over our laws, for all the world to see. I say with confidence that only good will come to the United States from sweeping away the national origins quota system. Our action is already late. It will, at last, represent a return to our earlier idealism. At the same time, it will bring important practical benefits to our society.

Under the new immigration system, immigrants will be selected not on the basis of their race but primarily on their family relationship to American citizens and on the talents and skills that they possess. A total of 170,000 immigrants—apart from those in special categories—are henceforth to be admitted each year, with no country to be allowed more than 20,000 immigrants. The new system permits us to reunite families and to encourage the coming of men and women who will be assets to our economic and cultural life.

Let me describe briefly the humane aspects of the measure before us. The first 20 percent of the total allocation will go to unmarried children of American citizens. The second 20 percent, plus unused portions of the first 20 percent, will go to the husbands, wives and unmarried adult children of alien residents. The fourth 10 percent will be assigned to the married children of American citizens. The next 24 percent, plus leftovers from earlier priorities, has been set aside for brothers and sisters of American citizens. In addition to these preferences, a category of "immediate relatives" has been established to include parents, spouses and minor unmarried children of American citizens, all of whom are to be admitted without regard to the 170,000 total limitation on immigration. The bill, then, goes far toward eliminating the cruelties of family separation which the United States has inadvertently been responsible for committing under the old law.

Thanks to the provision that sets aside 20 percent of the total annual limitation to members of professions, scientists and artists, the bill will certainly go far toward enriching the cultural and economic life of our Nation. We in the United States are very fortunate in being able to offer great opportunities to persons in this category. In the past, we have been handicapped in inviting them to live among us. This provision wisely encourages the most highly educated and talented members of our societies to make their homes in the United States. In addition, it establishes a category to which 10 percent of the total annual allotment is assigned for skilled and unskilled persons whose capacities are needed to remedy deficiencies in the United States. The Secretary of Labor is held responsible for the certifying of labor shortages which this provision is meant to remedy. This and other laws make it quite clear that the Secretary is not to authorize the admittance of immigrants to displace American labor. But if there appears a shortage of labor which Americans cannot fill and of which there is an abundance abroad, the Secretary can take action to satisfy the need. American labor is not hurt thereby and the American economy is helped to prosper.

It is important to note that this bill also reaffirms the great American tradition, symbolized by the Statue of Liberty and the inscription on its base, of offering a haven to the victims of oppression anywhere. This bill sets aside an annual allotment of 10,200 places for the entry of religious, political, or racial refugees. It carefully establishes conditions which guarantee against any influx of refugees who might be openly or covertly hostile to American principles. But it permits the President, under the supervision of Congress, to act with dispatch in assisting the oppressed to find relief in the United States from danger. This provision enables this country to acquit with a minimum of administrative difficulty that obligation we have always assumed toward those whom Emma Lazarus glowingly called the "huddled masses yearning to be free."

Finally, this bill makes a variety of other improvements, some major and some minor, on previous immigration legislation. It eliminates, for example, the "Asia-Pacific triangle" provision of the existing law, which points a particularly discriminatory finger at oriental peoples. It further takes into account the recent independence of Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago by relieving them of all quotas and including them in the category of "special immigrant" countries, in which all the other free nations of the Western Hemisphere are included. This bill maintains the policy of freely admitting our neighbors from the Western Hemisphere, but instructs the President to inform Congress if the practice begins

to threaten population balance or national values.

This is with reference to the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR]. We have built into this bill, as Chairman CELLER stated earlier, a protection that in the event immigration from the Western Hemisphere exceeds a certain amount the President can go back to Congress for a remedy.

I join with the chairman in urging the rejection of the MacGregor amendment, because we have the protection at the present time, and I believe that we are crying "wolf" when the wolf is not present.

The measure also retains the exclusionary provisions of its predecessors, designed to assure that the United States does not become burdened with persons who are physically or morally unfit. Though this objective remains unchanged, several of the old definitions of unfitness have been refined to conform with new medical or psychological knowledge. It is the careful attention to details such as these that make the bill an excellent piece of legislation.

Let me say that the net result of this legislation on everyday American life will not be great. This bill corrects injustice. It substitutes practicality for bigotry. It will remove a thorn from the conduct of our foreign relations. But the annual influx of foreigners will continue to be barely perceptible in a population as large and as heterogeneous as our own. The immigration total of 170,000 does not represent a substantial increase over earlier years. The effect on our economy and our society will scarcely be noticed.

But for the individuals who are affected by this measure, the impact will be enormous. The family reunited will know the meaning of this law. The men and women who are extended new hope in life will understand the meaning of this law. It is right that Congress act in their behalf because concern for the individual is our national heritage. It is our birthright that we are a nation of men, women and children, each an individual, and not a pawn of society or the State. This measure is testimony of America's regard for the worth of the individual. I urge that it be passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I have to indicate to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] that at such time as his amendment will be offered I shall be compelled to do my very best to convince the Committee that it is not necessary.

In this legislation we have tried our very best in more than one instance to protect the interests of the American workingman. We have gone to great lengths to try to do this and to write into this bill some affirmative requirements so that the American workingman may be protected from an inflow of mass immigration from any area of the world. We have made this applicable to the preference categories set up in the bill; the third preference, the sixth preference and the nonpreference categories as well as the Western Hemisphere. So for those reasons and fact that I am fully convinced that we have taken every precaution that we possibly can to write into this bill restrictions which go to the very heart of protecting American labor, I shall oppose his amendment.

In addition to that, the amendment which the gentleman suggests he desires to offer is in present law, is in operation and is now working effectively to do the very things that he indicates he desires to have done.

I would oppose the amendment for this further reason, that this covers a subject matter which legitimately belongs to another committee of this body. For a long time past the Committee on Agriculture has had this matter under its consideration from time to time. I should think this would be not the proper place to consider a change of this type. For that reason I must respectfully say to the gentleman from New York that I intend to oppose his amendment.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, under no circumstances could I have supported H.R. 2580 in the form in which it was originally introduced. In that form, it would have increased annual immigration by several hundred thousand, an increase which the American economy could not possibly have absorbed, an increase which would have added an unsupportable burden to the unemployment and public welfare rolls of this country and further complicated our urban housing, sanitation, education, and medical problems. The original bill would have legalized the status of ship jumpers and lifted restrictions against admission of the insane and those afflicted with psychopathic personality. Far worse, the bill as first introduced would have surrendered historic congressional control over immigration and delegated discretionary authority to the executive branch of the Government. Specifically, it would have for the first time in our history created an Immigration Board and authorized the President to distribute up to 50 percent of pooled quota numbers as he saw fit.

Suffice it to say that H.R. 2580 in its present form bears practically no resemblance to the original text, either in content or consequence. Not only does the committee bill represent a vast improvement over the original bill; it also tightens and strengthens the present statutory law. Accordingly, if the MacGregor amendment which I will discuss later is adopted and if no weakening amendments are added, I will support this legislation.

Let me discuss a few of the provisions of the new bill which I regard as meritorious. First of all, this bill, unlike the original bill, places chief emphasis on the human equation. In three ways, it gives first priority to the reunification of families. First, on the spouses and children of American citizens and on the parents of citizens over 21 years of age, there is no numerical limitation whatever. If they meet all of the qualifications and violate none of the exclusionary provisions contained in the present statute, these immediate relatives will be able to join their American kinsmen promptly. Second, four of the eight preference categories, including the first two, are assigned to other qualified relatives of citizens and permanent resident aliens. Third, while relative immigrants must still furnish proof that they will not become public charges, they are not subject to the new labor controls applicable to other types of immigrants.

The new labor controls, I think, constitute another distinct improvement over the original bill and, indeed, the present law itself. This bill provides that no immigrant will be granted a visa until the Secretary of Labor has made an affirmative finding that his presence in this country will not deprive an American worker for a job and will not impair the American wage structure or other working conditions. This mandate applies to all Western Hemisphere immigrants—except immediate relative immigrants—and to professional workers, skilled workers, unskilled workers, and all workers in the nonpreference category. Moreover, the Secretary of Labor must make this finding on an individual immigrant basis and must report his findings regularly to the Congress. Although some fear has been expressed that the Secretary's power is too broad and too flexible, I am encouraged to believe that, in the face of a continuing congressional oversight, the Secretary will use his power prudently.

This bill makes a significant improvement in the refugee program. Heretofore, under the Fair Share Refugee Act, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees had authority to determine eligibility qualifications for refugee status. This bill repeals that act, spells out our own definition of a refugee, commits to the President power to authorize the conditional entry of up to 10,200 refugees and reserves to the Congress the power to review the case history of every individual refugee he admits. Under the new definition, the applicant must submit to an examination by an American immigration official in a non-Communist country. He must satisfy the official that he has fled from a Communist-dominated country or some country in the Middle East because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion; that for that reason he is unable or unwilling to return to such country; and that he is not a national of the country in which he files his application.

This change in the refugee program involves a change in the manner in which the parole provisions of the present law have been administered. When originally written, the parole provisions were designed to enable the Attorney General to give temporary sanctuary to individuals caught in isolated personal crises. Over the years, the Attorney General, by interpretation, has stretched the parole provisions far beyond their intended boundaries to admit large groups. The language of the new bill, which for esthetic and psychological reasons changes the word "parole" to "conditional entry," restores the original intent of the law.

H.R. 2580 as amended also deals with a problem which has plagued consular officers for many years but with increasing frequency in recent years. Those who represent themselves as nonimmigrants and apply for student and visitor visas do not always honestly intend to remain in the United States only temporarily. This bill gives the consular officer, uncertain about the applicant's bona fides, the power to require him to post a compliance bond.

Except for the repeal of epilepsy as a ground for exclusion and changing the word "feebleminded"—which has no precise medical definition—to "mentally retarded," the exclusionary provisions of the present law are left intact. However, the bill adds by specific language an exclusion which the authors of the present act thought had been included. Until the court ruled otherwise, it was intended that the term "psychopathic personality" should embrace "sexual deviation." By using that precise medical term, the bill makes it plain that the Congress intends that aliens afflicted with that disgraceful disability be excluded from our shores.

In only one important particular does the present version of H.R. 2580 resemble the original version, and that resemblance is qualified. As originally introduced, the bill would have repealed the national origins system immediately. As now written, repeal is postponed for 3 years, and in the interval, unused quotas are made available to the nations with oversubscribed quotas. Since first enacted on May 26, 1924, the national origins system as a concept has been a focal point of national and international debate. Its purpose has been called worthy and unworthy. Whether the concept is sound or unsound, the purpose worthy or unworthy, debate is no longer relevant. The question is moot. The purpose has not been achieved. The national origins system has not maintained the ethnic ratios of the American population which prevailed in 1920. As early as 15 years ago, after the system had been in operation for only 25 years, there were as many aliens entering this country outside the quota system as inside it. For the last 3 years, for every immigrant entering under the quota system, there were two entering by other means, entirely within the law as amended by Congress from time to time.

Accordingly, to condemn this bill because it phases out the national origins system is to tilt at a windmill which has long since quit pumping water. It is less quixotic and avails more to aim our energies at another target. What we need to do is to fashion a substitute system which promotes family solidarity and fosters cultural and technological growth but which at the same time protects the national interest against a population surplus and a natural resources deficit. That is an altogether legitimate target, and the bill before us goes a long way in the direction of the target. It places a numerical ceiling of 170,000 on immigration from the Eastern Hemisphere. However, it falls short of the target because it places no ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

This is regrettable, not only because it ignores the imminent danger of a population surplus in the United States; it is regrettable because it works the injustice of inequality. It is no answer to say that the present law places no limit on the Western Hemisphere. That is simply to confess that there is injustice in the present law, and such a confession in no way argues that the injustice of inequality should be perpetuated. Indeed, the entire purpose of this legislation is to eliminate from our immigration laws discrimination based on geographical origin. So long as there is a numerical ceiling on the number of immigrants who will be admitted to the United States from the Eastern Hemisphere and no ceiling on the number of immigrants who will be admitted to the United States from the Western Hemisphere, this legislation will have failed in its stated purpose. Indeed, the discrimination will be threefold. In three ways, it will be easier for a man born in the Western Hemisphere to obtain an immigrant visa. First, he will not be subject to a hemisphere ceiling like the man born in the Eastern Hemisphere. Second, he will not be subject to a national ceiling like the man born in a nation in the Eastern Hemisphere. Third, he will not have to qualify in one of the preference categories like the man born in the Eastern Hemisphere. So, in the absence of the MacGregor amendment, this bill will still discriminate against people on account of their place of birth.

The MacGregor amendment, following the blueprint of the bill itself which fixes the ceiling for the 109 nations of the Eastern Hemisphere at 170,000, would impose a numerical ceiling of 115,000 immigrants for the 24 countries of the Western Hemisphere. Like the Eastern Hemisphere ceiling, this ceiling would not apply to the spouses, children, and parents of American citizens.

The first important thing to understand is that the MacGregor amendment is not numerically punitive. On the contrary, the ceiling it imposes is 4,000 higher than the average annual immigration from the Western Hemisphere in the last 10 years. Moreover, the two hemisphere ceilings jointly authorize a world total of 285,000. This total is greater than the annual average, exclusive of immediate relatives, for the last 3 years.

It is equally important to understand, however, that the MacGregor amendment recognizes the inescapable fact that, in the absence of a ceiling, Western Hemisphere immigration will expand at a dramatic pace in the immediate future. Modern history clearly reflects the trend. In the 5 years between 1955 and 1959, Western Hemisphere immigration averaged 97,713 per year. In the 5 years between 1960 and 1964, the annual average was 125,014—including spouses, children, and parents. This represents an increase of better than 25 percent. The increase is due principally to two factors, a dramatic population growth (attributable to higher birth rates and lower death rates) and a stagnation of the economy. By way of example, Brazil's population growth rate is currently estimated to be 3.6 percent compared with 1.6 percent in this country; her annual per capita income is only $129. Between 1933 and 1959, Brazil quadrupled the number of her schools. Yet today, only half the Brazilian children in the 7 to 14 year bracket are attending school and in the high school age bracket, the figure is only 6 percent.

Projections of population growth prepared by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations predicted an even greater expansion in the next 35 years. The 163 million population of Latin America and Mexico counted in 1950 will grow to 592 million by the year 2000. This represents an increase of 263.2 percent.

According to the same source, in addition to the absolute population increase, there will be a startling increase in the density of population. In tropical South America in 1950, there were 16 people per square mile; by the year 2000, the figure will be 59. In Central America, the increase will be from 36 to 143.

While the percentage population growth rate in the United States is only half that of Latin America, the numerical growth is substantial. In 1800, the daily increase was only 450; currently, U.S. population is growing by about 7,200 a day. This means that in 700 days, less than 2 years, we will have 5 million more people, pushing our population above the 200 million mark. According to the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, our current population growth rate requires the creation of a million new jobs a year. Today, over 70 percent of all Americans live in cities. Every demographer who appeared before the subcommittee testified that an even larger percentage of new immigrants settled in the large cities rather than the rural areas in America. Already plagued by perplexing problems of urban congestion such as shortages of jobs, housing, schools, medical facilities, water, et cetera, the United States can hardly be fairly condemned if we weigh the additional burdens an even larger population would impose.

I am not much impressed with the argument that the MacGregor amendment would embarrass the United States in her relations with her neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. What about our neighbors and allies in the Eastern Hemisphere? What is embarrassing about a policy of equal treatment for all members of the community of nations? And why should not such a policy, designed to take effect 3 years later, be established now while we are engaged in the omnibus task of reforming our immigration laws? Why postpone a chore we will some day most surely have to perform? And when that day comes, will not that chore, standing alone, be more difficult and more embarrassing to perform?

In summary, with the MacGregor amendment, H.R. 2580 will both improve our immigration laws and hold worldwide immigration approximately to its present level. Without the MacGregor amendment, it is absolutely impossible to predict how high the total tide of immigration might eventually rise. All nations and all fairminded men, East and

West, will applaud us if, by adopting the MacGregor amendment, we register our firm purpose to treat all men everywhere alike.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as many Members have pointed out to the House, this bill is a product of long hours of study, debate, and proper review by the Judiciary Committee and especially its Immigration Subcommittee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, MICHAEL FEIGHAN.

It should be pointed out that the ranking Republican member of the Immigration Subcommittee, Congressman ARCH MOORE, of West Virginia, was especially helpful in the major contributions which he made to this bill. Without the patience and persistance of Congressman MOORE, the bill which we are passing today might never have materialized.

Mr. Chairman, my grandparents were immigrants from Poland. As a matter of fact, my mother was an immigrant, having entered this country as an infant before her first birthday. I have worked closely with Americans who came to this country as immigrants and can bear witness to the progressive contributions they have made to the American scene. This is one of the many reasons why I feel this immigration bill is an overdue effort by Congress to give practical emphasis to once and for all solving the problems of our immigration processes.

It is a good bill and deserves the overwhelming support of the Members of the House.

The major contribution of the bill is the repeal of the national origins quota system which is archaic, discriminatory, and has become clearly unworkable. The bill instead sets up a very practical system of preferences in which the primary emphasis will be upon reuniting of families.

May I point out that it provides for a 3-year phaseout of the national origins system in which unused quota numbers will be reallocated to those countries with large registration backlogs. This is a very practical and fair process of adjustment.

Members who have struggled for years with private bills and other technical complications caused by the present immigration law must certainly appreciate the wisdom and practicality of this proposal before us. It is especially significant that this bill is being processed without any real opposition either in or outside the House, which dramatizes public acceptance of the practical nature of this new immigration law.

This bill, I emphasize, is very constructive and long overdue legislation and should be supported by the Members of the House.

It is my hope that the Senate will act with more than its usual dispatch and pass an immigration bill prior to congressional adjournment next month.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill but would suggest to the Members that they give every practical and fair consideration to the MacGregor amendment. I feel that the best course of action that the House could take this afternoon is to adopt the MacGregor amendment and then overwhelmingly give support to this bill—with perhaps a special message to the other body that we hope they would proceed faster than they normally do so that one of the accomplishments of this session of the Congress would be the final passage of an immigration bill.

Mr. Chairman, the details of the bill and now the details of the MacGregor amendment have been discussed I believe in a sufficient manner. I should like to remind the Members of some very unique developments in this legislative process. When I was elected to the Congress in 1958, I was advised by the senior statesmen of the House—"never get too upset over the legislation"—all legislation has its pros and cons and you always found people on one side or the other.

However, I was always told to beware of immigration legislation; that this would open up a Pandora's box, in that the most emotional and the most turbulent hours of debate in the House of Representatives would come if an immigration bill were brought to the floor.

Obviously, the atmosphere here is not emotional. Obviously, it is not turbulent. It is one of deep study and concentration on the technical and practical aspects of this bill.

I believe we all should give special commendation to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], for the very scholarly and practical manner in which they processed this bill through their subcommittee and through the full Committee on the Judiciary.

In this legislation we find sustained interest of the Members of the House in its very practical and proper features. I believe this is testimony to the effective bipartisanship and the scholarly, fair, and objective attitude which the two gentlemen I mentioned have produced in leading this bill to its present point.

I would hope that the debate on the MacGregor amendment will be conducted in the same scholarly and objective fashion we have witnessed to this point.

I feel in regard to this legislation that we in the House who have suffered occasional frustration over what we considered destructive legislation passed in this session can honestly support this bill and call it one of the most effective, objective, and proper actions in this session of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that this very important legislation has reached this stage. I feel its fairness and objectivity is visible to all. I hope we can improve the bill by adding the MacGregor amendment and then give it our overwhelming support.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, the Order Sons of Italy in America, whose membership roster sparkles with so many names of outstanding and distinguished Americans of Italian heritage, now meeting in convention has addressed to me the following wire, which I would like to read into the RECORD at this point:

BALTIMORE, MD.,
August 25, 1965.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

The Supreme Council, Order Sons of Italy in America, at its biennial convention, has unanimously passed the following resolution and urges your continued support of historic H.R. 2580:

"Whereas America in its true traditions as the land of the free has given haven for the oppressed against tyranny; and

"Whereas America judges man not by his color, creed, or religion nor by where he was born; and

"Whereas the national origins quota system which has shaped our country's immigration policy for more than four decades has been capricious and discriminatory; and

"Whereas many families have long endured hardships, inhuman separation of families by the discriminatory provisions in our immigration laws; and

"Whereas the present immigration laws violate the principles and great traditions upon which our country was founded and these laws impose indignities upon man; and

"Whereas this great Nation is the fusion of all diverse national stock which follows the divine plans of the Supreme Architect of the Universe: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this 89th Congress of the United States of America be urged to remove from this free and blessed land the inequities in the present immigration laws and enshrine by this noble deed in the hearts of all men the true American meaning that all men are created equal."

For the Supreme Council resolution committee:

MICHAEL A. RIVISTO,
Chairman,
Grand Venerable, Northwest States.
AMERICO V. CORTESE,
Grand Venerable, Pennsylvania.
GRACE GENCO,
Grand Venerable, Florida.
MODEST S. MELE,
Supreme Recording Secretary.
ANTHONY O. CALABRESE,
Assistant Supreme Venerable.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill, according to the committee report, page 8, and according to the author of the bill, is the elimination of the national origins system as the basis for the selection of immigrants to the United States.

If that were true, I would have no particular concern, although I am convinced the scrapping of our national origins system will be unfortunate for the future of our country. The system we have has worked well, has stood the test of time, and I think we should leave well enough alone.

My chief objection to this bill is that it very substantially increases the number of immigrants who will be admitted each year, and it shifts the mainstream of immigration from western and northern Europe—the principal source of our present population—to Africa, Asia, and the Orient.

Let us first discuss the numbers. In round figures, we are now admitting 300,000 new immigrants each year to this

country, including quota and nonquota. The annual quota for European countries is, roughly, 158,000 per year. But only about 100,000 of this number come in each year. Under the Celler bill, now being debated, instead of 100,000 being admitted, there will be a total of 170,000—an increase of approximately 70,000 annually. Added to that are parents, spouses, and unmarried minor children of citizens.

In addition to the 70,000 who will be admitted under this bill, there will be immigrants from Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago, numbering several thousand per year.

The Celler bill repeals the Asia-Pacific-triangle provision, now a part of our Immigration and Nationality Act. This is of grave concern to me. That provision requires quota chargeability on the basis of racial ancestry, and has traditionally been very useful and effective in curbing the great pressures for more immigrants to be admitted from the more overpopulated areas of the world. The so-called triangle includes more than one-half of all the people of the earth.

By repealing the triangle, the Celler bill will admit as many as 20,000 a year from each of those countries that now have an annual quota of 100. Those countries include Japan, China, Pakistan, Ceylon, Iraq, Iran, the Congo, Kenya Colony, Liberia, Ethiopia, and every other nation in the world outside the Western Hemisphere.

Thus, we will decide here today whether we want to undertake a major shift in the makeup of our main immigration stream from western and northern Europe, to Asia, Africa, and the Orient. At the same time we will decide whether we want to increase the net total of immigrants to this country by some 100,000 or more each year.

The elimination of the national origins quota system, as proposed here, would do much more than change the cultural pattern of our immigration—serious as this would be. It would have a direct effect on the numbers of people who would be pouring in from nonquota countries. When the Asia-Pacific-triangle provision is removed, and place of birth as a criterion in making a quota charge is eliminated, the nonquota countries of the Western Hemisphere will then become simply way stations in an ever-increasing migration to the United States from the overpopulated countries of Asia and the orient. In the future this will undoubtedly bring about the admission to this country of tens of thousands of people from the Far East and Asia. I understand, for example, there are more than half a million Chinese now living in South America, many of whom will be made eligible for admission to this country if the Celler bill is enacted.

Mr. Chairman, there is a serious security threat which would result in the expected substantial increase in Asiatic migration to these shores. At the present time, the flow of Asiatics to this country is checked by the simple device of quota limitation to which all Asiatics are chargeable. With a substantial increase in immigration of Asiatics, coming not only from the Orient, but from every country in which they reside, the problem of procuring background information to screen out subversives becomes increasingly difficult. Moreover, most of the background information regarding Communist activities would be located in oriental Communist countries; and hence unavailable to our security officials. Furthermore, the language barriers, with the many dialects unfamiliar to our immigration officers, would only compound the danger inherent in an attempt to screen out security threats; and I have no doubt that the international Communist conspiracy will avail itself of the opportunity to increase its penetration of our country. The passage of this bill will present an inviting opportunity.

It has been argued that because some European countries now have a larger annual quota than others, this country regards the people of the larger quota nations as being better people than those in countries with the lower quotas. That is a ridiculous argument. Immigration laws, like trade laws and the like, come under the normal exercise of sovereign power. Under our present law, and under the Celler bill, we make 10 Argentines, for example, admissible, where only 1 Italian may be admitted. Does that mean that the author of this bill, which perpetuates that provision in the law, regards an Argentine as being 10 times as good as an Italian? Of course not. Such an argument is utter nonsense and is without logic. It has no place in this debate.

Mr. Chairman, never let it be said that this country is not generous in its immigration policies. Each year, for 175 years, the United States has admitted more immigrants than any other nation in the world. We have admitted nearly 5 million since World War II. No other nation can match that. Yet there are those who would open even wider the gates and allow greater numbers to enter. That will be the case if this bill is enacted.

This Nation, and the whole world, is becoming overpopulated. The United States now has 195 million people. Our current birth rate is more than twice our death rate. Even without this liberal immigration law that is here proposed, we are due to have 240 million people in this country by 1980. Our neighbor to the south, Mexico, is due to double its present 38 million in about 20 years. That same growth rate is characteristic of all of Latin America. In an attempt to stem the tide, nations everywhere are pushing birth control measures.

It is high time we remove this immigration issue from the realm of politics and treat it as one of the most serious domestic issues with which we are confronted today.

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

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. May I say to the gentleman that I appreciate very much the observation he has made in this area. This is not the way we have constructed this bill. The limitation of immigration is still controlled by the country of birth. The overpopulated areas cannot transfer their residence from another hemisphere to the Western Hemisphere and use it as a way station, sir, and come in, because they must still fit into the overall limitation upon that nation of their birth.

So I say respectfully that the gentleman is not quite accurate in saying—although I appreciate his concern—that the Western Hemisphere by reason of its being a nonquota area would be a way station for overpopulated areas of the world. It is not so today. We are preserving those provisions in existing law so that they are applicable to H.R. 2580 as amended.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman agree with me that there are considerable numbers of people now living in the Western Hemisphere who are not admissible to this country under present law who would become admissible by the passage of this bill?

Mr. MOORE. I would have to disagree with the gentleman and say that my study would indicate, "no." Let us take the instance of a Chinese, a first-generation Chinese born in South America who would now under the proposed bill be eligible to come in. In that particular instance I would agree with the gentleman. But beyond that there is not going to be this great influx because these individuals are still chargeable to the nations of the world where they were born.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] has expired.

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

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I see the gentleman's point, but it is my understanding that there are about half a million Chinese living in the Western Hemisphere, many of whom would like to come into this country if they could, but who are prohibited now from doing so because of the triangle provision. The passage of this bill would remove that limitation and permit them to come in if they could otherwise qualify.

Mr. MOORE. Only if they were born in this hemisphere, not having migrated there.

Mr. FISHER. I am speaking of those who were born in this hemisphere, who are not eligible to enter now. I understand there is a very substantial number of them who would like to come in but who are kept out and who will be kept out unless this bill is enacted.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to say, with all due respect, that while I appreciate the gentleman's position, I do not have the same fear that he has of the Western Hemisphere becoming a way station for that kind of immigrant.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I should hope the committee would give further study, if the occasion arises, to that potentiality that I have referred to, because the information I have is that there are more than half a million Chinese, for example, as long as they have been mentioned, who live in the Western Hemisphere who are not eligible to come in now but who will be eligible to come in once the triangle provision is repealed.

We cannot treat this issue lightly. I think undoubtedly it will mean that a very large number of people will be eligible to come in who are now not permitted because of the prohibition in the triangle provision. I have examined the hearings and I fail to find any testimony with respect to the number of people now living in the Western Hemisphere, who are now ineligible for admission to this country because they were born in one of the countries included in the Asia-Pacific triangle, who would become eligible for admission the moment the triangle is repealed. The record is silent with respect to how many would become eligible for admission, now living in the Western Hemisphere, but who will become eligible with the passage of this bill. To be conservative about it, there must be many thousands of them. I am afraid the committee, in its hearings, failed to reveal the magnitude of that source of new immigrants.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I repeat that the passage of this bill will result in the admission to this country of approximately 100,000 additional immigrants each year. That fact is documented. It is a matter of record. It cannot and will not be disputed.

Moreover, the Members who vote for this bill must know that by its passage they are voting to shift the mainstream of our immigrants in the future from western and northern Europe, to Africa, Asia, and the Far East. If that is what you want, well and good. But you should know what you are voting for when you approve the passage of this measure.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary but have long researched, studied, and even on occasion debated this question of immigration. Today in this vast audience of "filled seats" in the Chamber, as so often, passion enters into the colloquy and debate on immigration policy, we are reminded oftentimes that America is the "melting pot" of the world, that present immigration policy under the Walter-McCarran Act runs counter to our heritage.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that at one time and place in our history we were indeed a "melting pot," but that time and place have changed, and to adopt this legislation would not be advancing into the 20th century but rather would be retreating a bit into the 19th century when our needs were far different.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we had a wilderness to conquer, "savages" to be subdued by we immigrants, laws to be established, and land to be cultivated. Our task was to bring civilization to America. Immigration had to play a major part in this development. Immigration policy has always been geared to our own national interests. This is as it should be. But our national interest now is not the same as it was a few decades ago.

Mr. Chairman, from the "melting pot" which we certainly were, and had to be, has come an American culture, a culture no less unique than that of any other established nation in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind you that we are the oldest constitutional republic in the history of known man. Persons from many nations and many nationalities and many ethnic groups all contribute to this culture. But it is also important to recognize that as they have changed America, so has America changed them. The result is a nation which in combining the best of each ethnic group has, in effect, like a great, fine hybrid, surpassed each predecessor, and has provided a standard of living that surpasses that of any country from which all our forebears once immigrated.

Mr. Chairman, the question that must be answered today, it seems to me, is, will our national interests be advanced by the emasculation of a new immigration policy which has served us so well, even though it is imperfect, or will it, instead, create new problems for a nation that is only now beginning to accept, that even in a land of plenty, we have problems of poverty, problems of unemployment, and of racial conflict?

Mr. Chairman, will a drastic change in immigration policy contribute to or aggravate those problems That is the question. Surely it is all too obvious that it will compound our efforts to reduce poverty, to provide jobs for the unemployed, and to reduce minority tensions.

Mr. Chairman, let us not lose sight of the fact that under the present McCarran-Walter type of immigration law, the United States is the most generous of all nations in its immigration policy. It not only admits about 200,000 more newcomers a year than any other country in the world, but it is one of the few countries on earth that excludes no nation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is said that the main thrust of this bill will be to establish skills rather than the country of origin as the basis for immigration. Now, presumably, those skills will be of little use unless there are vacant jobs to utilize them.

Mr. Chairman, with an unemployment rate vacillating from month to month around 5 percent, we are spending billions of dollars in taxpayers' money at the present time under a host of Federal programs to provide the unemployed with new skills that will qualify them for jobs, whether they will relocate to the place of opportunity or not.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, by this legislation, we put the same persons we are now training into competition with the very people we propose to come here. Does this make sense? Only if we assume we will then have to untrain our present unemployed and put them back on the dole.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is still another contradiction. We have just authorized $3.3 billion for our foreign aid program whose stated objective is to help our foreign friends help themselves. We have sent Peace Corps personnel to the four corners of the world.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HALL. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have sent Peace Corps personnel to the four corners of the world to teach new skills and modern scientific techniques in the underdeveloped nations which are literally starving for trained workers. Are we now to establish a program which will literally skim the cream off the very countries that desperately need new skills to emerge from the dark ages?

Mr. Chairman, does it make sense at all to spend billions bringing new skills to the underdeveloped nations and at the same time initiating a new immigration policy that will draw the same skills from nations which need them far worse than we do? I say it does not.

Mr. Chairman, in every major metropolis in the United States urbanization and the population explosion have created problems which no major city in this country has been able to solve. We have no better example of this than the insurrection which took place 2 weeks ago in the city of Los Angeles. We have seen the failure to solve these problems in Harlem, in Philadelphia, in Rochester, in Springfield, Mass., in Selma, in Birmingham, and in varying degrees in a hundred other cities. The problem is not one of minorities alone. It is one of too few jobs, of too few skills, of too little housing, of insufficient classrooms. It has led some of our so-called leaders to practically advocate insurrection, or at least government by man, not laws.

We have problems of polluted water and insufficient water, of crowded highways and impossible traffic jams, these and a thousand others. These are problems which have projected us into a race against time, a race in which we have to run faster just to stay where we are, a race in which our own birth rate and population explosion, exclusive of new immigration, are straining our own technology and resources. Let all nations prescribe appropriately and treat the basic disease, not ask us to smother ourselves in relieving, on a temporary basis, their national symptoms.

It is almost fascinating to see the manner in which we can place so much stress on problems that are partially caused by the population explosion, and then switch gears with hardly a murmur, and stress an opposite problem, to say nothing of finding an opposite solution.

Let me state still another contradiction. We have just enacted the most far-reaching medical legislation in a century, to provide Government medical and hospital care for all persons over age 65. Every medical expert in the country, both proponent and opponent of the measure, admits that this will create a new strain on our medical facilities. We know full well that under this bill's preference clause for close relations many persons over age 65 will be among the new immigrants who will come. Each and every one will be entitled to Government medical care, thus adding to the strain on our hospital and nursing home facilities, to say naught of our own "abuse" factors.

Mr. Chairman, if we could eliminate political pressures and efforts to rally support from various pressure groups, this bill could not be passed. But surely we do not have to wipe out a good law just to prove our good intentions. We

need respect based on responsibility—not an image of fawning and supplication. The United States need apologize to no country for our present law. It is fair, it is humane, and it compares favorably with the immigration policy of any nation in the world.

Look at a few samples. Australia, which has thousands of square miles of unsettled land, prohibits all nonwhites. Switzerland permits no immigrants. Argentina and Venezuela both exclude nonwhite immigrants. Some countries in Central America permit no Asiatics or Middle Easterners. Jordan and Morocco permit only those who know Arabic. Israel permits only Jews, Mr. Chairman. Liberia permits no immigrants who are not of Negro descent. Japan permits no immigrants at all. The U.S.S.R. permits no immigrants except by special arrangements. The United Kingdom has recently raised bars to its own colonial Negroes of the Caribbean areas. Yet we eliminate all. Wherefore goes consistency?

The present law is more liberal than that of any other nation. We need not apologize for it. We should not repeal it, and I for one will not be a party to its demise. I hope others will follow suit.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the members of the subcommittee and the full committee for reporting out this legislation. With some amendments that I hope will be adopted when this bill is read for amendment, under the 5-minute rule it will be the kind of bill the vast majority of the Members of this House can support.

I want to raise one question, however, particularly in view of the emphasis that this bill very properly puts on the importance of reuniting families and the preference it gives to persons in that category.

There is one category which I believe is not reached by any of the changes in our immigration laws as proposed in this legislation. That is the foreign exchange student who comes here under a student visa under one of our exchange programs and then falls in love and marries an American citizen. Then a child is born. Then after the expiration of the student visa, he is told by our Government, "You have to go back to your homeland—you have to go abroad and live abroad for 2 years until you can return to join your spouse and child and so that you can acquire citizenship under the laws of this country."

I have a case identical to the one I have just described in my office at the present time, and I am sure that many of my colleagues here on the floor of the House today could come up with similar situations. They know of the hardship that is involved in such cases. It disturbs me that there is no provision either in present law or in this bill that we are debating today which would provide that the Secretary of State should take into consideration facts such as I have just outlined and grant an exemption from the requirement of 2 years' residence abroad before return on an immigrant's visa.

I would like to take this opportunity to ask the gentleman from West Virginia, the ranking minority member of the Immigration Subcommittee if he knows of any plans on the part of his subcommittee to deal with this particular problem.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. May I say that the question the gentleman from Illinois poses is one of the most serious problems that our subcommittee has been wrestling with for a long time past—as to how we are going to deal with this question of the exchange student. May I say to the gentleman, there is nothing in the bill that deals with this subject. The matter is so complex that we intend as a subcommittee to go into it in the very, very near future. To the extent that I can as ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I represent to you that also is the intention of the subcommittee chairman—to go into this and take a very thorough look at this question of exchange students.

What our problem here is—these students have entered into a contract themselves, that is the foreign student who desires to come here to further his education and add to his education. At the time he gets the visa which gives him the right to enter the United States, he then commits himself contractually to go back and perform services for his own country. We are in the position here of giving attention to the problem that the gentleman raises. If the gentleman's proposal is adopted we are in a position of practically terminating unilaterally this contract without giving any consideration to the requirement that this man go back to the country from which he came and put his education to work, which is the general thesis and objective of this whole program.

May I say to the gentleman, there are thousands of students, some of them that this country needs very badly, in this particular category. But rather than treat this matter legislatively, now we intend to go into it as thoroughly as possible and suggest now some additional administrative approaches to the problem.

May I say further to the gentleman, there is a procedure in present law for hardship cases to be forgiven.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. But the Secretary of State does not consider the fact of marriage alone or the fact that a child has been born to be the kind of hardship that will produce a waiver of this requirement of going back and residing 2 years abroad before becoming eligible for an immigrant visa.

Mr. MOORE. You are correct, sir. The Secretary of State will not consider that fact standing alone as a basis for such a waiver for the simple reason that just as soon as a foreign exchange student comes to the United States, the first thing he does is to buy his books and the next thing he does is look for an American wife. This is where the problem has been. I would say to the gentleman that 95 percent of the exchange students in this country are in the category that the gentleman speaks of—married and having an American-born child.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The case that I brought to the attention of the committee in my remarks a few minutes ago definitely does not represent one of those in the category where the person came to this country seeking a spouse. I can testify to that from my personal knowledge. I see the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]. I wonder if he could give us some assurance that the subcommittee will hold some hearings on this problem and consider the bill that I have introduced to deal with this kind of problem.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Very definitely, we intend to go into that as expeditiously as possible. We have been consuming our time of course to a great extent on the bill presently under consideration, but the gentleman can be assured that we will take that up before this session of the Congress adjourns.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I came to the floor of the House today prepared to offer an amendment to the present section 212(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, setting forth some additional requirements for the Secretary of State to take into consideration, in respect to the kind of situation I have described.

With these assurances from the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, I am sure the subcommittee will hold hearings and give this matter consideration.

Mr. FEIGHAN. We will be happy to have the gentleman appear before the subcommittee.

Mr. CHELF. If the gentleman will yield, since I am also a member of the subcommittee, I assure the gentleman likewise we will do all within our power on this problem. This is one of the toughest problems we have ever faced. We have put our hearts and souls into it, trying to find an answer. We are seeking an answer, but I hope the gentleman will believe me when I say it is not easy.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I take these few minutes to express my conviction that this is good legislation. It may not go as far as some would in liberalizing the restrictive covenants we have had based upon quotas, which were based upon unreal ethnic qualifications. However, at times problems have come up, and will come up again, on the basis of whether or not this Nation at this stage in its history can have a complete open door such as it had in the 1880's and the 1890's, up to about 1910, when we were seeking immigrants to this country in order that we could develop our mills, our mines, and our shops, and build our railroads and other facilities.

Too many times when we talk about contributions to America we talk about those contributions which can be seen

because of artistic value or because of what has been contributed to the cultural life of this Nation. But the real contribution that has been made was made by the sweat of the brows and the bending of the backs of millions of those who came from where my father and mother came, from middle Europe, from Italy, who contributed the sweat that made this country what it is.

At that time we needed their sweat, and today we do not need it, because we have within our confines today a great deal of unemployment that cannot be wished away.

So the committee, in its judgment, has tried to write a law which will still hold out to those who are oppressed, to those who are disfranchised all over the world, the hope that they can find a haven within our midst in this liberal Nation which has given so much to so many, and yet has written into the law a sort of restrictive covenant, to protect those within the Nation against the loss of job opportunities.

The committee also has written into the law an understanding to people all over the world that we, too, are reaching the point of saturation in our ability to provide a livelihood for all peoples of the earth who are disfranchised.

We have opened up a very important phase in which we have recognized that with all the trade relations we have tried to achieve all over the world there can be no free-trade doctrine worldwide unless there is free migration and free emigration of people. Without the free movement of people there cannot be a free movement of goods. That is historical. We are beginning to find it out.

While we have spent billions of dollars trying to build friendships, we have closed the door on so many people, especially the Orientals, that these people have not reached the point of accepting that which we have tried to hold out as a friendly hand, because we hold out an open hand in trade and close our hand on persons.

I say that immigration itself is a form of trade. You should remember one thing: I would rather see people come into the United States than the products of people whom we refuse the right to come into the United States. Economically, that is unsound.

In support of my position, I would like to repeat for the RECORD an article from the Redondo Beach, Calif., South Bay Breeze, showing the impact of imports upon the U.S. job economy:

[From the Redondo Beach (Calif.) South Bay Breeze, July 29, 1965]

AID COMES HOME TO ROOST

Problems of international involvement are not confined to diplomatic areas. They get into trade, too.

According to a report by the National Federation of Independent Business, the organization with the largest individual membership of any business organization in the United States, our own producers are suffering because foreign manufacturers are selling their goods in the United States at lower prices than in other nations.

This is "dumping," which is contrary to even the lax regulations of tariffs under reciprocal trade treaties. Under these treaties, Congress no longer handles the adjustment of tariffs; this job has been pretty well centered in the State Department.

Using America as a dumping ground for surplus goods is specifically forbidden, however. Yet through some quirk of bureaucratic entanglement, responsibility for investigating complaints is held not by the State Department, but by the Treasury Department. And the Treasury has been taking from a year to a year and a half to investigate any complaints which it decides to recognize. By this time, any threatened damage is pretty well done.

What happens is this: foreign manufacturers may go into operation, in many cases with American aid or financing, and find that mass production methods turn out more goods than European markets can absorb. They refuse to cut prices in their basic European market, so turn to the United States. These surplus goods are "dumped" here, disrupting both domestic manufacturers and doing away with domestic jobs.

The textile situation is one of the worst examples. Foreign mills receive a subsidized price on the purchase of raw American cotton, not available to domestic manufacturers. When foreign mills have a surplus which they cannot sell in their established markets at their price, they are perfectly willing to take advantage of this subsidy, plus their lower labor costs, to undercut the American textile industry.

Under past and present practice, the surplus goods are "dumped" and gone before the Treasury Department gets around to making an investigation. And the American manufacturer, who may be hurting, is helpless.

In this, as in so many other ways, our dollar benevolence comes back to haunt us.

[From the Willoughby (Ohio) News Herald, July 30, 1965]

BITING THE HAND

While the trite bromide as to whether man or canine bites make news has long been considered the classic example of the impossible, perhaps a new standard has been developed.

This has been achieved by the Nation's independent businessman asking the U.S. Treasury to speed up its investigations.

However, the accelerated investigations are not requested of themselves, but of foreign businessmen.

In a poll, just completed by the National Federation of Independent Business, a majority of 76 percent of the independent business respondents voted in favor of H.R. 301.

The bill would require the Treasury Department to complete its investigations within 180 days of complaints that foreign producers are selling goods at lower prices in the United States than in other nations.

Only 17 percent voted against the bill, with 7 percent undecided.

This bill is the current attempt to at least develop a modicum of protection out of the U.S. system of protective tariffs.

For many years the Congress, either by direct action by authority granted to it by the Constitution, or by its agent, the Tariff Commission, handled the adjustments of tariffs.

About 30 years ago, when the first reciprocal trade treaty was enacted, the tariff-making provisions were largely transferred to the State Department.

The situation has been further aggravated by adoption of mass production methods by foreign manufacturers.

They are finding that after the jigs and dies have been produced for a mass production run, it is necessary to complete the run to amortize costs of tooling up.

However, they often find sales do not meet the production estimates on which the tooling was predicated, and hence, in order to recover their cost it is necessary to dump the excess goods into some other market.

They are reluctant to cut prices in their regular established markets, especially European ones, as they fear setting a price precedent which would be hard to overcome.

Therefore, the population and the buying power of the American market presents an attractive market for dumping such surplus goods, which in turn disrupts both domestic manufacturers as well as domestic jobs.

This situation seems to be especially bad in the textile industry.

Foreign mills receive a subsidized price on the purchase of raw American cotton, not available to domestic manufacturers. Then when the foreign mills have a surplus which they cannot sell in their established markets at the profitable levels that they wish to maintain, they are perfectly able to take advantage of this subsidy as well as their much lower labor costs, to create havoc in the American textile industry.

Any manufacturer in this country is helpless to alleviate this damage or damages of this type, until the Treasury Department does complete its investigation.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I would favor the immigration of foreign workers into the United States rather than the exportation of the products of foreign workers into the United States.

When we limit the number of immigrants we do so because of the lack of jobs and income producing opportunities for the immigrants.

How can we justify our position in doing this while at the same time the potential and willing foreigner is allowed to produce the goods and export them to the United States while being barred personally.

Free trade cannot be justified in a world that bars the free movement of peoples.

When we had the great migrations to the United States of millions of the peoples of other lands, it was to produce the needs of our growing economy. That need is disappearing.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to state that the major provisions and objectives of the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], are incorporated in H.R. 2580 as amended.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to express myself as in support of this legislation and to express my opinion that this is a great improvement over existing law. We have heard some criticisms of the legislation this afternoon. These criticisms have gone all the way from suggesting that we should not have any ceiling insofar as immigration from any part of the world is concerned up to the point where some have said that we should restrict immigration more than we do even at the present time.

I certainly feel this bill in promoting quality immigrants for our country is doing something very much worthwhile. It is encouraging to realize that those who are scientists and members of the professions and people who can benefit our Nation with their skills, and who want to come to this country will be

welcomed here, and will promote our own national interest as well as in their interest.

It also is very important for us as Americans to support this legislation which will enable American families to be reunited with other members of their families who are here in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the minority additional views with some hesitation, I hesitated particularly because the Secretary of State testified in the committee in opposition to placing any ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration. However, I do not think the mere fact that he presented his testimony bars this Congress from defining and setting forth immigration policy. We are setting forth policy with regard to the establishment of a ceiling on the rest of the world, and it seems to me that we should set a similar policy with regard to the Western Hemisphere as well. I question seriously that it is the best thing insofar as our foreign relations and our diplomacy is concerned to shove this issue aside and say that we are going to look at this question next year or the year after or wait for a message from the President to the effect that a 10-percent increase in immigration has occurred from the Western Hemisphere over that which we had during the past 5 years. It seems to me from the standpoint of good international relations that it would be well for us in enacting a comprehensive revision of our immigration laws and of our immigration policy to decide this issue here and now.

It has been suggested that perhaps the administration of this law can take care of the increased immigration from South and Central America. I am opposed to any such policy that would relinquish our legislative responsibility in favor of a policy of administrative slow-down to be handled by the consular officers and other persons. That is a responsibility which we have as Members of Congress.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. McCLORY. I am happy to yield to my friend, the ranking minority member of the Committee.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Is not what you are saying to the Committee that the Government, the Congress, giveth with one hand and taketh away with the other?

Mr. McCLORY. I certainly am. I thank the gentleman and state further that it is important for us to consider carefully the demographic studies to which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], referred. These studies establish that the population increase in Central and South America is the greatest of any area in the world. If we are going to continue unlimited immigration from Central and South America, are we then encouraging a great population explosion down there? Are we not inviting them to say, here is a place for the excess population to go? How misleading can we be to them?

It seems to me by suggesting that we defer this issue to a later date we are making problems for ourselves in the future and for our Western Hemisphere friends as well. By failing to act today we will be undecisive with respect to an issue on which we should be decisive. We should let our friends in the Western Hemisphere know what our policy is going to be in the future so that they can plan accordingly.

The MacGregor amendment would be fair and equitable to all the peoples of the world, and I encourage support of it.

Speaking of diplomacy and good foreign relations, we have good foreign relations with the nations of Western Europe, and yet we are not afraid to set a ceiling on Western Europe, combined with Asiatic immigration. Why should we be timid about doing it with respect to the Western Hemisphere? Are we favoring some of our friends over others? It does not seem to me that that is wise policy or wise foreign relations. It seems to me further that we have the responsibility and that the welfare of our Nation is involved in this decision which we are asked to make. We should make the decision courageously and decisively so that all may know what our immigration policy is and so that all our friends around the world may know that they are equal friends, friends of equal status and not first- and second-class friends.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS].

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2580 and to express my conviction that our Nation must reexamine, reevaluate, and revise its standards for admission of aliens to this country. The existing law which discriminates needlessly against many who wish to settle here and bring us great contributions is repugnant to our national traditions, for it is founded on an erroneous concept of racial and national inequality or relative desirability. We must learn to judge each individual by his own worth and by the value he can bring to our Nation.

It is time that we, as a Nation, realize that our present immigration policy hurts no one but ourselves and represents a real danger to our future. For a multitude of reasons, the new immigration policy will benefit our Nation in its economic growth. In abolishing the national origins quota system, more people who possess valuable skills will be able to come in from countries which previously had a very small or no quota allotment. Of the people who will enter the working force, the great majority will be in the most productive stage of life.

The economic impact of the increased immigration will be slight. Revision of the law will eliminate racial and national discrimination. We cannot deal equally with other nations until we accept their individual citizens on a basis of equality. Not until then will our great country be able to accept its rightful place as a leader of the free and democratic nations of the world.

Americanism has too long been equated with conformity. We must learn to take pride in the cultural diversity which is fundamental to our history. Today, as we strive to eliminate discrimination within our borders, we will not—we must not—tolerate legalistic bigotry in our immigration policy.

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Judiciary Committee for the work it has done in studying and strengthening the immigration bill before us today. The bipartisan work of that committee represents a signal achievement in an historic effort to bring justice, sympathy and understanding to those who yearn to share the hope that is America.

I heartily commend the subcommittee chairman, the able and highly respected gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], for his outstanding work in this field. It has been a painstaking, complex and difficult subject, and we are greatly indebted to him for his superb leadership.

And those of us who have staunchly advocated a revision of the immigration law to remove its glaring inequities and blatant discrimination are grateful indeed to the subcommittee's ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], for his brilliant work, for the time, energy and effort he has devoted to the shaping of this legislation. Few men in this or any other Congress, understand more the details, the scope and the ramifications of immigration policy than the gentleman from West Virginia. I compliment him most enthusiastically.

I also want to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York, the able and beloved chairman of the full committee [Mr. CELLER], who has devoted so many years to the cause of immigration reform. No one has been a more vocal critic of existing policy, nor a more effective spokesman throughout the years for equity and justice in our policy. I know how gratified and proud he must feel to see this bill before us today, and to see his long efforts and hopes come closer to realization.

The national origin quota system, which this bill abolishes, has long been a source of great distress to me. The practice of determining a man's eligibility for immigration on the basis of his place of birth, or in some cases that of his ancestors, has always appeared to me to be clearly at variance with the American principles we cherish. The present outrageously discriminatory policy makes second class nationalities of many of the world's people. Our immigration policy must dovetail with our foreign policy, if we expect to be successful in leading the free world. At this time, when we are trying to demonstrate the nobility of our cause to the peoples of eastern and southern Europe, it is unconscionable to open our door to others and close it to them.

In my many years of public life, it has always been my experience that Americans are concerned with a man's merit and personal integrity, and not with his ethnic background or racial stock. And to the extent that we perpetuate and advance these American values, our Nation and its high ideals

will prosper. We are not a stagnant people, nor a nation stuck in its ways. Ours is a dynamic and ever-progressing society, always receptive to fresh insights and new ideas, while at the same time, preserving those principles which have made our Nation great.

I think it is fitting, in this regard, to note that two characteristics of the American people are a high regard for excellence of achievement, and an all-embracing human warmth, evidenced by a sensitivity to the difficulties and aspirations of others. Both of these values are indelibly and unambiguously written into the bill before us today, for in abolishing the national origins quota system new standards emerge. The objectives of these criteria are: to alleviate the anxiety and misery of separated families; to bring to this country professionals and workers with needed skills; and to give haven to those suffering the stings of racial, religious, and political persecution.

I was privileged to cosponsor the original bill introduced at the beginning of this session, and honored to testify on its behalf when the bill was being considered by the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration. And today, I am very proud indeed to support this just and thoughtful legislation.

If we may reflect at this historic moment on a tragic aspect of our immigration history, we recall the era of the 1930's and early 1940's when many victims of Nazi murder camps were denied admission to the United States. They were barred because of the discriminatory national origins quota system which we are now, finally, repudiating in the proposed bill. Had such legislation as the pending bill been adopted 30 years ago or 25 years ago, many valuable new citizens might today be making a contribution to our Nation rather than lying buried in mass graves in Europe at the grim sites of the Nazi death camps.

This bill abolishes the national origins quota system over a 3-year period to permit a smooth transition to the new universal system under which, preferences are based on family ties in the United States, and professional skills.

Until the national quota system is removed, unused quotas will be transferred to the heavily oversubscribed countries, thus allowing for a gradual increase in immigrants from countries that were discriminated against in the past. A yearly limitation of 17,000 is established, with no more than 20,000 immigrants a year coming from any one foreign state, excluding any quota for special immigrants from the Western Hemisphere and immediate relatives of U.S. citizens. The various preference quotas will be filled on a first-come first-serve basis. Within this numerical limitation of 170,000 is a quota for about 10,000 refugees who have been persecuted because of their race, religion, or opposition to communism and other totalitarian beliefs.

This bill upholds our belief in family life and gives automatic preference to immediate relatives, meaning parents, husbands and wives, and unmarried minor children of U.S. citizens, without regard to the numerical limitations. Strong preference is also given to other close relations.

When all America was a frontier, we found ourselves asking each other not "Who are you?" or "Where did you come from?" but "What can you do?" And this regard for ability, not nobility, has served us well. It is most appropriate, therefore, that certain preferences for an immigration visa be accorded a person who, because of his ability in the professions, arts, or sciences, can benefit the economy, welfare, and culture of the United States. Also, any laborer whose skill in performing his craft, for which there is a shortage within the United States, may receive preferential treatment.

I would like to point out that, under the present law, the Secretary of Labor has the responsibility of excluding any immigrant who might displace an American laborer. Under this bill, however, the prospective immigrant-worker must himself demonstrate to the Secretary of Labor that he will not take another's job before he can receive the clearance necessary for obtaining a visa. This provision will serve to maintain our high standards of wages and working conditions and protect our economy from unemployment.

I also hasten to point out to my colleagues that enactment of this bill will not result in a substantial increase in the annual number of immigrants. The estimated increase in authorized quotas is only 2,000 per year above the present level.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask all my colleagues to join in supporting this vital and historic legislation which corrects the glaring inequities and blatant discrimination that exists in our present law. This bill will stand for decades as a beacon and a source of hope to those whose only chance for a better life lies with the promise of America.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 2580, and to say a word of commendation for the outstanding work of the members of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and, particularly for the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE]. I also wish to say during the time I have been in Congress I have found that the members of this subcommittee have been very much interested in the problems that immigrants have faced. In every instance they have tried as best they could to eliminate inequities. This is an area full of technical problems. Their job has required patience, understanding, time and a complete knowledge of these difficult areas.

Mr. Chairman, I support the pending legislation to modernize this Nation's immigration laws. Action of this kind, I believe, is long overdue in order to base the entrance of qualified people on a more equitable foundation.

Many of my colleagues are aware of the steps I have taken in behalf of bills that would reform immigration policies and procedures. The emphasis of my activity has been to more fairly distribute among the countries of the world the numerical limitations on U.S. immigration.

In the last Congress and again in this current Congress, I joined with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] in sponsoring a bill to accomplish this purpose. Twice we went before the Immigration Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary to urge action on our proposal.

The bill now before us, while not word-for-word alined with my bill, does accomplish to my satisfaction the kind of improvement I feel is so necessary. Therefore, I can and will cast my vote for it.

Because there have been some inaccuracies reported to the public on the contents of this immigration bill, I think we have a special obligation to our constituents to make plain precisely what is proposed. To that end, I have called attention to the provisions of H.R. 2580 in my weekly broadcast commentaries. And in that regard, Mr. Chairman, I ask that there be included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD three releases from my office:

TEXT OF REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY ON WROC–TV, CHANNEL 8, ROCHESTER, N.Y., IN THE NEWS PROGRAMS OF TOM DECKER ON FRIDAY, AUGUST 20, 1965

Thanks, Tom.

I know many of my constituents are aware I have been working for some time to reform America's immigration law. Its very age—there has been no basic change since 1924—keeps it from being a practical policy for entrance into the United States in the 1960's.

Both in the last Congress and again this year, I introduced legislation to overhaul the immigration formula. I also testified twice in committee.

My bill would reflect actual immigration figures rather than the national origins of the United States population in 1920. It also would help end personal hardships and reunite families. Another important provision would give preference to those with skills needed in our country, but would not admit any immigrant whose employment would displace an American citizen.

Tom, I am pleased to report that a bill containing many of these proposals will be considered by the House early next week. Because it protects mental, moral, health, economic and security requirements and because it will have renewed meaning for those anxious to become partners in the American dream, I think we can expect a winning margin for modernized immigration legislation.

TEXT OF REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY ON WOKR, CHANNEL 13, ROCHESTER, N.Y., ON OR AFTER FRIDAY, AUGUST 27, 1965

This is your Congressman, FRANK HORTON.

The most significant reform of our Nation's immigration laws in more than 40 years came considerably closer to enactment recently. The House of Representatives passed and sent the Senate landmark legislation to eliminate the national origins quota system and set general priorities for immigrants to the United States.

I voted for the immigration improvement bill, and during the debate in the House I urged my colleagues to support it. For some time I have been working with a number of other Congressmen to bring these laws up to date. We, therefore, were pleased that our

efforts helped to produce the major margin of victory for the bill.

It is important to stress, because there have been some inaccurate descriptions of this bill, what this immigration legislation proposes, in other words, what it will and what it won't do.

Principally, it does away with arbitrary quotas that are based on where a person was born. But, it still sets a numerical limitation on the total number of immigrants permitted in any one year, to protect against any sudden swell of migration. Also there is a ceiling on the total number of immigrants allowed from any one country. And, of special importance, the bill in no way relaxes admission qualifications relating to mental, health, moral, economic, and security requirements.

The other parts of the bill which I consider very worthy are the new preferences for family members and those with skills needed in our country. Parents, married children, and brothers and sisters will not have to face the painful hardships of the past in order to come to America. And, industries needing workers not available in our own labor force will be helped, although we made sure that no U.S. citizen will be displaced from his job by the entrance of an immigrant.

There are many people in our community who will be helped by this immigration legislation and I am hopeful the Senate will pass it soon and that it will become law in the near future.

This is Congressman FRANK HORTON reporting for channel 13.

IMMIGRATION BILL FEATURE OF HORTON BROADCAST

WASHINGTON, July 28.—A detailed explanation of the immigration revision legislation expected to be voted on by Congress in the next few weeks will be included in "Report From Washington," Congressman FRANK HORTON's public service broadcast on Saturday, July 31. Appearing as HORTON's guest to discuss immigration problems and proposals will be the ranking Republican member of the House Immigration Subcommittee, Congressman ARCH MOORE, of West Virginia.

The Horton program will be carried at 1:30 p.m. on WHEC-TV, channel 10. Area radio stations also will include it in their schedules at varying times.

MOORE is one of the principal authors of the immigration reform measure which recently was approved in subcommittee. Once full Judiciary Committee action is taken, the comprehensive bill will be scheduled for debate and decision by the House.

HORTON said he would ask MOORE to outline present immigration laws and compare them with the modernization contained in the pending legislation. HORTON also plans to ask MOORE for comments on various points in the immigration reform legislation which have been subject to public misinterpretation.

Omnibus immigration legislation sponsored by HORTON in this Congress also will figure in the broadcast interview.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the foregoing expressions and my statement here today will make my position clear and also will serve to explain the impact of this legislation and how it will serve the national interest.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ].

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I have had grave reservations toward any change in the immigration laws of this country. Chief among my reasons has been the fear that any change in the laws might add to the unemployment problem as well as the fact that our own growth in population has placed increasing demands upon education, housing, health facilities, and transportation.

As this bill was initially introduced, I could not support it, but H.R. 2580 has been completely rewritten by the Subcommittee on Immigration. In its present form I think it is a good bill. I am hopeful that the amendment that will be presented by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] to limit immigration from countries in the Western Hemisphere will be accepted by this body.

Mr. Chairman, the major objective of this bill is to eliminate place of birth as a basis of the selection of immigrants into the United States and establishes in its place a preference based on close family relationship to citizens of the United States.

H.R. 2580 nullified the so-called "national origins theory" which in fact has not been in existence since 1952. Let me illustrate what I mean. Since 1952, 3 million aliens have legally entered this country. Sixty percent of them have been admitted outside the national origins quota system. During the 10-year period, 1952–63, 119,000 immigrants have come to our shores from China, Japan, and the Philippines, yet the annual quota for Japan is 185, for China is 205 and for the Philippines is 205. The annual quota for Italy under existing law is 5,666 but during 1953–62, 213,434 Italians immigrated to the United States. Yugoslavia has a quota of 942, yet 37,000 came to our shores from that country during the same 10-year period.

Mr. Chairman, the national origins theory is based on a fiction. Certainly no nation has a corner on talent. A measure of a man must always be based on his character, his talents, and his willingness to serve his fellow man. These qualities do not in any way attach to the land of one's birth.

Certainly no one in this body desires to permit unrestricted entrance into this country, and this is not the purpose of this bill. Under the proposed legislation, H.R. 2580, a total limitation, exclusive of the Western Hemisphere, will be set at 170,000. This is little more than the total of 158,561, also exclusive of the Western Hemisphere, now set under existing immigration law. An important feature of the bill before us sets the maximum admission from any one country at 20,000 per year.

As the distinguished and able chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration pointed out, this measure establishes a preference system. It includes more restrictive provisions to safeguard the American economy and the jobs of American labor than the law now in effect.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, my father was a coal miner. If the present law had been in effect when he made application to come to this country—under existing quotas he would have been on the waiting list for nearly 30 years—and I doubt very much if I would have been a Member of this body. I hope, however, this admission will not encourage any of my colleagues to vote against this measure. I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Mr. Chairman, I desire to make it clear that this is constructive legislation and to draw the attention of the committee to several aspects of this legislation.

The new immigration system proposed has two highly significant characteristics or features that may not be apparent at first reading.

First, this bill is more restrictive than present law. It imposes even more rigid requirements, and it sets more specific limitations than does present law.

Second, for the first time in 25 years it establishes an immigration policy and practice based, not upon an accumulation of pent-up pressures and past mistakes, but upon present-day needs. This new system is one that will adjust to our future needs and the changing patterns of immigration.

RESTRICTIVE NATURE

H.R. 2580 is a restrictive bill because our immigration laws are laws of exclusions; designed to keep out the inadmissible. That is why our immigration law is complex and necessarily must be so. The underlying purpose of the law is to exclude the inadmissible, and to select for admission only those who can meet high qualitative and quantitative standards.

This process of selection under present law involves careful screening of applicants. In addition to the existing numerical quota limitations, intending immigrants must satisfy strict moral, mental, health, economic, and national security requirements. The law is long and detailed on the specific criteria to be applied in testing the qualifications of applicants. The objective of these tests is obvious: To insure that those aliens admitted are of good character, healthy, will not be a burden on our economy, and will not endanger our form of government and way of life. Altogether, present law lists 31 classes of aliens who are ineligible for admission; 31 different grounds for exclusion.

The additional restrictions imposed by the new bill are:

First. A limit on the number admitted from any one country.

Second. A limit on the number admitted from colonies.

Third. A fixed limit on the number of refugees to be admitted.

Fourth. A requirement of individual certification from the Secretary of Labor that the intending immigrant will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers similarly employed in the United States.

Fifth. A requirement that the President report to the Congress, with his recommendations, if any, if the immigration from the Western Hemisphere increases by 10 percent above the previous 5-year average.

Sixth. A specific bar against admission of sexual deviates.

Seventh. A requirement that visas be issued to nonpreference applicants in the order in which they qualify rather than registration to prevent buildup of unrealistic waiting lists.

Eighth. Authority given to the Secretary of State to purge from the registration lists any alien who does not continue an interest to immigrate.

Ninth. A requirement that reports on admission of each refugee be submitted to the Congress.

Tenth. The prohibition against adjustment of status for aliens originally entering as other than intending immigrants is broadened to include all natives of the Western Hemisphere.

Eleventh. Changed provisions regarding fees for visa application and issuance are designed to discourage registration by persons not sincerely intending to immigrate.

Twelfth. The fair share law is repealed.

Thirteenth. Consular officers are authorized to require a bond for student or visitor visas to insure that aliens will maintain such status.

A NEW SYSTEM TO MEET CHANGING PATTERNS OF IMMIGRATION

Every Congress since World War II has been forced to enact emergency immigration laws to meet international crises involving displaced and persecuted persons, or to satisfy the pent-up pressure of huge backlogs of aliens registered and waiting for admission to the United States.

The Congress established a commendable, humanitarian record in meeting world needs by enactment of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and the Fair-Share Refugee-Escapee Act of 1960. On five separate occasions since 1957, the Congress granted nonquota status to quota immigrants who had been waiting for an extensive period of time.

In each of these cases, the Congress was attempting to alleviate an immediate need or one of long standing.

Under H.R. 2580, as amended, for the first time we will clear the decks of accumulated problems and pressures and have a system sufficiently flexible to meet new situations as they arise.

Section 201(c) provides for a 3-year period to clean out the waiting list backlogs and prepare for the end of the national origins quota system on June 30, 1968. I first proposed such a plan in the 88th Congress, and it was unanimously adopted by the subcommittee as an essential, integral part of the immigration reform.

Estimates by the Department of State indicate that reallocation of unused quota numbers among the registered preference applicants in oversubscribed countries will clear up all the waiting lists well before the end of the 3-year period. In fact, all of the preference registrants can be admitted during the first year except in the case of Italy, where slightly over 2 years will be required to catch up.

I must emphasize that all of these registrants in the oversubscribed countries are qualified applicants who in time would be admitted under present law. The new proposal merely clears up this ever-accumulating backlog in short order and clear the decks.

It is significant to note that after the clean-up, the State Department predicts that total immigration—exclusive of the Western Hemisphere—which is subject to the 170,000 limitation, will actually be in the neighborhood of 105,000 to 110,000 annually. This is an interesting comparison with our present average quota immigration being 98,000 occurring under existing law. In 3 years the preference lists of waiting relatives will be gone.

With the pressures arising from oversubscribed waiting lists removed, our immigration will proceed in an orderly, systematic manner. Existing exclusion provisions and the strict moral, health, economic, and security requirements will control our immigration. As mentioned previously, adequate provision is made under the refugee section to meet foreseeable needs.

The numerical limitations set in this bill provide adequate ceilings for the ebb and flow of immigration—numerical limitations sufficient to meet our needs and to honor our humanitarian obligations to our fellow men. The health, economic and security restrictions guarantee our American way of life against the threat of moral impairment, adverse influences, and unfair competition.

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the Nation's gaze is today fixed upon a national policy which mirrors to the world an America where freedom and opportunity are meted out according to national origin and racial background. This policy is the national origins quota system upon which our present immigration regulations are based. It is not now, nor has it ever been, congruent to the democracy we are building. Four Presidents have called this policy unwise and unworthy of this Nation. President Johnson has said that the enactment of a new system replacing national origin quotas with an immigration policy based upon family relationship and needed work skills would be good government and good sense.

In past Congresses I introduced legislation to this end. In this Congress I cosponsored the administration's bill as H.R. 2851. I have repeatedly urged that the present quota system be supplanted by a policy in line with the principles of a free and democratic nation.

The bill before us today will replace the old quota system over a 3-year period with a system under which preference is given to the reuniting of families and the admission of persons with special skills and talents useful to the United States. A ceiling of 170,000 total immigrants is set, of which no more than 20,000 may come from a single country. Visas will be issued on a first-come, first-served basis to each of six preference groups. Each group is entitled to a certain percentage of the 170,000 total. A percentage is reserved for refugees, and the remainder of available visas, if any, will be issued to qualified nonpreference applicants strictly in order of date of petition.

A reallocation of unused quota numbers from a quota pool during the 3-year transition period will go a long way toward eliminating the waiting lists which in many countries have lengthened greatly over the years. Unused numbers under the present system are not transferable.

Of the 65,361 quota numbers allocated to Great Britain, thousands go unused, while a total of 2,000 numbers is allocated to an area comprising 23 nations who hold within their borders between a third and a half of the total world population. This area is known in the law as the Asia-Pacific triangle. Waiting lists in this area have grown so long that waiting times are no longer estimated for applicants. A few quota numbers will be available in September to residents in certain countries of the Asia-Pacific triangle whose applications were filed with our consulates 13 years ago.

Due to the mortgaging of the quota for Chinese persons occasioned by the admission of a certain category of refugees, numbers for all preferences on the Chinese portion of the Asia-Pacific triangle quota have been completely unavailable for 6 years.

There are other problems with the Asia Pacific triangle.

A particularly insidious provision requires that anyone who is at least 50 percent Asian by ancestry, regardless of where he was born, is subscribable to the Asia-Pacific triangle quota.

This means that a Canadian citizen, for instance, who is 50 percent Chinese by ancestry, although born nad raised in Canada, would be subscribable to the Chinese portion of the Asia-Pacific triangle quota, for which, as I said earlier, no numbers at all have been available for 6 years.

The new bill will eliminate the Asia-Pacific triangle.

Now, let us look at the long waiting lists. The number of people on the waiting list for the Italian quota of 5,666 is 200,000 at last count. Greece has a quota of 308 and 98,000 on the waiting list. Spain has a quota of 250 and 14,000 on the waiting list.

The inequities and iniquities of our current policy are innumerable.

The present policy was conceived and enacted in 1924. Its original intent was to preserve an ethnic balance in the United States according to that found in the 1920 census. Revised and amended only a few times over the years, the basic policy was again extended in 1952, this time over the strong veto of President Truman. Forty-one years of legalized prejudice have blackened the eye of the United States in our foreign policy endeavors long enough. It is time to erase the mark.

Loudest of all arguments against the enactment of this bill is one which claims that the new bill will "open the floodgates" for immigration into the United States. This simply is not true. The annual quota increase will be 2,000 persons. In a nation nearing the 200 million mark, this hardly amounts to opening the floodgates.

An attempt may be made to amend this bill to set a numerical ceiling on nonquota immigration from the Western Hemisphere. The hue and cry is

that the nonquota status to which nationals of independent Western Hemisphere nations are entitled under the bill will bring thousands of new immigrants into the United States. Proponents of this amendment overlook the fact that this nonquota status has been enjoyed for years by these nations, and there has been no overwhelming race for the Golden Gate. To be sure, there has been an increase in their number, but the need for a numerical ceiling has not been established to the satisfaction of the Justice Department, the State Department, the Committee on the Judiciary, and others most knowledgeable in the field of immigration.

H.R. 2580 does provide for the President to notify the Congress when Western Hemisphere immigration reaches a 10-percent increase over the average for the last 5 years. This should be sufficient legislation. We should not take action which will impair Western Hemisphere solidarity and have other adverse foreign policy implications.

Conditions and a numerical quantity for the admission of refugees have been established in this bill in place of the Fair Share Refugee Act. While this does not take care of certain pressing problems regarding refugees already in the United States, it will help regulate and codify future procedure.

The new bill eliminates minimum quotas which have worked hardship on people from new Western Hemisphere nations.

In addition, certain mental and physical conditions warranting excludability under the old law have been clarified and made to conform with recent advances in medical science.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not an omnibus revision of immigration regulations. It is addressed to the specific problem of the eradication of prejudice and discrimination and the establishment of a sane and humane policy. It corrects certain glaring inconsistencies and makes technical corrections as required by the advance of medical science.

There is much more to be done in this area, but this bill will provide a foundation upon which to build policy in line with our convictions.

Few Americans are the product of indigenous peoples. It is an affront to the heritage of the United States for any prospective immigrant to be discriminated against by a racially and ethnically oriented policy.

As of the 1960 census, there were nearly 2 million foreign born persons in New York City. This is a quarter of the city's population. The dynamism and greatness of New York City springs from the free interchange of ideas between persons of diverse backgrounds. This has been the great strength of New York and of the Nation.

In this Congress we have considered the duties and privileges of the citizen and his society. We have considered these responsibilities in the areas of education, housing, and job opportunities. We have tried to secure the full rights of citizenship for all Americans. The bill before us today deals with another aspect of the development and realization of our democracy.

We have the opportunity to enact an immigration policy which is fair, sensible, and humane—one which is consistent with the democratic aims of our free society. We can no longer tolerate a policy enacted in the post-World War I atmosphere of isolationism and xenophobia.

Mr. Chairman, we owe it to ourselves, to our Nation, to the people of the rest of the world, and to the cause of humanity, peace, and freedom, to pass this bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, as introduced in January of this year, had a provision in it originally to relax somewhat the present absolute prohibition against admission to this country for permanent residence of certain persons, including mentally retarded children, who wanted to join their families. This provision was stricken from the bill in committee.

It is my understanding that the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman FOGARTY, proposes to offer an amendment later today, which would permit admission of a mentally retarded person under certain restrictive and careful screening criteria. In effect this would give us the opportunity of letting retarded children, who do not present a threat to public safety or to the public purse, to join their families under the right conditions.

I would remind the Members that with modern methods of training, mentally retarded children are growing up to lead socially acceptable lives in many cases, either within their own families or as workers in needed low-level occupations.

I will support the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and I hope the Members of the House will give it their consideration and support, because I believe it is fully in keeping with the goal this bill attempts to reach, that of reuniting families. A mentally retarded child, like a physically handicapped child, can be a very much loved and much needed member in a family. Compassion and understanding should surely guide our decision on this amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2580, the bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

We in Hawaii, perhaps to a greater extent than the people of any other State, have been constantly aware of the objectionable features of our existing immigration law. And, insofar as the provisions of our immigration law relate to Asians, we are able, because of our unique geographical location, to speak from the vantage ground of actual observation and experience.

Being of the westernmost State in the Union, we in Hawaii have extended our hand out to the peoples of Asia. However, we have often been concerned that that hand might have appeared to Asians to be in the shape of a fist, instead of an open palm, in the light of our discriminatory immigration law.

It is difficult for anyone, whether European, African, or Asian, to view our present immigration law as being anything but discriminatory to the Asians. Unfortunately, statistics substantiate such view. For example, in 1964, 292,248 immigrants were admitted into the United States. Of that number, only 17,430 were from the Asia-Pacific triangle, an area which contains over 50 percent of the world's population.

This great discrepancy, of course, has been directly attributable to the national origins quota system in our immigration law. The provision in the reported bill for the abolition by July 1, 1968, of the national origins quota system, therefore, represents a significant advancement in our efforts to achieve an immigration law that is consistent with our best American traditions.

The bill we are considering also provides for the immediate repeal of the Asia-Pacific triangle, the uncharitable creation of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. The repeal of the provision requiring that an Asian person be charged to the quota of his ancestry, even though born outside of the Asian area, would be an important step forward in our efforts to make our immigration law fair and equitable.

Mr. Chairman, I am especially pleased to note that while H.R. 2580 removes these principal discriminatory provisions from our existing law, it is also geared to bring together separated members of a family. The humanitarian motive underlying such immigration policy is certainly attuned to the best American tradition.

The proposed legislation also contains provisions which are intended to safeguard the national interest. I am sure that no one will voice any serious objection to these provisions. There is certainly a marked difference between provisions which are discriminatory as they relate to the racial origin of prospective immigrants and those which are designed to keep subversive elements from our shores.

Mr. Chairman, I have joined in cosponsoring the bill recommended by the administration both in the present Congress and in the 88th Congress. The bill was drawn up with the benefit of advice from experts in the executive agencies that are responsible for administering our immigration program. Both the State Department and the Justice Department contributed to the drafting of the bill. In addition, our Committee on the Judiciary has reported the bill with amendments after holding extensive hearings. We are consequently assured that the bill on the floor represents the best thinking in both the executive and legislative branches.

Mr. Chairman, I urge overwhelming support for H.R. 2580.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 2580, to amend the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

I want, first of all, to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, who has fought so vigorously and valiantly for many years in support of reform in our immigration and naturalization laws. His success this year is a tribute to his dedication to the purposes of this legislation.

I support this measure because of the long overdue changes and improvements it makes in our present immigration and naturalization laws. I am proud, by my bill, H.R. 2587, to be a coauthor of these changes.

I am particularly pleased by the phasing out of the national origins quota system, which through its discriminatory structure runs counter to the basic democratic principles upon which our Nation was founded.

Just as we sought to eliminate discrimination in our land through the Civil Rights Act, today we seek by phasing out the national origins quota system to eliminate discrimination in immigration to this Nation composed of the descendents of immigrants.

We can certainly pass no more meaningful piece of legislation which seeks to make a reality out of the dream of America than this bill we act on today.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, immigration laws have needed review and updating for years. For that reason I am glad to see this legislation come to the House floor. I cannot pose as an expert on the details of immigration law, but I do offer some thoughts on the philosophy which should be behind it.

The beckoning beacon of our Statue of Liberty is one of America's greatest and most appealing symbols. For years it cast a gleam on nearby Ellis Island, the major point of debarkation for immigrants. Now most immigrants come by aircraft, and ocean voyagers check in at points elsewhere.

But the Statue of Liberty—the gift of our great sister Republic France—still stands as an inspiration and a hope to those millions beyond our borders who long for an opportunity to share in the American heritage.

To them America is a promised land, a place of refuge, a place where people can live in dignity and without fear.

It is a place which exalts the individual person and prizes people as the greatest of all national resources. In America people are regarded as a form of wealth and national enrichment, not as problems. Immigrants enrich our national life today just as they did in the last century. They don't really put people out of work, whether they are skilled or otherwise. Each can help America by providing services, helping to produce goods, being good citizens.

This is indeed a nation of immigrants. The achievements of immigrants of past generations are tremendous.

American history is largely the history of immigrants. Who are we to suggest that the achievements of the immigrants of today and tomorrow will be less than those of the past?

America has vast land spaces—room for many more people. Ours is not a restricted, protected system but an open one. Or at least it should be. Most of us did not choose to be American citizens. We won this rich heritage as the accident of birth. Those who decide they want to be American citizens and make the personal sacrifice and effort necessary should be welcomed. In my district are many immigrants, and I find most of them are intensely patriotic, hardworking, and good citizens. My district is a better place because it has these immigrants as citizens.

As we write this legislation, let us keep to the high road so there can be no mistake that the Statue of Liberty's beacon gleams brightly as ever.

Some fear the day will come when immigration from Latin America will pose a crisis. No such crisis is in sight, and if we proceed wisely in our foreign policies we can help to avert any such problem.

Should we therefore fix a limit on immigration from Latin America? To my way of thinking, this action would be a step backward. It would be interpreted—whether justly or not—as a tightening up of our immigration policies. Throughout most of our history we have discriminated in regard to Latin America in ways other than immigration. The Monroe Doctrine, sadly abused in regard to Castro's Cuba, is an example of discrimination. So, in a sense, was the Good Neighbor policy, and the more recent Alliance for Progress. The United States has long recognized a special responsibility in regard to Latin America.

Instead of establishing an immigration limit which might be misunderstood we would be wiser to restate our longstanding and magnanimous attitude toward immigration. Instead of imposing numerical limits in Latin America, we should state our desire eventually to lift limits elsewhere.

We should remind our friends abroad that our Union of States is not a fixed, closed system. It has grown steadily from 13 States along the eastern seaboard to one which now stretches almost within sight of the Soviet Union at one point and bridges part of the Pacific ocean at another.

The years ahead will hopefully see still further growth in our Union, and perhaps someday include parts of Latin America.

Abraham Lincoln defined liberty as "the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere." He warned:

> Destroy that spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism around our doors.

The best way to keep the spirit of liberty alive—and to prevent despotism from flourishing around our doors—is to assure those who love freedom that a welcome awaits them in our Union, whether through the process of immigration or statehood.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, our Declaration of Independence declares all men to be created equal with respect to certain unalienable rights; our pledge of allegiance to the flag offers liberty and justice for all; our Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlawed discrimination based on race, color, or natural origin. Can there be any doubt that this country has indelibly declared that each individual shall be judged on his own merits? Yet these sacrosanct pronouncements are tarnished by a conscious policy that this country is now pursuing, and which now must be terminated. Our immigration law, today, reflects a racial philosophy repugnant to our American tradition. This iniquitous law is predicated on the belief that certain people are inferior to others solely by reason of their land of birth. Mr. Speaker, the proposition that some are more equal than others must not be permitted to persist as a national immigration policy.

Opposition to a change in immigration law is based on unfounded fears. It is said that a new law would flood the country with 1 million immigrants a year—many of them hard to assimilate—that it would bring to this country thousands who are unfit and that it would overload the labor market. These fears have no foundation and crumble when exposed to the facts of immigration reform.

Under the present law, the sum total of quotas for all areas, excluding the Western Hemisphere, is 158,561. This total does not include the number of refugees who are paroled in the United States. Under the proposed immigration revision a limitation of 170,000, exclusive of the Western Hemisphere, is imposed, but this limitation includes an allocation of up to 10,200 for the conditional entry of refugees. Thus, the increase in the authorized annual total will not exceed 2,000. It should also be emphasized that there has been no relaxing of the qualitative criteria for admissibility to the United States, and that no relaxation of the mental, health, moral, economic, and security criteria is proposed.

The preferences within the new revision are designed to reunite families and to admit those whose skills are vitally needed by our country. As an added guarantee the law would require the Secretary of Labor to make an affirmative finding that any alien seeking to enter the United States as a worker will not replace nor adversely affect wages and working conditions of the American worker.

This is a land of immigrants, this is a nation of immigrants and we must remain cognizant of the genesis of this great and powerful country. It has been built on the broad backs and agile minds of immigrants and their descendants. Those same people who deny or exclude entrance on prejudicial grounds would no doubt be denied this prerogative if their forebears were subject to present unjust law.

An added factor necessitates revision. The effectiveness of American foreign policy is minimized when we pursue a

domestic policy that actively discriminates against citizens of countries whose support and cooperation is required to attain our international objectives.

The safeguards remain; the prejudice is removed—let us act today to effect the needed change.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2580, a bill to eliminate the national origins quota system and to revise our national immigration policy.

Since January 3, when I became a Member of the 89th Congress, I have repeatedly made my feelings known to my colleagues of my avid support of President Johnson's position on the revision of the immigration law and the abolishment of the national origins quota system.

Three past Presidents, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, have also denounced the present statute as being unjust, prejudiced and biased toward certain nationalities.

In June 1964, the Democratic Party in convention in Atlantic City in its platform adopted a program urging a more realistic immigration policy. This program included the repeal of the national origins quota system, a proposal under which families may be united, where professionals and technicians would be admitted regardless of national origin, where people would not be limited by their national origin from entering this country.

Before coming to Congress, I served as an executive board member of the Chicago chapter of the American Committee of Italian Migration. In 1963, I chaired an immigration rally held in the Arie Crown Theater in Chicago which was attended by more than 5,000 people. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and a chief proponent of revised immigration law, delivered the keynote speech. This great rally sparked a move in all major cities in these United States, and as a result, more people have become aware of the injustices of our present immigration policy.

Week after week, I have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, articles about great Americans, sons of immigrants, Italian, Polish, Greek, and Irish, to name only a few nationalities, who have contributed and continue to contribute to the distinction of America. Men of prestige, too numerous to list, are sons of immigrant tailors, shoemakers, laborers. These great men have risen to the highest positions in both the Government and business world.

It is with a warm feeling in my heart, and a joy that I rise this afternoon in support of H.R. 2580.

This bill marks the culmination of years of effort by many dedicated men. We are indebted to the gentleman from New York, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who provided the leadership on this issue.

We are also indebted to the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, for all of his tireless efforts. We owe a vote of thanks to the members of the subcommittee which spent the long, arduous, and necessary hours holding hearings, drafting and redrafting the bill we now have before us.

Another man whose great contribution to immigration reform should be acknowledged is the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman PETER W. RODINO, JR. He has continued to strive, not for months, but for many long years, in the hope and in the knowledge that his efforts would one day help abolish the national origins quota system.

Through the tireless efforts of a great number of Americans, we have reached the day when we will at last erase a great stain on our country's honor. For 40 years, the national origins quota system has remained on our statute books, in contradiction to every American concept of equality and justice, making a mockery of the ideals we so cherish.

The basis of America's greatness has always been a commitment to the value and dignity of the individual and a willingness to admit immigrants of diverse backgrounds and talents to our land. We have always measured a man's worth by his capacity to contribute and not by his religious beliefs or nation of origin. We must adhere to this conception and continue to be a nation of nations.

This bill looks to the future of our Nation which continues to grow, and to create a nation eager to utilize talents and ideas from people all over the world.

I am proud to be one of the Congressmen who sponsored the administration bill, and I want to urge all of my colleagues in the House to vote for H.R. 2580.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 2580, a bill which will accomplish some long-awaited and extremely desirable changes in our existing immigration laws.

Embodied in this bill is a realization and a recognition which has become widespread in this Nation rather belatedly. Indeed, even now it is not yet accepted in all quarters. I am speaking of the recognition of the basic equality of all men.

In this immigration bill, we express the same belief expressed in the recent Voting Rights Act of 1965, passed overwhelmingly by this House, and in the Civil Rights Act of last year. That is the belief that men are to be judged on their own merit, as individuals—and not on the basis of their racial ancestry, their skin color, their religion, or their place of national origin.

Our present immigration law, as it now stands embodied in the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is a repudiation of everything we Americans supposedly believe about the dignity and equality of man. Written into our law as the so-called national origins quota system is a device which is blatantly designed to allow entry into this country only to certain favored racial and national groups.

Under existing law, we are supposedly trying to maintain the racial and national composition of the United States substantially as it was in 1920. Of course, the attraction of that year to some people is that the racial and ethnic majority in the United States was then white and Anglo-Saxon. For no good reason, our law has been trying to preserve that racial balance ever since.

As the law now stands, 70 percent of the total authorized annual immigration of approximately 156,000 is allocated to 3 countries: Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany; and only 30 percent is available for over 100 other countries and areas.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has commented in testimony before a Judiciary subcommittee that it is very difficult to explain to our allies and our critics abroad, particularly the nations of Africa and Asia, why on one hand we claim it is our national policy to accord equality to all races and nationalities, and on the other hand we continue to foster a clearly discriminatory immigration statute.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it is always difficult to explain away hypocrisy, and it is hypocrisy to permit the national-origins quota system to remain on the books along with our recently passed civil rights legislation.

The inadequacy of the rigid and unwieldy quota system is amply demonstrated by the way immigration into this country has been handled in the past 10 years. We in Congress are quite familiar with the thousands of private immigration bills introduced each session for the benefit of those who deserve to enter the United States, many of whom are political refugees, but are prevented from so doing by an unfair and arbitrary national quota. We in Congress are put in the position of having to circumvent our own legislation in order to be equitable. It is high time for a change.

I would remind this House, however, that, for some, the elimination of the national-origins quota system will come too late. They are dead; thousands upon thousands of them, buried in mass graves at Auschwitz, Dachau, and Bergen-Belsen. They are the many Jews of eastern Europe who, in a last desperate effort to escape the Nazi terror, made one futile trip to the American consulate nearest them. There they were told that there was no hope, no escape. The quota was filled, they were told. There was no point even registering, they were told. They would never get out in time.

Mr. Chairman, this was no bill just prior to World War II, when the persecution of Jews in eastern Europe began. There were only the good intentions of liberal Congressmen then, when millions of Jews found the door closed to entry into the land where there is no oppression, no persecution, no mass murder. They found that door irrevocably closed, fatally closed I might say, by a quota.

I believe the 6 million Jews who died under Hitler will rest easier in their reward with the knowledge that never again will this Nation renege on its much-advertised promise of a haven from the gun, the whip, and the gas chamber. I believe that the high principles upon which this Nation was built demand the revision of an outmoded immigration law.

H.R. 2580 will eliminate the national origins quota system, after a 3-year tran-

sition period, and provide for a general pool of immigration numbers distributed among all nations of the world on a combination first-come, first-served and preference-priority basis.

This means that 170,000 immigrants, including 10,200 refugees, and exclusive of immediate relatives of U.S. citizens and natives of independent Western Hemisphere nations would be permitted into the United States each year. The latter two categories are favored because it seems only humane to permit the reuniting of families when possible, and because our friends from the nations of Latin America have always occupied a privileged position with regard to immigration, even under the old law. No more than 20,000 immigrants per year would be permitted from any one foreign country.

I believe the preference priorities written into H.R. 2580 reflect the long experience of the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee in dealing with immigration problems caused by the present system, and its analysis of what type of immigration policy is in the best interest of the United States. The subcommittee feels, and I think we must all agree, that the reuniting of families should receive primary consideration in any revision of the immigration law. Thus the first 20 percent of the 170,000 annual immigration total is allocated, on a first-come, first-served basis, to unmarried adult children of U.S. citizens. The next 20 percent goes to spouses and unmarried children of alien residents.

The United States became a great nation because it was built with the skills and talents of many persons from many lands. It is in recognition of this Nation's continuing need for skilled persons that the third preference priority is reserved for members of the professions, scientists, and artists. The next 10 percent is delegated to the married children of U.S. citizens and the next 24 percent is set aside for the brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. Ten percent is reserved for skilled or unskilled persons capable of filling U.S. labor shortages, and the last 6 percent is limited to political refugees. Any unused portion of a preference priority may be added to that of the next in line.

It is clear that the only real change made in the immigration law by this provision is the elimination of an odious and objectionable mechanism of racial and national bias. The bill will not substantially raise the present authorized ceiling of total immigration to the United States—it will merely distribute it more equitably. It will not change any of the existing security safeguards and other restrictions designed to exclude undesirables.

Beyond the national origins quota system, the immigration statute as it now stands contains one further vestige of discrimination and racial prejudice, the purpose of which is to make even tighter the restrictions against non-Caucasian persons. This is the thoroughly disreputable section 202(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, often called the Asia-Pacific triangle provision, which requires a person of Asian descent to be placed on the quota of the country of his racial origin, no matter where he was actually born or what his nationality is. I cannot believe that there is any Member of this House who would say a word in defense of this provision; I am sure we all desire its immediate repeal, as is provided for under this bill.

There has been a lot of loose speculation by conservative and right-wing spokesmen about how this bill will somehow cause a worsening in the unemployment situation in the United States. Visions are conjured up of unwashed Hottentots taking jobs away from good, wholesome American types. I say this is a lot of hot air, and I have the evidence to back it up. For one thing, it is on the record that this bill will require the Secretary of Labor to make an affirmative finding that any alien seeking to enter the United States as a worker will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the United States worker. Secondly, the labor unions, who more than anyone would be concerned if a worsening employment situation were to result, overwhelmingly favor the bill. Permit me to quote from a telegram I received recently from the president of Transport Workers Union Local 100 in New York City. It reads in part:

> The TWU of America Local 100 * * * urges you to aggressively work for H.R. 2580. * * * It is our opinion that the legislation is no threat to employed workers in this country but would make it possible through preference classifications to allow people to enter this country who could fill particular skilled labor shortages.

Finally, I would like to anticipate the amendment which my friends on the other side will offer to limit the immigration of natives from independent Western Hemisphere nations, and comment thereon. H.R. 2580 continues this country's policy since 1924 of conferring special nonquota status upon nations of the Western Hemisphere. We have always found this policy, based upon our close mutual interests, ideals, and aspirations, to be in the best interests of our foreign relations within the hemisphere. Since immigration from Western Hemisphere nations has never been overwhelming in numbers, and since this bill requires that Congress be informed if there occurs a sharp rise in Western Hemisphere immigration, I see no reason why our historic policy of friendship should not continue as before. I further believe, and the Secretary of State has expressed himself on this point, that to now impose quota status on Western Hemisphere immigration would cause difficulties in our diplomatic relations with the countries involved.

The liberal ideal and the entire history of Western philosophy has always exalted the inherent worth and dignity of the individual man. It is my belief that this philosophy is at present the dominating sentiment of this Congress and indeed, of the Nation. We have before us today an opportunity to change our immigration law so as to reflect our real character and objectives. I hope my colleagues here today will take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed pleased to address my colleagues today on the subject of amending our present, outdated public immigration laws. Our last four Presidents have urged changes in our immigration laws, but this is the first time in those years that the House itself has had a chance to vote on the question. Now, with that opportunity finally before us, I am hopeful that this body will take the positive action of approving these proposals.

As has been outlined so ably by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the bill calls for a phasing out of the present national origin provisions of the current law. It sets up instead a total limitation of 170,000 on the number of quota immigrants allowed in each year, no more than 20,000 of whom may be from any one country. Within these overall limitations, the bill rearranges the preference categories to give special priority to the immediate family of present U.S. citizens, to those with particular skills and training that the Secretary of Labor certifies are not available in this country, and to 6 percent of the total held for political refugees.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased that by passing H.R. 2580, we will abolish once and for all the unfair national origin quota system. Under this system the census figures of 1920 have been used to set archaic and discriminatory limitations on the number of immigrants that are permitted into the United States each year. And I am equally elated that this bill will insure that U.S. citizens will not be forced to live apart from members of their immediate family, their husbands, wives, parents and children, as so often is the case under the present provisions of the law.

I submit to my colleagues that the present quota system is full of inconsistencies, the greatest of which is that it unfairly singles out the citizens of certain countries and specifically says that people with this background may not come into our country, or that they may come in but only in small numbers. This discrimination is a complete contradiction to the principles of democracy on which this Nation was founded and has grown strong. As such it should and must be abolished, not only as a matter of self-respect, but so that our friends and allies around the world will know that America practices what she preaches. Under our present procedures, many must have their doubts, and this fact has been a source of diplomatic friction with our allies at a time when we should be increasing rather than decreasing the extent of our mutual cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to endorse specifically those provisions of H.R. 2580 which place a greater priority upon keeping the family unit together, enabling the husbands, wives, children, parents, brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens to be reunited in this country. I am sure that my colleagues in the House know as I do of so many cases where our present quota system has caused incalculable

heartache by keeping the members of families from joining each other. Bringing these families together is a matter of the highest priority in my view, and I am pleased to see that provision is made for this in the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I say that as the Representative of an area in which I have had many opportunities to observe our immigration laws in practice, I respectfully submit that the current law is discriminatory, if not in its design, then in its practice, and that the amendments being proposed here today are not only desirable but necessary. I wholeheartedly urge their adoption by the House. By doing so we shall be taking a significant step to benefit our country both as individual citizens and as a Nation. I feel it my great privilege to support this bill.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Chairman, this Congress will long be recognized for the progressive legislation it has passed, and will continue to pass, until we adjourn sine die.

Let us look back upon some of the major accomplishments of this Congress to date. We have enacted legislation to provide aid to Appalachia so that we can alleviate poverty in an 11-State Appalachian region. An act to guarantee equal voting rights was enacted. To provide for better educational facilities, we have enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and will act shortly on legislation to provide for higher education. We have cut excise taxes and provided for our elderly citizens by passing the historic bill on medicare.

Today we are on the threshold of passing another historic measure, which has not been radically amended since its enactment in 1924. I speak of the pending Immigration and Nationality Act.

This bill has far-reaching effects and shall be one of the monumental endeavors of this Congress.

The Immigration and Nationality Act is an important part of President Johnson's program and I am sure it will receive overwhelming support when this House votes upon this measure.

The main feature of this legislation is the termination of the national-origins quota system which has damaged the image of America as a place of opportunity and freedom. Upon the passage of this bill, this system which has long reflected an attitude of ethnic bigotry will be wiped from the statute books.

Another significant change made by this bill is in relation to the immigration of persons who are members of the professions or have exceptional ability in the sciences and arts. In the field of qualified immigrants "capable of performing specified skills or unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States."

This legislation will go a long way in reuniting families now being kept apart by existing regulations. We have seen definite hardships among those families whose loved ones had to remain behind while other members of the family were permitted to emigrate to the United States. This injustice will be corrected by the pending bill.

Another injustice under the present law would be corrected by this measure, that of assigning unused quota numbers to countries which have already used up all the numbers assigned, and eliminate the discrimination against newly independent countries of the Western Hemisphere by providing nonquota status for natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago.

Opponents of this legislation would want us to believe that this bill, if enacted into law, would open the gates to floodlike proportions of prospective immigrants. This is a gross misrepresentation because it is estimated that about only 7,000 authorized quota immigrants would be added to the present number of immigrants.

In this bill we are seeking an immigration policy which will reflect America's ideal of equality of all men without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, through which we can accomplish two purposes.

First. We would enhance America's image as a leader of the free world in according equal dignity and respect to all people of the world, and thus take a significant stride forward in our international relations.

Second. We would recognize the individual worth of each immigrant and his ability to contribute to the development and growth of our national economy.

These basic changes in the American immigration policy are long overdue and the revision of our present immigration laws is a logical extension of our efforts to achieve our ideal of equality.

I have high hopes that this House will not permit the adoption of any amendments to this bill which would cripple our efforts in providing a just and equal immigration policy. It is my hope that by nightfall of this date we will have asserted ourselves to equal rights of all peoples of the world.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, for too long our Nation's foreign policy has been muddled by those who worry incessantly about what others think of us. Such a course has apparently resulted in more enemies than friends for the United States.

Now, the shapers of our foreign policy propose that we liberalize our immigration laws to gain worldwide approval. In January of this year President Johnson said our present procedures "imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition."

So here we go on another tangent to improve international relations to the detriment of our own citizens.

Why do I say that a liberalization of immigration policies will be detrimental to our own citizens? I say this because our Nation is now faced with poverty and unemployment. Overpopulation is also a potential problem considering that our current birth rate is more than twice our death rate. You can be sure that a greater influx of immigrants from underdeveloped countries will not relieve the present situation. If any change in our present immigration policy is needed, it is in the direction of tighter controls.

The supporters of this legislation argue that it will admit more immigrants on the basis of skills and talents needed in this country. However, I find it difficult to believe that underdeveloped countries will provide many immigrants with special skills. At the same time, this bill boosts the quotas for such countries in question.

You must also consider that this new influx of immigrants from underdeveloped nations will compound our domestic problems. They will compete with the very class of American citizens our Federal Government is seeking to aid through its war on poverty. Unemployment among the Negro population of this country will not be eased regardless of the efforts of the administration to give them preferential treatment.

The President either fails or refuses to understand that America is not hurting for population, jobseekers, or illiterates.

The supporters of this legislation also refuse to accept the fact that human beings differ in their desire to maintain stable governments, their levels of ambition, and their degree of morality.

All other advanced countries in the world recognize their right to regulate immigration to correspond with the desires and welfare of their own citizens. The United States alone seeks world approval, and I might add to no avail. Perhaps it would be more intelligent to follow the wishes of our own citizens as indicated in a Louis Harris survey published last May. The survey indicated that American citizens stand 2 to 1 against our immigration law.

If this bill is passed, I think it will be proper to change the inscription on the Statue of Liberty to read as follows: Give me your jobless, your poor, your untrained masses yearning to draw Federal unemployment checks. Send them to me, and I will register them to vote.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 2580 which is one of the great pieces of legislation to come before this House in this or any other session of the Congress.

I would like to commend the very able dean of the House, the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. EMANUEL CELLER], the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN], the chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction over immigration matters.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other Member who deserves great commendation for this bill which we are discussing today. My colleague from New Jersey's 10th District has been one of the greatest advocates of immigration reform who has ever served in this House. For 17 years he has been a consistent battler for a change in our immigration statutes. For 17 years he has been like the Scriptural "voice crying in the wilderness." Now, at long last the House is

ready to pass what the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER RODINO, has been urging for 17 years. I know that today is a special moment for him and I would like him to know that the people of my district and all the people of New Jersey have reason to be especially proud of the dean of our congressional delegation.

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently advocated reform of our immigration law. Our present immigrant law was passed in 1952 over a veto by President Harry S. Truman. It is in essence a continuation of the national origins quota system which was enacted into law during that dark period after World War I when religious and racial hatred was at its zenith. This was a time when the idealism of Woodrow Wilson was thrust aside in favor of the reactionary nativism of Warren Harding and Calvin Coolidge. It was a time when the Ku Klux Klan marched by the thousands down Pennsylvania Avenue and when a resolution to condemn the Klan was voted down at the Democratic convention held in Madison Square Garden.

We have come a long way since the 1920's and yet one of the last vestiges of the racial and religious hatred of that day still remains on the statute books. The very basic contention that "all men are created equal" is negated by our immigration policy. A policy which flies in the face of our national ideals by holding that some races and some ethnic groups make better Americans than others.

We have frozen into law a concept that should have been buried with Adolf Hitler in the bunker in Berlin. Racism simply has no place in America in this day and age.

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent a district where people of almost every race, creed, and color live in harmony. Perhaps the 14th District of New Jersey can be described as a true melting pot district. In Hudson County we have people whose ancestors came from every part of the globe.

The one common denominator that unites these people of diverse backgrounds is that they came to these shores to share in the American dream of a better life for all.

In 1917, 1941, and 1950 when America stood in need, these newer Americans took their place in our armed services beside those whose ancestors had fought at Bunker Hill and Gettysburg.

Today as the crisis in Vietnam deepens, many thousands of young Americans who are, under the terms of our immigration statute, descendants of so-called inferior peoples prepare to risk their lives for this Nation. And these young Americans will again demonstrate that they are the equal of any people on earth.

It is time that we practice what we preach. We can show to a candid world that in the United States we judge a man by what he is and not by where his ancestors came from, what his religion is or what color his skin is. I urge every Member of this House to cast his vote for the American dream by supporting H.R. 2580.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the United States, more than any other country in the world, is a nation of immigrants. In the last 200 years, more than 40 million people have migrated to these shores. They have established, developed, and sustained this country. They have contributed to, in fact they have molded, every aspect of American life.

Yet today we find countless thousands who look to this great melting pot as a land of freedom and opportunity being denied the opportunity of immigration solely because of where they happened to be born. The loss is not only theirs but ours as well.

The national origins quota system of 1924 has served to grade citizens of other countries on the color of their skin and on their nationality. It has implied that men and women from some areas of the world are more desirable than others. It has arbitrarily denied us people with skills and talents that would benefit our way of life and our well-being. It has kept thousands of our citizens needlessly separated from their families. For all these and still other reasons, the national origins system has been inconsistent with our basic promise of equal opportunity. It has weakened us both at home and in the eyes of the world.

Just what is the national origins quota system? It is a method of selecting immigrants that assigns an annual quota to all countries outside the Western Hemisphere in proportion to the persons of that nationality or descent making up our white population in 1920. It should be abundantly clear that using quotas made up from such a base would give a handful of nations a completely disproportionate number of immigrants and, in fact, this is exactly what has happened. The countries of northwestern Europe are assigned nearly 82 percent of 157,000 immigrants permissible, leaving southeastern Europe with 16 percent and the rest of the world with only 2 percent of the total. Immigration lists in many countries having only small or minimum quotas are backed up from 5 to 90 years.

This method of selection cannot possibly give us the best new American citizens. Too much emphasis is placed on a man's place of birth and race at the expense of his skills and qualifications. It is shortsighted and it does violence to the traditional American standard that rates men by their worth, not by their birth.

And let us look at this policy from the other side as well. How can the countries of the world believe that we are sincere in our concern for the elimination of prejudice and discrimination in the United States if we discriminate among them because of race or national origin? Certainly we can find no better way to contradict the idea that the United States is the bastion of freedom and equal rights than by continuing the quota system.

The enactment of this legislation will not provide all of the changes or all of the reforms which our present immigration system requires. It is, however, a start. It does provide a sound basis on which we can build in developing an immigration policy that serves both the national interest and reflects the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes.

As the Attorney General has made very clear:

> Without injury or cost, we can now infuse justice into our immigration policy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this bill be approved without delay as a measure of our responsibility to this country and to the people of the world.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York, H.R. 2580, calling for far-reaching and much-needed immigration reform.

It is imperative that this body take effective action to bring our immigration policy into balance with 20th century America's position in the world. We must be realistic. In the volatile area of world relations, it is difficult enough to maintain a peaceful balance, without the unnecessary millstone of an outmoded and outdated immigration policy hanging around our necks.

It is clear to me that in a world where the old concepts of ethnic discrimination are rapidly being erased, the United States could rightly be charged with refusing to be realistic if current American immigration policies are maintained any longer.

Mr. Chairman, there is also an obvious humanitarian problem created by our current immigration policy.

It is well known to everyone in this body, that because of the manner in which the national quota systems are devised, many countries come nowhere near filling their quotas while others have an unending waiting list.

In my own district, I can refer you to a particularly heartrending case which I am sure is repeated many times across the land.

A young man of Greek extraction, who immigrated to this country several years ago, and took up residence in my district, has been able to establish himself in his community. He is now in a position to support his widowed mother, who remains alone in Greece. She has been trying for 2 years to get an immigration clearance to America to join her son, but has so far been unsuccessful.

Mr. Chairman, under the discriminatory immigration policy now maintained by the United States, it is doubtful that this poor lady will be reunited with her nearest kin. It is in a case such as this, multiplied a thousand time across the land, where the need for reform is made obvious.

The President has come forward and wholeheartedly endorsed this legislation because he realizes that current policy must be revised. I agree with the President and support him on this matter. Further, I urge each of my fellow representatives to seriously review our current policy in the perspective of a changing world and I am sure that they will find this proposed legislation absolutely necessary.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, until the early 1900's, immigration to the United States was relatively unrestricted. After the First World War, the first quota laws were enacted, with the intent

of reducing southern European immigration.

The immigration law now in effect is the McCarran-Walter Act, passed over the veto of President Truman in 1952. Its most important feature is the quota system which provides annual quotas for each country equal to one-sixth of 1 percent of the inhabitants in the United States in 1920 who have national origins in the country in question. There is a minimum quota of 100 for each country.

On January 13 of this year, President Johnson sent a message to Congress proposing legislation to amend the McCarran-Walter Act. He said that his proposed bill would not alter any of the current security restrictions on immigrants and that no immigrants admitted under this bill could contribute to unemployment in the United States. He said that this bill would "return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals."

In an era in which we are offering greater opportunity for all Americans—opportunity for freedom from poverty and illiteracy, from exploitation and discrimination—the existing immigration and nationality act is outdated. The immigration policies basing admission to our shores on national origin are inconsistent with our goal of equality of opportunity in America. The existing law places more emphasis on an individual's place of birth or the way he spells his name than his skills and the work he can do. The existing law discriminates against those people from southern Europe and other areas of the world. The existing law separates members of a family from each other. What is required is an admission policy based on need and talent which will allow a fairer distribution of people to come to this Nation where traditionally neither name nor birth is a deterrent to free development and success.

Equality of opportunity has been part of the American tradition since the pilgrims landed in Massachusetts. The millions of immigrants who have come to our land have worked together as Americans to forge a great nation. The skills and intelligence as well as the hard work of all people have been used to raise our cities, push our roads and railroads coast to coast, write our laws, found our schools, develop our industries, grow our foods, and provide us with music, art, and drama to enjoy when we lay down the plow and rest the pick.

The new immigration bill would repeal the national origins quota system as of July 1, 1968, and substitute an annual numerical limit of 170,000 to be distributed on the following basis: 20 percent for unmarried adult children of U.S. citizens; 20 percent for immediate relatives of aliens admitted to permanent residence; 10 percent for artists and professional persons; 10 percent for married children of U.S. citizens; 24 percent for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; 10 percent for persons with skills needed in the United States; 6 percent for political refugees.

All unused visas would be distributed on a first-come, first-serve basis. The bill places a ceiling of 20,000 immigrants from any single country exclusive of nations in the Western Hemisphere, and spouses, parents, and minor children of U.S. citizens, who are exempt from any numerical limit.

Before the proposed bill goes into effect in 1968, it authorizes the use of about 50,000 unused national quotas as a pool to which applicants from countries with oversubscribed quotas can apply.

The issue of immigration and nationality involves not all Americans. By liberalizing our immigration law, we can bring our immigration policy out of contradiction and into compatibility with the philosophy that has made and that is America—equality of opportunity for all its citizens.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am happy that I am alive and I am humbly grateful that my constituents have extended my service into the 89th Congress.

In the campaign of 1948 the unpopular, undemocratic immigration law with its cruel and snobbish national origins formula was one of the issues, as also, was the repeal of obnoxious provisions of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act.

When I, with many other new Members, came to the 81st Congress, I thought it was with the clear mandate from the American people to clean the stables of an unworthy immigration law and unfair provisions in the labor law of our land.

That was 17 years ago. I have waited long and patiently. I have come hopefully to other and later Congresses, the 83d, the 84th, the 85th, the 86th, the 87th, the 88th, and each has run its course and taken its place in history with the mandate of the American people in 1948 as regards immigration and labor unheeded and unnoticed.

But, Mr. Chairman, morality does not die on the vine. That which is moral in its principle, decent in its concept, and right in its application inevitably must triumph. If once the American people have spoken, and their mandate has been ignored or discarded, they will speak again and again, and their voices will take on the volume of thunder until the courage and the stubbornness of the defiers are broken.

It is to the everlasting glory of the House of Representatives of the immortal 89th Congress that it has voted to repeal one of the most obnoxious provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act and that now in the closing week of the humid month of August in the year of 1965 it is about to retire forever an immigration law that was a reflection upon the very face of decency and did violation to the American image.

In every Congress of which I have been a Member, I have talked and I have worked for a reformation of our immigration laws. In every Congress, I have introduced as a sponsor a bill that would end the national origins concept.

In my judgment, the bill we are now considering meets the requirements of our times and measures up to what in most American homes will be held to be the decent, humane, equitable, and sensible thing to do. Our country is truly indebted to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], and to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], as well as to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Indeed it seems to me that a large share of credit is due all the members of the subcommittee and all the members of the full committee. They have shown an industry and a tireless application to the public business that is in the finest legislative traditions. I would add that never since I have been a Member of the Congress have I listened with greater interest and intellectual profit to the general debate than that on H.R. 2580. And I must repeat what I stated at the commencement of these observations, I am happy that after an impatient wait of 17 years I seem now to be about to attend the burial of an immigration law that was made of snobbery and thumbed its nose at democracy.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the immigration measure now under consideration. Our present immigration laws are based on the national origins of our population as it was constituted nearly 50 years ago, and assign large quotas to countries that neither need them nor want them.

At the same time, other nations with which we have close ties are given small quotas and very long waiting lists. As an example, in the Second District of New Jersey, which I have the honor to represent, we have 23,727 citizens who were born in Italy, according to the 1960 census. Time and again I have had the sad duty of notifying families among this group that the present annual quota of immigrants from Italy does not permit relatives of theirs to come to the United States. At present, the Italian quota is 5,666 annually, whereas, under terms of the immigration measure we are considering here, the quota would be almost quadrupled—raised to 20,000 anuually. And that is only one example of many I could cite.

As a result of the present immigration laws, we are depriving the United States of people whose skills we urgently need and we are delaying the day when many American citizens can be united with their families.

I am pleased to note that I submitted an immigration measure similar to the bill now under consideration, and I am anxious that the bill we are debating be enacted into law. No nation can base its immigration procedures on more practical or humane bases than those included in this measure—the contributions an applicant can make to our country through his skills and his family relationship to an American citizen.

I urge that my colleagues give favorable consideration to this important and long-overdue measure and I hope it will become the law of our land during this session of the Congress.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the House Republican policy committee, I rise to report the statement of policy that has been

adopted by this committee with respect to H.R. 2580 the Immigration and Nationality Act amendments. The policy statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE ON H.R. 2580

The Republican policy committee recommends that the nationals of all countries be treated equally. We endorse H.R. 2580, which amends the Immigration and Nationality Act and adopts a new system for the admission of aliens, but we believe it essential that an amendment be adopted which places the Western Hemisphere also under a reasonable numerical limitation.

For many years, the Republican Party has advocated an immigration policy based upon the individual merit of each applicant rather than upon the individual's race, place of birth, or ancestry. On several occasions, President Eisenhower sent messages to Congress recommending immigration reform and noting that experience in the postwar world had demonstrated that the present national origins system of admitting aliens needed reexamination.

This Republican-sponsored legislation will:

1. Abolish the national origins system;

2. Adopt a new immigration system which emphasizes the reuniting of families and the individual merit of each applicant;

3. Set a limitation of 170,000 (including 10,200 refugees) on the number to be admitted each year (exclusive of the Western Hemisphere);

4. Eliminate discrimination based upon race;

5. Safeguard the American workingman from unfair competition and a lowering of wages and working standards.

We congratulate the Republican members of the Committee on the Judiciary on their contribution to this historic legislation. Due to their efforts, the provisions which surrendered to the executivewide discretionary powers over immigration policy were deleted from the administration proposal. They successfully insisted that reuniting of families be given first priority, that the American workingman be protected. And they initiated the provisions of the bill which will give immediate relief to the heavily oversubscribed countries such as Italy, Greece, Poland, Spain, and China.

The proposed bill with respect to Western Hemisphere immigration is stronger than the present Walter-McCarran Act. In three different instances Republican amendments were adopted that provide a qualitative control over immigration from this area. We are concerned, however, by the fact that this broad reform of our immigration system and policy continues a form of discrimination by not including the Western Hemisphere countries under a numerical ceiling concept. Despite our close and continuing ties with our friends in the Western Hemisphere, we do not believe that the citizens of the 24 independent countries of the Western Hemisphere should remain in a highly preferred position to that of the citizens of the more than 100 countries in the rest of the world.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the very much publicized amendment placing a limitation on Western Hemispheric immigration. I wish only to point out several items which I feel make this amendment an absolute necessity. First, the only device in this bill which limits the number of immigrants from the Western Hemisphere is the so-called labor clearance clause. We are expected to believe that prior to approving an application the Secretary of State must first be assured by the Secretary of Labor that such approval will not displace or inconvenience any American worker. Mr. Chairman, the labor clearance clause is not a workable provision. This is not an effective limitation. Can you picture the Department of Labor deciding whether or not an applicant plumber from Bolivia will displace any workers in Buffalo or New York; and further, whether or not this plumber will have an adverse effect on the wages and working conditions of plumbers in Buffalo? This provision directs the Labor Secretary to do the impossible. Second, our natural resources and national economy already experience severe strains. We have a responsibilty to our children and to their children to conserve our resources and to will to them a healthy economy. We have a responsibility to Americans now living to do our best to solve this Nation's problems and the more people there are, the more difficult the solution becomes. Third, the amendment now before us was eliminated from the bill by the full committee after hearing arguments by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. But, both the Secretary of State and the Attorney General testified that numerical limitations would probably be necessary at some time in the future.

The longer we wait to impose these restrictions the more difficult it will be to explain to the leaders of Latin America just why such limitations are necessary. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that short-term diplomacy is not in our national interest. Because there is no effective restriction on Western Hemisphere immigration contained in this bill, because our resources and economy are already strained, because short-term diplomacy is not in our national interest, and because the bill discriminates against all the peoples of the world outside the Western Hemisphere by placing a numerical limitation upon their immigration while permitting Latin Americans to come in without limitation, I strongly urge all Members to support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota when it is offered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my support for H.R. 2580, the pending bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The major change that would be enacted by this bill is the repeal of the national origins quota system which has been the dominant theme of our immigration policy for more than 40 years.

The national origins quota system was enacted in an atmosphere of isolationism and suspicion of foreign influence which approached hysteria. It was a bad law when it was enacted and it has become a worse law over the intervening years not only because of its inherent discrimination but because with every passing year it has proven itself to be unworkable and ineffectual.

In recent years the quota has controlled only one-third of the immigration admitted into the country. Numerous laws have been adopted to circumvent its unrealistic strictures, including legislation for refugees and the reunification of families.

The pending bill takes cognizance of these shortcomings in the present system and would replace it with a system of immigration selection that will foster the unification of families and allow skilled and talented immigrants to enter the country, without regard to the place of their birth. These purposes are eminently more in keeping with our national ideals and traditions. The bill would not increase immigration sharply. It is estimated that an increase of approximately 20 percent over current figures would result. The bill also recognizes the interests of the American workers, and actually increases the safeguards of those workers against the potential dangers of job competition and deterioration of wages and working conditions resulting from immigration.

The bill is reasonable and sound in my opinion and has my complete support.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, America is truly a nation of immigrants. Every American, every Member of this House can trace his ancestry back to England or France, Germany or Poland, Italy or Ireland, or some other land across the sea. It occurs to me also that our Nation is a far stronger, better place to live in because of the vast contributions made by foreign-born Americans, men like Einstein, Von Braun, Frankfurter, Celebrezze, Trojan, and scores of others, past and present, who scaled the heights in business, commerce, government, medicine, and the arts and sciences.

I have heard very little opposition to this legislation from within my congressional district. The opposition that I have heard was based on the misconceptions that the bill would "open the floodgates," that it would aggravate unemployment problems in certain areas.

The fact, of course, is that H.R. 2580 would result in an overall increase of less than 2,000 admissions over and above the present rate of influx. What the measure would do is redefine preference priorities and eliminate the obnoxious national origins system which has never served any useful purpose. But it definitely would not lower the gates to unrestricted immigration.

As to the fear that H.R. 2580 would affect employment, I make the point that the bill specifically requires the Secretary of Labor to make an affirmative finding that any alien seeking to enter the United States would not replace any worker or adversely affect existing wages and working conditions. It is significant that one of the strongest supporters of the bill is the AFL–CIO.

It is significant also that this legislation has broad bipartisan support within both great political parties. Four Presidents of the United States—Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and now Lyndon B. Johnson—have recommended its enactment during the last 18 years.

Mr. Chairman, as the Lutheran Immigration Service has declared, and I quote from its January 31, 1964, bulletin:

Inevitably a nation's immigration laws reflect her basic attitude toward other nations and races. They also provide a glimpse into her standards of national interest as related to international responsibility. Here her concept of justice, her view of human

rights, and the quality of her moral principles are tested and exposed for all to see.

Let us put on display America's concept of justice, her high quality of moral principles by passing this legislation into law.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2580, which proposes to make the first major reforms in our Nation's immigration policy since 1924 when the national origins quota system was adopted. In the intervening years since the Congress made this policy decision the position of America in the world and the attitude of many Americans has changed.

When the original legislation was enacted four decades ago, isolationism was the keystone of our relations with other nations. Since World War II, however, the United States has become increasingly committed to a policy of international cooperation. Today we are recognized as the defender of the Free World. We have committed our Nation to the preservation of freedom for all peoples of the world; not only those of Northern Europe. It seems quite inconsistent that we should be asking people throughout the world to join us—to fight and die for the cause of freedom and at the same time deny them an equal opportunity to become American citizens. The current policy also presents the ironic situation in which we are willing to send our American youth to aid these people in their struggle against Communist aggression while at the same time, we are indicating that they are not good enough to be Americans.

Making our position in the world community more rational is not the only reason we should adopt a new immigration policy. The fact that the current national origins quota system has not met the needs of the time, in itself is a sound basis for making necessary changes. In recent years only about one-third of the immigrants who have entered the United States have done so under the quota system. The majority enter under private immigration legislation. For a Nation which prides itself on rule by law, it is unreasonable to allow a statute which does not meet the needs of the time to guide our policy.

Another man from Massachusetts, our late President John F. Kennedy, summed up the situation when he said:

> The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations, such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth.

This was no wisp-in-the-willow idea of President Kennedy's either, for he championed the cause of immigration reform as a Congressman and Senator and as President of the United States. As his brother, Senator Robert F. Kennedy noted in the introduction to President Kennedy's book, "A Nation of Immigrants":

> I know of no cause which President Kennedy championed more warmly than the improvement of our immigration policies.

President Kennedy felt deeply about this subject because he believed, as I believe, that the pluralistic society which has resulted from the amalgamation of so many cultures has enriched the lives of all Americans and has strengthened our national character. President Johnson expressed similar sentiments in his immigration message to the Congress when he commented:

> A change is needed in our laws dealing with immigration. Four Presidents have called attention to serious defects in this legislation. Action is long overdue. Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to these shores. The fundamental longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities. On this basis men and women migrated from every quarter of the globe. By their hard work and their enormously varied talents they hewed a great nation out of a wilderness. By their dedication to liberty and equality, they created a society reflecting man's most cherished ideals.

The proposed immigration bill is based upon the criteria President Johnson advocated. It places major emphasis on the skills and education of the immigrant which is in keeping with the American tradition.

Mr. Chairman, certainly this Congress which has made notable achievements in so many fields resulting in the improvement of the lives of Americans born and yet to be born; surely this Congress will also see that more equitable treatment is given to those who wish to become Americans.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly hope this measure, H.R. 2580, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes, will be promptly and resoundingly approved by the House.

I think that most Members here will agree that the need to equitably revise our current immigration laws is one of the most vitally important subjects that today challenges our national moral conscience and the legislative prudence of the Congress.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee that developed this immigration revision bill, I can testify that the committee members diligently and studiously sought the answer to this challenge throughout extended hearings and exhaustive review of expert testimony. On this score, the Congress and the country are deeply indebted to the dedicated leadership of the distinguished and esteemed respective chairmen of the subcommittee and the full committee whose combined guidance, together with the nonpartisan cooperation of the committee membership, has led to the presentation of this legislative solution of one of our greatest national problems.

No one will pretend that this bill is the complete and perfect instrument that will immediately correct and dissolve all the difficulties and deficiencies inherent in and projected by our present immigration laws and regulations, but I do believe that after full and open discussion and examination of its provisions the great majority here will recognize and approve it as a great forward step in the equitable correction of an outmoded and discriminatory immigration system that has too long prevailed.

Even a very brief review of our present law reveals that the current national origins system, which determines a nation's immigration quota by the proportion of the U.S. population of that national extraction in 1924, visits a most unfair and unpopular discrimination against the majority of the nations of the world. This persistent discrimination has increasingly weakened our position of world leadership and has unwittingly delivered into skillful anti-American hands an effective instrument for Communist propaganda against the United States as the proclaimed hope and asylum of the poor and the persecuted and the homeless.

As a glaring example of discrimination, under this national origins system, a very heavy priority is given to immigrant applicants of the countries of Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany, yet there were more than 34,000 unused numbers in the last British quota. On the other hand, Israel and other Asiatic and African countries are permitted only about 100 immigrants per year into the United States.

An examination of the situation in other countries, in southern and eastern Europe, demonstrates similar and even greater discrimination. For example, Italy's yearly quota of 5,666 must be projected in an attempt to cover well over 250,000 applicants. Greece has been granted a quota of 308 to process a backlog of over 100,000 qualified applicants. Poland is permitted only 6,488 quota numbers per year to somehow be allocated among more than 65,000 annual applicants.

Mr. Chairman, surely the great majority of Americans would objectively judge this system and situation to be gravely unfair and it is, indeed, a matter which has seriously hurt the prestige and influence of the United States, both at home and abroad. One of the primary purposes of the bill before us now is to correct the injustices generated by this outdated national origins quota system and the adoption of this bill will correct it by establishing a new quota system. It is important to note that the operation of this new quota system will not result in any substantial change in the total number of immigrants traditionally admitted to the United States; rather the new system is designed to eliminate, over a period of 3 years, by pooling and redistribution, our present discriminatory system of national quotas and thereby help to alleviate the backlogs of those countries having the highest number of applicants.

Another vitally important section of this bill recognizes the desirability of close family relationship and encourages the preservation, as the foundation of civilized society, of the family unit. This particular section provides preferential priorities to close relatives of American citizens and resident aliens who have been on waiting lists for a heartbreaking length of time. The adoption of this feature alone should save countless expenditures of Federal money, as well as time and energy of Federal legislators and agencies, in the processing of private

bills, for the relief of extreme and unusual hardship immigration cases that come before our House Judiciary Committee by the thousands every year.

Limited preferences are further provided for professional qualified people, and some semiskilled people, whose services are urgently needed here and who will contribute the most to the national economy, welfare and cultural interests of the United States. However, it should be emphasized right here that this measure purposely contains ironclad provisions of protection for American labor and living standards, at all levels, whether skilled, semiskilled, or professional, because a heavy burden is placed upon every intending immigrant who, prior to visa issuance, is individually required to obtain the certification of the Secretary of Labor that his entrance into the United States will not displace a qualified American worker and his potential employment in the United States will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers similarly employed in this country.

I think, on this score, we should further remind ourselves that, within this bill, there has been no relaxing of the qualitative criteria for entrance into the United States and that no relaxation of the mental, health, moral, economic, and security standards is proposed or intended.

Mr. Chairman, it is pertinent, this afternoon, that none of us should forget that this mighty Nation was itself founded and developed almost altogether by immigrants.

Certainly in advancing our position of world leadership and inspiration in these perilous days we can speak more convincingly and persuasively for freedom everywhere when we have done our legislative utmost to grant real freedom, real sanctuary, real family unity, and real opportunity to qualified immigrants who wish to begin a new life in this country. Our national history emphasizes that these are the kind of people in whose behalf the original American tradition of asylum was established and whose immigration to these shores has enriched our country from its earliest days right up to this very hour.

Mr. Chairman, in his legislative recommendation on the immigration problem our late and beloved President John F. Kennedy stated:

> Our investment in new citizens has always been a valuable source of our strength.

Accepting his counsel, and in his valiant spirit, let us adopt this measure, now, in the national interest.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a brief statement concerning the bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The national origins quotas system has been a matter of controversy in the Congress for many years. The system was first adopted over 40 years ago amidst a storm of protest. It was continued in existence by the McCarran-Walter Act in 1952 after heated debate and over the veto of President Truman.

President Kennedy lent inestimable support to the efforts to improve our immigration system when he sent his immigration message and recommended legislation to Congress in July of 1963. President Johnson has given his complete and active support to this legislation ever since he took office, having urged its adoption in his first state of the Union address and on numerous occasions since, including a special message to Congress on January 13 of this year.

Extensive hearings on immigration have been held by subcommittees in both the House and the Senate over the past 2 years. A bill was favorably reported by the House Judiciary Committee which I believe is good legislation.

The bill's purpose is to abolish the national origins quota system, which has long been criticized as fundamentally unworkable.

All of this would seem to indicate that some action is about to be taken on this long-delayed issue. That is why I am taking this opportunity to urge the adoption of H.R. 2580, the bill recommended by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

I think that it is important that we recognize precisely what this bill will do and what it will not do. There are several false apprehensions concerning the effects of this bill which should be put to rest.

Many fear that the bill will result in a wholesale increase in immigration. This is not true. It is estimated that immigration which has averaged around 360,000 annually in recent years, will not surpass 360,000 under the bill.

The main purpose of the bill's substitute for the national origins quota system is to put our immigrant selection policy on a purely nondiscriminatory basis, one which would judge every immigrant upon his own merits rather than granting one an advantage over the other because of the accident of his place of birth.

A second misapprehension concerning the bill is that it may have unfavorable effects on labor market conditions in this country. This, understandably, is a matter of primary importance to the American worker and is probably the overriding consideration for many.

This misapprehension is unsound for a number of reasons. First, the number of additional immigrants allowed to enter the country under the bill who would be candidates for the labor force would be less than 25,000. In a labor force fast approaching 80 million workers—78.4 million in May 1965—this increase—roughly three one-hundredths of 1 percent—would hardly cause a ripple on the Nation's labor pool.

Second, it should be remembered that all of the additional immigrants resulting from enactment of the bill—including workers and nonworking spouses and children—would be consumers whose everyday demands for goods and services would add to the national production and provide additional job opportunities for American workers.

Third, there are qualitative controls under existing law, which would be maintained under the bill, that would prevent immigration from having an adverse effect upon employment in this country. The two principal such controls are the provision barring from entry any alien who is likely to become a public charge and the provision granting the Secretary of Labor authority to exclude immigration which would adversely affect wages and working conditions of workers in the United States.

The final—and I believe the most important—point I would make regarding the bill's effects on employment is that the bill is designed to attract immigrants whose skills and talents would contribute to the economic and cultural growth of this country. The real unemployment problem in this country today is limited almost exclusively to unskilled workers, those capable of performing only unskilled tasks that no longer exist because of sweeping technological advances. Actually, we have a shortage of skilled manpower, which can be and is now being met in part by immigration. The bill would make several changes to allow these skilled immigrants easier access to our shores. Once they are here they will not displace American workers. On the contrary they will in many cases provide additional jobs for American workers. For example, the employment of an engineer in a position now unfilled would call for the hiring of several technicians to back him up. Several immigrants of the recent past, such as Enrico Fermi and Igor Sikorski, have helped to open up whole new industries in this country. And who knows where the next Fermi or Sikorski will come from?

Mr. Chairman, the Immigration and Nationality Act is a rather lengthy and complex statute. But the purpose of this bill is simple and easily understood. And when this purpose is understood it should not be controversial. There is no hidden nefarious motive behind the bill to undermine our American way of life by throwing open the floodgates to cheap foreign labor or subversive individuals. Spokesmen for organized labor and the American Legion have recently testified to these points. It is time we recognized the many myths that have developed concerning the repeal of the national origins quota system for what they are.

This bill was prepared with the assistance of experts in the Departments of Justice and State who are charged with the administration of our immigration system. I am confident that it is a practical bill, which will remove a source of embarrassment abroad and frustration within this country with an outmoded, highly discriminatory and unworkable quota system which touches the lives of many of our citizens very intimately. I therefore urge its adoption by the Congress.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to voice my support for the bill which is before us to modify and improve the immigration laws of the United States.

All of us are conscious of the way in which this Nation began, through exploration of the seas, then of the New World, then of the lands to Louisiana and the West, and finally with the settlement and admission to the Union of the distant States, the Southwest, the Far West, Alaska, and Hawaii. We pay frequent tribute to the bold, restless adventurers, and the progressive, solid people who followed them into these new lands.

We also are conscious of the tradition which they established of welcoming those who followed. And, in this 20th century, as we first established immigration legislation, these traditions and principles remain strong in our minds as we seek to work out basic tenets of immigration law.

It has been evident, however, that with the modern improvement in transportation and in knowledge of the earth, that it is peopled by a much more mobile society. In turn, the law has not always reflected the willingness to change that was so evident in the past. In the Northeast, one of the first areas of our country to be populated, this resistance to change that has been embodied in the law in recent decades has too often worked a real hardship. It has kept families apart, it has made travel difficult.

It has frequently harmed the United States by preventing or delaying the admission of new immigrants whose skills could have meant much to our Nation. In the field of science, where my Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development, has made a thorough study of the resources which are available to us and the goals we seek, we are deeply aware of the international character of science and of the contributions which have been made by so many distinguished men and women to American security and to our knowledge by the foreign-born who have come to our shores. Yet we also know of the difficulties which have been experienced in bringing such people to our land.

We are a country of many races and of many national origins. I am particularly pleased that the committee has recommended to the House, and that we will endorse a proposal to eliminate the national origins system which has plagued our country since 1924. This principle, whose primary objective when enacted in 1924 was to maintain the ethnic balance among the American population as it then existed, is inherently wrong. It has worked a hardship on those elements of the American people, no less worthy, who had come to the United States in this century, and who found themselves blocked from being joined by dear and close relatives.

I want to commend the gentlemen of the committee for the difficult task they have surmounted and for their achievement of a fair and workable immigration policy.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, we are about to vote on another of the historic legislative measures to come before the 89th Congress. The reforms in our immigration laws which this bill provides are long overdue. For many years the national origins quota system has resulted in grave injustices and has effectively prevented tens of thousands of people with much to contribute to our country from immigrating here. The quota system has also prevented many families from being reunited.

I particularly welcome in this bill the elimination of the last vestige of discrimination against Asians. This type of discrimination against Asians was something my father fought against during his years in the Senate from 1924 to 1932.

Immigration has been a source of enormous strength to our country and this bill will carry on that tradition more effectively than in the past.

My congressional district contains an unusually high proportion of citizens who came to this country as immigrants or whose parents did so. I am sure that the overwhelming majority of my constituents are strongly in support of the principles of the legislation before us. Last June I sent out a questionnaire which included a question on "the President's proposal for replacing country quota system with standards favoring workers with needed skills and relatives of people in the United States." Of the 8,000 replies received, 78 percent indicated their approval of the President's proposal and only 15 percent their disapproval.

I hope very much that this bill will be overwhelmingly adopted by the House and that any weakening amendments will be defeated. I particularly oppose the so-called MacGregor amendment, which would unnecessarily offend our neighbors in this hemisphere by imposing upon them for the first time a ceiling on immigration.

There should be no concern that this bill will contribute to unemployment in this country. There are ample safeguards in the bill to prevent that, including a new requirement that the Secretary of Labor certify that adverse effects will not result in the areas concerned.

At the same time, this bill will make it possible for us to live up to our traditions as so beautifully stated on the Statue of Liberty. It is appropriate that in this year in which we are about to adopt a historic change in our immigration laws, we should also be preparing to do adequate honor to our past immigrants by making Ellis Island a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument. I am proud that my bill to accomplish this result was enacted by the Congress and signed by the President on August 17.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2580. As the only Member of Congress of Greek descent—indeed, as the first native-born American of Greek origin ever elected to the Congress of the United States—this legislation has special meaning for me for if our immigration law, as it now stands, had been on the statute books 55 years ago, when my father decided to leave Greece to come to the United States, it is highly questionable whether he would have had any realistic chance of immigrating to this country and becoming an American.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2580 goes a long way to bring right reason to our outdated immigration law—a law fundamentally out of keeping with American traditions.

The new law will repeal the discriminatory national origins quota system. It will repeal the Asia-Pacific triangle which has too long been an insult to those of oriental ancestry. It will unite families now separated by endless waiting lists for visas. It will bring to our Nation new immigrants whose skills may add so much to our culture and development.

This new legislation will do much to improve our posture abroad by showing that we live by our ideals of liberty and individual human dignity. It will make new provisions for refugees fleeing political persecution.

Mr. Chairman, this bill opens no floodgates. It is directed at the method of selection of immigrants, not at the number to be allowed into the country. The actual increase in authorized total immigration will be about 2,000 per year over the current number of quota admissions. This bill protects American workingmen and women by requiring the Secretary of Labor to make an affirmative finding that any alien seeking to enter the United States as a worker will not replace or adversely affect the wages and working conditions of U.S. workers.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that this legislation is long overdue, and it should be passed now.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, patience is a small virtue in the contemplation of a wrong law. H.R. 2580 sets right four decades of wrong embodied in legislation passed in 1924.

With its passage we can correct a mistake of history and reaffirm our devotion to the principle of equal justice for peoples previously subject to discrimination.

When the national origins quota system was introduced in the 1920's, a House minority report called it "blatant discrimination." The report said the system adopted "an unfounded anthropological theory that the nations which are favored are the progeny of the fictitious and hitherto unsuspected Nordic ancestors while those discriminated against are not classified as belonging to that mythical stock." It was, in the eyes of the minority, a "pseudo-scientific proposition."

Today it is still a pseudo-scientific proposition. That is now recognized by the majority. I would have been with that minority in 1924. I am happy to be with the majority who will vote for this bill in 1965.

The national origins quota system was last considered in depth in this House 13 years ago. I had hoped at that time—as many other members who are here today had hoped—that three decades of the inequities of that system would have prompted its abolition. Instead of abolition, we obtained the McCarran-Walter Act, which incorporated most of the worst features of the existing quota system and added further restrictions. It is best described by that which a celebrated author labeled "administrative ecstasy." It spun a labyrinthian web of consular, executive, and congressional redtape over and around the American melting pot.

I fought that bill. I voted against it and I voted to sustain President Truman's veto. I have sought its repeal ever since because it is unfair, it is discriminatory, it is arbitrary and it is obsolete. It is a legal hangover from the xenophobic isolationism that permeated this Nation in the Harding-Coolidge days.

There are few Members of this House who have not made attempts to bypass the narrow limitations of the present immigration laws. Congressional action shows that the humanity of America is more evident in the exceptions to the law than in the law itself. We have endorsed bills admitting thousands of displaced refugees from World War II, from behind the Iron Curtain and from disaster struck homelands. The committee report on H.R. 2580 almost understates when it says:

> The performance of the Congress in the field of immigration in the postwar period has been far more generous and sympathetic than adherence to the national origins systems alone would allow. The failure of that system is noted by the continual changes that special legislation have made on the pattern of immigration over the years.

One of those changes is in private immigration bills. In the 78th Congress, there were less than 100 such bills. In the last Congress there were more than 3,000. I have introduced many such bills to permit war brides to join their husbands, children to join their parents, parents to join their children—all this, to correct the cruelties of the immigration law.

Mr. Chairman, one of my favorite immigrants was the fictional Mr. Dooley, a longtime resident of Chicago, who arrived in the 19th century as "a Pilgrim father that missed the first boats." Once ashore, Mr. Dooley soon determined that he must "raise me claryon voice agin' th' invasion iv this fair land be th' paupers an' arnychists—ye bet I must—because I'm here first."

The fact is that some 43 million Americans missed the first boats, which hardly deterred their coming. They were imbued with the belief that a better life could exist here, that America was a land of opportunity for all people who sought political freedom and economic progress.

Unfortunately, some of their children, or their children's children, held short memories of that dream, and made periodic attempts to curtail the invasion from abroad. Among them were the know nothings, who glorified native born Americans and decried foreigners. Abraham Lincoln was asked to join their Native American Party and refused to do so, saying:

> Well, who are the native Americans? Don't they carry a tomahawk and don't they wear a breechcloth?

Mr. Chairman, our national conscience now dictates that we remove discriminatory barriers that we have placed before the world with the national origins quota system, which penalizes a man for the place of his birth or for his ancestry.

I am aware that this bill is more concerned with the equality of immigrants than with their numbers. It is obvious in any event that the great days of immigration have long since run their course. World population trends have changed, and changing economic and social conditions at home and abroad dictate a changing migratory pattern.

It is also clear that the emphasis on qualified immigrants will be maintained by a new preference system based on needed skills. I am convinced that the new system will benefit, rather than impede, the American economy, and that it will not displace American workers or boost unemployment. The safeguards are written in the law. We will receive skilled people, and consumers; and as the Attorney General testified, "the net effect would be to create rather than absorb jobs."

The humanitarian aspects of this bill are obvious. The old system has divided families and kept them separated for years. The new law favors their reunification. Four of the first five preference priorities belong to relatives of American citizens.

I am especially glad to note the passing of the so-called Asia-Pacific Triangle provisions. It is bad enough to penalize a man for the place he was born, let alone for his ancestry. Potential Asian immigrants have felt the sting of this double discrimination. In attempting to help many Asian-Americans, I have run up against the heavily mortgaged Eastern quotas for years. From my own experience as an Ambassador to the United Nations, and from discussions with diplomats from the Far East, I can tell you that Asians feel very strongly about this discrimination. It is well that the Asia-Pacific Triangle is being eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2580 is not an ordinary bill. It cannot be measured in statistics, compounded by quota numbers, debated by cost. In essence, H.R. 2580 is a reaffirmation of American history. It erases the overt discrimination of the national origins quota system and by so doing it testifies to our historical proposition that all men are created equal. It affirms, as Herman Melville said, that "we are the heirs of all time, and with all nations we divide our inheritance."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, at long last we have an opportunity to give the authority of law to the principle that in welcoming immigrants to our Nation family ties and potential contribution to our society should weigh more heavily than the accidents of national origin.

For too many years, an outdated quota system has been permitted to govern our immigration policy. The system proposed in this legislation is far more rational, sensible, and humane. Without significantly increasing the annual rate of immigration, we can make the selection process a far more qualitative one. Within the ceiling of 170,000 for the quota countries the standards for mental, health, moral, and economic eligibility will continue to be applied. But they will be applied on the basis of the most relevant criteria for admission: family relationship and skill or talent.

Instead of making it difficult for families to be reunited this legislation will greatly ease this burden by granting nonquotas status for the parents of U.S. citizens. I am sure we have all had letters and pleas from U.S. citizens who have been unable to have their families join them due to outmoded restrictions and oversubscribed national quotas.

I think that the members of the House Judiciary Committee should be commended for the outstanding work they have done in connection with this legislation. They have produced a bill at the same time flexible and humane and mindful of the national economic and security interests. There is no danger of a flood of immigration from any one country due to the 20,000 limitation written into the bill. In fact, the bill insures that we will continue to welcome those many groups from all over the world that have contributed so much to our culture, our economy, and our national life.

The committee, in my judgment, was wise in leaving the nonquota status for immigrants from the Western Hemisphere in the law. This provision is an important symbol of hemispheric solidarity and has presented no problems of abuse or of claims of discriminatory treatment from other nations. This feature, which was incorporated into the original 1924 statute, proved to be one of the soundest of that legislation. It should be retained.

The transition period embodied in the bill is probably necessary, but I am pleased that the unused quotas will be put to the immediate use of those which have been traditionally oversubscribed and of refugees.

In addition, more protection is provided for U.S. workers through the requirement that an intending immigrant obtain clearance from the Secretary of Labor that he would not be likely to displace a qualified American worker or adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers employed in the United States.

The actual impact of the legislation can best be seen by a brief look at statistics. The quota of Italy, for example, is now 5,666 per year. It is oversubscribed by about 100,000. Under the terms of the new bill when totally in effect, immigration could reach the maximum of 20,000, but is estimated by the Department of State to reach 17,000. This picture could be repeated for country after country where the quotas have been terribly oversubscribed for many years.

In summary, then, I think that this is a long overdue, eminently reasonable solution to an important national problem. Of course, we cannot possibly absorb every immigrant who wishes to come to the United States. But we have a responsibility to insure that the necessary selection process is conducted with the maximum good sense and humanity.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of the Immigration Act of 1965, a long overdue piece of legislation which should pass overwhelmingly today.

All we have to do to see the necessity for this measure is to look at this year 1965 and at the year 1924 when the original Immigration and Nationality Act, based on the national origins quota system, was passed. This year, 1965, is a year of progress, a year when we and other men are beginning to move toward the realization of a society in which all men are truly free and equal. In 1924, we were striving to "return to normalcy," a normalcy which could be no more. It was the aftermath of World War I, a

holocaust which revolted the American people and made them turn into the shell of isolationism, feeling secure in the expanse of ocean which separated the United States from her allies and enemies, from the peoples and problems of the rest of the world. And the feelings of this year, coupled with the events of the past decade, brought about a system known as the national origins quota system, which said that others of your nationality must be in the majority in the United States before you stood a Chinaman's chance of entering the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Now is our chance to change this policy which has worked so much against the best interests of the United States and of the world.

The current policy, cornerstone of the U.S. view toward immigrants for the past 40 years, cannot escape the label "unfair." It is a system which allows Great Britain more than 65,000 emigrants to this Nation per year, and which sees less than half of this amount used annually by England. And it sees us impose a quota of 100 per year on nations such as Iraq, Korea, Luxembourg, the Philippines and others. It sees us impose a quota of only 200 on India, with her teeming population and lack of jobs and food for them. It sees us impose a quota of approximately 6,500 on Poland, a nation which needs many more allotments than this in order to perform the simple act of keeping families together.

So that is the ironic fact which has developed as a result of our 40 years of unfairness. A nation such as England never uses her quota. There are jobs there for the people and they are not clamoring to leave for a country which offers them opportunities they cannot gain any other way. But a country such as Poland is allowed only these few each year. And this means that in a country where people are trying to escape oppression, trying to regain that life in which the work of a man's hands determines whether he fails or succeeds, there are thousands wanting to come to this land of opportunity, but we have to say "No."

We have cases in my office—a son is in the United States. He wants to bring his mother and father to this country. But it will be years and maybe even his lifetime before they can come to live with him in the United States. A husband wants to bring his wife and children. The same situation exists in this case.

And all the while nations such as England are not beginning to use their entire quota.

What this means is simple. A man from England, for instance, with no preferences, has no problem if he wants to come to America. But a man from Poland can be highly skilled and with close relatives in this Nation, all of which makes him a high preference immigrant, but he must wait for years in hopes of coming under the current quota.

We now have a chance to change all of this. We now have the chance to correct the inequities, to show through our actions that we consider the individual's worth of the utmost importance, not the color of his skin or where he was born.

We now have the chance to approve the Immigration Act of 1965 and take the first step forward in correcting all the many faults which have existed in our immigration policy for too long.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I will support H.R. 2580, which amends the Immigration and Nationality Act, because of the reforms it brings to the law by abolishing the national origins quota system.

I find it inexcusable, however, that provisions are being retained in the proposal, at the insistence of the administration, that will discriminate against the Polish, the Italian, and the Swedish immigrants.

These people and those from other countries outside the Western Hemisphere are being discriminated against in this bill by the rigid numerical limits being placed on their immigration here. Highly preferential treatment, meanwhile, is being afforded to our friends from our own hemisphere.

I will vote for the bill because of the changes it will bring to our archaic immigration system. But the proposal leaves the job only half done by discriminating against many other countries of the world.

I regret that this legislation could not have carried the Republican amendment that would have corrected this glaring contradiction.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 2580, as amended, which offers a humanitarian and practical solution to the long overdue revision of our basic immigration law as called for by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson.

H.R. 2580, as amended, meets every objective of the major recommendations of the administration. It eliminates the national origins quota system during a transition period of 3 years; it eliminates the notorious Asia-Pacific Triangle; it maintains nonquota status for close relatives of American citizens, adding to this category, parents of American citizens; it maintains nonquota status for the Western Hemisphere; it makes provision for a reasonable number of refugees from Communist-dominated areas, and the Middle East to find a haven in the United States, at approximately the same rate as during the past several years. It accomplishes all these things without significantly increasing the ceiling on immigration to the United States, which is presently 158,000 persons and, under the new law, would be 170,000. At the same time, it makes possible a continued flow to the United States of persons whose professions, skills, and trades are badly needed by our expanding economy, without in anyway creating a danger of increasing unemployment. As Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz testified before the House Subcommittee, under this bill, a maximum of 23,000 new workers would enter the labor market—a tiny fraction of the total American labor force, and a very high proportion of even this modest number would bring to our shores much needed skills. Our country has always greatly benefited from the contribution of immigrants and children of immigrants to every field of endeavor—the arts, sciences, education, industry, labor, and to the very Government itself, including high-ranking members of the administration, and distinguished Members of the House of Representatives and Senate.

I am especially pleased to remind the House that this bill has the backing of the major Catholic, Jewish, Protestant, as well as nonsectarian voluntary immigration agencies who, as representatives of the vast majority of the American people, have been engaged for many years in assistance to immigrants, aliens, and refugees, in this country and overseas. Last year, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, representatives of the Committee on Refugee and Migration Problems of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, stated:

> The voluntary agencies believe that the basic provisions in the proposed legislation will not only eliminate the discriminatory national origins quota system, but that they will constructively change our immigration laws so that they serve the common good of our people and reflect what is best for the interests of the United States both domestically and internationally. This proposed legislation will also, we believe, provide the necessary flexibility which is needed in a rapidly changing world. It has become almost commonplace for Members of Congress, Government officials, agencies working with aliens, immigrants, and refugees, as well as private citizens, to state that for too long a period America's immigration and nationality laws have conflicted with our traditional American ideals. As the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, said in his statement before the May 1964 Geneva Council Session of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration: "Until we write into our law books an immigration statute which will be worthy of the traditions of the United States and of our considerable responsibility in the world today, until we do that we deny that famous phrase in our Declaration of Independence which says 'All men are created equal.' The national origins theory states all men are not created equal because it gives preference to some and metes out discrimination and proscription to others."

It is the firm belief of the agencies working in the field of immigration and refugees that the goal of world peace and brotherhood in this or any other generation can be furthered only in a climate of increasing understanding and good will among nations; important in the area of international relations are immigration policies and procedures. Inevitably a nation's immigration laws reflect its basic attitude toward nations and races.

In conclusion, we might simply point to the remarks made by President Johnson on January 13, 1964, when he met at the White House with representatives of organizations interested in immigration and refugee matters. The President said:

> This is a Nation that was really built by immigrants, immigrants from all lands, and that is why we should ask those who seek to immigrate now what can you do for our country? What we ought never to ask is: in what country were you born?

I am informed that in a letter to Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN, chairman of the House subcommittee, dated May 5, 1965, these organizations reaffirmed their support of H.R. 2580 and urge its passage at the earliest possible date.

While it is proper to emphasize the humanitarian aspects of the revision of our immigration laws, the proposal before the House does more than that. At a time when America is making every effort to maintain its friendly ties with all the nations of the free world, indeed to improve its image all over the world, there could be no greater proof that America is true to its democratic and liberal traditions, than the passage of this bill.

In casting our votes in favor of H.R. 2580, we are casting our votes for the security and well-being of America and the free world.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I feel there are few areas in our law which more urgently demand reform than our present unfair system of choosing the immigrants we will allow to enter the United States, particularly under the archaic and inequitable national origins quota system. This system embarrasses us in the eyes of other nations, it creates cruel and unnecessary hardship for many of our own citizens with relatives abroad, and it is a source of loss to the economic and creative strength of our country.

While I believe that our immigration laws must first serve the best interests of our Nation and must contain a clearly defined system of selective controls, I feel that the provisions contained in H.R. 2580 are far better than the national origins quota system which makes no attempt at all to distinguish which immigrants will best serve the interests of our Nation. As President Kennedy so aptly noted in his book "A Nation of Immigrants":

> The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth.

It is my belief that the bill under discussion would make it easier to bring to the United States persons with special skills and attainments that we need and want; it would reunite thousands of our citizens with members of their families from whom they are now needlessly separated; it would remove from our law a discriminatory system of selecting immigrants that is a standing affront to millions of our citizens and our friends overseas; and, it would provide for the needs of refugees and serve our traditional policy of aiding those made homeless by catastrophe or oppression. In essence, this measure would accomplish all these necessary goals without damaging the interests of any person or group, either here or overseas.

It is obvious that if a change were not necessary in our immigration laws, four Presidents would never have called attention to this serious flaw in our legislation.

Some sections of our immigration laws are particularly unjust, such as that which involves the Asia-Pacific triangle where the quotas are not on the basis of one's place of birth but rather on their racial ancestry. As our distinguished Secretary of State noted: "It represents an overt statutory discrimination against more than one-half of the world's population."

Of almost equal inequity is the fact that much of the total quota goes unused each year. Thus, while England and Ireland are assigned 83,000 persons a year, or about one-half the total for all nations, and use only about 32,000 persons annually, most of the other countries of the world must suffer under small quotas which are, in the greater majority of cases, heavily oversubscribed.

Our great Nation was built by immigrants of courage and ability who came from many lands. We have benefited from the genius of men who came to our country, often seeking religious, political or intellectual freedom—men such as Albert Einstein, Neils Bohr, Enrico Fermi, and thousands of others. Our country has prospered not only economically from the contributions of these people, but also socially and culturally.

Under the protections provided in this bill, I am convinced that the proposed law constitutes no threat to our labor force. Governmental studies show that the present quality of immigration results in the creation of more jobs than the immigrants themselves take and, in many cases, the immigrants are highly skilled and can make major contributions to our science and industry. This bill emphasizes needed skills whereas existing legislation virtually ignores them.

I would submit as a further safeguard, however, that while preferences should be provided to meet particular labor shortages, I do feel that this preference must be precisely defined and properly administered. Furthermore, I feel a definite distinction needs to be made between those jobs which are permanent and those of purely a seasonal or temporary nature.

Another provision which is salutary is the establishment of an Immigration Advisory Board. I feel this Board would be most useful in providing in-depth evaluation of the operation of the new law. Also, this Board would serve to help remove some of the injustices in the present system by administering the pool of unused quotas during the yearly reduction of these quotas. However, on decisions pertaining to the existence of labor shortages in particular fields, I feel the Secretary of Labor should be given a more active and clearly defined role than is presently envisaged. The Secretary of Labor possesses the necessary information on which to base sound judgments in this area of concern.

In essence, then, it is my belief that H.R. 2580 will clarify our policy and bring it closer to the desires of the American people. It will demonstrate to the world our dedication to equal and just treatment of immigrants. I take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to support this fine bill. I join with the President in urging my distinguished colleagues "to return the United States to an immigration policy which both serves the national interest and continues our traditional ideals."

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to thank President Johnson for the letter which he addressed to the Speaker urging passage of the immigration bill under consideration by the House of Representatives today. The President's generous remarks concerning the work which has been done in our country by Americans of diverse nationalities is most gratifying and rewarding.

I am greatly honored and sincerely touched that we would include my name with those other of my colleagues of varying national backgrounds and ancestry who serve in the Congress of the United States.

Perhaps more than any of his predecessors, President Johnson is indeed the President of all the people. I join with him wholeheartedly in supporting this legislation to bring our immigration laws up to the ideal which we have proclaimed to the world for so many years.

We in the House of Representatives today have been called to right an old wrong, to bring justice where prejudice and injustice have prevailed too long.

We are asked to support a revision in our present immigration laws which will eliminate the test of nationality as a condition for admission to the United States of America. It is incredible that it has taken us so long to correct this inequity.

Each of us is familiar with the historian's description of America in the 1840's and the results of our great experiment in self-determination. He said:

> Democratic nations care but little for what has been, but they are haunted by visions of what will be; in this direction their unbounded imagination grows beyond all measure. Democracy, which shuts the past against the poet, opens the future before him.

In our own century and generation, Franklin Roosevelt spoke of the greatness which called men throughout the world to join with America, as Americans, to rid the world of ancient disorders, ancient prejudices, ancient tyrannies. We responded to his call, for our honor would not permit us to do otherwise.

President Roosevelt appealed to our sense of nationhood and our kinship with men of other nations and times. He said:

> Remember always that all of us, and you and I especially, are descended from immigrants and revolutionists. We and all others who believe as we do would rather die on our feet than live on our knees.

The immigration bill we are considering today does more than renew our belief in the equality of men—it does something to implement it. It states to all the world that America seeks men and women of ability, who believe that the soul must be nurtured in freedom, and who wish to contribute their knowledge and their unique skills to building a greater America. The prospects for our future, upon enactment of this legislation, are incalculable.

So much is said of the unique quality of the United States. Those of us here today share personal knowledge of it. We in the Congress have come from villages, towns, enormous cities, small farming hamlets, suburban communities, and we lend our individual voices and skills toward representing Americans in the greatest legislative body in the world.

We speak here for people of all nationalities, of all economic, and cultural levels. In this Chamber, we speak for all men.

Our disregard of ancestry as a qualification for public service is well known. Under a standard of majority rule, with equal protection for the rights of the minority, we have sculptured a philosophy which has proved and renewed its vitality time and time again.

Men and women have come to this continent for more than 350 years. Their differences have been many. Often they did not share the bonds of a common language or a common cultural or social heritage. Rather than establish a rigid class structure in this new country, they set about finding means to work together.

Their sons wrote the Declaration of Independence and a Constitution which sparked dreams of liberty among people in every other Nation on earth. America became more than a geographic area—it became a philosophy which spoke to the souls of men of all races, creeds, and colors.

Every man who seeks self-determination, who practices charity and understanding toward his neighbor, who strives to make a better world for his sons by contributing his talent in his own generation and in whatever measure to advance civilization, is an American and a brother.

This bill before us today says to all men that our Nation is unsatisfied with a law which presumes men of one nation are somehow superior or more preferable than others.

The future confronts us daily. We have worlds to conquer in science, literature, music, medicine, space. We can no longer afford to ignore the enormous resources of human talent which abound on earth. We cannot afford to be insular and concerned only with preserving the status quo in such an age of challenge.

It has been said that the only shield to a man's memory is the sincerity of his actions. This bill before us today is right, it is proper, it is long overdue.

We and generations before us have helped make this legislation possible. We cannot deny our debt of honor to this country, which has showered such abundance on each one of us.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues are familiar with the provisions of this bill. They know it does not propose appreciably increasing the present immigration rate to the United States.

We are helping, through this legislation, to reunite families which, prior to this bill, had no hope of seeing their relatives again. We are actively seeking skills and talents which are in short supply in America today.

This legislation will dispel forever the assumption that a nuclear physicist from Italy or Spain is not as welcome among us as his colleague from Scandinavia of equal career qualifications.

An earlier Roosevelt, Theodore, said in his day:

> The first requisite of a good citizen is that he be able to pull his own weight.

I believe it is now time that we in Congress recognize the value of these words and set about doing something to implement them.

We need good citizens, good Americans from all the four corners of the world. It is time to welcome them home.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, in the last 10 years there has been great concern in this country at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—over discrimination against minorities. The U.S. Government has responded to the call for equality and an end to discrimination by enacting several laws, culminating in the Voting Rights Act of 1965, protecting and fostering these minorities. Slowly, but most surely, we are guaranteeing freedom from discrimination to these minority groups.

But, Mr. Chairman, during all this time of fighting to protect minorities, we have been discriminating, believe it or not, against a great populous majority. Indeed we have been discriminating against the rest of the world.

I refer, of course, to our immigration regulations and laws as they now exist. For many years we have tenaciously held to the concept that some peoples, or races, are more desirable than others.

We have excluded the great ethnic groups who have contributed so much to the culture and ways of life of our Nation. For a few examples, the Italians, the Spaniards, the Poles—all have had an immeasurable effect upon the United States. It would be useless to even begin to name the immigrants from these and other countries, and their contributions, to our Nation. But in recognition of these contributions, instead of welcoming them, we lock them out. Instead of utilizing their talents, we exclude them. Instead of realizing that they are a great asset to America, we close the gates. Instead of taking them as fellow human beings worthy of our respect and friendship, we turn our backs. We have in the process excluded literally millions of people who, I am sure, could have and would have most gladly offered valuable and much needed talents and energies to our Nation.

Because of my firm belief in this, I feel that the ancient and dated national origins system is phased out in this measure.

There is no nation on earth that owes more to immigrants. As Franklin D. Roosevelt said in 1944:

> All of our people—excepted full blooded American Indians—are immigrants, or desendants of immigrants, including those who came here on the *Mayflower*.

I most sincerely and respectfully urge my colleagues in the House to join in the spirit of international cooperation and good will to pass this most urgently needed legislation.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us represents a tremendous step forward in establishing a reasonable and just immigration policy generally treating all applicants whatever their origin on the same basis. Similar treatment for those similarly situated is the touchstone of democracy. By this measure the national origins quota system fell far short. In changing the law today, we should remove an impediment which has been an unnecessary detriment in our relations with many countries around the world.

There will be those who will say—indeed they have already said—that this bill will open our gates to hordes of undesirable aliens. It will do no such thing. With only minor exceptions there are no changes in the pages of restrictions, safeguards and guarantees already in the lawbooks, against such happenings. The maximum permissible immigration will not exceed approximately 2,000 more under the new bill than is now permitted. It actually is expected to increase somewhat more than that figure because of the elimination of the quotas, some of which have not been filled. But, in any event, there will be no "hordes" invading our shores.

It is interesting and informative to observe that in recent years twice as many people have been admitted into this country through special legislation as have come in under the quota system. Refugee legislation is one example; special bills on the private calendar coming before us periodically are another. This legislation should eliminate the pressures for such bills, minimizing the work of the Judiciary Committee and the Congress. For a year or so now I have been unofficial objector on the private calendar. I am still repelled by the thought that special consideration, not only in regard to financial claims against the Government of one sort or another, but also with regard to such important considerations as who shall or shall not be admitted to this country, depends not on a law of general application to everyone, but on whether or not the claimant or applicant is fortunate enough to know a Member of Congress or smart enough to become acquainted with one. I do not have available at the moment the precise number of private bills which fall into this category, but the passage of this legislation should, as I say, substantially reduce the work of the Judiciary Committee and this Congress in considering such legislation and result in a much fairer immigration policy.

I, of course, do not consider this to be a perfect piece of legislation. I have supported and intend to further support the so-called MacGregor amendment, to set a numerical limitation on immigrants from the Western Hemisphere. The arguments in support of this amendment seem to me to be the most cogent. Those in opposition most unpersuasive. The latter are predicated on the opposition of the State Department whose representatives, while suggesting that a numerical restriction would offend our Latin American neighbors, have, I am told, also admitted that, in the years not too far

distant, such a limitation will be essential.

Last year I supported a strong resolution in support of the then American position that article 19 should be invoked against those nations refusing to pay their share of the cost of the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. In effect an ultimatum was given. The gauntlet was thrown down. No compromise was possible, and the fact that someday we might be forced to pay for an operation we considered inimicable to our interest was ignored. I said then that I supported the resolution because, if our policy succeeded, the United Nations would be immeasurably strengthened—while pointing out the hazards—and because it was reported to the Congress that the State Department wanted the resolution, as I then said, for reasons which were a mystery to me. Within the past 2 weeks the United States—in order to preserve the United Nations, albeit in a weakened condition—has had to retreat from the position so firmly taken by this Congress last year. Both the French and Russians on one hand and the Americans on the other had become prisoners of their own positions so rigidly taken and so dogmatically maintained.

I have concluded that a bald assertion by the State Department or any other branch of this Government, including the White House, that such and such a policy is desirable or essential, when this conclusion is at variance with my own judgment, based on what I deem to be good and sufficient evidence, will not again tip the scales on which my vote is weighed. It will be otherwise, of course, where there is sound evidence fairly and evenly balanced.

On the MacGregor amendment I have heard no arguments in opposition which seem to me to be persuasive. To argue that we ought not upset the traditional immigration policy with respect to Latin America when this bill is intended to upset our traditional policy toward the rest of the world is not persuasive. To argue that the imposition of a numerical limitation is discriminatory to Latin American nations when we impose by this bill a numerical limitation against all the other nations in the world is not persuasive. Indeed it convinces me that our failure to do so is discriminatory against the balance of the nations of the world among which are numbered friends and allies at least as important to our country as those neighbors and friends which we claim in the Western Hemisphere.

To argue that we will do damage to our relations with Latin American countries while conceding that a numerical limitation will inevitably be required not only fails to persuade but in my mind concedes the desirability and necessity of taking the step now, during a general revision of our laws, rather than later in the emotional heat of a population crises when the damage done—if any—will be infinitely greater and infinitely more damaging. And I predict that within a decade we will be in this same Chamber imposing—probably at the request of the State Department—a numerical limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration.

And I should like to express here my support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Within the last few weeks this House has approved private bills to admit a number of people in circumstances such as he describes who could not, under our present law, be admitted. While his age standards are probably too stringent—why should we admit a retarded 14-year-old and exclude a retarded 15-year-old—it is a step in the right direction, will impose no burdens on the taxpayers, and will set up an administrative procedure treating all alike rather than relying on a host of special private bills to which I have already unfavorably alluded.

Even without these amendments, however, I will support this bill. It contains adequate safeguards for those in the labor market. It is humanitarian and will result in the reuniting of divided families. It will eliminate many special bills. It should improve our relations with many nations around the world. It extends the traditional American welcome to infusions of new, vigorous blood. In short, it is a bill in the best interest of this country—though it would be, in my judgment, infinitely improved by the addition of the MacGregor amendment and the Fogarty amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this much needed change in the present immigration laws with some misgivings, since it does not provide some relief from the highly discriminatory portion of the present law, which is perpetuated by today's proposal, that says that certain relatives of citizens or permanent resident aliens from the Western Hemisphere should be subjected to requirements that intending immigrants with identical relationships from the rest of the world are not subject to.

Section 212(a)(14) would, under the bill we are considering, require the intending immigrant to obtain the Secretary of Labor's clearance prior to issuance of a visa, if that immigrant falls under the third or sixth preference categories for quota immigrants, under the nonpreference classification from quota countries, or if he is from the Western Hemisphere.

The committee report on page 14, points out that, in the case of persons from quota countries who fall into the preference categories solely on the basis of relationship, "such certification by the Secretary of Labor is unnecessary" because "there is a clear responsibility assumed by citizens and permanent resident aliens who have filed preference petitions for relatives to come to the United States."

Citizens and permanent resident aliens who have relatives in the Western Hemisphere are denied the opportunity to assume this clear responsibility. There is no preference system in the Western Hemisphere, and the consular offices are required to impose the provisions of section 212(a)(14).

On many occasions I have had constituents come to me who could not understand why the United States would not let sons, daughters, brothers and sisters of these constituents enter the country. I could explain the features of the law to them, but I could not defend such a situation. I could not explain what justification there is for treating persons from Western Hemisphere countries in such a discriminatory manner.

We are eliminating the national origins quota system beacuse it is "incompatible with our basic American tradition," according to the President. The President also stated:

> The procedures imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way.

He also pointed out:

> Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition.

How, then, can we justify this discrimination against the people of the Western Hemisphere? Can our foreign policy be less important for the countries of North and South America than for the rest of the world?

Every argument that has been used to justify today's changes should also apply to citizens of the Western Hemisphere.

We can, of course, point to the fact that we have maintained nonquota status for citizens of the Western Hemisphere, and that we have not placed a direct ceiling on total immigration from our Latin neighbors.

I am afraid that this does not satisfy the citizen who tries unsuccessfully to bring his brother or his unmarried daughter to this country, only to be told that he cannot do so because he is a native of the Western Hemisphere. If he had been born anywhere else in the world, he would not have been forced to seek the Secretary of Labor's approval.

Therefore, it becomes obvious that we have not completely removed discrimination from our immigration laws. We have, in fact, made it a little more obvious and a little more stringent for our closest friends.

I would like to close on a more pleasant note, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the Committee on the Judiciary, its distinguished chairman, and the entire membership of this body should be commended highly for—in the main—adopting a history-making bill that will prove to be a credit to the United States. We can be proud of the legislation that we act on today for the rest of our lives.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, we are today considering one of the most important and complex measure to come befor the Congress in years. It is designed to modernize and remedy many of the faults of one of the most complex statutes on our books, our immigration laws. It recognizes great needs for reuniting families and eliminates racial barriers. It seeks to restore the principles of equality and human dignity which permitted our forebears to settle here and make it possible

for ours to be the greatest country in the world.

To attain those goals, this legislation reflects a degree of dedication and hard work rarely so outstandingly evidenced by a Congressional committee. I wish at this point to commend the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee on the results of their labors. While this bill makes no pretense at resolving all of the immigration problems, it appears to go a long way toward that end in the most critical areas.

Without immigration, there would have been no United States of America. It is the very basic heterogeneous nature of our population that has always given us the strength, the initiative, the ability to make our country great and to cope with the adversities with which we have been faced. Through the years ahead, I am sure there will continue to come to our shores countless more who can contribute distinctively to the continuance of that tradition. The bill before us will help assure that nourishment of our unparalleled society.

What better way to start than by reuniting the families of those among us who have long been anguished by separation from loved ones because of conditions in our present immigration laws. I think this is a vital focal point of this bill. The emphasis placed on reunification of families is admirable and will, I believe, result in a tremendous lifting of morale and, in consequence, appreciation of citizenship in our Nation.

There is one discrepancy in the pending bill which does give cause for concern, I believe. While, on the one hand, eliminating the national origins quota system, the committee bill fixes a limit of 170,000—inclusive of 10,200 refugees—immigrant admissions annually from former quota countries. This limit, according to the committee report, "will permit immigration within the absorptive capacity of this country."

As reasonable as this appears to be, it certainly is inconsistent with the portion of the bill applied to the countries of the Western Hemisphere. Although I am glad to see that the public charge provisions of the law must be satisfied by a prospective immigrant from any part of the world, no numerical limitation is placed on immigration from Western Hemisphere nations.

I understand that in the past Congress has followed the policy of recognizing the common bond uniting the Americas by exempting from any quota restrictions those immigrants who were born in independent countries of our hemisphere, but I cannot help but question the advisability of continuing that policy. Certainly no one will deny that conditions are now, and will continue to be for the indefinite future, much different from the days of yore. There is every reason to expect that continually increased numbers of natives of this hemisphere will decide to come to the United States to live. An average of 110,435 such immigrants received visas annually over the past 10 years—and that is just 60,000 less than we propose to limit each year from the rest of the world.

I was greatly impressed by the statement on this subject made by Chairman FEIGHAN of the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee, earlier this year. He said, in regard to the proposed new policy of immigrant admissions:

> First and foremost is the question whether people who are natives of the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere are to be considered superior to and therefore preferable to people born in Europe or elsewhere in the world. That is precisely what retention of the nonquota status for natives of countries of the Western Hemisphere, under provisions of the basic 1924 law, would clearly imply. If we eliminate the theoretical quota system for countries outside the Western Hemisphere, which system has been labeled with being racial and prejudicial, how can we continue to justify the nonquota status for natives of independent countries in the Western Hemisphere?

That certainly seemed to make a lot of sense, and I regret that Mr. FEIGHAN was apparently overruled on this point within the Judiciary Committee. But, Mr. Chairman, it has taken so long to get this basic bill before us to correct inequities of our immigration laws. Dare we proceed without due consideration of further improvement along the lines I have just quoted?

Among the amendments being offered to this bill is one, sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR], who is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, which would place a reasonable ceiling on the number of Western Hemisphere immigrants just as we are placing one on immigrants from Europe, Asia, and Africa. Indeed, it is difficult to see how what Mr. MACGREGOR calls the "double standard" of immigration as now provided in the pending bill can serve to improve our foreign relations. Rather, the policy of more equal treatment for all would seem to cause far fewer hard feelings. The potential future complications of any mass influx of immigrants from one or more of the Western Hemisphere nations well could necessitate belated legislation that would be more resented than if we do the job right, here and now.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress will seriously weigh the importance of amending H.R. 2580 so as to establish an appropriate limitation on immigration from the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere as well as from the independent nations of the rest of the world.

With that we will be enacting what will give us the type of well-rounded new immigration laws that so long have been needed.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act is a triumph of constructive and responsible compromise. As such, I support it wholeheartedly.

For many years, there has been growing recognition of the fact that our immigration laws have been unjust and discriminatory, but despite this awareness there have been significant differences as to how best we might correct this situation. Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson have all called the Nation's and the Congress attention to these inequities, but for a variety of reasons proponents of change were never able to reach agreement.

This year, the story is different. Thanks to the hard work and careful study of members of the Committee on the Judiciary, the support of so many of our colleagues, the leadership of hundreds of distinguished citizens, and the sense of justice of our people generally, the differences have been resolved and the obstacles overcome and we have a bill the great majority of us can support.

As a sponsor of immigration reform legislation for several years, and as one who is privileged to represent a congressional district whose residents include many thousands of the foreign-born and their descendants, I am deeply gratified that the time has come when we can move ahead and adjust our immigration policy to conform to the highest ideals of our country.

If credit must be given to what is truly a national demand for immigration reform, then it must be distributed equally between members of both political parties. For this is genuinely a bipartisan bill and I am confident that the vote to approve it will reflect this happy fact.

For too many years, Mr. Chairman, I have observed—and tried my best to relieve—the fears and anxieties among many of my constituents who were seeking to bring their loved ones to join them in their chosen homeland only to be frustrated by oversubscribed quotas. And I have seen our country deprived of the talents of skilled doctors, scientists, engineers, and educators as well as those whose crafts were greatly in demand, because of a rigid quota system which denied them the opportunity to realize their deepest ambitions to become Americans.

This has been the fault, of course, of the archaic and essentially unjust national origins quota system. And it is the elimination of this system which is the heart and soul of the present legislation. The bill now before us will not open the floodgates of unrestricted immigration, as some of our people have feared. But it will place immigration to the United States on a more rational and equitable basis—consistent with our national interests and our humanitarian ideals—without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin. It will recognize our character as a nation composed of the peoples of all the nations of the world, our role as the leader of the free world, and our commitment to freedom and justice for everyone, everywhere.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, the pending bill contains provisions which will protect the security of the United States, assure intending immigrants of available employment opportunities, protect American workers against unemployment resulting from excessive or unwise immigration, and put an end to a system which encouraged favoritism and the resort to special legislation.

The new law will establish legal standards—fair and compassionate and reasonable standards—which will apply equitably to all intending immigrants and which will place our immigration

policy on a workable and unassailable basis for all the world to see.

I am proud to support this legislation, Mr. Chairman, and I urge our colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 2580, the long-awaited bill to repeal the national origins quota provisions from the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The national origins quota system has been the object of a continuing controversy ever since it was enacted in 1924. The intention with which it was enacted has always been apparent. This intention was to check the flow of immigration that this country had experienced early in this century from southern and eastern Europe. That so-called threat to our national institutions has long since passed. But the national origins quota system has remained on the statute books to give a false impression of the actual immigration policy of the United States.

It has given a false image because it simply has not controlled the flow of immigration as it was intended to do. As has been pointed out many times in the hearings and discussions concerning the pending legislation, the present quota system has controlled only one-third the immigration this country has experienced since the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted in 1952. The national origins quota system has been chipped away by the enactment of numerous laws granting admission to refugees, victims of disasters, and relatives of U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

It is clearly apparent by now that the national origins quota system is not only highly discriminatory, but that in fact it has proven itself ineffectual because it does not comport with our national aspirations and ideals. As President Kennedy stated in his immigration message of July 23, 1963, "The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose."

The pending bill would replace the present quota system with a system of preferences based on a first-come, first-served principle but with a limitation of 20,000 immigrants from any one country in a given year. The new system would go into effect on July 1, 1968, after a 3-year phaseout of the present system. The new system would increase immigration, which now averages around 300,000 a year, by more than an estimated 60,000; a 20-percent increase. The bill would, in addition, strengthen the existing safeguards of American workers from the effects of immigrants seeking to enter the United States to find employment.

This is a reasonable bill. It is the product of nearly 3 years of labor on the part of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary. It will replace a system that has no justification on the basis of principle or experience. I therefore urge that it be adopted.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2580, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, because I believe it provides many urgently needed and long-overdue reforms and revisions in America's present immigration system.

We are, in the words of John F. Kennedy, "a nation of immigrants"—and no country on earth owes more to immigrants than America.

As Franklin D. Roosevelt said in 1944:

> All of our people—except full-blooded American Indians—are immigrants, or descendants of immigrants, including those who came here on the *Mayflower*.

Californians, particularly, have always had a special stake in our immigration policies—because we owe so much to the immigrants who came to our State from all over the world.

And we have always been an outward-looking people, coming as we do from many ethnic and cultural backgrounds—a true melting pot of the strength and diversity that has made America great.

For this reason, I welcome the opportunity to support the legislation before us today as the first major revision in our now long out-dated and highly discriminatory 40-year-old immigration system.

The last four Presidents of the United States—Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman—have all opposed continuation of the discredited and ineffective national origins feature of the present law, and have recommended enactment of a number of reform measures to secure a fairer, more equitable, and nondiscriminatory immigration system.

In vetoing what later became the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, President Truman stated:

> This quota system—always based upon assumptions at variance with our American ideals—is long since out of date and more than ever unrealistic in the face of present world conditions * * * (its) greatest vice, however, is that it discriminates, deliberately and intentionally, against many of the peoples of the world. * * * The basis of this quota system was false and unworthy in 1924. It is even worse now.

President Eisenhower also sent messages to Congress recommending immigration reform, stating that experience in the postwar world demonstrated that the national origins method of admitting aliens needed to be reexamined, and a new system adopted which would admit aliens within allowable numbers according to new guidelines and standards.

On July 23, 1963, in his special immigration message to Congress, President Kennedy declared:

> The most urgent and fundamental reform I am recommending relates to the national origins system of selecting immigrants.* * * The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth. * * * Accordingly, although the legislation I am transmitting deals with many problems which require remedial action, it concentrates attention primarily upon revision of our quota immigration system. The enactment of this legislation will not resolve all of our important problems in the field of immigration law. It will, however, provide a sound basis upon which we can build in developing an immigration law that serves the national interest and reflects in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes.

And in January of this year, President Johnson characterized the present immigration law as "incompatible with our basic American tradition."

He continued:

> Over the years the ancestors of all of us—some 42 million human beings—have migrated to these shores. The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities. On this basis men and women migrated from every quarter of the globe. By their hard work and their enormously varied talents they hewed a great nation out of a wilderness. By their dedication to liberty and equality, they created a society reflecting man's most cherished ideals. * * * Violation of this tradition by the national origins quota system does incalculable harm. * * * I do not believe it is either good government or good sense.

With this background of bipartisan presidential support for a major overhaul of our immigration policies, it is a real privilege to be able to support the present legislation, which, though still not perfect, represents a tremendous improvement over the existing system.

The bill's main provisions will:

First. Abolish the national origins quota system, which is based largely on birthplace and ancestry and is tied to the 1920 Federal census. Besides being highly discriminatory in both theory and practice, the national origins system has been a failure even as a device to control immigration by pre-determined percentages of national and racial stock.

For example, during the period since the 1952 law was enacted, only approximately one-third of all aliens admitted to the United States were quota immigrants admitted in accordance with racial or national eligibility. Despite this fact, the entire fabric of our immigration law has been blemished by the very existence of such a discriminatory system.

Second. Provide for a new and far more equitable system of preferential admission of immigrants based on close family relationships with U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens. It also provides priority for immigrants with special skills and talents, for persons of exceptional ability in the sciences or arts, and for some openings to fill jobs where workers are in short supply.

Third. Put an overall 170,000 limitations—including 10,200 refugees and a maximum of 20,000 for any one country—on the number of immigrants who could be admitted to the United States in any fiscal year. This would not include "immediate relatives—spouses, children and parents of U.S. citizens—or "special immigrants" from the Western Hemisphere, both of which groups are considered outside the overall numerical limitation.

Fourth. Eliminate the present Asia-Pacific triangle provision, which greatly restricted immigration by people of Asian ancestry. Other discriminatory features of that provision were removed by Congress in recent years, and this bill will

end them all—thus eliminating the last vestige of discrimination against persons of Asian descent from our immigration laws.

Fifth. Require safeguards to protect American workers from unfair job competition and to protect the economy against adverse working standards.

Mr. Chairman, I was gratified that the House did not accept the amendment to impose a numerical ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. Such a ceiling would, in my opinion, have adversely affected our historic good neighbor policy and would have disturbed the close, friendly relations we are attempting to build through the Alliance for Progress.

However, I am disappointed that the legislation before us continues a provision of the present law which discriminates against certain relatives of U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens from the Western Hemisphere by requiring that they obtain a special clearance from the Secretary of Labor prior to issuance of a visa.

It is my intention to continue to work to eliminate this unjust and discriminatory provision of our immigration laws, so that intending immigrants from the Western Hemisphere will be accorded the same consideration as persons from other parts of the world with similar family relationships to U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens.

With this exception, Mr. Chairman, I believe H.R. 2580 is a major improvement over our current policy.

It certainly does not "open the immigration floodgates" as some have alleged, for the actual increase in authorized annual total immigration will be less than 2,000 over the present number of quota admissions.

But, by eliminating the long-discredited national origins quota system and setting up an equitable selection system based on first-come, first-served within preference categories designed, first, to reunite families, and second to admit those with special knowledge or skills, this bill can make a real contribution to our Nation's foreign policy, while at the same time strengthen our domestic U.S. economic and cultural objectives.

For these reasons, I hope that H.R. 2580 will receive the wholehearted support of the Members of this House.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151) be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. (a) Exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27), and of the immediate relatives of United States citizens specified in subsection (b) of this section, the number of aliens who may be issued immigrant visas or who may otherwise acquire the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or who may, pursuant to section 203(a)(7) enter conditionally, (i) shall not in any of the first three quarters of any fiscal year exceed a total of 45,000 and (ii) shall not in any fiscal year exceed a total of 170,000.

"(b) The 'immediate relative' referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall mean the children, spouses, and parents of a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That in the case of parents, such citizen must be at least twenty-one years of age. The immediate relatives specified in this subsection who are otherwise qualified for admission as immigrants shall be admitted as such, without regard to the numerical limitations in this Act.

"(c) During the period from July 1, 1965, through June 30, 1968, the annual quota of any quota area shall be the same as that which existed for that area on June 30, 1965. The Secretary of State shall, not later than on the sixtieth day immediately following the date of enactment of this subsection and again on or before September 1, 1966, and September 1, 1967, determine and proclaim the amount of quota numbers which remain unused at the end of the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, respectively, and are available for distribution pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

"(d) Quota numbers not issued or otherwise used during the previous fiscal year, as determined in accordance with subsection (c) hereof, shall be transferred to an immigration pool. Allocation of numbers from the pool and from national quotas shall not together exceed in any fiscal year the numerical limitations in subsection (a) of this section. The immigration pool shall be made available to immigrants otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act who are unable to obtain prompt issuance of a preference visa due to over-subscription of their quotas, or subquotas as determined by the Secretary of State. Visas and conditional entries shall be allocated from the immigration pool within the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203 without regard to the quota to which the alien is chargeable.

"(e) The immigration pool and the quotas of quota areas shall terminate June 30, 1968. Thereafter immigrants admissible under the provisions of this Act who are subject to the numerical limitations of subsection (a) of this section shall be admitted in accordance with the percentage limitations and in the order of priority specified in section 203."

SEC. 2. Section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) No person shall receive any preference or priority or be discriminated against in the issuance of an immigrant visa because of his race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or place of residence, except as specifically provided in section 101(a)(27), section 201(b), and section 203: *Provided,* That the total number of immigrant visas and the number of conditional entries made available to natives of any single foreign state under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) shall not exceed 20,000 in any fiscal year: *Provided further,* That the foregoing proviso shall not operate to reduce the number of immigrants who may be admitted under the quota of any quota area before June 30, 1968.

"(b) Each independent country, self-governing dominion, mandated territory, and territory under the international trusteeship system of the United Nations, other than the United States and its outlying possessions shall be treated as a separate foreign state for the purposes of the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section when approved by the Secretary of State. All other inhabited lands shall be attributed to a foreign state specified by the Secretary of State. For the purposes of this Act the foreign state to which an immigrant is chargeable shall be determined by birth within such foreign state except that (1) an alien child, when accompanied by his alien parent or parents may be charged to the same foreign state as the accompanying parent or of either accompanying parent if such parent has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa, if necessary to prevent the separation of the child from the accompanying parent or parents, and if the foreign state to which such parent has been or would be chargeable has not exceeded the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section for that fiscal year; (2) if an alien is chargeable to a different foreign state from that of his accompanying spouse, the foreign state to which such alien is chargeable may, if necessary to prevent the separation of husband and wife, be determined by the foreign state of the accompanying spouse, if such spouse has received or would be qualified for an immigrant visa and if the foreign state to which such spouse has been or would be chargeable has not exceeded the numerical limitation set forth in the proviso to subsection (a) of this section for that fiscal year; (3) an alien born in the United States shall be considered as having been born in the country of which he is a citizen or subject, or if he is not a citizen or subject of any country then in the last foreign country in which he had his residence as determined by the consular officer; (4) an alien born within any foreign state in which neither of his parents was born and in which neither of his parents had a residence at the time of such alien's birth may be charged to the foreign state of either parent.

"(c) Any immigrant born in a colony or other component or dependent area of a foreign state unless a special immigrant as provided in section 101(a)(27) or an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b), shall be chargeable, for the purpose of limitation set forth in section 202(a), to the foreign state, except that the number of persons born in any such colony or other component or dependent area overseas from the foreign state chargeable to the foreign state in any one fiscal year shall not exceed 1 per centum of the maximum number of immigrant visas available to such foreign state.

"(d) In the case of any change in the territorial limits of foreign states, the Secretary of State shall, upon recognition of such change, issue appropriate instructions to all diplomatic and consular offices."

SEC. 3. Section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1153) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. (a) Aliens who are subject to the numerical limitations specified in section 201(a) shall be allotted visas or their conditional entry authorized, as the case may be, as follows:

"(1) Visas shall be first made available, in a number not to exceed 20 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), to qualified immigrants who are the unmarried sons or daughters of citizens of the United States.

"(2) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 20 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraph (1), to qualified immigrants who are the spouses, unmarried sons or unmarried daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(3) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions, or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences or the arts will substantially benefit prospectively the na-

tional economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States.

"(4) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (3), to qualified immigrants who are the married sons or the married daughters of citizens of the United States.

"(5) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 24 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), plus any visas not required for the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (4), to qualified immigrants who are the brothers or sisters of citizens of the United States.

"(6) Visas shall next be made available, in a number not to exceed 10 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), to qualified immigrants who are capable of performing specified skilled or unskilled labor, not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States.

"(7) Conditional entries shall next be made available by the Attorney General, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe and in a number not to exceed 6 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a)(ii), to aliens who satisfy an Immigration and Naturalization Service officer at an examination of any non-Communist or non-Communist-dominated country, (i) that, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinion they have fled (A) from any Communist or Communist-dominated country or area, or (B) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, and (ii) are unable or unwilling to return to such country or area on account of race, religion, or political opinion, and (iii) are not nationals of the countries or areas in which their application for conditional entry is made. For the purpose of the foregoing the term 'general area of the Middle East' means the area between and including (1) Libya on the west, (2) Turkey on the north, (3) Pakistan on the east, and (4) Saudia Arabia and Ethiopia on the south: *Provided*, That immigrant visas in a number not exceeding one-half the number specified in this paragraph may be made available, in lieu of conditional entries of a like number, to such aliens who have been continuously physically present in the United States for a period of at least two years prior to application for adjustment of status.

"(8) Visas authorized in any fiscal year, less those required for issuance to the classes specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) and less the number of conditional entries and visas made available pursuant to paragraph (7), shall be made available to other qualified immigrants strictly in the chronological order in which they qualify. Waiting lists of applicants shall be maintained in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State. No immigrant visa shall be issued to a nonpreference immigrant under this paragraph, or to an immigrant with a preference under paragraph (3) or (6) of this subsection, until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(14).

"(9) A spouse or child as defined in section 101(b)(1) (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) shall, if not otherwise entitled to an immigrant status and the immediate issuance of a visa or to conditional entry under paragraphs (1) through (8), be entitled to the same status, and the same order of consideration provided in subsection (b), if accompanying, or following to join, his spouse or parent.

"(b) In considering applications for immigrant visas under subsection (a) consideration shall be given to applicants in the order in which the classes of which they are members are listed in subsection (a).

"(c) Immigrant visas issued pursuant to paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) shall be issued to eligible immigrants in the order in which a petition in behalf of each such immigrant is filed with the Attorney General as provided in section 204.

"(d) Every immigrant shall be presumed to be a nonpreference immigrant until he establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer and the immigration officer that he is entitled to a preference status under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (a), or to a special immigrant status under section 101(a)(27), or that he is an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b). In the case of any alien claiming in his application for an immigrant visa to be an immediate relative of a United States citizen as specified in section 201(b) or to be entitled to preference immigrant status under paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a), the consular officer shall not grant such status until he has been authorized to do so as provided by section 204.

"(e) For the purposes of carrying out his responsibilities in the orderly administration of this section, the Secretary of State is authorized to make reasonable estimates of the anticipated numbers of visas to be issued during any quarter of any fiscal year within each of the categories of subsection (a), and to rely upon such estimates in authorizing the issuance of such visas. The Secretary of State, in his discretion, may terminate the registration on a waiting list of any alien who fails to evidence his continued intention to apply for a visa in such manner as may be by regulation prescribed.

"(f) The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress a report containing complete and detailed statement of facts in the case of each alien who conditionally entered the United States pursuant to subsection (a)(7) of this section. Such reports shall be submitted on or before January 15 and June 15 of each year.

"(g) Any alien who conditionally entered the United States as a refugee, pursuant to subsection (a)(7) of this section, whose conditional entry has not been terminated by the Attorney General pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe, who has been in the United States for at least two years, and who has not acquired permanent residence, shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and shall thereupon be inspected and examined for admission into the United States, and his case dealt with in accordance with the provisions of sections 235, 236, and 237 of this Act.

"(h) Any alien who, pursuant to subsection (g) of this section, is found, upon inspection by the immigration officer or after hearing before a special inquiry officer, to be admissible as an immigrant under this Act at the time of his inspection and examination, except for the fact that he was not and is not in possession of the documents required by section 212(a)(20), shall be regarded as lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his arrival."

SEC. 4. Section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8 U.S.C. 1154) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) Any citizen of the United States claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationships described in paragraphs (1), (4), or (5) of section 203(a), or to an immediate relative status under section 201(b), or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that an alien is entitled to a preference status by reason of the relationship described in section 203(a)(2), or any alien desiring to be classified as a preference immigrant under section 203(a)(3) (or any person on behalf of such an alien), or any person desiring and intending to employ within the United States an alien entitled to classification as a preference immigrant under section 203(a)(6), may file a petition with the Attorney General for such classification. The petition shall be in such form as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Attorney General may require. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside the United States, administered by a consular officer.

"(b) After an investigation of the facts in each case, and after consultation with the Secretary of Labor with respect to petitions to accord a status under section 203(a)(3) or (6), the Attorney General shall, if he determines that the facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in behalf of whom the petition is made is an immediate relative specified in section 201(b) or is eligible for a preference status under section 203(a), approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the preference status.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) no more than two petitions may be approved for one petitioner in behalf of a child as defined in section 101(b)(1)(E) or (F) unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers and sisters and no petition shall be approved if the alien has previously been accorded a nonquota or preference status as the spouse of a citizen of the United States or the spouse of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, by reason of a marriage determined by the Attorney General to have been entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws.

"(d) The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under section 203(a)(3) or 203(a)(6) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to entitle an immigrant, in behalf of whom a petition under this section is approved, to enter the United States as a preference immigrant under section 203(a) or as an immediate relative under section 201(b) if upon his arrival at a port of entry in the United States he is found not to be entitled to such classification."

SEC. 5. Section 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176, 8 U.S.C. 1155) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. The Attorney General may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204. Such revocation shall be effective as of the date of approval of any such petition. In no case, however, shall such revocation have effect unless there is mailed to the petitioner's last known address a notice of the revocation and unless notice of the revocation is communicated through the Secretary of State to the beneficiary of the petition before such beneficiary commences his jounrney to the United States. If notice of revocation is not so given, and the beneficiary applies for admission to the United States, his admissibility shall be determined in the manner provided for by sections 235 and 236."

SEC. 6. Section 206 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181, 8 U.S.C. 1156) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. If an immigrant having an immigrant visa is excluded from admission to the United States and deported, or does not apply for admission before the expiration of the validity of his visa, or if an alien having an immigrant visa issued to him as a preference immigrant is found not to be a preference immigrant, an immigrant visa or a preference immigrant visa, as the case may be, may be issued in lieu thereof to another qualified alien."

SEC. 7. Section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181, 8 U.S.C. 1157) is stricken.

SEC. 8. Section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 166; 8 U.S.C. 1101) is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (27) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(27) The term 'special immigrant' means—

"(A) an immigrant who was born in any independent foreign country of the Western Hemisphere or in the Canal Zone and the spouse and children of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him: *Provided*, That no immigrant visa shall be issued pursuant to this clause until the consular officer is in receipt of a determination made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(14);

"(B) an immigrant, lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad;

"(C) an immigrant who was a citizen of the United States and may, under section 324(a) or 327 of title III, apply for reacquisition of citizenship;

"(D)(i) an immigrant who continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the time of his application for admission to the United States has been, and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of carrying on the vocation of minister of a religious denomination, and whose services are needed by such religious denomination having a bona fide organization in the United States; and (ii) the spouse or the child of any such immigrant, if accompanying or following to join him; or

"(E) an immigrant who is an employee, or an honorably retired former employee, of the United States Government abroad, and who has performed faithful service for a total of fifteen years, or more, and his accompanying spouse and children: *Provided*, That the principal officer of a Foreign Service establishment, in his discretion, shall have recommended the granting of special immigrant status to such alien in exceptional circumstances and the Secretary of State approves such recommendation and finds that it is in the national interest to grant such status."

(b) Paragraph (32) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(32) The term 'profession' shall include but not be limited to architects, engineers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries."

(c) Subparagraph (1)(F) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(F) a child under the age of fourteen at the time a petition is filed in his behalf to accord a classification as an immediate relative under section 201(b), who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from both, parents, or for whom the sole or surviving parent is incapable of providing the proper care which will be provided the child if admitted to the United States and who has in writing irrevocably released the child for emigration and adoption; who has been adopted abroad by a United States citizen and his spouse who personally saw and observed the child prior to or during the adoption proceedings; or who is coming to the United States for adoption by a United States citizen and spouse who have complied with the preadoption requirements, if any, of the child's proposed residence: *Provided*, That no natural parent or prior adoptive parent of any such child shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under this Act."

SEC. 9. Section 211 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 181, 8 U.S.C. 1181) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 211. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) no immigrant shall be admitted into the United States unless at the time of application for admission he (1) has a valid unexpired immigrant visa or was born subsequent to the issuance of such visa of the accompanying parent, and (2) presents a valid unexpired passport or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under the regulations issued by the Attorney General. With respect to immigrants to be admitted under quotas of quota areas prior to June 30, 1968, no immigrant visa shall be deemed valid unless the immigrant is properly chargeable to the quota area under the quota of which the visa is issued.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(20) of this Act in such cases or in such classes of cases and under such conditions as may be by regulations prescribed, returning resident immigrants, defined in section 101(a)(27)(B), who are otherwise admissible may be readmitted to the United States by the Attorney General in his discretion without being required to obtain a passport, immigrant visa, reentry permit or other documentation."

SEC. 10. Section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended as follows:

(a) Paragraph (14) is amended to read as follows:

"Aliens seeking to enter the United States, for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor, unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and to the Attorney General that (A) there are not sufficient workers in the United States who are able, willing, qualified, and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place to which the alien is destined to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and (B) the employment of such aliens will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the workers in the United States similarly employed. The exclusion of aliens under this paragraph shall apply to special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27)(A) (other than the parents, spouses, or children of United States citizens or of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence), to preference immigrant aliens described in section 203(a)(3) and (6), and to nonpreference immigrant aliens described in section 203(a)(8);".

(b) Paragraph (20) is amended by deleting the letter "(e)" and substituting therefor the letter "(a)".

(c) Paragraph (21) is amended by deleting the word "quota".

(d) Paragraph (24) is amended by deleting the language within the parentheses and substituting therefor the following: "other than aliens described in section 101(a)(27)(A) and (B)."

SEC. 11. The Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175; 8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended as follows:

(a) Section 221(a) is amended by deleting the words "the particular non-quota category in which the immigrant is classified, if a non-quota immigrant," and substituting in lieu thereof the words "the preference, non-preference, immediate relative, or special immigration classification to which the alien is charged."

(b) The fourth sentence of subsection 221(c) is amended by deleting the word "quota" preceding the word "number;" the word "quota" preceding the word "year;" and the words "a quota" preceding the word "immigrant," and substituting in lieu thereof the word "an."

(c) Section 222(a) is amended by deleting the words "preference quota or a nonquota immigrant" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) or a preference or special immigrant".

(d) Section 224 is amended to read as follows: "A consular officer may, subject to the limitations provided in section 221, issue an immigrant visa to a special immigrant or immediate relative as such upon satisfactory proof, under regulations prescribed under this Act, that the applicant is entitled to special immigrant or immediate relative status. In the event that the number of immigrants admitted pursuant to the provisions of section 101(a)(27)(A) in any one fiscal year exceeds by 10 per centum or more the average number of immigrants admitted from the Western Hemisphere in the previous five fiscal years, the President shall so notify the Congress by January 15 of the following year with such recommendations as he may have, if any."

(e) Section 241(a)(10) is amended by substituting for the words "Section 101(a)(27)(C)" the words "Section 101(a)(27)(A)".

(f) Section 243(h) is amended by deleting the word "physical."

SEC. 12. Section 244(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Upon the cancellation of deportation in the case of any alien under this section, the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the cancellation of deportation of such alien is made, and unless the alien is entitled to a special immigrant classification under section 101(a)(27)(A), or is an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of nonpreference immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a)(8) for the fiscal year then current."

SEC. 13. Section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 217; 8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (b) is amended to read:

"(b) Upon the approval of an application for adjustment made under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the order of the Attorney General approving the application for the adjustment of status is made, and the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of the preference or nonpreference visas authorized to be issued under section 203(a) within the class to which the alien is chargeable, for the fiscal year then current."

(b) Subsection (c) is amended to read:

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any alien who is of the class described in section 101(a)(27)(A)."

SEC. 14. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230; 8 U.S.C. 1351) is amended as follows:

(a) Immediately after "SEC. 281." insert "(a)";

(b) Paragraph (6) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) For filing with the Attorney General of each petition under section 204 and section 214(c), $10; and";

(c) The following is inserted after paragraph (7), and is designated subsection (b):

"(b) The time and manner of payment of the fees specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section, including but not limited to partial deposit or prepayment at the time of registration, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State."; and

(d) The paragraph beginning with the words "The fees * * *" is designated subsection (c).

SEC. 15. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182, 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)) is amended by deleting the language "feeble-minded" and inserting the language "mentally retarded" in its place.

(b) Paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182; 8 U.S.C. 1182 (a)(4)) is amended by deleting the word "epilepsy" and substituting the words "or sexual deviation".

SEC. 16. Section 1, 2, and 11 of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504–505), as amended by section 6 of the Act of June 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 124), are repealed.

SEC. 17. Section 221(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 192; 8 U.S.C. 1201(g)) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following: ": *Provided further*, That a visa may be issued to an alien defined in section 101(a)(15) (B) or (F), if such alien is otherwise entitled to receive a visa, upon receipt of a notice by the consular officer from the Attorney General of the giving of a bond with sufficient surety in such sums and containing such conditions as the consular officer shall prescribe, to insure that at the expiration of the time for which such alien has been admitted by the Attorney General, as provided in section 214(a), or upon failure to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or to maintain any status subsequently acquired under section 248 of the Act, such alien will depart from the United States."

SEC. 18. So much of section 272(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 226; 8 U.S.C. 1322(a)) as precedes the words "shall pay to the collector of customs" is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 272. (a) Any person who shall bring to the United States an alien (other than an alien crewman) who is (1) mentally retarded, (2) insane, (3) afflicted with psychopathic personality, or with sexual deviation, (4) a chronic alcoholic, (5) afflicted with any dangerous contagious disease, or (6) a narcotic drug addict,".

SEC. 19. This Act shall become effective on the first day of the first month after the expiration of thirty days following the date of its enactment except as provided herein.

SEC. 20. (a) The designation of chapter I, title II, is amended to read as follows: "CHAPTER I—SELECTION SYSTEM".

(b) The title preceding section 201 is amended to read as follows: "NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS".

(c) The title preceding section 202 is amended to read as follows: "NUMERICAL LIMITATION TO ANY SINGLE FOREIGN STATE".

(d) The title preceding section 203 is amended to read as follows: "ALLOCATION OF IMMIGRANT VISAS".

(e) The title preceding section 204 is amended to read as follows: "PROCEDURE FOR GRANTING IMMIGRANT STATUS".

(f) The title preceding section 205 is amended to read as follows: "REVOCATION OF APPROVAL OF PETITIONS".

(g) The title preceding section 206 is amended to read as follows: "UNUSED IMMIGRANT VISAS".

(h) The title preceding section 207 is repealed.

(f) The title preceding section 224 of chapter III, title II, is amended to read as follows: "IMMEDIATE RELATIVE AND SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS".

SEC. 21. (a) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 1—SELECTION SYSTEM

"Sec. 201. Numerical limitations.
"Sec. 202. Numerical limitation to any single foreign state.
"Sec. 203. Allocation of immigrant visas.
"Sec. 204. Procedure for granting immigrant status.
"Sec. 205. Revocation of approval of petitions.
"Sec. 206. Unused immigrant visas."

(b) The table of contents (Title II—Immigration, chapter III) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is amended by changing the designation of section 224 to read as follows:

"Sec. 224. Immediate relative and special immigrant visas."

Mr. POFF (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POFF

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POFF: On page 41, strike out lines 7 through 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any alien who is a native of any country of the Western Hemisphere or of any adjacent island named in section 101(b)(5)."

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

Mr. POFF. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CELLER. I have no objection to the amendment.

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

Mr. POFF. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. I merely wish to indicate that we have no objection to the amendment on this side, and feel it is necessary to conform to other applicable sections of the bill.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to correct what obviously is a simple oversight of legislative draftmanship. The Immigration and Naturalization Service in recent years has been faced with a recurring problem. Nationals of Central and South America have been circumventing the letter and the spirit of the immigration law. Instead of following the formal procedures required of an intending immigrant, they merely pursue the simple course of obtaining a visitor's visa and, once physically present in the United States, make application under section 245 of the act for adjustment of status to that of permanent resident alien. Such conduct is unfair to other Western Hemisphere aliens seeking permanent resident status and citizenship through the intending immigrant procedures.

The bill before us undertakes to correct that problem. Section 13, subsection (c), on page 40, prohibits the use of section 245 procedures to aliens described in section 101(a)(27). The aliens described in that section are nationals of independent nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Clearly, the authors intended that this restriction should apply against aliens close to our borders and within easy travel access. However, the language did not accomplish that purpose. By specific inclusion of the nationals of independent nations of the Western Hemisphere, this language excludes nationals of what is described as the adjacent islands, which include colonies of Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands. Specifically, as defined in section 101(b)(5), the term "adjacent islands" includes St. Pierre, Miquelon, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Jamaica, the Windward and Leeward Islands, Trinidad, Martinique, and other British, French, and Netherlands territory or possessions in or bordering on the Caribbean Sea.

Conclusive proof that a legislative oversight has occurred is that the present law already precludes nationals of adjacent islands from adjusting their status under section 245. Without my perfecting and correcting amendment, the language of the bill will have the awkward consequence of depriving some nationals of the Western Hemisphere of a privilege which they formerly enjoyed while granting that privilege to other inhabitants of the Western Hemisphere who never enjoyed it before.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POFF

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POFF: On page 40, strike out lines 3 and 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) Section 243(h) is amended by striking out 'physical persecution' and inserting in lieu thereof 'persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion.' "

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

Mr. POFF. I will be happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection on this side to that amendment.

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. Again, Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to this amendment on this side. I believe the language that has been suggested is superior to that contained in the bill and will, as we look to the future, be more easily operable than the language therein contained at the present time.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, section 243(h) of the present law authorizes the Attorney General to suspend deportation of any alien if the alien can establish to his satisfaction that he would, if returned to a foreign country, be subject to physical persecution.

The language of the bill on page 40 deletes the word "physical." I can understand and appreciate the purpose of this change. The clause "physical persecution" is entirely too narrow. It is almost impossible for the alien under an order of deportation to assemble the quantum of evidence necessary to discharge his burden of proof.

On the other hand, I suggest that the word "persecution" standing alone may be too broad in concept and too flexible in definition. It seems to me that between these two extremes there should be some reasonable middle ground. My amendment seeks to approach that middle ground. First, it broadens it beyond the boundaries of physical persecution but it narrows the word "persecution" by limiting the scope of its interpretation to three specifics; namely, persecution on account of race, persecution on account of religion, or persecution on account of political opinion.

There can be no mistake about the meaning of that language. Indeed, as will be seen from page 26 of the bill, this same language is used in the definition of "refugee." In other words, an alien who seeks to enter this country as a refugee must prove that he is a victim of persecution on account of one of three things, race, religion, or political opinion. My amendment simply requires that the alien who is about to be deported from this country must bear the same burden of proof if he is to be spared the penalty of deportation and retained in this country.

In all truth, I believe that this result is what the draftsmen of this subsection intended to achieve when they proposed the deletion of the word "physical."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POFF

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POFF: On page 35, line 23, strike out the word "for" and the remainder of line 23, all of lines 24 and 25 and the words "the United States." On line 1, page 36, insert in lieu thereof the following: "who has only one parent due to the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, the other parent, and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for the child".

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is not substantive. It is essentially clarifying.

The language as written at the bottom of page 35, particularly the words "the sole or surviving parent," could be interpreted to disqualify a child for purposes of adoption and immigration if the child could not prove that one of its parents is dead. I am sure those who drafted the text of this bill did not intend such a consequence. Many alien children, for a variety of reasons, find themselves in the custody of only one natural parent. One of the reasons may indeed be the death of the other parent. In such case, the language as presently written in the bill would pose no problem. However, if the absence of one parent is due to abandonment or desertion by parent or separation or loss from the other parent, then the language of the bill would deny the child status as an eligible orphan.

The amendment I have offered has the effect of restoring the original content and intent of the orphan section of our immigration laws. When only one parent is with the child and when, in the language of the amendment, that "parent is incapable of providing care for the child," then that child is as much destitute as an orphan who has lost both parents. Such a child should be eligible for adoption and immigration under our laws.

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

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much having to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF]. We have a problem here which I believe should be brought to the attention of the Committee. If the amendment as suggested were adopted, and if the language contained in the bill were changed, then we are going to take the definition of who is considered an eligible orphan and leave the construction of eligibility to administrative determination rather than meet the qualifications and provisions set forth in the bill and specifically enumerated as to who shall be construed to be an eligible orphan.

I can conceive under the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia that this situation could happen; that you would have a child whose parents on purpose would abandon the child or refuse to care for the child, and by reason of the language which has been suggested by the gentleman from Virginia that child would come within the criteria of his amendment and be an eligible orphan. Certainly this is not our intent in this area. We want to provide that an eligible orphan may under a proper set of circumstances come into this country, but I think we want to prevent any sort of collusion taking place between parents who perhaps have a child they do not want, or under a number of other circumstances which would leave it to the consular officer to decide whether that child does meet the criteria set forth for an eligible orphan.

There is not anything wrong with the language in the bill whatsoever. There is not anything that is a departure from present law and in those instances where there is a question whether the child does qualify as an eligible orphan under present law this Congress decides whether that child so qualifies and we do that, I might say, with great liberality, attempting to take into consideration all of the extenuating circumstances surrounding the child's life.

I should emphasize that this section applies to a child under the age of 14, but I think the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia would encourage the opportunity for administrative decisions in this area which would in the long run do violence to the operation of the law as it is presently written and the law as it would be under the bill which we are considering here in the Committee.

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

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

Mr. POFF. I believe the gentleman will agree that my amendment does no more than preserve the present statutory language, the content and intent of the present law.

Mr. MOORE. No, I would have to disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. POFF. In what particular?

Mr. MOORE. If I felt that were the case I would certainly agree with the gentleman's amendment and would not oppose it.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. POFF. I believe the gentleman must agree that the language which I propose to be added to the bill would restore the language of the law as it exists today.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask the gentleman a question? Will the gentleman state for the members of the Committee whether in his opinion his amendment would liberalize and expand this section of the immigration law?

Mr. POFF. I must agree that it would be a liberalizing amendment, and I propose it because of my special and personal interest in this particular field with which the gentleman is personally acquainted. I must repeat, and I do not believe it can be gainsaid, that the amendment which I have offered will do nothing more than restore the orphan law as it exists today in its present liberal posture. I believe that a child, one of whose parents is separated from him, for whatever reason, and the other parent is unable to provide for that child's care, is almost as destitute as the child both of whose parents are lost by death. My amendment would simply place that child in the status of an eligible orphan.

Mr. MOORE. I suggest the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FEIGHAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: At the end of the bill, as reported, add a new section 22 to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. Paragraph (6) of section 101(b) is repealed."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to that amendment. It is a pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, my purpose is now to read a very interesting and revealing letter which was sent to our revered Speaker by the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1965.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As you suggested I write you, more fully and formally, the view I expressed in our conversations earlier yesterday and today.

There is no piece of legislation before the Congress that in terms of decency and equity is more demanding of passage than the immigration bill. Four Presidents have urged this kind of legislation. Four decades have been witness to this kind of need. Countless Americans with ties of family and heritage reaching beyond the seas have cried out for this kind of action.

Our present restrictions say that Italians, Greeks, Spaniards, all the southern European countries in particular, are not as desirable as others. What a shameful declaration.

By what distorted principle do we assert that Enrico Fermi, or Conrad Huber, or David Sarnoff, or Marconi, or George Christopher of I. M. Pei, Benjamin Cardozo, John Phillip Sousa, or Senators FONG and PASTORE, and Congresswoman MINK, and Congressmen BRADEMAS and PUCINSKI have not added to the culture and achievement of our land? All these men and women, and millions more whose forebears were immigrants, are stained by a national commitment to restriction, isolation, and indifference.

You and I, Mr. Speaker, and the great majority of the Congress know this is wrong. The vast majority of our fellow citizens know this is wrong.

I hope the Congress will act speedily on the immigration bill as reported by the House committee, free of any crippling amendments.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILBERT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILBERT: On page 38, after line 16, add the following:

"SEC. 11. Section 214(c) is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The question of importing any alien as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(h) of this Act in any specific case or specific cases shall be determined by the Attorney General, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Labor, after consultation with appropriate agencies of the Government, upon petition of the importing employer'."

And to renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, under the terms of the amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act which we are considering today, the Secretary of Labor is designated the responsible official for determining when there is sufficient shortage of manpower and certain skills to justify the importation of practitioners of those skills.

My amendment that I put before you would amend section 214(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to bring the proceeding for admitting nonimmigrant labor into conformity with the procedure for admitting immigrant labor. The law now empowers the Attorney General to make the necessary determination on nonimmigrant labor. My amendment would hold the Secretary of Labor responsible to certify to the necessity of admitting nonimmigrants to perform temporary labor or services.

I have solicited the opinion of both the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General on my proposal. Neither objects. Both agree that a standard procedure to cover the two categories of working aliens would be wise. I ask you to give thoughtful consideration to this amendment, permitting the two operations operating at cross purposes to be treated in the same way. This represents both sound management and sound policy to give the Secretary of Labor authority for making the necessary judgments on labor shortages, a subject on which he is the Government's designated expert.

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

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

Mr. RESNICK. On the subject of migrant labor, the gentleman is aware of the fact even though the States have certified shortages, the Secretary sees fit to ignore these shortages, and this is now disrupting many agricultural commodities. In my own district we face a serious shortage of labor. How would the gentleman's amendment affect that situation?

Mr. GILBERT. I will say that I presume the Secretary of Labor is sufficiently aware of the situation of labor shortages in each State and in each district in the country, and if it is his opinion there is sufficient labor within the States to pick up the slack or do the work, I would abide by his judgment rather than an individual in that particular State.

Mr. RESNICK. It is not the individuals who are involved. This is where the State labor service has certified there is a shortage, which is the situation occurring now in the State of New York.

Mr. GILBERT. Is it the gentleman's opinion in the State of New York there is an oversupply of labor, and we do not have any unemployment in the State of New York?

Mr. RESNICK. We do. We have a shortage, for instance, in the tool and diemaking industry, and we do not have enough people to take care of the apples.

Mr. GILBERT. You do not have applepickers because you do not pay a sufficient wage.

Mr. RESNICK. I appreciate my colleague's yielding. The fact is in the State of New York we pay a minimum wage of $1.35 to our agricultural workers. We have met all of the criteria that the Department of Labor has suggested for migrant workers. This is not a case where the Secretary said "you are not paying the minimum wage, and you have not met the criteria."

We in New York State are bearing the sins of other States in this matter. We have met all of the criteria on this point, yet the Secretary refuses to relieve the situation.

Mr. GILBERT. In the State of New York I know we have an unemployment situation, and I am sure if the people were advised properly they would go to work and protect the apples in your district.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated in the committee earlier when the gentleman from New York spoke with respect to his amendment I intended to oppose it. I want to state to the Members now my reasons for opposing it.

First, and I say this certainly respectfully, this amendment is not needed in any respect at all. First, everybody in this committee should understand that in this bill before us we have given complete and mature consideration to the problem of protecting the American worker. We have in three specific instances in this legislation written in safeguards for the American worker and for the American laboring man that are far more strict than the present law. As a matter of fact, in these three areas these are new and affirmative sections that have been put into the law or are suggested to be put into the law.

Second, all that the gentleman from New York desires to do in legislation which is nominally under the control of the Department of Justice, and is in the field of immigration, is to insert a veto power over the actions of the Attorney General by the Secretary of Labor. If you will take the gentleman's amendment, and perhaps you do not have the present law before you, but if you would refer to page 52 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subsection (c), you will find there verbatim the language of his amendment save for this one point, that he seeks to make a determination of the Attorney General subject to the approval of the Secretary of Labor.

This is a bill which the Department of Justice has the responsibility of administering. It seems to me the Department of Justice has adequately administered this section of the bill in the past and the gentleman's amendment in that respect I believe to be unnecessary.

For a further reason, may I say that this particular area that he touches upon is legitimately the jurisdiction of another committee of the Congress. The Committee on Agriculture has had this under their jurisdiction and has discussed this matter and has from time to time made recommendations to the Congress with respect to it.

So I respectfully suggest that, first, the amendment is not needed; second, we have safeguards in this legislation for the American worker that are completely adequate in all respects; and, third, it is a matter which should not be dealt with at this time.

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

Mr. MOORE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Yesterday there was discussion and debate on this question of migrant labor and temporary labor during the consideration of the supplemental

appropriation bill which clearly indicated that another committee other than the Committee on the Judiciary was assuming jurisdiction over this very matter.

Secondly, does not the gentleman feel we have offered in this bill ample protection to labor and also does not the gentleman feel it is unnecessary to go beyond what we have done in this bill to protect labor?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from New York is eminently correct.

Mr. CELLER. And is it not also a fact that we cannot correlate migratory labor and persons coming into this country temporarily to do certain work with people coming into this country under our regular immigration laws? Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CELLER. And therefore is it not also a fact that we cannot have the same restrictions operating against the one as we have against the other?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CELLER. And is this not a slap in the face in a certain sense of the Attorney General because you are taking jurisdiction away from the Attorney General and placing it in the Department of Labor? Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CELLER. Therefore, it does not seem fair that this amendment should prevail; am I correct in that statement?

Mr. MOORE. I would hope this amendment would be defeated, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. MOORE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILBERT. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. CELLER], that the Attorney General has no objection to my amendment and as late as this afternoon he indicated he supported this amendment. He told me it was properly within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Labor who should make this determination. In the bill we are considering now, we have amended the law so that it requires a certification from the Secretary of Labor for the immigrants to come in who have certain skills so that they will not displace American workers. You must have that certification from the Secretary of Labor and that is something that we did not have up to this point.

Mr. MOORE. We say that the Attorney General must have certification from the Secretary of Labor with respect to the ordinary flow of migrants. May I say under the present law it specifies that these cases shall be determined by the Attorney General after consultation with the appropriate agencies of Government. Does that not do exactly what the gentleman's amendment desires to do?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MOORE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILBERT. May I say that the Attorney General at this time consults with the Secretary of Labor and asks him for his opinion. Then the Attorney General can proceed and do what he pleases.

The expert in this field is the Secretary of Labor and not the Attorney General. What we are doing is asking the opinion of the expert and then ignoring his opinion we properly place this before the Secretary of Labor, not as the gentleman says the Agriculture Committee. This is not a question of agriculture, this is a question of immigration. This is an amendment to the immigration law. It is under section 214, where we import labor under the immigration law, and not under the agriculture law.

Mr. MOORE. The real debate and the thrust in this particular problem area arises because the Attorney General has followed the advice of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. GILBERT. Quite to the contrary. The very purpose of my bill is for the reason the Attorney General did not follow the advice of the Secretary of Labor. Only recently the Attorney General requested of the Secretary of Labor his opinion with respect to extending the time of temporary workers in the State of Florida. The Secretary of Labor said, "No, it is not necessary." In spite of that, the Attorney General granted the extension of time.

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

Mr. MOORE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. Is it not correct that the vast majority of migrant workers allowed in, under the labor shortage provisions, are in the agricultural field?

Mr. MOORE. I would say that is correct.

Mr. RESNICK. Other than some permitted for show business reasons. So the expert in this field is the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. MOORE. I say to the gentleman that I believe the law adequately covers this matter today, and that the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] is not necessary. I suggest that it be defeated.

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

I rise in opposition to this amendment. As I tried to bring out in the previous colloquy, today the agricultural economy faces disaster in many areas.

In the 28th Congressional District, because of the complete intransigence of the Secretary of Labor our apples are rotting on the trees.

We have heard others of my colleagues, during the debate on the farm bill, bring up the point that pickles and other produce are not being picked because of a shortage of labor.

It seems to me that if we vest completely and entirely and without any recourse the problem of migratory workers for agricultural crops in the hands of the Secretary of Labor we will be doing a harmful thing to agriculture.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this suggested amendment. Our experience last season in Florida has clearly demonstrated that the Attorney General must have jurisdiction of this program. He has available to him the reports of the Secretary of Labor, and, importantly, those of the Secretary of Agriculture. Defeat of this amendment will serve as notice to the Department of Labor that it is not the will of the House of Representatives that it completely dominate determination of need for offshore supplemental farm labor. It will also serve as support for the proper actions of the Attorney General, when during the past season it was necessary for him to override a determination of the Secretary of Labor, to support the crops needs clearly documented by the Department of Agriculture and his own Justice Department staff. Apparently the Labor Department wishes to see this lawful authority of the Attorney General shifted to their own Department. Defeat of this amendment will show that the Congress does not share this view.

The impartial review of the success of a farm labor program, evidenced by actual crop conditions and workers available for the jobs to be done, must be left in the hands of one who can look at the situation without previous commitment. The Attorney General has available to him the reports of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, and any other agency he may see fit to call on. On the basis of this information, he can make fair and impartial determination. This is clearly in the national interest, and this will be the clear intention of this House in defeating this amendment.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GILBERT) there were—ayes 10, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make an inquiry, if I may, of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the able gentleman from New York.

In view of there apparently being some confusion about the applicability of this measure to the Cuban refugees who are already in this country, mostly in Florida, and others who might come,

may I ask the able chairman these questions: First, What would be the effect of this measure, if enacted, on the Cuban refugees who are now in the United States?

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. This bill will not affect their status. Their status cannot be adjusted by the terms of the bill. They are in Florida, and we have offered asylum to them. There would be need for other legislation to take care of the adjustment of the Cuban refugees.

Mr. PEPPER. What will be the effect of this measure, if enacted, may I ask the able gentleman, upon future refugees coming from Cuba to the United States who would otherwise come under the parole provisions of the present law? Could they continue to come and be permitted to come, or does this measure prescribe a different standard and a different quota?

Mr. CELLER. They come from the Western Hemisphere and therefore there would be no numerical limit if they come as immigrants, but if they apply as refugees they would have to satisfy the definition on page 26 commencing on line 2. They would have to show that they came here or sought to come here because of persecution or fear of persecution. If, however, they are avowed Communists or members of a Communist organization, they would be barred. They have to satisfy the security regulations which now exist in the statute.

Mr. PEPPER. If the gentleman would answer one other question, this bill, as I understand it, prescribes a number of 10,200 refugees a year permitted to come to this country. Would any refugees in the future coming from Cuba, as long as that is a communistically controlled country, be included in that figure of 10,200?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, sir. They would be included in that 10,200, which is the limitation on the number of refugees that can come in. It is an overall number.

Mr. PEPPER. That is a world number?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. There can be only that number coming in from the world and any who might come from Cuba, even while it is a communistically dominated country, would be included in that?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. As refugees.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentleman for his explanation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to express my complete support for this legislation and state that I will vote for H.R. 2580.

This legislation which finally amends the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 was a long time in coming—but its eventual arrival has always been a certainty.

It was inevitable, when the national origins quota system was first enacted in 1924 and reenacted in 1952, that it would some day be stricken from the law. We are, today, approaching that long-awaited day.

One of the most inequitable parts of our present law is the national origins quota system. It has been, from its very inception, a discriminatory law. It asks of the immigrant where he was born and does not treat the man of one nation as an equal of the man of another country. It does not look at this qualifications for life in the United States.

It is difficult to understand our logic. We spend billions of dollars in foreign aid so that we can convince other nations that our democratic way of life is the best and then we say to the people of these countries when they wish to come into the United States, "sorry, you were born in the wrong country." I agree with the sentiments expressed by the late President Kennedy when he said that the national origins quota system was "without basis in either logic or reason."

The national origins systems is a denial of our heritage. It ignores the fact that ours is a nation of immigrants; that much of our prosperity, wealth and strength as a country is derived from the diversity of our citizens' backgrounds just as much as it is derived from our unity.

To those who say that the national origins system is working well, I say then why is it necessary for the Congress to pass so many bills every year dealing with specific cases of immigration? Why is it necessary for Congress to pass exceptional legislation year after year? Is it not time to make the exception the rule? Ninety percent of the Far Eastern immigration between 1953 and 1963 was nonquota immigration. Is it not time to reconcile the letter of the law to the facts of immigration?

The last four Presidents to hold office have recommended that this law be drastically modified or repealed. It is surprising to me that this inequitable system has remained in effect as long as it has.

This bill is not a radical proposal—it is a just and humane piece of legislation. It is conservative in that it seeks to abolish the national origins system in favor of the equality of opportunity that existed before we blindly adopted the quota system.

It is conservative in that it does not seek to significantly increase the number of immigrants coming to our shores. In fact, it will help stimulate our economy rather than add to the unemployment figures.

Passage of this bill will not result in unregulated immigration. The bill retains all the necessary security requirements now in the present law. The passage of H.R. 2580 will bring to our immigration law the kind of flexibility required by the international situation. It will bring our immigration policy into line with our foreign policy. But most important, it will bring our immigration policy in line with the heritage, the fine traditions and ideals of the United States—the heritage that believes and does not merely profess to believe in the fundamental truth that all men, regardless of race, color or religion, are created equal.

I am pleased with the objectives of this bill and support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I have some amendments at the Clerk's desk which I respectfully ask unanimous consent to have considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. MAC GREGOR

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MACGREGOR: On page 39, line 16, strike the period and insert:

": *Provided*, That exclusive of immediate relatives of the United States citizens specified in subsection (b) of section 201, the number of special immigrants who may be issued immigrant visas pursuant to the provision of section 101(a)(27)(A) shall not in any fiscal year subsequent to June 30, 1968, exceed a total of 115,000, such visas to be issued to qualified special immigrants in the chronological order in which such special immigrants are registered on lists which shall be maintained in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State."

On page 39, line 18, strike the words "in any one fiscal year" and insert in lieu thereof the words "during the fiscal years 1965, 1966, and 1967."

On page 40, lines 12 and 13, strike the words "entitled to a special immigrant classification under section 101(a)(27)(A), or is" and on line 17 after the figure "(8)" insert the words "or of special immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 224, as the case may be."

On page 41, line 5, strike the comma and insert the words "or of special immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 224,".

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the principal amendment of the three read by the Clerk is the Western Hemisphere numerical ceiling amendment which was discussed at length during general debate on the bill. The other amendments must necessarily follow the principal amendment. The first of these conforming amendments would require cancellation of one of the 115,000 special visa numbers allotted to the Western Hemisphere whenever the Attorney General cancels the deportation of an alien from the Western Hemisphere and records his lawful admission for permanent residence.

The second conforming amendment would have as its purpose charging the numerical limitation upon special visa numbers for the Western Hemisphere with the number for each approved application for adjustment of status involving a native of the Western Hemisphere.

May I say to the Members of the House that these two conforming amendments would give to my proposed 115,000 numerical ceiling the same effect given to the 170,000 numerical ceiling for all

countries external to the Western Hemisphere as recommended by the full committee.

I think it is fair to say that the only objections raised to my amendment pertain to the fact that in someone's subjective opinion it would be disadvantageous to the foreign policy of the United States in that policy's application to our friends and neighbors south of the Rio Grande. May I say to those who insist that we give high preferential treatment to the Caribbean area and to Latin America: Would they have American foreign policy declare that a Swede, a German, an Irishman, an Italian, or a Japanese is less desirable as a future citizen of the United States than a native of Panama or Jamaica or Paraguay or El Salvador? Do we really wish today in this Chamber to put our stamp of approval on a double standard in immigration?

I have listened to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary ridicule my proposal of a ceiling of 115,000 plus immediate family members for the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, if a 170,000 ceiling has merit for all countries external to the Western Hemisphere, does not a very generous numerical ceiling applicable to the Western Hemisphere also have merit?

Are we really desirous of saying that it is our intent and purpose to control immigration from the more than 100 countries across the Atlantic and Pacific by legislative ceilings, but that we will rely on administrative controls to keep in proper balance the immigration from Latin America and the Caribbean?

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, I did not ridicule the ceiling. I hope the gentleman does not really mean that or intend that.

Of course, the immigration from the Western Hemisphere has always been deemed different than the immigration from Europe or Asia. Shall I say it is in a category that is sui generis. We are very close to our southern neighbors. We are in coalition with them by virtue of the Organization of American States, the Alliance for Progress, and our harmonious close relationships with the countries of the Western Hemisphere go back to the days of Monroe.

Mr. MACGREGOR. And, my dear Chairman, so, too, are we in close and harmonious alliance with our sister states in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. And in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and in all the organizations sanctioned by the Charter of the United Nations throughout the world in which we have membership.

Is one relationship to be regarded as highly superior to another, particularly, Mr. Chairman, when you consider that we are not simply continuing the free flow immigration from the Western Hemisphere that has been enjoyed by these countries in the past? We are making a marked change in the status of the Caribbean countries which have recently acquired their independence or who will subsequently acquire their independence. At the present time these countries have been sharply limited, and unfairly so, to 100 per year.

But we have, Mr. Chairman, as you well know, almost 15,000 on the waiting list from Jamaica alone. The numbers on the waiting lists for the other countries including Barbados, which is moving toward independence, British Guiana, which has almost achieved independence, and in other countries are less. But we are sharply upgrading the preferred status of these countries, while we are downgrading, through the 170,000 ceiling and the 20,000 per country limitation, the status of Western Europe and the rest of the world.

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

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, I do not agree with the gentleman's characterization of the facts as elucidated, but I do not think we can afford to turn the clock backward. You must take into consideration that certainly we cannot disregard the fact that for over 40 years we have never placed a ceiling on countries in the Western Hemisphere as far as immigrants coming into this Nation. If we suddenly placed that ceiling on these countries of the Western Hemisphere, do we not wound the sensibilities of these countries, to say the least?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Not in the slightest, because the numerical ceiling which I propose would provide for a reasonable increase over the pattern of immigration from the Western Hemisphere for the past 5 years and will accommodate in a reasonable fashion the newly acquired status of Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I do not see how that could be so because you would have no inward control over the 115,000. Conceivably, two nations could absorb and preempt, for example, the entire figure that you mention.

Mr. MACGREGOR. If that be true, then under the 170,000 ceiling which will apply to over 100 countries external to the Western Hemisphere 9 countries could fill all the spaces. Eight countries could take their 20,000 maximum and a ninth could claim the remaining 10,000 spaces under the 170,000 limit.

Mr. CELLER. No, because we provide no country can send into this land of ours more than 20,000.

Mr. MACGREGOR. But 8 times 20,000 is 160,000. One more country could take the remaining 10,000. Nine countries could dominate immigration from outside the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman disregards what we have provided for countries other than the Western Hemisphere. You must take that into consideration.

Mr. MACGREGOR. If these nine countries could fill the preference requirements, they could completely take up the immigration ceiling that you support.

I think it is important that Members know that informed journals and journalists throughout the country have without exception endorsed the idea of a numerical ceiling applicable to all parts of the world. Yesterday's RECORD contains the opinion of the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, and syndicated columnist Charles Bartlett. Today many more newspaper editorials have come to my attention. Perhaps the best is the following editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Aug. 25, 1965]

NEW IMMIGRATION DANGER

Under the flimsy and foolish pretext of making a friendly gesture to Central and South America, the State Department and the Johnson administration propose to revise but maintain numerical limits on immigration from all the rest of the world, but to leave the doors wide open for a flood of Latin Americans.

A revolt against this dangerous and unjustified favoritism is forming among House Members. Their efforts deserve backing from the public and from Congress.

What has happened in the House is that the bill to abolish the national origins quota system for regulating immigration has been twisted into a vehicle for a new form of discrimination. While an overall limit of 170,000 immigrants a year is set for all the nations outside the Western Hemisphere, including England, West Germany, the Scandinavian nations and Italy, no limits whatever are provided for the Latin American countries.

To call this bill nondiscriminatory is hypocrisy. It discriminates against the nations that have traditionally supplied America with desirable immigrants.

Such a policy does not make sense. If we are to replace the national origins principle with the theory that immigrants should be judged on their character and ability, regardless of nationality, then the Latin Americans should come under the same rules, and there should be a maximum quota for them as well as for others.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have, as many Members are aware, mixed feelings as I rise to speak on this amendment. My personal feelings on the amendment, and an abundance of objective logic, support the proposal for a worldwide immigration ceiling or, alternatively, a separate ceiling on the Western Hemisphere immigration. From a purely immigration standpoint, many of Mr. MACGREGOR's arguments are irrefutable. However, immigration legislation cannot be considered in a pure vacuum.

There is a problem of foreign relations which must be considered, although it is a secondary consideration. Overriding, as always, are the domestic welfare interests of our own country. The conduct of our foreign relations vests by the Constitution in the President. He is advised on this subject by the Secretary of State. I have discussed this matter with both President Johnson and Secretary Rusk. The current situation with respect to our relations in the Western Hemisphere, particularly in the Caribbean area, are such that not even the

most casual reader of our daily press can be unaware. The analysis of these situations by the President and his advisers, the most competent in this field, cannot be ignored. They have flatly stated that the proposed amendment cannot serve our best interests at this time, and quite to the contrary, would perform a distinct disservice.

To these arguments my judgment has yielded. I am yielding on my original proposal at this time, but I serve clear notice I am not abandoning it. The effective date of this bill is July 1, 1968, insofar as the new nonnational numerical ceilings are concerned.

Now during all that period it is my intention to pursue this matter unremittingly.

In the meantime and effective immediately, our subcommittee has expressed our concern on the potential deluge from elsewhere in this hemisphere, by the special provisions in the present bill under consideration.

First, we have prohibited an adjustment of status by Western Hemisphere natives who may have succeeded in entering the United States temporarily under section 245.

Second, we have required every immigrant from the Western Hemisphere to be cleared by the Secretary of Labor before he may receive an immigrant visa.

Third, we have required that the President notify the Congress should immigration from this area increase at any time by as little as 10 percent over the past years.

Should these new provisions not prove effective in keeping a reasonable limit on the Western Hemisphere between now and July 1, 1968, I will be the first to join in making that the date, which I confidently believe is inevitable, July 1, 1968.

I do believe, however, that these requirements which have been incorporated in the subcommittee bill will achieve the objectives sought by all of us and therefore they make the proposed amendment unnecessary at this time.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of our subcommittee. I think the gentleman has made it clear and if he has not, I wish to emphasize it, that my amendment would not take effect immediately. It would not take effect until July 1, 1968, the day on which we eliminate the national origins quota system.

Mr. FEIGHAN. As I said before, I realize it does not take effect until July 1, 1968. In the meantime, between now and then, we should take a very thorough look at the rate of immigrant admissions and, as I said just a minute ago, if during that interim I feel we ought to put a ceiling, we should do it and make it effective July 1, 1968.

Mr. MACGREGOR. The only trouble with that is that to do it as an independent item of legislation directed against just one area of the world instead of doing it as part of a reform of our overall immigration laws will, I believe, be exceedingly difficult legislatively. It has been 40 years since we had an overhaul of our immigration legislation, and I do not want to wait that long before accomplishing the objective of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I join with the distinguished chairman of the committee in opposing this amendment—but perhaps for a different reason.

There is no valid reason at this time to move away from the special relationship which we have had with the Western Hemisphere for the past 40 years during which time we have granted nonquota status to natives of this hemisphere for immigration purposes. This special relationship, which has long existed between this Nation and our American sister republics, is based upon a mutuality of interest, ideals and aspirations, which first found expression in the Monroe Doctrine and was later reaffirmed by the founding of the Organization of the American States, the good neighbor policy and, more recently, the Alliance for Progress. Now to restrict immigration from these countries by the imposition of a quota system would be a significant departure from these historic policies.

Some of those who support this amendment are the very people who worry about whether or not the Monroe Doctrine is still a cornerstone of our foreign policy. The foundation of the Monroe Doctrine rests in the special relationship that exists between the United States and Latin America. There is a certain inconsistency to say we no longer should adhere to this special relationship and should now terminate it.

An overall ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration would not eliminate any problem since none exists. Whatever the theoretical advantage, the imposition of a ceiling may well create problems in our foreign relations. Those nations in the Western Hemisphere which have been treated in a special way since 1924 may well regard unfavorably any move to change this particular demonstration of our special relationship with them.

The favored position of natives of the Western Hemisphere who are permitted to immigrate to the United States on a nonquota basis was never intended to be discriminatory against any quota country. This distinction made in the Immigration Act of 1924, was not based on race, religion, ancestry or ethnic origin. It was simply a recognition of Western Hemisphere solidarity which has been and is the firm policy of the United States. Even though some may characterize this advantage accorded natives of independent Western Hemisphere countries as discrimination against quota countries, it most certainly is not an invidious discrimination any more than is the preference afforded by our law to relatives of U.S. citizens and to individuals with special skills. It does not raise racial or cultural barriers or distinctions which other nations find offensive.

There has been no indication from any government of a quota country that this special position in immigration policy with respect to the Western Hemisphere is regarded as derogatory or unfair in relation to quota countries or that it is causing them any problems or creating resentment. On the other hand, our sister republics would regret any move to change this particular demonstration of a special relationship in this hemisphere.

Western Hemisphere immigration has not been out of proportion despite the absence of a numerical ceiling. It has ranged between a peak of 147,000 in 1927 and a low of 41,000 in 1948. The annual average for the past 10 years has been about 110,000. If, in the light of experience, there should occur a far-reaching change in the pattern of Western Hemisphere immigration, the Congress will always be free to review the situation and, if necessary, to take appropriate measures. In other words, if there are changes in the trend of immigration, changes in economic circumstances, or other changes which raise a problem, this would be a proper subject for the attention of Congress. Section 11(d) of H.R. 2580 as amended assures the Congress that any abrupt change in the pattern of immigration from the Western Hemisphere will not go unnoticed and can be dealt with by congressional action.

Qualitative restrictions governing all immigrants, which will remain in our law, and the administrative controls available to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor to cope with any appreciable increase in immigration from this hemisphere which might adversely affect the interests of American labor, have stabilized immigration from the Western Hemisphere to an average of 110,000 annually. The Secretary of Labor's responsibility for protecting those interests—see section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act—is an effective safeguard, as is the consul's authority to refuse a visa on public charge grounds. Experience has demonstrated that these two provisions have been effective in protecting our economic interests and have resulted in the average annual immigration indicated above.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a letter from the Under Secretary of State to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee with regard to this amendment and it being adverse to our national interest.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 24, 1965.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MANNIE: You have asked the Department's views about the proposal of Congressman MACGREGOR, described on page 46 of Report No. 745 which accompanied H.R. 2580 as reported out by your committee August 6, 1965. The proposal calls for a numerical ceiling of 115,000 immigrants annually from the Western Hemisphere, exclusive of immediate family members of U.S. citizens who are not subject to any numerical limitation.

Secretary Rusk has previously testified before your committee on this matter. I enclose a summary of his views. This makes clear why we are convinced that it would not

serve the national interest to impose a ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere as envisaged in the MacGregor amendment.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. BALL,
Acting Secretary.

The adoption of this amendment would be a national insult to all of Latin America. I strongly urge that it be defeated.

The distinguished chairman of the committee discussed this with the Secretary of State. I have permission to read the reply. He said:

DEAR MANNIE: You have asked the Department's views about the proposal of Congressman MACGREGOR.

Described therein, with a page number.

Secretary Rusk has previously testified before your committee on this matter. I enclose a summary.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for his statement. The Latin Americans, the Canadians, and we ourselves are part of the Western Hemisphere. We are geographical neighbors. We are friends of long standing. We have in many ways a common inheritance. I believe it would be a tragedy to depart in this manner from the historic relationship we have had with our friends and neighbors of the South.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the distinguished majority leader. That is exactly what we would be doing. We would be departing from an historic precedent.

I would believe this would be exceptionally insulting to our Latin American friends. No reason exists for this amendment. The only result of the amendment could be a very insulting blow to a special relationship that exists in the world today.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first I should like to speak forthrightly in commending the members of the subcommittee and the members of the full Committee on the Judiciary for doing a very constructive job in drafting H.R. 2580. This is a fine step forward and I am pleased and proud that so many provisions are the result of Republican effort in the committee.

On the other hand, I believe there is a missing link in the work the committee has done. H.R. 2580 seeks to erase the discrimination and the preferences that were built up in the national origins legislation of the 1920's. This legislation seeks to eliminate a double standard, one that has existed too long with quotas on European and none on those from the Western Hemisphere. But when we look at the overall and see the basic problem, without the inclusion of the MacGregor amendment I believe that, in effect, possibly we will be perpetuating a double standard.

It seems to me without the MacGregor amendment you will be writing into immigration legislation for the future discrimination and preference.

The gentleman from New York, the chairman of this committee, claims that we have a close relationship with our Latin American neighbors. The gentleman from New Jersey says that we have a special relationship with our Latin American neighbors. I concede that we have a close and special relationship geographically with those south of our national border. I admit that there is a special and important relationship with the Organization of American States. However, it is legitimate to raise this question: Is that relationship any more important to the United States than those treaties we have with our European allies in NATO? Is that relationship any more essential to us today than agreement we have with our SEATO allies in the South Pacific? The answer, in my judgment, is "No."

Yes, we have a special and a close relationship with the people in Latin America. But, do we not as Americans have as strong a blood relationship with more people in more countries in Western Europe? The answer is yes. In Poland, in France, in Italy, in England, in Germany, in Scandanavia, in all of the western European countries we have extremely close and broad ties on the basis of blood. So the blood relationship argument is in favor, not against, the MacGregor amendment.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is making a strong statement with reference to our friends around the world. If I understand this bill correctly, the purpose of it is to end discrimination against our friends, and relatives if you will, in various parts of the world. I think they will all be grateful for that. I do not think any of them will expect us to limit our relationships with our closest neighbors while we are broadening our relationships with our friends around the world. I remind the gentleman it was a Republican Congress that established this precedent at least 40 years ago.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, may I respond to the comments by the distinguished majority leader. This bill is aimed at ending discrimination and eliminating a double standard. Yet in the process, unless you have the MacGregor amendment incorporated in the legislation, you are perpetuating this double standard and probably unfortunately writing it into the law for a long, long time to come.

As I understand the testimony before the subcommittee, even spokesmen for the Department of State admitted that in due time there would be such a serious problem and it would be necessary to take some legislative action to prevent a tremendous onrush of immigration as critical population problems arise in Latin America. It seems to me that we should not postpone the day of inevitability. If even the opponents of this amendment concede that we will have to take corrective action at some future date, then why not do it when we can say with all honesty and all frankness that we can treat all people, all nationalities, all nations, identically? Let us not slap in the face any nationality, any nation. Therefore I strongly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is approved.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note, and I say this in reply to the distinguished minority leader from Michigan, that this so-called double standard, which is a term used on the other side, has existed for over four decades. We heard no murmur of objection, not even a peep or squeak, of discontent from the Republican side all these years. Now suddenly, out of the blue, we have this MacGregor amendment.

In 1924, this "no ceiling," if I may use that term, on the Western Hemisphere was embodied in what act? It was embodied in the Johnson Act. He was the Republican chairman of the Committee on Immigration. In whose administration? In the Coolidge administration, a Republican administration. Was there any change suggested by the Republican President, Mr. Hoover? No. Was there any change suggested by the Republican President, Mr. Eisenhower? No.

So that the Republicans joined with Democrats all these years without the slightest murmur of objection in maintaining this open door as far as the Western Hemisphere is concerned.

Then there was the 80th Congress. The Republicans were in control of the 80th Congress and were in control of the 83d Congress. Did the appropriate committee in those two Congresses make any recommendation of the type now suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota? I know of no such suggestion, and I have been here all these years. Nobody on the Republican side ever made a speech from the well of this House or anywhere else advocating that we abrogate or nullify this open door policy as far as the Western Hemisphere was concerned. Of course, it was never done because we wanted to solidify as best we could the relations that exist between this country and the countries to the south of us, and with Canada, with the countries of Pan America. It would be unfortunate if at this late date, and at this crucial time we were to make this sudden change and say to Argentina and Chile and Bolivia and Paraguay and Colombia and Brazil, "We are now going to put limitations on you."

These countries have not sent in a tremendous influx of immigrants. The number that has come in is very slight. Peru sent in a little over 2,000; Honduras, 1,700; El Salvador, 1,600; Nicaragua, 1,500. That is the situation with all these countries. There has been no avalanche of immigration from any of these nations.

Now you want to slap them down, you want, in a certain way, to insult them and say, "No, we are going to put a limitation on those who can come in."

You are going to do grievous harm to the conduct of our foreign policy, and I hope that this amendment will not prevail. It would be most unwise.

The principal reason for opposing a ceiling, in addition to what I said, is that to do so moves the United States away from the special relationship we have had with the Western Hemisphere countries over the past 40 years, at a time when we are intensifying our efforts through the Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress to develop even closer relations with our sister republics and to strengthen, and not weaken, the ties between us.

Our relationship with the republics of this hemisphere is based upon a mutuality of interests, ideals and aspirations. That is quite different from our relations with countries in Europe and Asia and Africa. Our basic foreign policy objective is to nurture and expand that mutuality of interest. Having treated our sister republics in a favorable way since 1924, to change now or 3 years hence without compelling reasons of national intersts, can hardly be viewed as consonant with the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. No one regards, for example, as discriminatory the special relationship existing between member countries of the Common Market which has manifested itself in many ways, including the free movement of natives among the Common Market member countries. Similarly, no one, to my knowledge, regards the favored position of the natives of the Western Hemisphere to immigrate to the United States as discriminatory aginst the rest of the world.

The MacGregor proposal states that the most compelling reason for imposition of a numerical ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration after not having done so in 40 years, is the worldwide population explosion and the "possibility of a sharp increase in immigration from the Western Hemisphere countries."

The qualitative restrictions applicable to all intending immigrants, which will remain in the law, together with the administrative controls available both to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor to cope with any appreciable increase in immigration from this hemisphere which might adversely affect the interests of American labor, have stabilized immigration from the Western Hemisphere over the last 10 years to an annual average of 110,000. These built-in safeguards have been reinforced by the exercise of the authority of our consuls abroad to refuse a visa on grounds that the applicant is likely to become a public charge. Experience has amply demonstrated that these provisions have and will continue to be effective in protecting our economic interests.

I should emphasize that section 11(d) of the bill affords an additional safeguard. The President will report to us if there is a marked change in Western Hemisphere immigration and send us his recommendations so that we can be fully informed and take whatever actions the Congress deems necessary.

The imposition of a ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration is not necessary and would not help us attain our foreign policy objectives which require closer cooperation with our sister republics and continued manifestation of our mutuality of interest.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, there are sufficient safeguards in the pending bill to prevent any great avalanche of immigrants into the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the imposition of the ceiling on the Western Hemisphere is not necessary and it will not help us with our foreign policy objectives which require closer cooperation with our sister republics and continued manifestation of our mutuality of interests.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is, in my opinion, regrettable that the charge of partisanship should have been brought into the consideration of this very important legislation, legislation which should have been considered from time to time throughout the years.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the members of this committee who do not know it that it was not the Members on this side of the aisle who drew into the discussion of this legislation partisan considerations.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the record will show that it was the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and the other minority members of the subcommittee who joined with enough of the majority of the subcommittee to write the legislation, which is before the committee this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that in his criticism of the party for not doing anything about the Walter-McCarran Act or the act that was passed in the twenties, that his party has been in control of the House and of the Senate at least four times as many of the years during that period of time as has the minority party been in control of the House and the Senate.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am always happy to yield to our delightful and friendly Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to make the observation so that there would be no misunderstanding, that there is no injection of partisan politics into the debate, and I want to disabuse my friend's mind of this fact. We can debate here and have honest misunderstandings or differences of opinion without partisanship in the sense of partisanship being injected into it.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side have in a most polite way called to the attention of my colleagues that 40 years ago, under a Republican administration, this very wise policy in relation to the other countries of the Western Hemisphere was put into operation, and we accepted one of the first wisdoms of the Republican Party for the past 40 years. We think it is a wise policy. We are simply trying—and we have adopted this policy—to carry it on. We are urging you not to repudiate the good policy that you established 40 years ago.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, of course the Speaker who sees all, hears all and knows most all, knows that the law which is sought to be amended bears the distinguished name of the late great Senator McCarran and the late great Representative Tad Walter.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the Speaker apologized for the partisan politics that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary brought into the discussion. I listened to every word of it, and I repeat what I said about the time that the party of the Speaker and the chairman and the majority leader has been in control of the House.

As I recall, the distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the other side, who spoke in opposition to the amendment, said that immigration from the Western Hemisphere had dropped appreciably, and he cited one 6-month period in a 5-year period to prove his statement that there was a material decrease of immigrants to the United States from South American nations.

I would like to say that the record before the Committee on the Judiciary shows that in 5 years the increase in immigrants from South America to the United States increased 230 percent.

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

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. McCULLOCH) he was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, it is known to all those who read that the population explosion, great as it is in so many parts of the world, will be even greater in South American countries, and as the immigrants increase in numbers it is going to be more difficult by the day and by the week and by the year to put an overall ceiling on such immigration.

We are looking ahead to the time when it will of necessity be done, compared to the present when it can be done without great pain or suffering, or international hurt.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the decision to slow down immigration in the face of legislation such as in the bill now before us, if it is not amended, does not do justice to this great country in its diplomatic relations with South American nations.

Mr. Chairman, the MacGregor amendment should be adopted now.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the MacGregor amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 25 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, it is a very difficult assignment for one who has

served on the Judiciary Committee for over 20 years to differ with his chairman of the full committee and also his chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration.

My friends and colleagues, it has been my good fortune not only to have been a Member of this great body for the past 21 years but also to have been a member of the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee for 18½ of those 21 years.

I have seen a lot of immigration legislation come and go. I have voted for every progressive piece of immigration since I have been a member of this subcommittee since 1947. I was chosen, so I was told by our late and beloved friend, Tad Walter, as the balance wheel on the old five-man subcommittee on immigration, yes—two liberals, two conservatives and myself. I appreciated the confidence that was placed in me at that time and I hope that you will agree with me on both sides of the aisle today that I have never done anything in any way or by any official act to have violated that confidence. Personally, my colleagues, I think this is a good bill with the MacGregor amendment that is, and I want to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] for his contribution—and he made a magnificent contribution. Also I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] and our beloved chairman, Mr. CELLER, for all the contributions that they made—and, yes, I want to thank our wonderful staff members who helped us to write this bill. This is a committee bill. This bill was written by your subcommittee. This bill was not written by the Attorney General or the Secretary of State. We members of the subcommittee wrote it the hard way. I am for the bill except for one thing—I think it ought to have incorporated into it the MacGregor amendment. I will tell you why. I voted for Mr. MACGREGOR's amendment in the subcommittee and it carried 5 to 4—it was that close.

That means that we were really thinking about what we were doing. We did not race or hurry through the matter. We spent over 3 years holding hearings so as to know all of the facts.

Upon the request of the White House, I agreed to help them, and so did another Democrat, and upon reconsideration it was defeated 6 to 3. Oh, I see some of you smiling—well, the President of the United States is my President, and he can ask me for a favor or to consider any legislation just as much as any constituent of mine back home. I hope and pray that the time will never come that I have to turn him down. If I think he is right, I'll help; if I think his advisers are wrong, I will not go along. In the instant case I honestly believe that his advisers on foreign policy are dead wrong. They tell the President that this amendment will ruin our relations with all the nations of the Western Hemisphere; I say to you, my friends, I think that it does not. This amendment is eventually going to come. It is like Morton & Ballard's old ad back in Louisville, Ky.—"Eventually; why not now?" Yes, Roger Morton, "Eventually; why not now?" The amendment offered by Mr. MACGREGOR in the subcommittee would have reserved 45 percent of the total world ceiling for the Western Hemisphere alone. Now is not that really taking good care of our friends that are close to us? If you had five sons and gave to one of them 45 percent of your total estate, then divided the 55 percent balance amongst the remaining four—do not you know that you have really taken good care of the one who obtained the 45 percent? In the instant case—our neighbors to the south would have received that amount while the balance of 55 percent would have been distributed to the rest of the world.

It is coming. We are going to have to adopt this amendment within 3 years. Let me tell you why. In the world today there are 3,300 million people. The experts tell us that within the next 35 years there will be 6,600 million people. In the Western Hemisphere today we are informed that there are some 200 million people. The same experts estimate that within the next 35 years, and you, Mr. MOORE, heard the testimony, I heard it, and every member of the subcommittee heard it, there will be 600 million people down south of the border, so to speak. Merciful heavens, where are we going to put them all? I love them—you love them—they are our friends. But you do not have to buy your friends. I never knowingly or willingly asked a friend of mine to do something that I thought would hurt him either spiritually, religiously, morally, mentally, physically, socially, financially, politically, or in any other way. If you do, then you are not a man's friend because you do not ask a friend to do something that is going to hurt him. Our friends to the north and south of us ought not ask us to do this. My colleagues, let me say this to you in conclusion. I think this MacGregor suggestion and approach is a good amendment. I am going to support the bill if the amendment is adopted and if it is not, then I am going to vote "no." I would do this with a heavy heart, but I would do it because I sincerely believe it is in the best interest of our beloved country. We simply cannot literally push our own family out of our own home in order to take in our neighbors who live on the same block. I repeat, I love our Latin American friends and all who reside in the Western Hemisphere, but I love America first, last, and always.

I changed my vote in the subcommittee only to get the bill to the floor. I thought that it was entitled to be heard and acted on by the entire House—the best jury in all of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I suppose we might say that one could be logical and consistent and support the MacGregor amendment, but, when we have to consider that there is the national interest at stake, that the Secretary of State, who is one who molds our foreign policy, has made such a strong statement that it is not in our national interest to do so, that it would be inopportune to set a ceiling on the Western Hemisphere, I do not then believe we should substitute our judgment for the judgment of the Secretary of State. Instead of logic and consistency, I believe we must face reality and consider the national interest as being paramount.

What is good for the United States of America? What is in our national interest?

The Secretary of State says it is absolutely important that we continue this longstanding special relationship.

I believe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] recognizes the validity of the argument that it is inopportune to make any change at this time in our relationship with the Western Hemisphere, for he projects his amendment to take place in 1968. Why does he do that? He does not want us to let the people of the Western Hemisphere know that we are actually going to do something now so he says let us wait until 1968 for the ceiling to take effect. But once we adopt this amendment we will be broadcasting to the world that we are changing our position and giving the Western Hemisphere a slap in the face. This is against our national interest and against our foreign policy. In a letter to the chairman of our committee, the Secretary of State—who is our distinguished expert on foreign policy says of such a ceiling:

> The Department continues to be strongly opposed to the enactment at this time of any measure that would terminate the nonquota status of immigrants from the Western Hemisphere. It is our view that such a change in the law would have extremely adverse effects on our relations with the friendly nations of this hemisphere and would be particularly inopportune at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the distinguished Secretary of State has weighed his statement and words carefully. He has spoken for the national interest. I am content to rest my case on his good judgment in the conduct of our foreign affairs. For these reasons I hope that the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. As a member of that committee, I have given this whole question much thought. I was called by a representative of the Department of State yesterday, who inquired about my position on this so-called MacGregor amendment. I expressed the hope that I still had an open mind on that subject.

However, as a result of the discussion on the floor today, I am firmly convinced of the advisability of acting favorably on this amendment.

The argument has been made in a variety of ways—including that of the gentleman from New Jersey, just now—that the time is not opportune, that we will be slapping our friends in Latin America in the face, if we impose a ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration.

I would like to point out a couple of things. First, the proposed ceiling is far

more liberal than with respect to 104 nations not in the Western Hemisphere. No preferences are applied. There are to be no quotas. And this annual ceiling is more liberal than the actual immigration from that area over the past 15 years.

I do not believe anyone can really argue that if we do not act now we will not be obliged to face this question at a later date. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] spoke of a potential deluge. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] by implication admitted that there might be an avalanche if we did not have some kind of restrictions, which he feels in part, at least, are presently in the bill. I might add that I cannot agree with the specious argument that we should not act now because we have not acted in the past 40 years. If we used that logic, we should have had no immigration bill from the Judiciary Committee.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am naturally sensitive to the possible implications, of what we do, on our friends overseas. I see no convulsions overseas if we act now and act in a reasonable way. I believe the best thing we can do with respect to this question of unlimited immigration from the Western Hemisphere is to grasp the nettle now.

I would guess that we have done more damage by our recent actions in the Dominican Republic, though I myself am not criticizing them, than by applying reasonable restrictions on our friends in the Western Hemisphere, and this amendment, I must repeat, still is more generous to them than we are to the rest of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not be accused of partisanship if I oppose the Republican Policy Committee position on this amendment. I am not really opposed to it because of that, but rather because of the substance of the amendment. It is a useless, irresponsible proposal.

It was mentioned earlier by the gentleman from Minnesota that we are being subjective in opposing his amendment. I suggest to you that friendship is subjective but it is of paramount importance to use and to the free world. If we review our relations with our friends in this hemisphere, we find that we erred rather badly in some of the policies we followed from 1920 to 1933. It took President Roosevelt to establish the good neighbor policy and renew old friendships. And we all recall how important those friends were to us during World War II.

In all of the nearly 200 years of our existence as a nation we have had no ceiling on immigration from other countries in this hemisphere and we have not been deluged with immigrants.

There is some apprehension about the double standard, but I suggest to you that the MacGregor amendment is a double standard. The gentleman from Minnesota does not propose to treat the Western Hemisphere as we treat the countries in the Eastern Hemisphere. He has his own double standard. He just does not like ours.

It has been said that a ceiling will be inevitable because there will be lots of people born in the world. I suggest to you that no ceiling is inevitable.

There is a qualitative requirement on every individual who comes into this country. First of all, for one to get into this country from any place else in the world he must either come to rejoin his family or have a skill or a profession which is in short supply or he must establish that he is not going to displace an American worker. How can we be deluged by people when we impose these requirements? The suggestion is an absurdity.

I urge you to reject the MacGregor amendment. It seems to me, not brave, but foolhardy to slap friends in the face at this time in our history.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, there has been a suggestion here, I think by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], that in drafting my amendment I was receptive to the arguments of the Secretary of State. Let me state emphatically that that is true. My amendment does give favored treatment to the Western Hemisphere. The amendment establishes a numerical ceiling which, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] indicated, is more generous to the Western Hemisphere in the light of past immigration patterns than is the ceiling of 170,000 recommended by the committee for the rest of the world.

Second. My amendment would give favored treatment, recognizing our 40-year history with the Western Hemisphere, to our neighbors in this hemisphere by excluding them from the 20,000-per-country limitation.

People have said to me, "My district borders Canada. The people there have some close ties with Canada. What will your amendment, Mr. MACGREGOR, do to Canadian immigration?" The answer is, Absolutely nothing. I say that because the 20,000-per-country limitation which will apply to the United Kingdom and to the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Italy and to all other countries across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans will not apply under my amendment to Canada, to Mexico, or to any other country of this hemisphere.

Third. I have recognized the appeal of the Secretary of State by giving favored treatment to the Western Hemisphere countries in a third respect. No immigrant from any Western Hemisphere country will be obliged to meet any of the preference requirements that govern immigration from all countries external to the Western Hemisphere.

The record is clear. Outstanding experts in the executive branch of the Government say that we are going to have to limit immigration from the Western Hemisphere at some time in the near future. Obviously it ought to be done now consonant with the overall objectives of eliminating discrimination based upon national origin and geographic location.

If a numerical ceiling has merit for our historical friends across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans why in thunder does it not have sense and logic for this hemisphere?

I point out to you that the ceiling which I propose for the Western Hemisphere is more generous to those countries than the ceiling recommended by the committee for the rest of the countries of the world. There has been statesmanship in the offering of this amendment.

May I say to the members of this Committee that my amendment was adopted on a bipartisan basis in the Subcommittee on Immigration and nationality of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Chairman, while we at this historic time are making this badly needed revision in our immigration laws, while we are striking down 3 years hence the national origins quota system, while we are emphasizing our traditional American interest in the reunification of families, we ought at the same time to extend the policy of nondiscrimination by adopting throughout the world the numerical ceiling concept.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment on the ground that foreign policy considerations far outweigh the other issues involved here.

Mr. Chairman, the Immigration Subcommittee has done an outstanding job of bringing to the Judiciary Committee and to the House a legislative proposal that is reasoned, moderate, and effective. The absence of bitter debate in the House today is evidence that the bipartisan authors of this bill—the members of the subcommittee—have achieved a remarkable degree of agreement on a subject charged with emotional controversy.

One of the reasons for the broad support for this bill is the fact that it contains administrative reforms and qualitative controls that do apply to applicants for entry to the United States from the whole world.

Under these circumstances, it seems that the imposition of a Western Hemisphere ceiling is primarily a foreign affairs problem rather than an issue of internal legislation. On an issue of foreign

policy I feel bound to give first priority to my conscientious view as to the vital interest of the Nation's welfare as affected by its relations with other nations, though that necessarily brings my opinion in conflict with that of my good friend from Minnesota.

I feel that it is essential that we support the views of the Secretary of State on the question of imposition of a ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. We have not experienced any problem to date and, as I have already said and as Secretary Rusk has pointed out, the question is simply one of foreign policy. There is little likelihood of a practical problem of being flooded by Western Hemisphere immigration. The bill, in addition to the built-in administrative safeguards available to the Secretary of State and Secretary of Labor, provides in section 11(d) that the President must bring to the attention of the Congress any marked increase in immigration from the Western Hemisphere so that we are alerted and can take any desirable action.

Under the direction of great Secretaries of State such as John Quincy Adams and Elihu Root the special relationship existing between the nations of the Western Hemisphere has been recognized. Nothing today materially changes that historic affirmity of sister republics.

I am convinced that, at a time when we are seeking through the Alliance for Progress and the OAS to express in practical ways our concern and mutuality of interests with our sister republics, we should not override the judgment of the Secretary of State on a question of foreign policy that will probably create immediate and serious repercussions that will prejudice the national interests of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment there would be no surer way to impair relations between North America and Latin America than to adopt, after 40 years, a limitation on immigration to this Nation from the Western Hemisphere.

In 1924, by virtue of historic, cultural and geographic ties, the Congress of the United States, in enacting the most restrictive immigration legislation in our history, provided nonquota status for immigrants from the Western Hemisphere. A special Senate review of our immigration policy in 1947 concluded that this nonquota status would be retained in the interests of our good neighbor policy, the difficulty in policing the huge borders of Canada and Mexico and the lack of abuse of the special relationship. The House Judiciary Committee again this year, after a careful review of our policy with the Secretary of State and other officials decided to retain this provision.

I can see no purpose in changing this provision. I can see only the creation of new problems resulting from it. Despite no numerical limitation at the present time, immigration from the Western Hemisphere has not been disproportionate. In fact it was highest in 1927 when 147,000 immigrants entered our country at a time when our own economy was less able to absorb large numbers of immigrants.

The imposition of a numerical ceiling would be completely inconsistent with our other policies and programs in the hemisphere. At a time when we are encouraging closer ties between the United States and the hemisphere through strengthened institutions, development programs and cultural and educational exchanges, it makes no sense whatsoever to say that we no longer intend to maintain the special relationship between our nations that has existed in the past in this area.

The record indicates that we will probably not have more immigration from the Western Hemisphere under this new immigration legislation than we have had in the past. We should also not lose sight of the fact that the normal qualitative and administrative controls will continue to be observed. Adequate safeguards for American labor and welfare institutions have been developed and these will continue to operate.

Indeed, this legislation already carefully guards against the result this amendment is designed to prevent. In the first place, intending immigrants, including those from the Western Hemisphere, must have a certificate from the Secretary of Labor that he will not displace a qualified American worker and that his employment would not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers similarly employed in the United States.

Should Western Hemisphere immigration under the nonquota provisions exceed by 10 percent or more the average number of immigrants admitted from the hemisphere in the previous 5 years, the President is required to notify the Congress of this fact. Congress is then free to take whatever remedial action is deemed necessary.

The argument that this provision discriminates against other nations in the Eastern Hemisphere has had more force with the proponents of the amendment than with the affected countries. The entire world has recognized the special ties that bind the United States and her sister republics in the hemisphere.

Throughout our history, from the friendships of men like Thomas Jefferson with patriots like Simon Bolivar, to the Monroe Doctrine, to the formation of the Pan American Union, the creation of the Organization of American States, and the partnership of the Alliance for Progress, the trend and commitment of the United States has been toward closer ties with our hemispheric neighbors. We would do a great disservice to this heritage by adopting this amendment. We should approve the bill as reported by the House Judiciary Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, the nine people in this body who know the problem with which we are confronted best are the six Democrats and the three Republicans who populate the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. In the subcommittee deliberations five members, constituting a bipartisan majority, voted for the MacGregor amendment. That, I suggest, is the best possible evidence of the merit of the MacGregor amendment.

I pay special tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky who made what I regard as a courageous dissertation on the floor of this House, and I must express my admiration for the candor of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], who referred to a wealth of objective evidence which reflects a need for a Western Hemisphere ceiling.

May I take the short time available to me to refer specifically to some of that objective evidence?

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations undertook a population study in the Western Hemisphere and, according to the projections of that study, in tropical America, in 1950 there were 16 people per square mile. By the year 2000, that figure will be 59.

In Central America, the increase in that period will be from 36 to 143 people per square mile.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is also legitimate for us to consider in context with these statistics the figures relative to population growth in the United States. Our growth rate, percentagewise, in this country is only 1.6 percent compared with 3.6 percent in Brazil. And, Mr. Chairman, although our percentage increase is rather modest, our absolute population increase is rather dramatic.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we are increasing the number of American citizens by reason of the increase in our birth rate and the decrease in our death rate, by 7,200 per day.

Mr. Chairman, in 700 days, in less than 2 years, we will have 5 million more Americans than we have today. That will push our population above the 200 million figure.

The Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs testified that we, at our present rate of growth, must create an additional 1 million jobs per year in this country.

Mr. Chairman, 70 percent of the American people today reside in the large metropolitan areas of America. Every demographer who testified before the subcommittee agreed that the vast majority of immigrants who settle in this country tend to settle in urban areas.

Already plagued by perplexing problems of urban congestion such as shortages of jobs, housing, schools, medical facilities, water, and so forth, the United States can hardly be fairly condemned if we weigh the additional burdens an even larger population would impose.

I am not much impressed with the argument that the MacGregor amendment would embarrass the United States in her relations with her neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. What about our neighbors and allies in the Eastern Hemisphere? What is embarrassing about a policy of equal treatment for all members of the community of nations? And why should not such a policy, designed to take effect 3 years later, be established now while we are engaged in the omnibus task of reforming our immigration laws? Why postpone a chore we will some day most surely have to perform? And when that day comes, will not that chore, standing alone, be more difficult and more embarrassing to perform?

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for 2 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is a sad and a tragic thing to throw a friend out of your home. This hemisphere is the home of all, the home of the North Americans, of the Central Americans, and of the South Americans. Hemispheric solidarity is our shield in a world of trouble, and from the earliest days of our Republic we have worked to build a hemispheric solidarity that would stand against all onslaughts of time and evil design.

And now in the flashing of the lightning, and on the whim of the moment, to throw it away—to throw the friends of the years out of our home—to slam the door in the face of friendship—it is tragic folly that approaches the dimensions of a mass hemispheric suicide. All this, too, at a time when the ugly head of communism has been raised on the island of Cuba and we have been joined with other nations on this hemisphere to keep this, our hemisphere, the land of freedom and of government of, for, and by the people. It is unthinkable that at such a time, and to such old and tried friends, we should give the bum's rush.

Mr. Chairman, I listened when my good and learned friend, in advocating the adoption of this resolution, and I know he is a wise and good man, said that no one knew the subject covered by the amendment except the seven men serving on the subcommittee. I must disagree with my good friend.

I think I know this subject. My knowledge comes not from books and legal approaches but from the personal touches. I spent part of my boyhood in Central America, and for my school mates and my playmates of those faraway days I have a warm affection. We passed many happy days in this, their hemisphere, my hemisphere, the hemisphere of all Central Americans and South Americans and North Americans.

Mr. Chairman, never will I be a party to throwing friends out of my home and slamming the door in their face. Never will I be a party to destroying the hemispheric solidarity that is a shield to our security.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, in respect to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN], a member of the Judiciary Committee, it should be stated to the Committee of the Whole that the MacGregor amendment we are now considering in actuality is not a Republican position at all. It is not representative of Republican thinking. As a matter of fact, initially as it first came to the subcommittee's attention it was the brainchild of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]. Following this suggestion I proposed such amendment in the subcommittee and was not successful in having it adopted.

May I say we are not discussing an amendment which is the position of the Republican Party any more than it is the position of a number of distinguished and respected newspapers of this country. I call to the attention of the Committee here today that the American Legion of this country has given their support in convention assembled in Portland this day to H.R. 2580, as amended, with the recommendation that the Congress consider placing a ceiling on our total immigration.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the MacGregor amendment deserves favorable consideration of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated by the gentleman from Virginia that there is a wealth of objective evidence for the MacGregor amendment. I would say that the most cogent reason for opposing the amendment, one of the most important reasons, to my mind, is that our present conduct of foreign affairs by our distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, demands a negative vote on this amendment. To fail in this, and of all he has been directed to do and has successfully done in the past with reference to our country, an affirmative vote would be a repudiation of the present conduct of our foreign policy.

Beyond that, a yea vote for this amendment would be taking an adverse view of the President's attitude toward the Alliance for Progress.

I hope the amendment will not prevail.

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

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, of course I was in favor originally of a worldwide ceiling which I think is inescapable. Again I want to assure the Membership our subcommittee will keep a close tab on this Western Hemisphere matter, and if we feel it is necessary we will recommend that we have a worldwide ceiling, which of course would include those numerically in the Western Hemisphere.

I will reluctantly vote against the MacGregor amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

It is of grave concern to me that a bill discriminating so strongly against some of our longstanding friends and allies throughout the world should be given such serious consideration by this body. Yet, this is what the bill before us today does.

Under this bill, there is no numerical limitation on immigration from any of the independent Latin American and Caribbean countries. Thus, while people from a Caribbean island such as Tobago, or from a Central American country such as El Salvador, or a South American nation such as Paraguay are totally unrestricted in their ability to enter this country; people from Greece, Italy, and Spain, as examples, would come under a numerical ceiling and a rigid system of qualifications called preferences.

Because control of immigration into the United States is admittedly essential, it is only equitable to our friends outside of this hemisphere that restrictions on immigration from Latin American countries be imposed as well. The MacGregor amendment accomplishes this objective.

Attorney General Katzenbach conceded before the House Judiciary Committee that the time will come when a restriction on immigration into the United States from Latin American countries will be needed. This body should be concerned, therefore, not only with the detrimental effect passage of this legislation in its present form would have upon our relations with countries outside of this hemisphere, but with the effect it will surely have upon our relations with Latin America when it becomes necessary at some future date to restrict immigration from our neighboring countries to the south. Unless the MacGregor amendment is adopted today, Congress will be called upon in the future to impose restrictions on Latin American nations when the full impact of uncontrolled immigration from Latin America is felt. For Congress to come back to this problem when it is most acute and to limit immigration at that time, will be interpreted by Latin Americans as pulling the welcome mat out from under them. Such future action cannot help but damage our relations with Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, the time to act is now when it is possible to treat all countries fairly and equitably.

Too often this Congress has adopted the slogan "Legislate now—perfect later." Perfecting this bill at a later time will have a harmful effect on our relations with Latin America. Passing it in its present form will have a harmful effect on our relations with the rest of the free world. This perplexity can be avoided by adopting the MacGregor amendment today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MACGREGOR and Mr. CELLER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 156, noes 154.

So the amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOGARTY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Amend section 15 by adding thereto a new subsection (c) after line 9 on page 42 to read as follows:

"(c) Section 212 (f), (g), and (h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 654, 655; 8 U.S.C. 1182), are hereby redesignated section 212 (g), (h), and (i), respectively, and section 212(g) as so redesignated is amended by inserting before the words 'Any alien afflicted with tuberculosis in any form' the following: 'Any mentally retarded alien who is a child under fourteen years of age of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or' and by adding at the end of such subsection the following sentence: 'Any alien excludable under paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of this section because of past history of mental illness who has one of the same family relationships as are prescribed in this subsection for aliens afflicted with tuberculosis and whom the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service finds to have been free of such mental illness for a period of time sufficient in the light of such history to demonstrate recovery shall be eligible for a visa in accordance with the terms of this subsection: *Provided*, That no alien who is mentally retarded shall be eligible for a visa under this subsection if both the parents or the sole surviving parent of such alien shall have entered the United States as immigrants unaccompanied by such alien.' "

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would provide some hope of giving humanitarian relief to prevent the separation of families by permitting the Surgeon General and the Attorney General to grant waivers of exclusion under proper safeguards for the public purse and public safety of mentally retarded children and of close relatives with a past history of mental illness who have been cured. It is much narrower than the waiver provisions of the original administration bill—the original administration bill which was suggested by President Kennedy when he was alive—included in this bill but stricken out by the committee when they considered this legislation. This would have covered close relatives with all types of exclusionary mental afflictions now enumerated in section 212. My amendment is similar to the waiver provisions previously enacted by the Congress for close relatives excludable for tuberculosis except for the proviso which would bar relief if both parents leave a mentally retarded child behind. The bill, H.R. 2580, has been advocated—and properly so—as a reform of our immigration laws which envisions the reuniting of families, but unless this amendment is adopted the bill will have no provision in it to prevent the needless separation of families from very close relatives, especially children and wives, in cases where to compel such separation is wholly needless and in situations that are especially cruel.

We have several illustrations that have been given to us by the Attorney General. One is the case of the young man, of Italian descent, who met and married an Italian girl while he was on duty with the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean. They had a daughter, who is an American citizen because her father is. The Navy now has transferred the young father to a new assignment in the United States and he has consequently made plans to take his family with him. But he cannot do so.

Several years ago, because of a nervous breakdown, his wife was hospitalized and then discharged after she recovered. The present law, however, takes no notice of medical advances in treating mental disturbances and makes any mental disability—whether present or past—the mandatory basis for permanent exclusion from the United States.

Consider the alternatives faced by this young serviceman. He could leave his wife and child in Italy, or he could leave the Navy and give up living in America in order to live with his family abroad.

Similarly, the present law is oblivious to the needs of mentally retarded children.

There is the case of a 5-year-old child, whose father is a doctor presently employed by a foreign city as its chief pathologist. He had an approved first-preference visa petition filed in his behalf by one of our large city hospitals and by an outstanding medical school which wanted him to join its faculty. The child was denied a visa as a mentally retarded alien. This retardation was due to a birth injury. The father would not come to the United States if his child could not accompany him, his wife, and their other child. The father had an income in excess of $20,000 a year and the child was the beneficiary of a $100,000 life insurance policy on the father. Fortunately, a private bill was enacted to admit the child. But this is quite unusual. Aliens in this position are faced with the choice of giving up coming to the United States or of leaving a mentally retarded child behind.

This is not a choice any of us would want to make. It is not a choice the United States of America should force any human being to make. The illustration given applies if the family is Italian, Scotch, or any other nationality. It applies if the father is an outstanding nuclear physicist, or a neurosurgeon needed by an American hospital or medical research center. It applies no matter how willing and able the family is to assure continued care for the child, who may in fact be only slightly or moderately retarded and quite able to live at home, or even do simple kinds of work. In short, the present law is rigid, cruel, and unnecessary.

Some of our neighbors to the north, in Canada, because of the exclusions of the present law, have been refused admission into this country even for a 3-week visit on a vacation. Because Canada has laws which reflect those we have on our own books at this time, it is equally difficult for American parents with a retarded child even to visit Canada on a vacation of 2 or 3 weeks.

In one case I know of, a mentally retarded youth, accompanied by his mother was refused entry to Canada as a tourist, simply because he is mentally retarded. When his sister protested to the Canadian consul she received "a prompt and very courteous reply" pointing out that the Canadian immigration act under which the boy was excluded reflects almost exactly section 212 of the United States Immigration and Nationality Act.

In a letter in my files, his sister went on to remark: "Both as a private citizen and as a clinical psychologist, many of whose patients are mentally retarded, I was shocked to realize that in both the United States and Canada there existed an official governmental policy which so obviously discriminated against the retarded. Additionally the implied equation of mental retardation with psychosis and psychopathy, and the idea that an immigration officer is capable of making an on-the-spot "diagnosis" of any of these disorders is appalling."

There is reason to believe that the special reciprocal relationship we enjoy with Canada and Mexico will mean that our affirmative action on this amendment today will bring a like response from their respective legislative bodies.

Present law defeats our own interests in certain other situations. If we have a scientist that we want to get from Switzerland who is necessary to our war effort or space effort, who has 4 or 5 children there, then he must make the decision, if he comes here, if he has one retarded child out of those 4, 5, 6, 10, or 12 children, as to whether to take all of the family but leave that 1 child in Switzerland. Unless we amend this bill, this perpetuates one of the most inhumane and archaic pieces of legislation I have ever read about on our books. I cannot understand the opposition of some members of the committee to this amendment.

You all know what a retarded child is and you all know the gains that have been made in the past 10 years since 1955 in trying to prevent mental retardation in the birth of children in our country. You all know of the gains that have been made in day schooling, rehabilitation and institution treatment with those who are educable and trainable and the gains that have been made in training teachers for teaching mentally retarded children. You have heard where they are now going into workshops and being trained so that they can get a job and no longer have to live in a State institution fortunately because we do not have one good State institution for the mentally retarded in our country at this time. Why in the world we cannot go along with a simple little amendment which would allow a parent to bring his retarded child in, as long as that child is under the age of 14, I do not understand. I do not understand why we cannot allow them to bring this child into the country when he is accompanied by his parents. This is just beyond my comprehension. If we vote down this amendment, I think it will be one of the worst setbacks to the progress that has been made in the past 10 years in all of the mental retardation fields, including

the gains that have been made for the educable, and including the gains that we have been making in training retardees for jobs in our industry as well as the gains that have been made by having the United States Government hire retardees in the past year.

All of these will go down the drain if we follow the recommendations of the Committee on Immigration this afternoon. President Kennedy recommended a more generous sort of legislation. The committee was not prepared to go so far. I hope that the committee in its wisdom will go along with this much narrower but still helpful and hopeful amendment. I hope the majority of the House will agree that it is only the humane thing to do. It is not a child's fault that it was born retarded, but if he is retarded and he or she is accompanied by his or her parents, and his or her parents are eligible to enter, I think we should permit that child to come into this country as part of the family group.

The subcommittee has done a generally excellent job on this bill, and the amendment respecting epilepsy is fully warranted. Unfortunately, the illustrations in the testimony of the Attorney General I just described were not before subcommittee, since that testimony was given on February 10 of this year in Senate committee hearings. Let us therefore now recognize these humanitarian needs. This amendment is carefully restricted to the kind of immediate family situations I have described, and fully safeguards the public interest by provisions which are identical to present law in the case of relatives afflicted with tuberculosis. There is no sound reason for failure to include it in the bill, and the positive reasons for including it will be clear to each person when he thinks of the precious personal ties which exist in his own family.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for introducing this amendment. I feel it is one of the most humanitarian amendments that could be added to this bill. This is a bill to end discrimination. I feel to deny a child, coming with its parents, or a close relative, to this country for the reasons stated is most inhumane—a misfortunate child—a retarded child.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we are going through an enlightened age which means that we ought not to discriminate against a child, who is otherwise qualified, to come here, even for a visit. It seems to me we should do more for the unfortunate in this respect. The heartache of having an afflicted baby is bad enough but to have to bear the separation of family, is unjust. I certainly hope that the amendment will prevail.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I have had two experiences in my own district involving families who were barred from bringing in a retarded child because of the present provisions of the immigration law. From my experience with those two families I know of nothing more inhumane than to split a family in this way and to compel a retarded child to be left in a foreign country when the rest of the family are in the United States.

I think every aspect of humane treatment should mean that a family should have the right to continue to live together. In the particular two instances involving my own constituents the families had adequate resources to provide for the retarded child and were willing to give all assurances to the Attorney General. But still the provisions of the law barred them from bringing in the retarded child. I do not think this is a way that we should handle such cases. I believe this amendment to allow such retarded children under 14 to be admitted when their parents come here is proper, and I hope the amendment will be approved.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island spoke to me about his amendment and inquired whether as a Representative from a border district, on the Canadian border, I had had any experience with the injustices perpetrated as a result of the present law; and I have had. Even if a Canadian family wishes to make a tour of the United States and enters at the Peace Bridge at Buffalo, they pass through the Canadian gate unimpeded, cross the Canadian-American border line and come into Buffalo where the U.S. Customs and Immigration inspectors are located.

The inspector looks into the car to inquire about the purpose of the visit and to ascertain if they are importing anything. He scrutinizes the occupants of the car.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if he discerns a noticeably Mongoloid child in that car, they are ordered back. They have to turn around, leave the United States and return to Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a very inhumane, unfair, and antiquated type of procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that they have not accepted the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. Chairman, the amendment has my wholehearted support. I feel that we need it and I hope that other Members will recognize the importance of this amendment.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I would like to join in supporting the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I feel it is a very desirable amendment and that it should be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise in support of H.R. 2580 to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. The reforms which this bill will bring to our discriminatory and antiquated immigration code are certainly long overdue. I am pleased to add my congratulations and gratitude to the Judiciary Committee for bringing out a measure as comprehensive and to-the-point as this one now before us.

To anyone familiar with my record on this issue of liberalizing our immigration code, my enthusiasm and deep personal satisfaction over this bill will come as no surprise. I have advocated reform along these lines ever since I came to the Congress and was pleased to introduce a comprehensive bill of my own early in the current session; my bill being H.R. 741, introduced on January 4, 1965.

Perhaps because my own parents were immigrants to this country, perhaps because I am proud to count a great many first and second generation immigrants among my constituency, and perhaps because this aspect of the American dream has always been most meaningful for me; this Nation's immigration laws have been a special concern of mine. I have long been aware of the discriminatory, unjust, and arbitrary nature of the national origins quota system. I have had to deal firsthand with a great many heartbreaking situations involving separation of loved ones, broken families, and orphaned youngsters which have been the direct result of outdated and unresponsive immigration laws.

The national origins quota system, of course, has been shown to be unrealistic and unsuited to the needs of this country and its citizens. We have in this body repeatedly supported legislation to circumvent the code and to provide so-called special humanitarian exemptions. It is certainly high time that we took the code apart and performed a major overhaul on it. That is the thrust of the bill now before us and it is my hope that it will prevail.

The United States has been called a Nation of immigrants. National traditions and the ethnic mores of virtually all other peoples of the modern world are lost among the shifting sands of time.

Only we Americans can trace our origins to a moment in recorded history, to a footstep upon Plymouth Rock, or a fleet of tiny Portuguese sailboats under command of an Italian navigator grounding on the shoals of the East Indies, or the crack of a musket across North Bridge, in Concord, Mass. These are our ethnic and national origins, and they are the distillate of the traditions and folkways of immigrant peoples who came to these shores aboard the *Mayflower*, the *Santa Maria*, the *Mauretania*, and the *Queen Mary*.

How many times have we been introduced to people who pronounce our name and then ask: "What nationality is that? Is that English? Is that German? Is that Italian?" Unless we can answer that our name is derivative of an Algonquin word, or an Iroquois, or a Cherokee, or a Seminole, we cannot honestly say we are ethnically American.

The point is, of course, that this Nation was founded by, and as a haven for, the spiritually destitute, the downtrodden, the enslaved, the peoples of the Old World who would seek a greater freedom, who would worship God in their

own way, and who would be governed by men of their own choosing.

It is contradictory and shameful to continue to serve modern immigration laws which conflict so broadly with that tradition. Because our present quota system is based on a period in our history when there was little emigration from the countries of southern Europe and Africa, these peoples bear the brunt of the unfair restrictions.

Because of my Italian ancestry, it is natural that I should be most keenly aware of the discriminatory nature of the system. Because of my Italian ancestry, I am also keenly aware of the vigorous, inventive, progressive, and courageous record of brilliant achievement which the Italian people have established on American soil. From Christopher Columbus down through the centuries to Fiorello LaGuardia, Enrico Fermi, and to the many Members of this and the other body who are of Italian descent, the record of contribution and achievement is brilliant and enviable by any standard.

The same may certainly be said for the descendants of Greek nationals, Turks, Spanish, and the African nations.

The single overriding point is that aliens should and must be evaluated as individuals, not as incorrigible vassals of a racial, ethnic, or national strain. They must be evaluated as future Americans, not as former Italians, or Greeks, or Congolese, or Ethiopians, or anything else.

I anticipate that those who would object to a more liberal immigration code on grounds of labor competition will be reassured on the provision calling for secondary preference in such circumstances. I would hope, too, that those who oppose on these grounds will take proper note of the preference given to professional people whose talents and services are urgently needed in this country.

But the single most significant aspect of this bill remains the removal of the national origins quota system. It will permit a more intelligent approach to admission of aliens. It will eliminate the burden of anxiety and unhappiness that plague so many of our citizens. It will restore the image of the United States in the eyes of the world as the true haven of democracy and freedom.

Mr. Chairman, President Johnson has recently proclaimed that Ellis Island should become a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument. I was happy to support this proclamation and had, in fact, suggested a similar action in a prior resolution before this body. I can think of no more fitting beacon to focus on that historic monument than the brilliant beam of an enlightened immigration law. I support this bill, I intend to vote for it, and I earnestly urge my colleagues to consider it favorably as well.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. Chairman, only those Members of Congress who have had one of these situations occur in their own district, where a family has not been permitted to bring a retarded child into this country, although the parents were citizens and the balance of the family was here, knows the heartache that is involved in such a situation.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is a most unfair and inhumane law.

Mr. Chairman, as a Representative who lives and represents a district on the border of Canada, I certainly urge the adoption of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and I strongly urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2580. Enactment of the proposed revision of our Immigration and Nationality Act will be one of the most significant and commendable accomplishments of this Congress. In my opinion, it will correct inequities and injustices which have long been inconsistent with basic American concepts and with the overall national interest.

The old law, as our country and your Congress have come to recognize, is no longer responsive to our present and, more particularly, our future needs.

H.R. 2580 will replace the national origins system as a basis for selection of immigrants with a new system of admissions based upon the existence of close family relationships with U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens, and upon the advantage to the United States gained from the special talents and skills of the prospective immigrant.

Under the proposed legislation, the preference categories established will pay special heed to reuniting families. Parents, for example, will be admitted to join their children in the United States without regard to numerical limitations. Special preference will be given to those with professional skills, such as teachers, engineers and physicians, and others of exceptional ability in the arts and sciences. This is a more sound basis for selection than we have had in the past and one that is clearly in the national interest.

This bill not only serves a great national purpose by creating a more equitable and beneficial immigration policy; it will also serve a second important purpose by eliminating a source of considerable foreign criticism, and thereby help improve our relations with many countries around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite the attention of my colleagues to my own district, which has the largest Portuguese-American population in the United States. Under the national origins quota system, the Portuguese quota has always been greatly oversubscribed. As a result, members of many families in my district have been forcibly separated from close relatives overseas for years, while other national quotas have gone unused in many instances.

We have been required to seek special legislation—an act of Congress—to alleviate such hardships and try to reunite families. Sometimes we were successful, sometimes not. Always it has been difficult and heartrending to those involved.

This new program, which has had the careful and deliberate attention of the administration and the Congress, will return to naturalization procedures the sense of fairness, opportunity and national pride which lies at the root of this nation of immigrants.

The essence of this legislation, Mr. Chairman, is the elimination of injustice. As such, it deserves our wholehearted support.

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

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

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate that my interest in the amendment and the position I have on this side of the aisle is that I will not oppose the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I join in urging that this amendment which, under reasonable safeguards, would permit mentally retarded children and other close relatives with a history of mental illness to be reunited with their families, be approved, and made a part of this bill.

One of the prime objectives of this legislation which we have been considering for the last 2 days is to insure that families are no longer needlessly and painfully separated for arbitrary reasons. This amendment would help to make this objective a reality in a very meaningful sense.

The distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who offered this meritorious amendment, has cited an example of the type of hardship this provision would alleviate. In my files I have another pointed example of the good, the decency and the common sense which this amendment would permit. I am sure that many of our colleagues know of similar situations.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge that his amendment be approved. I urge that it be approved so that our traditional sense of fairness may be made a part of this very vital section of the law of our land.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

There is no one in the Congress who understands so well, has done as much or has worked so hard in the field of mental retardation as the distinguished Member from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. For years, he has listened to the heartaches of families who have mentally retarded children among a perfectly normal family of children. He has led this Government in attempting to alleviate the hardships that have been imposed upon such families. He has been the constant and consistent champion of the goals and efforts of the National Association of Retarded Children. He has instituted legislation and implemented this legislation through the appropriation process in meeting the great challenges that this field poses. So he knows, as few others in this Nation, the importance of doing something in this field. And he is acutely aware of the anguish that is visited upon families who are eligible to come into this country under our immigration laws but who must leave behind any child who is mentally retarded.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] seeks to correct this inequity. It is a humane proposal. It is surrounded with sufficient safeguards with advice from the Attorney General and Surgeon General in all matters concerning the admission of aliens and their families among whom there is a mentally deficient child. All Mr. FOGARTY's amendment would do would be to make eligible for admission the mentally retarded child, under 14 years of age, whose mother and father and other members of the child's family are eligible for admission.

Mr. Chairman, the committee in charge of the bill ought to accept this amendment. If it does not, I hope the Committee of the Whole will overwhelmingly adopt the amendment of our colleague [Mr. FOGARTY].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, since the MacGregor amendment was adopted by a teller vote by a margin of 1, because of the fact that the present occupant of the chair did not have an opportunity to vote on it, I assume we will have a rollcall vote on that amendment, and I would like to comment before that vote is taken——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman suspect how the Chair would have voted?

Mr. STRATTON. I apologize, Mr. Chairman, for taking the liberty of guessing how the Chair might have voted. I just know how humane the gentleman is when it comes to dealing with our Latin American friends. I could not help but notice, Mr. Chairman, that those who are pushing this amendment today as an official policy of the Republican Members of this body, were some of the same people who I remember 2 years ago on this floor, when our session extended into December, periodically berating this administration for not having recognized the very special relationship that exists between this country and the people of Latin America, and thus have enforced more vigorously the Monroe Doctrine, which embodies that very special relationship. It is strange, indeed, to see that today these very same people on the other side of the aisle are now suggesting an amendment that would seriously breach that special relationship.

I think the MacGregor amendment should be defeated, and I hope it will be defeated on the rollcall vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 533, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the MacGregor amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the so-called MacGregor amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACGREGOR: On page 39, line 16, strike the period and the sentence that follows and insert: ": *Provided*, That exclusive of immediate relatives of the United States citizens specified in subsection (b) of section 201, the number of special immigrants who may be issued immigrant visas pursuant to the provisions of section 101(a)(27)(A) shall not in any fiscal year subsequent to June 30, 1968, exceed a total of 115,000, such visas to be issued to qualified special immigrants in the chronological order in which such special immigrants are registered on lists which shall be maintained in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State."

On page 39, line 18, strike the words: "in any one fiscal year" and insert in lieu thereof the words "during the fiscal years 1965, 1966 and 1967."

On page 40, lines 12 and 13, strike the words: "entitled to a special immigrant classification under section 101(a)(27)(A), or is" and on line 17 after the figure "(8)" insert the words "or of special immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 224, as the case may be."

On page 41, line 5, strike the comma and insert the words "or of special immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 224,".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 218, answered "present" 6, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

YEAS—189

Abbitt	Ford, Gerald R.	Morton
Abernethy	Fountain	Mosher
Adair	Frelinghuysen	Natcher
Anderson, Ill.	Fuqua	Nelsen
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gathings	O'Konski
Arends	Gettys	O'Neal, Ga.
Ashbrook	Goodell	Passman
Ashmore	Griffin	Pelly
Baring	Gross	Pirnie
Bates	Grover	Poage
Battin	Gubser	Poff
Belcher	Gurney	Purcell
Bennett	Hagan, Ga.	Quie
Berry	Haley	Quillen
Betts	Hall	Reid, Ill.
Bolton	Halleck	Reifel
Bow	Hamilton	Reinecke
Bray	Hansen, Idaho	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brock	Hardy	Rivers, S.C.
Broomfield	Harsha	Roberts
Broyhill, N.C.	Harvey, Ind.	Robison
Broyhill, Va.	Hébert	Roudebush
Buchanan	Henderson	Roush
Burleson	Herlong	Satterfield
Byrnes, Wis.	Hicks	Saylor
Cahill	Horton	Schneebeli
Callaway	Hosmer	Schweiker
Carter	Hull	Scott
Cederberg	Hutchinson	Secrest
Chamberlain	Ichord	Shriver
Chelf	Jarman	Skubitz
Clancy	Jennings	Smith, Calif.
Clausen, Don H.	Johnson, Okla.	Smith, N.Y.
Clawson, Del	Johnson, Pa.	Smith, Va.
Collier	Jonas	Springer
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Stafford
Conable	Keith	Stalbaum
Cooley	King, N.Y.	Stanton
Corbett	Kunkel	Stephens
Cunningham	Laird	Stubblefield
Curtin	Langen	Talcott
Curtis	Latta	Taylor
Dague	Lennon	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Wis.	Long, La.	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	McClory	Tuck
Devine	McCulloch	Tuten
Dickinson	McDade	Utt
Dole	McEwen	Waggonner
Dorn	McMillan	Walker, Miss.
Dowdy	MacGregor	Walker, N. Mex.
Downing	Marsh	Watkins
Duncan, Oreg.	Martin, Ala.	Watson
Duncan, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	Watts
Dwyer	Martin, Nebr.	Whalley
Edwards, Ala.	Matthews	Whitener
Ellsworth	May	Whitten
Erlenborn	Michel	Widnall
Evins, Tenn.	Mills	Williams
Fino	Minshall	Wilson, Bob
Fisher	Mize	Wyatt
Flynt	Moeller	Wydler
	Moore	Younger
	Moorhead	

NAYS—218

Adams	Boland	Conte
Addabbo	Bolling	Conyers
Albert	Brademas	Corman
Anderson, Tenn.	Brooks	Craley
Annunzio	Brown, Calif.	Culver
Ashley	Burke	Daddario
Aspinall	Burton, Calif.	Daniels
Ayres	Byrne, Pa.	Dawson
Baldwin	Callan	de la Garza
Bandstra	Cameron	Delaney
Barrett	Carey	Dent
Beckworth	Casey	Denton
Bell	Celler	Diggs
Bingham	Clark	Dingell
Blatnik	Cleveland	Donohue
Boggs	Clevenger	Dow
	Cohelan	Duiski

Dyal	Kastenmeier	Redlin
Edmondson	Kelly	Reid, N.Y.
Edwards, Calif.	Keogh	Resnick
Evans, Colo.	King, Calif.	Reuss
Everett	King, Utah	Rhodes, Pa.
Fallon	Kirwan	Rivers, Alaska
Farbstein	Kluczynski	Rodino
Farnsley	Krebs	Rogers, Colo.
Farnum	Leggett	Rogers, Fla.
Fascell	Lindsay	Ronan
Feighan	Love	Roncalio
Findley	McCarthy	Rooney, N.Y.
Flood	McDowell	Rooney, Pa.
Fogarty	McFall	Roosevelt
Foley	McGrath	Rosenthal
Ford, William D.	McVicker	Rostenkowski
	Macdonald	Roybal
Fraser	Machen	Ryan
Friedel	Mackay	St Germain
Fulton, Pa.	Mackie	St. Onge
Fulton, Tenn.	Madden	Scheuer
Gallagher	Mahon	Schisler
Garmatz	Mailliard	Schmidhauser
Giaimo	Matsunaga	Selden
Gibbons	Meeds	Senner
Gilbert	Miller	Shipley
Gilligan	Minish	Sickles
Gonzalez	Mink	Sikes
Grabowski	Monagan	Slack
Gray	Morgan	Smith, Iowa
Green, Oreg.	Morrison	Staggers
Green, Pa.	Morse	Stratton
Greigg	Moss	Sullivan
Grider	Multer	Sweeney
Griffiths	Murphy, Ill.	Tenzer
Hagen, Calif.	Murphy, N.Y.	Thompson, Tex.
Halpern	Murray	Todd
Hanley	Nedzi	Trimble
Hanna	Nix	Tunney
Hansen, Iowa	O'Hara, Ill.	Tupper
Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara, Mich.	Udall
Harris	Olsen, Mont.	Ullman
Hathaway	Olson, Minn.	Van Deerlin
Hawkins	O'Neill, Mass.	Vanik
Hechler	Ottinger	Vigorito
Helstoski	Patman	Vivian
Holifield	Patten	Weltner
Howard	Pepper	White, Idaho
Hungate	Perkins	White, Tex.
Huot	Philbin	Wilson, Charles H.
Irwin	Pickle	
Jacobs	Pike	Wolff
Joelson	Pool	Wright
Johnson, Calif.	Powell	Yates
Jones, Ala.	Price	Young
Karsten	Pucinski	Zablocki
Karth	Race	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Hays	Morris	Steed
Long, Md.	Randall	Willis

NOT VOTING—19

Anderws, George W.	Cramer	O'Brien
	Harvey, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.
Andrews, Glenn	Holland	Rumsfeld
	Kee	Sisk
Bonner	Kornegay	Thomas
Burton, Utah	Landrum	Thompson, N.J.
Cabell	Mathias	Toll

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Long of Maryland for, with Mr. Thomas against.

Mr. Morris for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. Randall for, with Mr. Holland against.

Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Mathias against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Cabell against.

Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. O'Brien against.

Until further notice:

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND]. If he were present he would have voted "no." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. If he were present he would have voted "no." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK]. If he were present he would have voted "no." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON]. If he were present he would have voted "no." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE]. If he were present he would have voted "no." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOLL]. If he were present he would have voted "no." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HALL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HALL moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2580, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was rejected.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 318, nays 95, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

YEAS—318

Adams	Bell	Byrne, Pa.
Addabbo	Bennett	Byrnes, Wis.
Albert	Berry	Cahill
Anderson, Ill.	Betts	Callan
Anderson, Tenn.	Bingham	Cameron
	Blatnik	Carey
Andrews, N. Dak.	Boggs	Carter
	Boland	Casey
Annunzio	Bolling	Cederberg
Arends	Bolton	Celler
Ashbrook	Bow	Chamberlain
Ashley	Brademas	Clancy
Aspinall	Brock	Clark
Ayres	Brooks	Clausen, Don H.
Baldwin	Broomfield	
Bandstra	Brown, Calif.	Clawson, Del
Barrett	Broyhill, Va.	Cleveland
Bates	Burke	Clevenger
Battin	Burton, Calif.	Cohelan
Collier	Howard	Pirnie
Conable	Hungate	Poff
Conte	Huot	Pool
Conyers	Hutchinson	Powell
Corbett	Irwin	Price
Corman	Jacobs	Pucinski
Craley	Jarman	Quie
Culver	Joelson	Race
Cunningham	Johnson, Calif.	Redlin
Curtin	Johnson, Okla.	Reid, Ill.
Curtis	Johnson, Pa.	Reid, N.Y.
Daddario	Karsten	Reifel
Dague	Karth	Reinecke
Daniels	Kastenmeier	Resnick
Dawson	Keith	Reuss
Delaney	Kelly	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dent	Keogh	Rhodes, Pa.
Denton	King, Calif.	Rivers, Alaska
Derwinski	King, N.Y.	Robison
Devine	King, Utah	Rodino
Diggs	Kirwan	Rogers, Colo.
Dingell	Kluczynski	Rogers, Fla.
Dole	Krebs	Ronan
Donohue	Kunkel	Roncalio
Dow	Laird	Rooney, N.Y.
Dulski	Langen	Rooney, Pa.
Duncan, Oreg.	Latta	Roosevelt
Dwyer	Leggett	Rosenthal
Dyal	Lindsay	Rostenkowski
Edmondson	Long, Md.	Roush
Edwards, Calif.	Love	Roybal
Ellsworth	McCarthy	Ryan
Erlenborn	McClory	St Germain
Evans, Colo.	McCulloch	St. Onge
Evins, Tenn.	McDade	Saylor
Fallon	McDowell	Scheuer
Farbstein	McEwen	Schisler
Farnsley	McFall	Schmidhauser
Farnum	McGrath	Schneebeli
Fascell	McVicker	Schweiker
Feighan	Macdonald	Senner
Findley	MacGregor	Shipley
Fino	Machen	Shriver
Flood	Mackay	Sickles
Fogarty	Mackie	Sikes
Foley	Madden	Skubitz
Ford, Gerald R.	Mailliard	Slack
Ford, William D.	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Iowa
	Martin, Nebr.	Smith, N.Y.
Fraser	Matsunaga	Springer
Frelinghuysen	May	Stafford
Friedel	Meeds	Staggers
Fulton, Pa.	Michel	Stalbaum
Fulton, Tenn.	Miller	Stanton
Gallagher	Minish	Stratton
Garmatz	Mink	Sullivan
Giaimo	Minshall	Sweeney
Gibbons	Mize	Talcott
Gilbert	Moeller	Teague, Calif.
Gilligan	Monagan	Tenzer
Gonzalez	Moore	Thompson, Tex.
Goodell	Moorhead	Thomson, Wis.
Grabowski	Morgan	Todd
Gray	Morrison	Trimble
Green, Oreg.	Morse	Tunney
Green, Pa.	Morton	Tupper
Greigg	Mosher	Udall
Grider	Moss	Ullman
Griffin	Multer	Van Deerlin
Griffiths	Murphy, Ill.	Vanik
Grover	Murphy, N.Y.	Vigorito
Gubser	Nedzi	Vivian
Hagen, Calif.	Nelsen	Watkins
Halleck	Nix	Weltner
Halpern	O'Hara, Ill.	Whalley
Hamilton	O'Hara, Mich.	White, Idaho
Hanley	O'Konski	Widnall
Hanna	Olsen, Mont.	Wilson, Bob
Hansen, Iowa	Olson, Minn.	Wilson, Charles H.
Hansen, Wash.	O'Neill, Mass.	
Hathaway	Ottinger	Wolff
Hawkins	Patman	Wright
Hays	Patten	Wyatt
Hechler	Pelly	Wydler
Helstoski	Pepper	Yates
Hicks	Perkins	Young
Holifield	Philbin	Younger
Horton	Pickle	Zablocki
Hosmer	Pike	

NAYS—95

Abbitt	Cooley	Fuqua
Abernethy	Davis, Ga.	Gathings
Adair	Davis, Wis.	Gettys
Ashmore	de la Garza	Gross
Baring	Dickinson	Gurney
Beckworth	Dorn	Hagan, Ga.
Belcher	Dowdy	Haley
Bray	Downing	Hall
Broyhill, N.C.	Duncan, Tenn.	Hansen, Idaho
Buchanan	Edwards, Ala.	Hardy
Burleson	Everett	Harris
Callaway	Fisher	Harsha
Chelf	Flynt	Harvey, Ind.
Colmer	Fountain	Hébert

Henderson	Murray	Stephens
Herlong	Natcher	Stubblefield
Hull	O'Neal, Ga.	Taylor
Ichord	Passman	Teague, Tex.
Jennings	Poage	Tuck
Jonas	Purcell	Tuten
Jones, Ala.	Quillen	Utt
Jones, Mo.	Randall	Waggonner
Lennon	Rivers, S.C.	Walker, Miss.
Lipscomb	Roberts	Walker, N. Mex.
Long, La.	Roudebush	Watson
McMillan	Satterfield	Watts
Mahon	Scott	White, Tex.
Marsh	Secrest	Whitener
Martin, Ala.	Selden	Whitten
Matthews	Smith, Calif.	Williams
Mills	Smith, Va.	Willis
Morris	Steed	

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews, George W.	Cramer	O'Brien
Andrews, Glenn	Harvey, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Holland	Rumsfeld
Burton, Utah	Kee	Sisk
Cabell	Kornegay	Thomas
	Landrum	Thompson, N.J.
	Mathias	Toll

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Kornegay against.

Mr. Thomas for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mr. Holland for, with Mr. Landrum against.

Mr. Cabell for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kee with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2580, as amended, is almost wholly a Republican bill. Its substantive content represents more of H.R. 9136 than any other proposed bill in this field.

The most significant changes made by the subcommittee as it completely rewrote the administration bill all came from H.R. 9136, the Moore immigration bill. These are:

First. Abolition of the national origins system after 3 years—not immediately or after 5 years—allowing for a reasonable period of adjustment.

Second. Reallocation of unused quota numbers during the transition to oversubscribed countries during the 3-year interim—a provision that will result in a complete clean up of the backlogs of qualified intending immigrants.

Third. Elimination of all delegation of authority to the executive branch of control over immigration policy and retention of complete authority in the Congress.

Fourth. First emphasis in the preference schedule upon the reuniting of families—not to the importation of skilled labor as proposed by the administration.

Fifth. A numerical limitation upon the number of refugees to be admitted.

Sixth. Stricter controls and restrictions upon immigrants entering for gainful employment—nowhere found in the administration or any other bills, in this area.

Seventh. A limit upon admissions from colonies and dependencies.

Eighth. Provision that in the event immigration from the Western Hemisphere increases by 10 percent over a 5-year average, the President must report to the Congress, with his recommendations if any.

Additionally the Republicans are responsible for the elimination of a long list of provisions which would not have been in the best interests of the United States.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

STATUTORY CHALLENGE TO THE REPRESENTATIVES FROM MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RYAN. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today 31 Members of the House announced that on September 21 we will bring to the floor of the House a privileged resolution with respect to the statutory challenge to the Representatives from Mississippi.

The statutory challenge is now pending before the House Administration Committee. Under rule XI, section 24, of the Rules of the House it should have been finally reported by July 4. Instead there has been inordinate delay.

The House must have the opportunity to confront this vital issue during this session of Congress. The facts are clear. There is no excuse for further delay. In the 1964 congressional elections a substantial number of American citizens were denied the right to vote. The unconstitutional denial of the right to vote makes these elections illegal, and the seats should be vacated.

Courageous citizens of Mississippi, members of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and civil rights workers from other areas have risked their lives to present the testimony concerning the systematic intimidation, harassment, terror, and murder which has prevented Mississippi Negroes from voting.

I urge all Members of the House to join in support of this resolution which will be brought before the House on September 21.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the statement which I issued today concerning the privileged resolution which will be brought to the floor on September 21.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN ANNOUNCING PLANS TO BRING MISSISSIPPI CHALLENGE TO HOUSE FLOOR ON SEPTEMBER 21

The statutory challenge to the seating of the Mississippi Congressmen is now pending before the House Administration Committee. This challenge is based on the deliberate and unconstitutional disenfranchisement of American citizens in the 1964 congressional elections in Mississippi. We are determined that the House have the opportunity to confront this vital issue during this session of Congress.

We therefore plan, under the rules and precedents of the House, to bring to the floor on September 21 a privileged resolution discharging the House Administration Committee from further consideration of the challenge and declaring the contested seats vacant, unless the committee reports to the House before then.

We are convinced that Members of the House should have the opportunity to vote on this challenge before the session adjourns. That is clearly the intent of rule XI, section 24, of the Rules of the House, which states:

"The Committee on House Administration shall make a final report to the House in all contested election cases not later than six months from the first day of the first regular session of the Congress to which the contestee is elected except in a contest from the Territory of Alaska, in which case the time shall not exceed nine months."

The 6-month time limit expired on July 4, yet the matter has not yet come before the House.

There has been great delay.

In complying with the statute governing the challenge, (title 2, U.S. Code, sec. 201 et seq.) the contestants obtained over 600 depositions supporting their care. These depositions were filed with the Clerk of the House on May 17. The Clerk promised to print the depositions as required by the statute, then reversed his position. It was not until July 29 that the Clerk transmitted the printed record to the Speaker who then referred the record of the challenge to the Committee on House Administration.

During the delay in printing the record, the contestants filed their briefs, pursuant to the statute. These briefs were filed on June 28, and copies were served on that date on the contestees. In spite of this fact, the Clerk has taken the position that the contestees brief does not have to be filed until September 1.

Despite the delay in printing, the challenge has been before the committee since July 29. To date, the committee and its Subcommittee on Elections have not scheduled a single meeting on the challenge.

The facts supporting the challenge are clear. There is no substantive reason for further delay. There is no question that in the 1964 congressional elections a substantial number of American citizens were denied the right to vote in Mississippi because of their color. This unconstitutional denial of the right to vote has been accomplished by a deliberate policy of intimidation, harassment, and terror, and even murder.

Mississippi's deliberate policy of disenfranchisement has been overwhelmingly documented. The U.S. Department of Justice has lawsuits in no less than 30 of the 82 Mississippi counties. The Civil Rights Commission has issued reports concerning the terror tactics used to stop Negroes from voting in Mississippi. There have been at least five murders since 1961 directly connected with the effort to register Negroes. In fact, just this week a minister

was critically wounded because of his involvement with voter registration. In addition, the 2,932 pages of depositions filed in support of the challenge constitutes a vivid record of the almost unbelievable brutality perpetrated against Negroes who try to exercise their basic constitutional right to vote. Never before has any issue been so thoroughly documented prior to action by the House.

The current challenges, moreover, do not present new and untested questions to the House. They are thoroughly supported by a long line of precedents. In over 40 election contests in the past, the House has set aside election results where Negro citizens were excluded from the polls.

This challenge involves more than the immediate question of unseating the Mississippi Congressmen. It is a testament of courage and a declaration of determination on the part of many Negro citizens. By bringing this challenge they affirm their belief that ultimately, through the orderly process of law, the U.S. Constitution will be upheld. The Members of the House must be given the opportunity to prove that they are right.

On the opening day of Congress, 149 Members of the House voted against administering the oath to the Mississippi congressional delegation. What has since been revealed only confirms the judgment that Mississippi has trampled upon the U.S. Constitution by denying American citizens the right to vote.

We cannot condone the election of U.S. Representatives who gained their seats through an unconstitutional election. There are those who risked their lives to present this challenge to the House in order that we may exercise our solemn obligation to the Constitution of the United States. On September 21 we are determined that the House will have that opportunity.

The following Members of Congress have agreed to support the resolution of September 21 discharging the House Administration Committee from further consideration of the Mississippi challenge and declaring the contested seats vacant:

John Brademas, 3d District of Indiana.
George E. Brown, Jr., 29th District of California.
Phillip Burton, 5th District of California.
Jeffery Cohelan, 7th District of California.
John Conyers, Jr., 1st District of Michigan.
Emilio Q. Daddario, 1st District of Connecticut.
Charles C. Diggs, Jr., 13th District of Michigan.
John G. Dow, 27th District of New York.
Ken W. Dyal, 33d District of California.
Don Edwards, 9th District of California.
Leonard Farbstein, 19th District of New York.
Donald M. Fraser, 5th District of Minnesota.
Jacob H. Gilbert, 22d District of New York.
Seymour Halpern, 6th District of New York.
Augustus F. Hawkins, 21st District of California.
Charles S. Joelson, 8th District of New Jersey.
Paul J. Krebs, 12th District of New Jersey.
Joseph G. Minish, 11th District of New Jersey.
Patsy T. Mink, at large of Hawaii.
Robert N. C. Nix, 2d District of Pennsylvania.
Adam C. Powell, 18th District of New York.
John A. Race, 6th District of Wisconsin.
Ogden R. Reid, 26th District of New York.
Joseph Y. Resnick, 28th District of New York.
James Roosevelt, 26th District of California.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal, 8th District of New York.
William F. Ryan, 20th District of New York.
James H. Scheuer, 21st District of New York.
Charles A. Vanik, 21st District of Ohio.
Weston E. Vivian, 2d District of Michigan.
Lester C. Wolff, 3d District of New York.

PLAYING POLITICS WITH MANKIND'S FUTURE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership of this House has exhibited once more its inclination to play politics with the peace of the world—rather than join in a serious effort to bring about a just peace in Vietnam. Constructive criticism is to be encouraged in a democracy, but political demogoguery aimed at dividing this country for the sake of their own warped conception of their domestic advancement endangers our national security and directly abets the Communists in their effort to pit American against American.

There was not a single constructive thought on how to bring about peace in Vietnam in the Republican White Paper. We were instead treated to a political diatribe aimed at dividing the most respected of our national leaders. We have a commitment in Vietnam—it is a commitment to peace and to that end we are engaged at this very moment in maximum resistance. But the true colors show through today—they reveal a commitment to political harangue while the future of mankind hangs in the balance, and the security of our country as well. They reveal a dedication to a trigger-happy former candidate who still breathes strong in the Republican breast. They reveal that the Republicans have never quite understood why we are in Vietnam.

Perhaps if they would get out from under the weighty tomes of their erudite research into the present for a moment, they would realize that the real problem facing the world is how to bring about peace in Vietnam—and not how to get elected next year.

VIETNAM

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

The SPEAKER prc tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of grave concern that our dialogs for peace are being smothered by partisan efforts to cast upon our present administration and upon the Democratic administrations of the past, the sole responsibility for the crisis that now exists for us and for the world in Vietnam. Let us not forget that since the Geneva agreement of 1954, until 1960 this country was led by the Republican Party and much could be said about things that could have been done then which might have prevented this painful situation in that part of the world today. But of what use is hindsight when what we must seek today is a means to end this war and to bring the parties to the conference table? We must be looking to the future and working through every possible means to bring an end to this conflict.

I am thoroughly convinced that our President is earnestly doing everything within his power and resources to seek the peace in Vietnam. I am equally certain that few are completely satisfied with the progress of our efforts to bring this matter to the stage of constructive negotiation. However, I believe that just as we are impatient that the talks begin, still in our anxiety to end this war we must be willing to allow the President the fullest degree of flexibility to bring about the desired result. We can continue to urge that he seek the involvement of the United Nations, but he has told us that he is doing everything possible to take this matter to the United Nations. Where bombs failed to bring the necessary conciliatory attitude, the President called for a temporary cease-fire, to no immediate avail. He has agreed to negotiate without precondition, but still he has had no affirmative response.

The critical period of the monsoons is nearly over and we have been able to hold our lines. I am firmly of the opinion that Hanoi will, if not already, begin to understand that the peace conference is the only course left to take.

Being of this belief I do now urge the President to persist in his repeated efforts to draw Hanoi to the conference table in an ever-increasing demonstration of good faith and determination that negotiations will in fact begin.

Let us stop this dialog of war and more war preparations, of blame and accusations, and begin in earnest our preparation for peace. Certain of our goal, why should we wait? Let us ready the conference site. Let us send to Geneva our country's foreign policy technicians and statesmen now. Let us commit our course for peace immediately. Let us invite our allies to journey with us once again to Geneva to resolve a new peace treaty for Vietnam. Let us hasten to sit as a nation determined that our will for peace shall be done. Let us wait upon Hanoi in Geneva and in so doing win this war with utter and complete faith that our President is right in his great expectations for peace.

And finally let us promise now without reservations that the bombs shall cease to fall from the very instant that the negotiations begin.

Let us be prepared to match every military dollar that we have spent these past 11 years in Vietnam with a like dollar for peace, for the restoration of this war-torn country, for its economic development, for education, for food and medical care for its desperately poor people.

Let us produce a lasting peace and credit ourselves as a nation with faith that peoples everywhere liberated from the fear of hunger and deprivation will choose the way of freedom.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, through all of my career in public life, both in this great body and in the senate of the Commonwealth which I am pleased to represent here, I have never felt compelled to support any action which would circumvent established procedures. Although I have been asked from time to time to support procedural shortcuts, I have always tested the question against my commitment to the rules of normal legislative process. And, up until this hour, I have never found a question strong enough to penetrate that commitment.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to make these remarks; because today marks the first time in my entire career that I have found a question which demands a breach in our procedures. Today I am adding my name to the discharge petition on behalf of the District of Columbia home rule bill.

I do not take this action lightly. It is inconsistent with my record and my concepts of public service. But after studying the situation, after reading the record of frustration over the years, and after balancing all this against the current social situation in the District, I have reluctantly decided that the discharge petition is the only hope for action on a bill that should have passed years ago.

My views on home rule are well known in this body. I was among the original cosponsors of a home rule bill in the current session, my bill being H.R. 5803. In my view, denial of home rule for the District contradicts democratic principles which are the very bedrock of this Republic.

It is one of the vital domestic issues facing us today. It is no less serious than poverty in Appalachia, unemployment in the slums, or school dropouts. We are witnessing today what appears to be a major crime wave in the District. We are witnessing an obvious and disgraceful social tragedy in the District public school system. Every passing day condemns more District youngsters to a lifetime of ignorance, frustration, and despair.

Congressional control over the District has failed to come to grips with these problems. We may prosecute a mighty war on poverty, or provide revolutionary medical care programs for the aged, but we have failed to solve the local problems of the Capital City of this great and prosperous Nation.

I suggest it is high time we gave the citizens of this city a chance to work on their own problems, a chance to work out their own solutions, and a chance to exercise the responsibilities of citizenship which we are only too eager to remind them about whenever a new crime is committed or a new name is added to the welfare roles.

I am pleased and proud to sign the discharge petition on behalf of home rule for the District of Columbia. I earnestly urge all of my colleagues to do likewise.

LET THE GUILTY ONES CLEAN IT UP

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, while newspapers are often not the most accurate sources from which to quote, I would like to comment on two articles that have recently appeared in the press.

One concerns a proposal that the Federal Government—through the poverty program—pay the people of the Watts section of Los Angeles to clean up the rubble and gutted buildings that resulted from 5 days of rioting there; the second concerns Dr. Martin Luther King's suggestion that those persons arrested during the 5 days of rioting, looting, and burning should be put on probation—probation for participating in an armed uprising that took 34 lives, injured over 850 persons, and caused well over $175 million in property damage. To me, both proposals are absurd.

Of course, not all of the guilty were apprehended, but there have been over 3,100 persons arrested in connection with the rioting and looting that swept Los Angeles. Some of those arrested were charged with felonies; the majority were charged with misdemeanors. Many of those arrested have since come to trial, have been sentenced and fined. Many others are still awaiting trial.

Instead of the Federal Government paying the people of Watts to clean up the results of the lawlessness and wanton destruction there, let us let the guilty ones clean it up.

Mr. Speaker, many persons more wise than I have warned of the dangers presented when high public officials, clergymen, and others give moral support to the breakdown of law and order under the guise of so-called social protest. Out of a disregard for some laws soon comes complete disregard for all law.

Speaking from 10 years experience as a judge—in city, juvenile, and circuit courts—I have found that the best punishment for any crime, the punishment that most serves as a deterrent to future lawlessness, is the punishment that best fits the crime. In this case, I can think of nothing more fitting than that the persons arrested during the rioting in Los Angeles be sentenced to hard labor cleaning up the city they have torn apart.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some of our fuzzy-minded eggheads will probably call this cruel and unusual punishment, but to me and to most plain, ordinary Americans, it is just plain good sense.

Let us hope this situation will show that lawlessness will not be rewarded by more Federal handouts, or punished by a mere reprimand, but instead will be punished by a just and strict penalty meted out in the best interests of all of our citizens. Any other course will surely invite a repetition of such occurrences as we witnessed in Los Angeles. We in the Congress certainly cannot dictate to the courts as to how they dispense justice—but, we can control the flow of Federal funds.

A NEEDED CRUSADE

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the very foundation of this Republic is being undermined by a determined, nationwide campaign to discredit our law enforcement agencies. Every rapist, murderer, robber, and petty thief is excused for his crime because we have swallowed the Communist line intended to make our police ineffective.

It is time we stage a new crusade in America, a crusade in which every responsible public official and every law-abiding, decent citizen should join, a crusade to protect our law officers as they strive to protect us.

As Martin Luther King and Bayard Rustin and other agitators go about the country calling for the ouster of good police officers and doing everything within their power to wreck the effectiveness of our law enforcement agencies, I would like to call to your attention some figures I just received from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Last year 88 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty. Fifty-seven of these were murdered by criminals. From 1960 to 1964, 225 law enforcement officers have been killed in the line of duty. I think the President should tell the American people those facts on one of his television programs in which he makes excuses for those who are part of the planned program of lawlessness and civil disobedience. I think we, as the elected representatives of the people, should demand a return to law and order and give our unqualified support to the law enforcement officers we ask to risk their lives to protect us and our society against those who would set themselves against society and those whose intent it is to destroy America.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE TRIBUTE TO CLARENCE BROWN, CHARTER MEMBER

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise as chairman of the Republican policy committee to report to the body the action taken at our meeting yesterday in connection with the passing of our beloved colleague Clarence Brown. The

policy committee adopted a resolution which I shall read in a moment.

First, I would like to express my own sympathy to the family of our late colleague, and to say that the privilege of serving in this body and on the policy committee with this great and dedicated American was one of the finest experiences of my political career. He will be missed sorely.

Mr. Speaker, I will now read the statement adopted by the policy committee:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE TRIBUTE TO CLARENCE BROWN, CHARTER MEMBER

The passing of our beloved colleague, Clarence Brown of Ohio, creates a vacancy on this committee that will never be filled.

This great Congressman, a Member of the House since 1939, was a founder of the Republican policy committee. Prior to the establishment of this committee, he served on the Republican steering committee which preceded the policy committee.

His wise and generous counsel were always evident in our deliberations. His guidance and understanding went far in making this committee an effective instrument of his beloved Republican Party.

The Republican policy committee of the House of Representatives expresses its deep sympathy to his bereaved family, and its gratitude for all that this great American accomplished during his years in our midst.

TAX CREDIT FOR TUITION PAID TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide a credit against Federal income tax for tuition paid by individuals to institutions of higher education. This legislation would also allow tax credit for charitable contributions made by individuals and corporations to colleges and universities.

I am deeply concerned over the marked increase in the cost of higher education. Both private and public higher education institutions have increased their costs by an average of 25 percent over the last 5 years. Today private school tuition and fees average $831. Add to this figure the other expenses of attending college and it is clear that families in the modest income brackets need help and need it now.

Under the provisions of our bill, whatever amount was spent for college tuition up to $500 annually could be subtracted from a parent's tax liability. The maximum $500 tax credit would be available for each child in college, thus giving some parents a multiple credit. The tax credit would also be available to the taxpayer who pays for his own education or that of his spouse.

The assistance proposed by our bill, therefore, would substantially offset tuition costs, and in the case of attendance at some public institutions of higher learning would completely cover the costs of tuition.

In my estimation a tax credit provides the soundest and fairest assistance to those who are financing the mounting costs of education. Such assistance is free from Federal control, both substantive and procedural, over educational policies. Moreover, there would be no need to expand the Federal bureaucracy to administer the program. And finally, no distinction is made between public or private universities or colleges.

It is essential for the Nation's present and future progress that we open college doors to all with the capacity and desire to acquire a higher education. Income tax credits appear to be the most effective and feasible method of achieving this goal. I am hopeful and would urge, therefore, that early and favorable action be taken on our tax relief proposal. Help is urgently needed for the vast majority of students whose families are in the middle or lower income brackets which are most burdened by the spiraling costs of higher education.

In order to adequately serve their ever-increasing enrollments, the Nation's colleges and universities also need help to expand their facilities and faculties. It is well known that tuition furnishes only a fraction of a university's operating expenses. For financial assistance they will turn to their alumni and friends for contributions.

To encourage such charitable giving, I have included a provision in my bill to allow tax credit for contributions made by individuals and corporations to institutions of higher education. This type of assistance is preferable to comprehensive Federal aid and is more in keeping with our traditions.

SUGAR LEGISLATION NEEDED

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of my bill, House Joint Resolution 634, and others like it, which would permit increased marketings of domestic beet and cane sugar during 1965 and 1966.

Our resolutions would permit the domestic beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area to market, as determined by the Secretary, a quantity of sugar not exceeding 3,025,000 short tons, raw value, and 1,100,000 short tons, raw value, respectively, during each of the years 1965 and 1966.

This additional sugar would be deducted from the quantities of sugar which otherwise might be authorized for purchase and importation in 1965 and 1966 pursuant to other provisions of present sugar legislation.

Mr. Speaker, hearings on this important legislation have now been concluded by the House Agriculture Committee, and I would hope that the committee will report the legislation favorably to the House so that it may consider this legislation at the earliest possible time. Otherwise, sugar producers and processors face a sugar crisis within a matter of months, and time is of the essence to them.

This is because, as Members of the House may recall, the Government in 1963 and 1964 encouraged increased production to alleviate the then-existing sugar shortage. But Congress failed to provide added authority to market the extra sugar subsequently produced.

As a result, the sugar industry now faces the prospect by late October of being unable to sell so much as 1 pound of this year's sugar crop until the start of the next calendar year. It normally in this period would market some 20 percent of the current crop. Also, the industry would be unable to sell more of its backlogged inventory of around 100,000 tons, which was our inventory at the start of the year.

This would mean sugar farmers, who already expect an acreage cutback of around 10 percent next year, would have to accept far more severe cuts—perhaps as much as 30 percent.

Plainly a chaotic situation for sugar growers and processors is developing, and Congress must take immediate steps to prevent it.

SLUM CLEARANCE IS A HOAX

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, once in a while someone comes along and says something that we wish we could have said and says it in such a way that its logic compels your attention. Such is the case with the article by Daniel M. Friedenberg in the "Speaking Out" column of the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. Friedenberg points out the manner in which urban renewal has been used by some modern robber barons to plunder the Federal Treasury under a guise of improving urban slum conditions. I do not often agree with the ultraliberal Christian Century but a recent article carried the following statement which is on target:

Urban renewal may prove to be the contemporary counterpart of the 19th century canal and railroad building, creating a new band of robber barons to outshine the Drews, Fisks, Vanderbilts, and Harrimans of yesteryear.

Does this overstate the case? Read Mr. Friedenberg's article and judge for yourself. My personal experience after hundreds of hours of studying urban renewal—I have thought of writing a book on it if I could find the time—certainly substantiates the contentions he makes.

SLUM CLEARANCE IS A HOAX

(By Daniel M. Friedenberg)

It is time to stop playing the cynical charade called slum clearance. Only a few years ago the program seemed the high hope

for our decaying cities and their slum dwellers, but this dream has turned as bitter as the reality. Title I—the Federal subsidy program for urban renewal—has spawned corruption, produced gushers of profits for promoters and giant corporations, and pushed slum dwellers into worse pigsties. We must face up to these wretched facts, scrap the program, and then go on to produce a new approach that can succeed.

One measure of urban renewal is the current attitude of minority-group leaders. Originally they were among the most enthusiastic supporters; now, the NAACP and other Negro groups militate against title I. The noted Negro writer, James Baldwin, has labeled urban renewal as "Negro removal." And Planner Lyle E. Schaller put the matter bluntly in the magazine the Christian Century: "Urban renewal may prove to be the contemporary counterpart of the 19th-century canal and railroad building, creating a new band of robber barons to outshine the Drews, Fisks, Vanderbilts, and Harrimans of yesteryear."

As a builder and manager of apartment houses in New York City, I am familiar with the basic problems involved in urban renewal: High rents, created by high land and construction costs, discriminate against the displaced poor more than any deliberate racial or ethnic policy. An example is the apartment house I constructed a few years ago in the city's Lincoln Square area. For a site I purchased several brownstones occupied by Spanish-speaking Puerto Ricans, struggling young artists and a wide assortment of other tenants. To cover the purchase and building costs, I had to charge an average of $75 per room per month in the new building. The high costs dictated the high rent, which dictated the type of clientele. The new apartment today has an exclusively upper-middle-class white tenancy.

I was paying the bills on that project myself, of course. If the project had been under title I, the city would have condemned and bought the land and buildings and sold them very cheaply to a developer. The loss—the difference between the purchase and resale prices—would be covered by public funds, two-thirds from the Federal Government, the rest from the city. As a sweetener the developer would get an attractive mortgage with FHA insurance.

In theory, combining the city power of condemnation with Federal subsidies seemed to be a brilliant device to meet a crisis in our cities. It would destroy the slums, create new housing units, bring vitality to blighted areas, and increase tax revenues. And the developers could charge rentals that would give the poor a place to live decently.

Tragic results have come from this attractive theory. In actual operation title I has primarily been used to move Negroes out of the more central and valuable areas. According to the most recent figures, 72 percent of the families washed out by redevelopment have been Negroes who have inevitably been driven into the more remote black ghettoes. Second, urban renewal has destroyed many more housing units than it has created. As of last count, 150,000 units had been demolished and fewer than 43,000 built, with two-thirds of the cleared land given over to highways, parking lots, offices, and civic and cultural centers, rather than to new housing. Next, the few apartments built have seldom met the promise that they would rent cheaply. A survey several years ago indicated that the subsidized housing rented for $33 to $100 per room per month, whereas the evicted tenants had been paying less than $10.

After 15 years of experience with this program, almost all responsible experts agree that urban renewal is not merely a failure—it is a disaster. Time after time, buildings acquired with the promise of redevelopment have been milked for their rentals. Land has been cleared and left idle for years. The few units built have been mostly of the cheapest design. Payoffs have been made to political figures. Land seized by condemnation has been used to underwrite with taxpayer money such New York institutions as Lincoln Center and the Coliseum. Perhaps the only feature about title I that some might call attractive is that it makes a lot of money for promoters, big realty men, and prime national corporations.

It is true that political corruption and favoritism are old complaints in American history. It is also true that high profits cannot be condemned of themselves. But what is distinct about urban renewal is the cynical use of the poor. A Federal program becomes suspect when it acts as an investment program for large interests under the guise of clearing the slums. A program subsidized by the taxpayer is a lie when, claiming to aid slum dwellers, it really drives the poor from bad to worse ratholes.

The operation of title I has been conducted largely above and beyond the democratic control of the community. Free and open competitive bidding is rare. Kickbacks, contributions to the "right" political party, deposit of funds in selected banks, trashy construction, choice of slumlords and racketeers as promoters—the web of political and financial contacts has been revealed in scandal after scandal.

New York City is the best example of the web of influence in title I activities. For instance, it was revealed at a public hearing that the West Village project, on the west side of Manhattan's Greenwich Village, was assigned to a builder 5 months before the city even indicated interest in the condemnation. In the same area a luxury housing project called Washington Square Village went ahead despite the fact that the condemned land was not a slum. The new tenants sued, claiming a half million dollars for shoddy construction. Finally New York University purchased the project, permitting the owners to liquidate at a fat profit. New York University promptly applied to the city for lower taxes in order to make up the cost of purchase.

An even more disgusting example of title I failure was a project called Park West Village. The original promoters, after buying the slum property at a large subsidy discount, simply collected full rents for several years instead of starting demolition. When pressure mounted they dumped the deal. A legislative investigation established that the promoters had sucked off $600,000, though delinquent in city taxes. It was disclosed shortly thereafter that 15 of the 25 sponsors of a Brooklyn project were the same people who had been parties to the Park West Village scheme, and that some of these same persons held stock in four of the nine title I projects authorized in New York City to that date.

Responsible realtors and national corporations, though free of taint, cannot help being tarred by title I scandal. But the helpless poor are the real victims. Distrust of the program is so acute that when plans are announced for a program of slum rehabilitation in Negro areas, as in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn, Negro tenant groups protest.

Urban renewal was not conceived in this spirit. It was created as an affirmative solution to the terrible obsolescence of American cities. After World War II our major cities showed signs of decay. The middle-class had begun its trek to the suburbs. Its place was taken by Negroes flowing out of the rural South, and Puerto Ricans and Mexicans seeking a better life in the United States. In the downtown areas decrepit properties sat on valuable land. As buildings got older, their income fell, and landlords grew reluctant to spend money for improvements.

Regular private investment could not supply the cure. Population increase had sent the price of centrally located land soaring. Simultaneously, building costs also tended to shoot up—and for a very good reason. The mutual interest of capital and organized labor is to maintain an unspoken truce. The unions fight against laborsaving devices and for ever shorter hours. Investors, to defend themselves against strikes, go along with old-fashioned methods and high wages just as long as renting is maintained at a profit. And the need of the banks and insurance companies to invest money safely at the highest possible return in effect assures their neutrality. Under pressure to increase social services, municipal governments desperately seek more revenue. And the tax assessment on real estate is an easy neck to grasp. Thus our economy tends to push land, construction, and maintenance costs higher and higher. And private capital, in its traditional role, is helpless to build decent housing that can rent to any but the upper middle class and the rich.

The Federal Government set out to change this through slum clearance and FHA. And it is now proved beyond a doubt that these programs cannot succeed. According to the best estimate yet attempted, of all the housing that FHA has financed, only 1½ percent has been for people with an annual income under $5,000. The final proof lies in the experience of cooperatives and unions, which build at no private profit. Even their costs are too high to permit renting to the poor. No matter how FHA and title I are modified, they will to a large extent remain devices for rich builders to get richer erecting housing and cultural and financial institutions for the upper middle class, whereas the poor will be kicked out and forced into worse slums.

If there is an answer to this terrible problem, it lies more in changing our way of thinking than in manipulating subsidies for the same old interests. As the Rockefeller Brothers Fund has somberly stressed, "The blight of slums is spreading at a rate far in excess of our efforts to remedy it."

The first step is to accept an obvious fact. The urban poor cannot be housed properly under present techniques; indeed, we cannot even satisfy middle-class needs. The second step is to look at the bogey-word "subsidy" with unblinkered eyes. Tariffs, which all industries seek, are subsidies. The tax-reducing depletion allowance given to oil, coal, timber, and certain metals is an immense subsidy. Agriculture is largely supported by gimmicks. The greatest part of war research and production is supported by the Government. In fact, it is hard to find any example in basic industry of free competition and the free market in the 19th-century sense.

It is curious that the war industries should be publicly subsidized while housing is manipulated as a source of profit for the rich at the expense of the poor. For that is the inner meaning of title I—a device whereby high-rent housing is erected by Government subsidy for the benefit of private individuals and corporations, on the neck of displaced minority groups.

That last step in this new thinking is to take action. An autonomous agency, separate and independent from the political intrigues and pressures of Washington, should be created with the aim of producing a minimum of 1 million housing units a year at prices the poor can pay. Either the Federal Government would supply the funds, or the agency could issue tax-exempt bonds. The agency would earn "dividends" that could revert to the Government or pay off the bonds; and the same inflationary factors now raising realty values for private owners would enrich this agency as well. A national

building code applicable to agency construction would eliminate local restrictions on modern materials and techniques. This could cut building costs as much as 30 percent.

According to projections of the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods, reducing the military budget 20 percent (an aim presently being striven for) would enable us to rid ourselves of the slums in a decade without raising taxes. For a nation that spends 25 times as much money on building highways as on urban renewal, this hardly sounds like a revolutionary goal.

Perhaps the most striking aspect of such a program is that big business should be first, and not last, in support. The materials used today in title I projects would be paltry compared with the demand in producing a million housing units a year. Labor would also benefit. With an enlarged market for construction workers, labor leaders could be more relaxed about their fears of laborsaving devices and their demands for shorter working hours.

The question is whether we can think anew and act anew. The results of the current urban-renewal program are clear enough to justify dramatic change. Title I should be thrown out, and a program based on reality installed in its place. For redevelopment must create better housing at a price the poor can afford. Unless this is done, a nation willing to spend up to $200 billion for two men to visit the moon will condemn untold millions of its citizens to squalor.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, during my absence with the Special Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which traveled to Vietnam during the month of June, I missed certain rollcall votes and I would like to have the RECORD indicate my position on each of these issues. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

June 16, H.R. 6927, rollcall No. 141: "yea."
June 16, H.R. 6927, rollcall No. 142: "nay."
June 16, House Resolution 416, rollcall No. 143: "nay."
June 21, H.R. 7743, rollcall No. 145: "yea."
June 21, H.R. 8620, rollcall No. 146: "yea."
June 21, House Concurrent Resolution 416, rollcall No. 147: "yea."

CLARENCE J. BROWN

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who knew Clarence Brown recognized the stamp of greatness on him. He commanded the respect and high regard of political friend and foe alike. The tributes which are being paid to him across the Nation are testimony to him both as a statesman and a splendid human being.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer yesterday in its editorial columns outlined the remarkable career which death ended Monday morning. Our friend and colleague, Clarence Brown, proved the validity of his principles in the nearly 50 years he served the State of Ohio and the Nation:

CLARENCE J. BROWN

For 47 years Clarence J. Brown's booming oratory served downstate Ohio's native brand of conservatism. Then death had the last word. Yesterday U.S. Representative Brown, Republican from Blanchester, died and the House fittingly adjourned out of respect to him.

Brown was born in 1895 of hard-working Highland County and Cincinnati early settler stock. As a boy he sold peanuts to buy school books, stoked furnaces, chopped wood, mowed lawns and sold newspapers to earn himself an education and a healthy publishing firm.

Little wonder that he grew into a six-foot, 200-plus pound husky, convinced that any man with a speck of ambition can live out the American dream of success without Government help.

At 23 he became the youngest man Ohio had elected Lieutenant Governor. In 1920 he led Warren G. Harding's presidential campaign. In 1928 as secretary of state he fired the election board here for vote shenanigans and cleared up the mess.

He ran for Governor in 1934, lashing out and roaring against the catch-as-catch-can fiscal remedies used in the depression. He asked why should the State go into the liquor business, why should Ohio suspend payments on its bonds and why should Ohio hire welfare workers when it couldn't pay its teachers.

Then in 1938 he was elected to Congress from the 7th district, and ever afterward asked similar conservative questions, working toward similar economies in government.

He helped to create the Hoover Commissions and served on them. Those too were consistent with his sound money principles.

But Brown was a conservative, not a reactionary. He favored sound welfare policies, if not liberal ones. He stanchly backed organized labor's drives for a shorter work day and a shorter workweek. He believed that good wages meant good purchasing power and good business.

Washington, and Ohio both will miss Clarence Brown, and so will his political party. We join with his colleagues and his daughters and son in mourning a fine American.

MILLION DOLLAR PAYMENTS TO SUGAR MILLS

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the Sugar Act about 60 percent of U.S. supplies come from domestic sources including Puerto Rico. These U.S. producers, because of a number of factors, cannot compete with foreign producers. Therefore, to protect domestic production, the Sugar Act provides heavy subsidies.

Curiously, the program has also resulted in premium prices being paid to all foreign producers who sell in the U.S. market. The subsidies to foreign producers are at a lesser level than those to domestic producers, but they are subsidies nonetheless.

These subsidies, both foreign and domestic, result in consumer prices which are higher than would otherwise be the case. The U.S. consumers are presently paying about 11 cents a pound for sugar. This compares with about 7 cents a pound across the Canadian border.

The reason for the higher prices in the United States is the subsidy.

To illustrate the magnitude of this program I am listing below the 25 highest Sugar Act payments for the 1963 crop. The information was supplied to me by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. You will note that two firms got payments in excess of $1 million for the year and six others got payments in excess of one-half million dollars.

This information is especially timely now because the Committee on Agriculture has under consideration a bill which would extend this act for 5 more years.

TWENTY-FIVE HIGHEST SUGAR ACT PAYMENTS, 1963 CROP

U.S. Sugar Corporation, Florida: $1,104,613.05.
Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $1,074,520.77.
Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $574,552.89.
C. Brewer Puerto Rico, Inc., Puerto Rico: $569,233.42.
Lihue Plantation Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $559,892.64.
Waialua Ag. Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $549,392.78.
Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Florida: $548,282.33.
Luce & Co., Puerto Rico: $539,645.20.
Ewa Plantation Co., Hawaii: $460,721.35.
Pioneer Mill Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $444,611.23.
Kekaha Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $399,285.52.
Grove Farm Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $368,795.14.
Pepeekeo Sugar Co., Hawaii: $362,866.55.
Hawaiian Ag. Co., Hawaii: $359,090.02.
South Coast Corp., Louisiana: $356,593.10.
Antonio Roig Sucrs. S. en C., Puerto Rico: $346,517.03.
Laupahoehoe Sugar Co., Hawaii: $344,705.63.
Kohala Sugar Co., Hawaii: $332,175.94.
Olokele Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $312,628.01.
Puna Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $298,803.48.
Wailuku Sugar Co., Hawaii: $296,631.39.
McBryde Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $294,161.87.
Hutchinson Sugar Co., Ltd., Hawaii: $287,647.39.
Suc. J. Serralles, Puerto Rico: $273,404.51.
Onomea Sugar Co., Hawaii: $268,893.31.

CATHEDRAL OF THE PINES—20TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, clergymen of 20 different denominations will gather to celebrate the

20th anniversary of the Cathedral of the Pines at Rindge, N.H. This internationally famous shrine thus will be the scene of a historic ceremony because never before have so many representatives of so many different faiths, Roman Catholic, Jewish, and many Protestant denominations participated in such a service.

This beautiful shrine has grown in fame and size since it was established by Dr. and Mrs. Douglas Sloane in memory of their son, Lt. Sanderson Sloane, a World War II pilot who was killed in action. The shrine draws thousands of visitors each year from every part of this country and from many foreign lands.

I am pleased to call attention to this occasion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include an article describing it which appeared in the Manchester Union-Leader.

SERVICE TO MARK 20TH YEAR OF CATHEDRAL OF THE PINES

RINDGE.—A religious service of historic significance will be held in Rindge, Thursday at 2:30 p.m., when the Cathedral of the Pines marks its 20th anniversary.

Representatives of 20 different faiths, including four bishops and the personal representative of Richard Cardinal Cushing, will assemble for commemorative rites at the Nation's only shrine dedicated to both military and civilian war dead, both men and women.

Among the leading churchmen who are scheduled to participate are Rt. Rev. Monsignor Francis J. Lally, editor of "The Pilot," who will represent Cardinal Cushing; Bishop James K. Matthews, D.D., Methodist member of the Central Committee, World Council of Churches; Archbishop Iakavos, Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America and one of the five presidents of the World Council of Churches; Rt. Rev. Charles F. Hall, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New Hampshire; Rt. Rev. Frederic C. Lawrence, Suffragan Bishop of the Protestent Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts; Dr. Dana M. Greeley, president, American Unitarian-Universalist Association; David E. Sleeper, CSB, Manager of committees on publication, First Church of Christ Scientist, Boston, Mass.

SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE

The service will have special ecumenical significance, in that never have so many faiths participated before in a religious rite under similar circumstances.

Earl Weidner, AAOG, Boston, will be at the Cathedral console; Ruth Hamilton, a noted Negro spiritualist singer and Brothers of the Queen of Peace Mission Seminary, Jaffrey Center, will sing, and usherettes will be Girl Scouts from Cadette Troop 520, Francestown.

The service will commemorate an event which occurred on August 26, 1945, when some 127 persons, all friends and neighbors of Dr. and Mrs. Douglas Sloane, gathered at the pine grove above Bullet Pond for a religious ceremony.

The Sloanes developed the scenic hillside as a memorial to their son, Lt. Sanderson Sloane, a World War II pilot who died in that conflict. It now includes about 400 acres with a seating capacity of 4,000 persons. Services are regularly conducted during the summer months, commencing with the Easter Sunrise Service. The cathedral is open to religions of all faiths.

The religious center of the cathedral is the Altar of the Nation, beyond which stands Grand Monadnock and the Green Mountains of Vermont. The altar is made of stones and other objects from all 50 States, the territories, and 102 nations of the world. It is recognized by the U.S. Congress as a national memorial for all American war dead.

The Cathedral of the Pines is now an international shrine. In 1949 the Sloanes turned the property over to a perpetual trust, which has a board of 42 members.

Construction is to begin soon on a $150,000 bell tower, which will contain a carillon, a Sheffield bell which once hung in the city hall in Keene, and an angelus bell. The tower will be dedicated to the sacrifices made by women in war service, and will include four bronze tablets, designed by Norman Rockwell, which will depict heroines from different periods of American history.

OTHER CLERGY

Clergymen in addition to the above, who will participate in Thursday's services are: Rev. Lionel Boulay, pastor of St. Patrick Church, Jeffrey, representing Most Rev. Ernest J. Primeau, S.T.D., Bishop of Manchester; Dr. H. Robert Smith, Protestant Episcopalian; Rev. Gilbert Caldwell, Union Methodist Church, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Bert Tofae Williams of Samoa, minister of the First Church in Newbury, Mass.; Rev. Peter Y. F. Shih, Chinese Christian Church of New England, Boston, Mass.

Rabbi Jacob Handler, Ph. D., Temple Beth Israel, Providence, R.I.; William Maxwell, Jr., Baha'i World Faith, Melrose, Mass.; Dr. Evan J. Shearman, president, Massachusetts Baptist Convention, Boston, Mass.; Rabbi Albert I. Gordon, Temple Emanuel, Newton Center, Mass.

Rev. Arten Ashjian, St. James Apostolic Armenian Church, Watertown, Mass.; Ven. Harry H. Jones, archdeacon of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Western Massachusetts; Rev. Richard Stoughton, Jr., minister of Porter Congregational Church, Brockton, Mass.; Very Rev. Canon Wilfred A. Tisdell, Roman Catholic Diocese of Worcester, Mass.; Rev. Burrett E. McBee, executive secretary, Synod of New England, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; Rev. Albert J. Penner, D.D., president, Massachusetts Council of Churches, president of Massachusetts Congregational Conference.

Elder Boyd K. Packer, assistant to the Council of Twelve of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints; Brigadier Fred H. Jackson, Northern New England Division, the Salvation Army; Pastor Francis F. Bush, pastor of Atlantic Union College, Seventh-Day Adventist, South Lancaster, Mass.

Rev. Hartley T. Grandin, executive secretary, New Hampshire Council of Churches; Rev. Raymond F. Smith, general secretary, United Baptist Convention of New Hampshire; Rev. Samuel H. Bullock, Pleasant Hill Baptist Church, Boston; Rabbi Roland B. Gittelsohn, D.D., Sc. D., Temple Israel, Boston, Mass.; Svani Sarvagatenanda, Ramakrishna Vadanta Society of Massachusetts, Boston.

The service will be conducted rain or shine; in case of storm, the facilities of Cathedral House will be used.

SEATING OF MISSISSIPPI DELEGATION

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the matter of the seating of the Mississippi delegation ought to be brought to the floor of the House for review by the House before the adjournment of this session of the Congress.

When this matter was before the House last January, I voted along with 149 other Members, against seating the Mississippi delegation on the grounds that there had been a basic denial of voting rights in Mississippi.

Not only should this matter not be left in abeyance and unresolved, but the evidence should be examined on the floor of the House by the whole membership while it is reasonably fresh. Surely the committee has had ample time to assess all the factors and make a presentation to the House as mandated by the House of Representatives over 7 months ago.

MRS. RUTH BAKER PRATT DIES, ONE OF NEW YORK'S MOST DISTINGUISHED CITIZENS

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, with the death of Mrs. Ruth Baker Pratt, New York has lost one of its most distinguished citizens. Mrs. Pratt served her city first as an alderman and later as a Representative in Congress from the 17th Congressional District of New York. She served the public well and faithfully both in office and as a private citizen. She was an outspoken critic of Government inefficiency and her struggle to eliminate slum housing in New York City will be remembered by New Yorkers. Mrs. Pratt's whole life was useful and constructive, and the community at large, as her family and friends, will greatly miss her. To her family, I, as the present Congressman from the 17th District of New York, would like to express my sympathy and the sympathy of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the permission of the House to insert in the RECORD the account of Mrs. Pratt's long and interesting life which appeared in the New York Times of August 25, 1965.

MRS. RUTH BAKER PRATT DIES; STATE'S FIRST WOMAN IN HOUSE—SERVED IN WASHINGTON FROM 1928 TO 1932—FIRST OF SEX ON BOARD OF ALDERMEN

GLEN COVE, L.I., August 23.—Mrs. Ruth Baker Pratt, the first woman to represent New York City on the old board of aldermen, and the first to represent New York State in Congress, died Monday evening in her home, the Manor House. She would have been 88 years old Tuesday.

Mrs. Pratt was the widow of John Teele Pratt, a son of Charles Pratt, a pioneer Standard Oil Co. executive, who founded Pratt Institute in Brooklyn.

She leaves 2 sons, John T. and Edwin H. B. Pratt; 3 daughters, Mrs. Robert H. Thayer, Mrs. James Jackson, Jr., and Mrs. Paul H. Nitze; about 20 grandchildren; and about 10 great-grandchildren.

ASKED TO RUN IN 1925

When Judge Frank Coleman, the Republican leader of the wealthy 17th Congressional

(silk stocking) District, asked Mrs. Pratt to run for alderman in 1925, she laughed and replied, "You couldn't buy my services."

But the wealthy and socially prominent Mrs. Pratt was to become not only a two-term alderman, but a Representative reelected over tough opposition, an early supporter of Herbert Hoover's presidential candidacy, and a Republican national committeewoman.

She came, she said, from a race of Republicans, but was the first of her family to hold elective office.

Born in Ware, Mass., in 1877, she was the daughter of Edwin H. Baker, a cotton manufacturer. She attended Dana Hall and Wellesley, where she majored in mathematics. She was married to Mr. Pratt in 1903, after she returned from studying the violin in Europe.

Mrs. Pratt's political specialty was economics, and she was not afraid to cross swords with the major political figures of her day.

She often defied her Tammany Hall-backed colleagues on the board of aldermen, and the flamboyant Mayor James J. Walker, whose regime she once characterized as the "worst administration in history."

She accused Mayor Walker of "carelessness, indifference, bungling, and inefficiency" in his handling of city problems. Five months after her election to the board of aldermen, she gave the press her impressions of that body:

"I cannot for the life of me see why New York City spends over $500,000 to support the board of aldermen," she said. "We are mere automatons moved at the will of that powerful organization, Tammany Hall."

She was reelected to the board in 1927, and explained her commitment to politics to a newspaperwoman by saying:

"I like people. I love going about and meeting them this way. As their alderman I may call on them and know them. As a private individual I would be intruding.

"It is a great satisfaction for me to wade in and fight, fight, fight for better housing conditions, for the abolishing of some of the tenements that are unfit for animals, much less for human beings."

In 1928, Mrs. Pratt joined the group backing Herbert Hoover for the presidential nomination. She became a candidate for Representative and was elected with the Hoover ticket.

As a Member of Congress, she was regarded as a spokesman for President Hoover in the State. As national committeewoman from 1929 to 1943, she was his stanch supporter. In 1932 she seconded his renomination at the national convention.

She was reelected to Congress in 1930, over the formidable opposition of City Magistrate Louis B. Brodsky for the Democrats and the newspaper columnist, Heywood Broun, for the Socialists.

Mr. Broun accused her of having made only two speeches in Congress—one advocating a 2-cent reduction in the sugar tariff and another in which she read an address of President Hoover to the Boy Scouts.

Mrs. Pratt was defeated in 1932 by Theodore A. Peysner. Early in 1934 she was appointed to the advisory committee of the Republican Builders, an organization dedicated to the rebirth of the Republican Party. After her service as national committeewoman, she became president of the Women's National Republican Club.

Well known in local cultural circles, she served as chairman of the Fine Arts Foundation, was a member of the board of directors of the Philharmonic Symphony Society, and a grower of prize-winning flowers.

Mrs. Pratt served for many years as a member of the board of trustees of Wellesley and received several honorary degrees.

She belonged to the Colony and the River clubs.

A FAIR IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for new immigration laws—laws which will eliminate once and for all the discriminatory aspects of our immigration policy.

Ours is a nation of immigrants. We have built our greatness from the outcasts of many lands. The persecuted, the oppressed, those who were not wanted elsewhere—all of these found refuge upon our shores and contributed to the making of our mighty Nation. We should never forget that our humble origin had its foundation in the efforts of people who were oppressed elsewhere. I hope that this quality of our history will guide us in humility to eliminate invidious discrimination in regard to our present citizens and in regard to future immigrants. I feel this quality of America in a most personal way. My ancestors came to settle in Pennsylvania as members of the Schwenkfelder group fleeing religious oppression in Germany. They yearned for peace; they yearned for a place where they could enjoy religious freedom; they yearned for an end to their oppression. If the gates of America had not been open to them at that time, I would not be here before you as a Member of Congress today.

We must keep in mind these aspirations of the oppressed. At the same time we must realize that our own population is growing with great rapidity, that opportunities which existed in 1620, in 1840, or in 1910 are not the same as the opportunities in 1965. Frankly we no longer need large numbers of people to populate frontier wilderness areas. We must reckon with a population explosion within our own borders. We must consider the present and future unemployment of our working population. Our Nation is already populated from coast to coast. Today we must seek the skills and talents which new immigrants can bring to our shores. We must seek the quality of their contribution to our Nation, not the quantity of numbers.

Let us fashion a new law which eliminates all discrimination on the basis of national origin and asks only of a man what he can contribute to the American civilization of 1965.

Because I am so deeply concerned with the nature of our future immigration laws, I introduced earlier this year my own immigration bill, H.R. 8203. At Judiciary Committee hearings on proposed immigration legislation, I expressed agreement with the basic purpose of H.R. 2580 as then proposed by the administration, but I suggested certain important improvements which I had incorporated in my bill. I am pleased to note that most of the improvements which I suggested be made have been included by the Judiciary Committee in the version of H.R. 8203 which is before the House today.

However, one important improvement which I suggested in testimony last May 18 has not been made. H.R. 8203 as brought before the House today does not completely reach the desired goal of eliminating national favoritism. The bill favors nations of Latin America and North America. It is our task to remove all hypocritical aspects of present immigration policy. We must fashion a new law which will be completely nondiscriminatory as written and applied.

All nations want equal treatment; all nations deserve equal treatment. Nations of the free world should have an equal chance to send their citizens here. The administration bill quite clearly does not place all nations on an equal basis. Written into H.R. 2580 is the potential for new preferential treatment.

The administration bill would offer preferential treatment to nationals from Western Hemisphere nations by maintaining for them special nonquota status. This preference has existed in the past. It should be abolished. Unless we settle this problem finally, by eliminating all national preferences, questions may be raised in future years as to why a citizen of Peru or Bolivia is given an open door for entry while an applicant from France, Greece, Italy, or the United Kingdom must wait in line under the quota system.

I, therefore, intend to support an amendment to end this discrimination in favor of Western Hemisphere nations. I feel sure that our Western Hemisphere neighbors will understand and accept a U.S. policy which plainly does not discriminate either for or against nationals of certain countries.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage of H.R. 2580. Many years ago one of our great Presidents, Woodrow Wilson, in an address given at Independence Hall in Philadelphia on July 4, 1914, gave a definition of liberty which applies to our efforts today. Wilson stated:

> Liberty does not consist in mere general declarations of the rights of men. It consists in the translation of those declarations into definite action.

We must translate the declaration of liberty into definite action as part of our new immigration laws. Our task is not merely to give a partial response to the demands for change. Our task is to create a clear, comprehensive, and completely fair law. It is time now to offer true equality to all applicants who seek membership in the American community.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE NOW

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt approval of a measure to provide self-government to the District of Columbia. I have introduced in this Congress, as I did in both the 87th and 88th Congresses, a bill (H.R. 10608) to provide for the District of Columbia an elected mayor, city council, board of education, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives. In addition, I have joined a number of our colleagues in signing the discharge petition made available yesterday to enable the House to vote on this most important question.

Congress devotes 1 day out of every 10 to the problems of the District. Four committees, two in the House and two in the Senate, devote almost all of their time to District affairs. It is inconceivable to me that in the mid-20th century an already overworked and overburdened Congress has to spend one-tenth of its time attending to essentially local issues. The time could be much better spent giving more attention to the numerous national and international problems before us.

It is extraordinarily inefficient for 535 legislators, none of whom are answerable to the citizens of Washington, to try to attend to the multitude of problems that come up every day in a big city. Local needs of a big city require local attention. Most Members of Congress are unable to devote the necessary time and study to Washington's problems to provide the city with effective government.

The cornerstone of our Nation is the right to vote. It is ironic that in the Capital of the leading republic in the world, the citizens have practically no right to vote.

Washington has a population of 750,000 Americans, more than 11 States in the Union. These citizens pay Federal taxes and share in our Nation's military and other obligations. There is no reason why they should not be permitted to share in the government of their own affairs.

Washington has been Congress' stepchild for 93 years. It is time that she be cleaned up and given a legitimate and effective government.

ADVANCED DESIGN FACTORY FISHING VESSELS

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced legislation calling for construction of three advanced design factory fishing vessels. My bill, H.R. 10215, has been referred to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I hope all members will study this proposed legislation and give it their support.

Under my bill, the Secretary of the Interior is empowered to take appropriate action to construct and outfit three factory ships of the most advanced design and with the latest gear and equipment. These vessels would exceed 300 feet and cost approximately $5 million each. One such vessel would be constructed in an Atlantic coast shipyard, one in a gulf coast shipyard, and one in a Pacific coast shipyard; each vessel's home port shall be located on the coast where constructed.

Under this bill, known as the "Factory Ship Act of 1965," the Secretary is authorized to lease each vessel to the highest responsible bidder for a term of not more than 3 years. Bidders must be U.S. citizens or U.S. firms.

Prior to coming to Congress, I served as Maine's Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries for 4 years. I am completing my 5th year as a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. My experience convinces me that we must assist the domestic commercial fishing industry in the harvesting and processing of food at sea, utilizing the most modern methods of catching, processing, storing, and transporting seafood.

There are two principle things we must do to help the fishing industry in the United States: First, we must increase the demand for fish and fish products in the United States, and second, we must rebuild our U.S. fishing fleet.

To accomplish these two basic purposes, we must come to grips with some unpleasant facts.

The quality of fish and fish products can be improved upon, both before it gets to the marketplace, and also in the Nation's restaurants. From my personal observations, I have found that in a large majority of restaurants, fish dishes are often prepared in a most unappetizing manner. Despite all that has been said by doctors and nutritionists of the great value to health from fish, millions of Americans do not really know how delicious good quality seafood can be when properly prepared. We must seek to improve our standards at every step from the ocean to the table.

There is far too much disagreement and bickering in the fishing industry itself. Selfishness must be put aside. Processors who use little or no fish caught in the United States must not seek to impede the rebuilding of our U.S. fishing fleet. Farsighted processors in the United States welcome the prospects of obtaining their supply from U.S. fishermen.

With the international situation becoming increasingly grave, the United States must not come to depend upon other nations for fish.

We should match and surpass the efforts of competitive nations in the quantity and quality of seafood.

CLARENCE J. BROWN—LEADER

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, words, of course, cannot express the true sentiments of all of the colleagues of our late beloved Clarence J. Brown.

Much has been said and will be said in sincere tribute to this great American. He served his Nation with honor, his State with pride, his district with wisdom, and his family with love and devotion.

Public service has its rewards, and the greatest for Clarence Brown's colleagues in the Congress was their opportunity to serve with a man of this caliber, and to have the benefit of his judgment, advice, and wisdom.

In his 27 years in Congress, Clarence Brown, who was known to most as "Leader," gave of himself unselfishly and was dedicated to truly basic American principles, constitutional government, and a sound philosophy favoring the free enterprise system and opposing centralization of power and authority in Washington.

He will be sorely missed by all of us in Congress, his countless number of friends, as well as his son, daughters, and grandchildren.

MINIMUM WAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time in order that, if there are Members at this late hour who wish to discuss the minimum wage bill or have any questions, I will be delighted to answer. The hour is so late I believe this is not a propitious time.

But I would simply say the blue sheet on H.R. 10518, which has been, I hope, delivered to all Members, is available, and if any Member desires to ask any question I shall be glad to try to answer.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Would the gentleman comment briefly on the changes made by the full Committee on Education and Labor with respect to the so-called small newspaper exemption in relationship to the recommendations of the subcommittee?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy to tell the gentleman that the full committee by unanimous vote deleted elimination of the exemption for small newspapers, and it stands in the bill now exactly as the law is presently written. It does not change the exemption in any way.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly interested in certain aspects of this bill. I appreciate the gentleman taking the time to explain this to the Members. I am particularly interested in how it affects tip employees. It is my understanding in reference to tip employees that a portion of their tips may

be deducted, but only 50 percent of the minimum. If this is true I would like to have an explanation as to why the full amount might not be deductible, or what is the difference between that kind of money and other money?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I may say to the gentleman that the bill defines the tip employees to include employees who customarily and regularly receive tips. If tips have been generally recognized as constituting a part of the income of such employees, it provides tips will not be considered in computing overtime pay, but that the regular rate of pay shall not be deemed to be less than the minimum wage. The gentleman is correct in that it does specifically state that not more than 50 percent of the tips which have been declared by the employee himself or herself, or the amount which the Secretary of Labor sets as the proper amount usually to be received by such individual in that category and in that area shall be considered as tips, whichever is the greater. So that the employer will receive a 50-percent credit on the minimum wage dependent on whichever of those two amounts is the greater.

I will say to the gentleman the philosophy behind this, of course, is properly a philosophy adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to tips and their application under the social security law. The feeling of the committee in general, however, was that we do not want to establish a relationship between the employee and the employer where the employer paid nothing whatsoever under the law. Otherwise, the employee would not be considered an employee, but really an independent contractor. This was not the fact and, therefore, the employer should be required to make some reasonable payment. We settled upon the 50-percent amount.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to ask another additional question in another area. A number of people in my district employ young summer students, very young students. And in our State of Georgia the laws are such with regard to child labor that with the permission of the school superintendent a number of these youngsters have been getting jobs in the past that have not been covered under the Minimum Wage Act. The particular company that I am thinking of right now employs 40 young boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 16. They are doing healthful outdoor work. I have been told that they will not be able to employ any of these youngsters at the minimum wage because they are paying a lesser amount for these students who are not only unskilled but they are young children. A great many of them earn a part of their livelihood or at least earn the means by which they are able to go to college. This particular company that I refer to has been employing such young students for a very long time in this resort area. I wonder if there is any thinking on the part of the committee as to any possibility in some way to exempt these young boys and girls who are between the ages, as I said, of 14 and 16 who now have this opportunity with their lesser skills to earn money to go to college but who would not be able to compete with more skilled people who would be paid at the minimum wage rate.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Let me say first to the gentleman that we have made some special provisions for what might be called seasonal operations such as hotels and resorts and so on. We have tried to do this on the basis that this is a special problem and we have therefore given them certain exemptions.

With respect to the problem of students, which I think is the main thrust of my good friend's question, we have amended the full-time student provision to provide for the employment of full-time students regardless of age so that it will change the existing regulation. The existing regulation says that a student is somebody 18 years of age or under. Of course, this is not a part of the law. This was a regulation made by the Wage and Hour Division. So we have removed that restriction and made it plain that we mean a full-time student regardless of age shall be considered as a student. Of course, this is in compliance with the applicable child labor laws. We have not touched the applicable labor laws in any way. But outside of their school hours in a retail or service establishment or in agriculture, they may be paid 85 percent of the minimum wage in full-time positions during school vacations; or in part-time positions, not to exceed 20 hours in any workweek under certificates issued by the Secretary.

We did this primarily to provide an incentive to the employer to give students these special positions during nonschool hours and at the same time to make sure that they were not taking the place of a regularly employed individual and at a substandard minimum wage level.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The particular business that I am most familiar with is a particular resort business and if this business, as I understand the bill, would not come under the provisions applicable to agriculture nor to a retail business, of course, but it would be an operation where these young people do everything from selling tickets on rides and working around with water skis and things of that kind for which they have been found to be very well suited in the past.

As I say, as I understand this bill, that situation would not come under the bill. If that is the case, I wonder if the gentleman would have any suggestion as to the possibility of working out an amendment that would be acceptable to the committee? In which case I would certainly be happy to work with the gentleman on this matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I hope the gentleman, before he thinks in the terms along which he has indicated, will read the specific provisions of the bill which would affect the resort, hotel and recreational type of business enterprises because we have given certain exemptions specifically for the reasons the gentleman has mentioned.

The employees in such establishments, of course, get both board and lodging which is applied of course to the minimum wage. Of course, the only thing that is required is that they do live on the premises. So the board and lodging will be provided by the employer.

The testimony before the committee was that this would take care of nearly all of the situations. I know of the one which the gentleman has close to his home. I know it well. I am sure it would be completely covered and in order to make sure, I will make an inquiry and put this specific instance, if I may, before the Labor Department and get a specific answer as to whether they would be covered or whether they are covered.

Mr. CALLAWAY. That would be helpful and I thank the gentleman. I hate to continue to take time on a personal problem, which this is, but in this particular instance that I speak of the young boys and girls live in this community and the beauty of this particular program has been that these boys and girls in this community have earned their college educations and literally hundreds of them have gone on to college.

This program has been extremely popular with the community and with business establishments and with everyone involved.

From my interpretation of this section as I read this section about resorts, in all legislation this section is extremely complicated and the regulations are rather complicated as to what is a resort. My understanding is that unless the people live on the premises and unless you have a different kind of hotel operation than this particular resort has, it would not be applicable. Certainly the purpose of this legislation is not to take away summer jobs from young boys and girls such as I have described.

I am wondering if there would be an opportunity to meet with someone on the staff, to see if an amendment acceptable to the committee could be worked out?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Of course we would always be glad to consult with the gentleman. I am sure the gentleman recognizes that we have dealt with the problem of the student in the student-exemption provision.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Does not the student exemption apply only to agricultural and retail groups?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes. It applies to retail or service establishments. I believe we will find there is a legal ruling that the hotel type of operation does come under the service type of operation and would qualify. I will make certain of that and inform the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAWAY I thank the gentleman. That was not the interpretation of the people with whom I talked.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I add one thing with respect to the management trainee section? We have introduced into the bill for the first time a provision which will give to management under a set formula a certain number of management trainees they may have under different regulations than would apply to other employees.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I have three or four questions which I should like to ask, if I might, with respect to this measure.

In the light of the fact that the rural community seems to set its own level of wages, to some degree, because of various conditions which are peculiar to rural communities, do we have any assurance—from any figures or anything the gentleman has on hand—that this will not cause a spiraling inflation or a raising of wages to compensate in other areas? Perhaps union officials or other people will have the idea that if we raise the minimum wage from $1.25 to $1.75, over a period of time, the man making $1.75 should demand $2.50, and the man making $600 a month should demand $800 a month. The result could be a tremendous impetus and a spiraling cost of wages and prices.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. First, let me say that the best guide we can go by is previous experience. The department has found, in the 4-D reports which have been made to the Congress, as required by the law, that this so-called spiral as a result of raising the minimum wage simply has not occurred.

Actually, the thing which is most controlling in the wage area is the negotiated contract. Those contracts, of course, are far above what we are talking about in any minimum wage bill. Even taking this at the worst, on the impact of the total wage bill of the country—and it will be less than 3½ percent—it is so relatively small that it will not have any spiraling effect.

We can go by the record of 1961 and of previous years. Judging from that record and the reports made by the Secretary, after investigation, we feel relatively confident that there will be no inflationary trend or spiraling effect in what is proposed.

I would, of course, emphasize to the gentleman that we are not going to $1.75 until practically 3 years from now under the provisions of the bill. We will go to $1.40, then to $1.60, and then to $1.75 in the three-period jump.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Of course, time passes rapidly.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, time passes rapidly. Of course, it has in the past. We are, as a matter of fact, as the gentleman knows, only coming now to $1.25 in some areas, from the last minimum wage bill.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. In the light of this, the gentleman does not believe that the rural community sets its own level to such a point that this would create some sort of impetus to other people to tend to raise their wages? For instance, a man making $1.75 under other conditions might want $2.50 an hour. The gentleman does not believe that will happen?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No. I do not believe there is any reason for it to happen in the rural area any more than it could possibly be said it would happen in an industrial area. The same argument could be made as to both areas. If it has not happened in the past, then we have good solid grounds to hope and believe it will not happen in this instance.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago, in answer to an inquiry, that small newspapers were properly considered under this legislation, and that the exemption remains.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The exemption remains exactly as it is presently in the law.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. What about seasonal industries such as canning?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There was a good deal of discussion in the committee as to what provisions were to be made and there were strong representations, both justified by the evidence, that in many areas the canning industry certainly did not need the so-called exemptions which they have had in the past. The committee compromised and cut the two 14-week exemptions to one 14-week exemption and reduced the number of hours from 56 to 48 in any one week. The statistics available to the committee and the testimony by Members who had cannery operations in their areas will more than justify the moderate position taken by the full committee.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Now, back to the farm for a moment. The gentleman from California mentioned or we were talking in terms of raising prices here. We have some statistics, I believe, that will serve to illustrate that our near neighbors such as Mexico have had a tremendous increase in imports into the United States whereas we have had a very small increase of exports into Mexico. Do you feel there is any possibility of bringing the farm labor under this minimum wage program which will cause us to force more of our farm potential out of the country and create more and more unemployment among our people under the guise of attempting to raise their standard of living?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No; because I think what the committee has done is to write a type of minimum wage for agriculture which will not affect the type of small industry which might tend to be looking for this kind of relief. The big industrial farm I just believe is not going to get up and walk to Mexico under the provisions of the bill, for a lot of reasons which surely the gentleman understands as well as I do, that is, the value of their land and their operation and the manner in which they do it would make it very difficult for them to find similar propitious circumstances in Mexico. We have, as you know, exempted all farms which employ less than 5 people on a 300 man-day per quarter basis. That simply means we have in essence eliminated all of the small farms of almost every kind and only included larger operated farms which are nearer the commercial type of farm.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. One last commentary. This is to the point that I hope complete and ample consideration will be given to the great triangle that we are always faced with when we concern ourselves with prices and wages of various sorts, that is, the triangle of taxes and the taxpayer in one corner, and in another corner of the triangle is the consumer and the prices he has to pay, and in the third corner, of course, and not the least important is the laborer and the problem of maintaining a job for him. We are not talking about just an income but a job. I hope these three things will be amply considered to the point that we are not creating something which will cause more problems than we are curing.

I appreciate the answers you have given me tonight.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to thank the gentleman very much and say to him I think he has contributed to a better understanding of the measure. I also wish to say to him I think that part of the proof of the basic validity of what we tried to do is, if I can go back to a certain number of Presidents, President Kennedy and before him President Eisenhower and now President Johnson, all have felt a proper minimum wage law would contribute to the prosperity of the country and not endanger the very things which the gentleman brought up. I think, of course, it is up to the committee in debate to present the facts as they are, and then the membership will have to decide if we are endangering it. We strongly believe we are not. We believe strongly that this is a very moderate bill compared to what some people asked for. There were some elements which were suggested which we did not go along with because we did exactly what the gentleman had in mind. For instance, double time for overtime. There were some of my friends on my side of the aisle who do not agree with you about this decision, but we did take these specific things into consideration.

Looking back again on history, wherever we have increased not only the coverage but the minimum wage, sometimes with a much more drastic increase than is being proposed in this bill, the evidence clearly points to the fact that an on-going economy can well absorb these changes to meet the changes which are taking place in the upper level of income.

What we are doing simply is bringing to the lower levels of income a comparable protection, because they are not as well organized, and by doing this we bring about a more well-rounded economy.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. The gentleman from California has brought to mind one further question, if he will yield further, and this is the question: What would happen if—of course, everyone says it cannot happen, but it seems to happen in cycles—if we have a deflation of the economy, if we have a recession and perhaps even a depression, does the gentleman think there is ample mechanism here in the Congress or in the legislation to enable us to take corrective measures without upsetting things to any great degree?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There is no question about it, that there is ample machinery, through the Committee on Education and Labor, to take any action which the committee or the Congress thinks is justified. But I would have to

say to the gentleman in all honesty that we have never solved a down-turn in our economy by lowering wages. If you go back to 1933—I know the gentleman is not as old as I am and perhaps he does not remember quite that far back—even then we came to the conclusion finally that cutting wages was not the way to restore prosperity. Some future Congress may take that point of view and try it, but I should hope that we would at least look at the lessons of the past and not make such an adjustment unless we found that we were so completely unbalanced that we were maintaining a minimum wage which was not in conformity with the rest of the wage structure of the country.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. The gentleman might agree that the Congress has had little to say about some of these reductions in wages and services. It is something that happens by national demand, or whatever, but not by an act of Congress.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is true. But acts of Congress have in turn helped. If the gentleman will remember, in 1933, they tried to create a situation where we upped the wages by creating all kinds of incentives. I can only say that I hope we do not. And I am sure the gentleman agrees with me that we hope we do not have that kind of economic crisis again. When it comes we will have to adjust to the state of facts. But certainly at this time we are not in such a situation. But if it does happen I am sure the Congress will meet its responsibilities at that time.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I thank the gentleman. I hope we do not contribute to getting things up so high that the ball will drop.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am sure we will not.

MANNED ORBITAL LABORATORY IN SPACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and 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. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President today made a very historic announcement. He announced to the people of this country and to the world that we are now launching a great effort to place a manned orbital laboratory in space within the next 2 years. The announcement said that we hope to have preliminary tests by 1968.

I think this is a momentous announcement. It is my hope that the American people will realize the full significance of this decision by our great President. It involves a tremendous outlay of expenditure, but it is my feeling, based on information that has been presented both to the Congress and to the people of this country, that the first nation to place a manned orbital laboratory into outer space, in this instance manned by two persons, and ultimately by larger crews, will indeed be able to make a profound contribution toward maintaining the peace of the world and toward giving man a greater knowledge of our own universe and, of course, all the other planets.

There is no question that when a manned orbital laboratory starts circling the globe, as I am sure it will under our experimentation and development, we will be able to predict more accurately the phenomena of weather; we will be able to tell our own American people and the world a great deal more about climatic changes.

But more important, we will then be able to have the eyes that man has sought. Many of us recall that several years ago, President Eisenhower spoke about an open sky policy. President Eisenhower suggested then that we develop some means of scanning the nations of the world in order to see what is happening so as to make sure that there is no activity of an aggressive nature that could disturb the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that Mr. Johnson's determination to move along with the manned orbital laboratory program is indeed going to give this country a tremendous advantage in, not only peaceful means, but in an effort to retain the peace of the world.

It will also give man a tremendous advantage in scientific development, scientific research, and scientific discovery.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we Americans can be proud of the fact that we have an engineering team, that we have American industry and, yes, American industry operating under free enterprise in the competitive system that is capable of developing those instruments and the kind of lift and the kind of power that it takes to get a laboratory out into outer space, a laboratory that is going to furnish us so much information that we need in this mid-20th century of world development.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that as this program proceeds that other nations are going to watch with great interest the progress that we make.

It is my hope that with the know-how we have developed in the space program, through the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and through the various military services, that there will be no question in my mind that we will be able to launch this laboratory.

I believe though, Mr. Speaker, the most significant and important aspect of this latest development is the peaceful aspect of this program. This, indeed, can provide mankind with the open sky policies that we have been working for in order to let people know that we have no intentions for any aggressive moves and to let them know that we certainly know what is going on in the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, my hope is that the world is going to greet this announcement with the same degree of sincerity that President Johnson spoke about when he announced this program as a great harbinger of progress for mankind. It is an instrument which man can share and through its use understand the environment in which he lives.

Mr. Speaker, I believe President Johnson is to be congratulated for his decision and it is my hope that the Congress will certainly provide all of the funds and the laws, if such are necessary, in order to keep this program going.

This program is perhaps even more important than some of the other space achievements that we have accomplished. It is my hope that it is going to move along without any delay and with great success.

Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly congratulate the U.S. Air Force for the very significant role that it already has played and will continue to play in developing this manned orbital laboratory. The Air Force is to be highly commended for assembling a development and engineering team which makes the President's announcement possible today.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an article on this momentous announcement which appeared in the Evening Star of August 25.

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

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

JOHNSON OK'S MANNED SPACE LAB—PROJECT TAGGED AT $1.5 BILLION GETS GO-AHEAD—LATE 1966 IS TARGET OF AIR FORCE FOR FIRST FLIGHT TEST

A long-deferred go-ahead on a full-scale military manned space effort was announced today by President Johnson.

He opened his news conference at 10 a.m. with the announcement that the Pentagon had been told to proceed immediately "with development of a manned orbiting laboratory that will bring us new knowledge about what man can do in space."

His announcement came even as Soviet organs were leveling their propaganda guns at the Gemini V spacecraft because of military experimental equipment that is being carried on board.

And it followed only a day after the two-man crew of the orbiting Gemini capsule had sighted the launching of a Minuteman missile from California as they sailed far overhead. The astronauts spotted a similar launching today.

TARGET DATES

Johnson said unmanned test flights would start late next year or early in 1967 and that the first of five flights by two-man crews in the manned orbiting laboratory are scheduled for late in 1968.

The President coupled his announcement with an offer of cooperation in space with the Russians, plus an invitation to the Soviet Academy of Sciences to send "a very high representative" to the United States "next month to observe the launching of Gemini VI."

Gemini VI is scheduled as a 2-day mission involving rendezvous and docking in orbit with another vehicle. Contrary to Johnson's phrase "next month," the flight is scheduled for the last week in October.

CONTRACTORS LISTED

The manned orbiting laboratory (or "MOL" as it is known in space circles) will cost $1.5 billion, Johnson said. The prime contractors for various parts of the system are:

Douglas Aircraft Corp. of Santa Monica, Calif., for the MOL itself—a 10-foot cylinder 20 or more feet long in which astronauts will conduct experiments in orbit.

General Electric Corp. of Valley Forge, Pa., for experimental instruments to be used in the craft.

Martin Co., of Denver, and United Technology Center, of Sunnyvale, Calif., for the Titan 3C booster rocket consisting of a liquid fueled Titan rocket with 10-foot-diameter solid rocket outriggers.

McDonnell Aircraft Co. of St. Louis for a modified Gemini spacecraft such as is being used in the present flight of Astronauts L. Gordon Cooper and Charles Conrad.

TOTAL EXCEEDS $2 BILLION

The MOL decision is the most costly and wide-ranging one since the authorization of Project Apollo—the moon program—by the late President John F. Kennedy in May 1961.

The cost of MOL itself and the Titan 3C rocket which was developed to boost it will total well over $2 billion.

Project Gemini, the next most costly program in the space effort, will have cost about $1.3 billion by the time it runs its course early in 1967. Apollo will cost about $25 billion.

Johnson said the MOL program as presently authorized calls for a series of test launchings and unmanned flights beginning "late next year or early in 1967" and continuing through an "initial unmanned launch of a fully equipped manned orbiting laboratory" early in 1968.

FIVE MANNED FLIGHTS

A series of five manned flights will follow "soon afterward," Johnson said.

The MOL will carry a crew of two, which is the capacity of the Gemini spacecraft that will house the astronauts on the way up to orbit and return them to earth at the end of their flight.

It was expected that the Air Force will turn the job of MOL manager over to Brig. Gen. Joseph S. Bleymaier, Jr., 50, who developed the Titan 3C and who has been in charge of MOL planning for the last year.

PEACEFUL AIMS STRESSED

Apparently in an effort to avoid a charge of rocket rattling, Johnson stressed America's peaceful aims in outer space. Although military astronauts are now to be given an overt role in space, Johnson reaffirmed this country's undertaking not to orbit weapons of mass destruction.

Actually, most space experts feel there would be little point to putting a multimegaton bomb-carrying spacecraft into orbit. It would be quicker, cheaper, easier, and a great deal surer to rely on instant-action intercontinental missiles such as the Minuteman.

In discussing space cooperation with Russia, Johnson said:

"Even as we meet, Gemini 5, piloted by two very gallant men now orbits the earth as a dramatic reminder that our American dream of outer space is a dream of peace.

"We believe the heavens belong to the people of every nation. We will work through the United Nations to extend the rule of law to outer space."

INVITATION EXTENDED

The President said he had directed Administrator James E. Webb of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration "to invite the Soviet Academy of Sciences to send a very high representative here next month to observe the launching of Gemini 6."

The MOL announcement ends several months of waiting during which an anxious Air Force leadership kept hoping for a green light.

A favorable decision had been considered an almost cut-and-dried certainty 2 months ago, on the heels of a spectacularly successful maiden flight of the Titan 3.

Then the escalation of the war in Vietnam came along, forcing the Pentagon to ask for more money to finance the conflict. For a time, at least, MOL seemed to be a postponable luxury, like a third car at home when Sonny reaches driving age.

SILENCE FELL OVER PROJECT

Between the time of the Titan 3 launching and the present, a pall of silence was cast over MOL. Bleymaier, ebullient and irrepressible about MOL in July, bluntly refused to discuss the project a month later at a rocket meeting in San Francisco.

The Air Force wanted MOL for a number of reasons, not the least of which was a desire to stop being upstaged by the NASA civilians.

Although most of the NASA astronauts are officers in the regular Military Establishment, the fiction has been fostered that the program is strictly civilian.

Under the Eisenhower administration, the Air Force consistently was put down in all efforts to get a manned space role. A stumbling and unfeasible program called "Dyna-Soar" was started but was destined from the outset not to get off the ground.

PEACEFUL PURPOSES

Titan 3C initially was developed on the assumption that Dyna-Soar or something like it might eventually come along, but was not actually perfected until the MOL idea was fairly firmly fixed in planners' minds.

Reluctance to give the Air Force a manned space role stemmed in part from money considerations but also from a phrase in the basic space act of 1958 which declares that space is reserved "for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind."

The Eisenhower administration interpreted "peaceful" to mean "nonmilitary," a view which Johnson as vice president repeatedly told confidants he did not share.

In Johnson's opinion, it is consistent with peace to keep guardians of peace in orbit.

AIR FORCE CONTENTION

All along, the Air Force has contended that its proper arena of action is something called "aerospace," which starts at sea level and goes up as far as man can contrive to reach.

The Air Force argument has been about as follows:

The upper atmosphere was not closed to military aircraft once planes were built that could climb above 20,000 feet. On the same line of reasoning, it is fatuous to say that the Air Force may operate at 100,000 feet—as many military planes do—but not at 600,000 feet, which is a typical orbital altitude.

It appeared from today's announcement that Johnson and his advisers agree with the Air Force's argument.

BETTER EDUCATION THROUGH TAX SHARING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am tomorrow introducing legislation which would return revenue collected by the Federal Government to the States for support of public elementary and secondary education.

Many of the services that our State and local governments must perform, including the education of our children, are becoming more and more difficult to provide as costs rise, population expands, and the problems of commerce, city, and farm become increasingly complex and costly.

State and local expenditures in 1964 are six times greater than they were in 1946—only 18 years ago. State and local outlays in the field of education alone have increased over 700 percent in the same period from $3 billion in 1946 to $22 billion last year. In 1964 State and local governments spent $65 billion, twice the amount the Federal Government spends on domestic programs. Over the past 10 years State and local expenditures have risen at 8 percent a year—twice as fast as the gross national product. Total educational outlays are expected to double in the next 7 years. Economists estimate that the State and local governments which spent $65 billion last year will spend $82 billion in 1967 and $100 to $120 billion by the end of this decade.

The present financial resources of State and local governments are inadequate to meet the rising demands placed upon them. State taxes have gone from $4.9 billion in 1946 to $24.2 billion in 1964—an average increase of over $1 billion a year. A sharp jump in 1963 produced a hike in property taxes of 7.3 percent over the previous year, sales taxes went up 8.7 percent, corporate and individual income taxes 7.5 and 6.3 percent respectively—all in 1 year.

In the 5 fiscal years beginning in fiscal 1959, there were 52 increases in State cigarette and tobacco taxes, 42 increases in levies on alcoholic beverages, 18 on general sales taxes, 17 on individual income, and 18 on motor fuel. Today every State taxes motor fuels and alcoholic beverages. All except 16 States tax personal income, all except 13 States tax corporate income and general sales and all except 2 tax tobacco products. Almost every imaginable tax resource has been subjected to increasing and even undesirable pressures.

The property tax which supplies 45 percent of State and local revenue is reaching the limit to which it can be tolerated. Property taxes are often inequitable in that they apply to only one kind of wealth. Huge nonproperty resources can escape taxation while the individual who owns property cannot even obtain an adjustment for debt outstanding against his property. Homeowners with small incomes are hit hard. Retired persons and widows often suffer greatly. Additionally this tax is too often open to maladministration and occasional misuse.

Consumption taxes have skyrocketed in some States. Five percent which many economists see as the upper reasonable limit has been reached in several States and broken in selected tax rates. In 10 States Governors have requested sales tax increases and extensions in 1965. But this is a regressive tax. It places a burden on the large family. It can produce pressure for inflationary wage increases but more often it discourages consumption and investment and thus has a deflationary effect. While the sales tax can be useful within limits, the limits are rapidly being reached.

Additional tax increases invite voter retaliation at the polls. The political risks involved in raising taxes are tremendous. In 1962, 13 Governorships changed hands, it is felt, due to tax increases.

The Federal Government has at its disposal the broadest source of tax collection—the income tax. It is highly

efficient and generally equitable. It expands with a growing economy. It has, on the whole, been administered most effectively at the Federal level.

At the same time the greatest knowledge of local problems, especially in education at the elementary and secondary level, rests in the local community with parents, PTA's, teachers, school boards, State and local community officials—not with the Federal Government in Washington. I would recommend that we combine the maximum strength of both these approaches into one effective solution to the problems of public elementary and secondary education.

I propose that 1 percent of the Federal revenue received from the Internal Revenue Code and tariff schedule be returned to the States the first year, 2 percent the second year, up to 5 percent the fifth year and thereafter. This money will be deposited in a trust fund administered by the Secretary of the Treasury who would be responsible for returning the money to the States.

Half of the money would be returned on a straight per student basis.

The remaining half of the formula would be based in the amount of effort each State is putting into public elementary and secondary education.

Effort is defined as the percent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education. The mathematics of the formula work as follows: The percent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education is multiplied by the number of enrolled students in public elementary and secondary schools. This figure I call a "State product." To determine the actual number of dollars each State receives under the "effort section" each State's percent of the sum total of "State products" is multiplied by the amount of money available in the effort section.

To guarantee that the money being shared with the States is spent for educational purposes, each Governor must submit an outline of how his State plans to spend the money to the Comptroller General of the United States. The Comptroller General must determine within 60 days whether or not the plan fits within the intent of Congress. If the plan is not disapproved within 60 days, it will be considered approved. If disapproved, the Governor will have the right to appeal the decision to the U.S. court of appeals in his district.

Additionally each State must submit an audit each year to the Comptroller General detailing how the tax rebate was actually spent.

The benefits from this approach to solving a pressing problem are manifold. First and foremost, of course, it would be an enormous boost toward meeting our responsibilities as legislators concerned with the welfare of our children. My own State of Tennessee while currently low in the effort she is making in education would nevertheless, first, have her pupil expenditure increased by over 35 percent when the program is fully operational—in its fifth year—and second, be provided with a meaningful incentive to increase her effort. I am inserting in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point five tables which estimate how much money each State will receive under my bill—assuming for convenience that 1 percent of the revenue from the Internal Revenue Code and tariff schedule equals $1 billion. Also I am inserting a table showing how much effort each State is putting into education in order of their ranking.

This expenditure represents the soundest investment Americans can make—far sounder than many of the programs the U.S. Government now undertakes. Simply stated, this is an investment in our children, their well-being, and their opportunities for tomorrow.

Second, this approach would, in my opinion, yield the greatest return for dollar expenditures, and it would utilize the maximum capabilities of each level of government—Federal, State, and local.

Third, it would keep the door open for maximum individuality, freedom of expression, and personal choice. Thereby, it would encourage individual responsibility instead of undermining it. The relative absence of Federal controls would serve to insure this.

Fourth, the statistics I have cited indicate the States are badly in need of financial relief. They are trying to meet their responsibilities but a severe imbalance has developed in the revenue structure at all levels of government. Tax sharing would first, provide additional financial assistance; and second, might save some States from going into bankruptcy. State and local taxation now is increasing at about double the rate the income is increasing. Since World War II, the Federal debt has gone up 20 percent while State and local debt has gone up 600 percent. Clearly, tax sharing will supply needed relief.

Finally, if successful, and I believe it will be, it would set a historic precedent for a whole new concept of Federal-State relationships which could well solve the continuing dilemma faced by liberals and conservatives alike—that of finding solutions to national problems while maximizing personal freedom. If we are to earn our freedom, then we must solve this vexing dilemma.

The preservation of our uniquely excellent Federal system is incumbent upon all of us. Increasing emphasis on the role of State government in that system will tend to strengthen the entire structure of government in its effort to serve all our people. It will guard against growing centralism in Washington.

A multiplicity of viable State and local governmental units forces each government to face the often rugged tests of comparison and contrast. It permits a wide variety of values and protects minority and regional interests. Innovation, experimentation, and progress grow best in a small area. What works well in one setting can spread to others.

Our national problems cannot be solved by an easy "No" to every new proposal offered by the so-called other side, because there is no other side when we seek to preserve our freedom and create a greater opportunity for our children. Our problems will be solved by a nation ever receptive to creative ideas and ever responsive to the continuing need for initiative and incentive.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my address to the House, I am inserting in the RECORD at this time five tables which estimate the amount of money each State will receive under the tax sharing for education bill which I will formally introduce tomorrow. The tables show the estimates of the amount of money each State will receive the first 5 years the program is in operation:

1st year (1 percent distribution)

State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]	State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]
Utah	$3,411,921	$4,920,000	$17.40	$8,331,921	$29.47	New York	$37,779,324	$38,250,000	$12.22	$76,029,324	$24.29
Montana	1,991,191	2,815,000	17.06	4,806,191	29.13	Iowa	7,489,843	7,500,000	12.08	14,989,843	24.16
New Mexico	3,141,496	4,410,000	16.94	7,551,496	29.01	Vermont	989,445	990,000	12.07	1,979,445	24.15
Alaska	678,422	945,000	16.81	1,623,422	28.86	Texas	29,748,751	29,695,000	12.05	59,443,751	24.12
Wyoming	1,062,649	1,375,000	15.61	2,437,649	27.69	South Carolina	7,528,195	7,445,000	11.76	14,973,195	23.84
Arizona	4,414,670	5,655,000	15.46	10,069,670	27.53	Oklahoma	7,243,200	7,015,000	11.69	14,258,200	23.76
South Dakota	1,980,351	2,515,000	15.33	4,695,351	27.40	Hawaii	1,830,945	1,825,000	11.57	3,655,945	23.64
Nevada	1,204,833	1,500,000	15.08	2,704,833	27.10	Maryland	8,882,239	8,530,000	11.59	17,412,239	23.66
Minnesota	9,513,001	11,745,000	14.90	21,258,001	26.97	Nebraska	3,745,084	3,670,000	11.56	7,415,084	23.63
Washington	8,674,625	10,665,000	14.84	19,339,625	26.91	Ohio	26,922,056	25,525,000	11.44	52,447,056	23.51
North Dakota	1,782,153	2,165,000	14.66	3,947,153	26.73	Alabama	9,907,961	9,370,000	11.41	19,277,961	23.48
Oregon	5,322,194	6,425,000	14.57	11,747,194	26.64	North Carolina	14,226,984	13,395,000	11.36	27,621,984	23.43
California	49,982,908	59,735,000	14.42	109,717,908	26.49	New Hampshire	1,513,466	1,395,000	11.12	2,908,466	23.19
Louisiana	9,491,453	11,145,000	14.17	20,636,453	26.24	Maine	2,633,458	2,415,000	11.05	5,046,458	23.12
Colorado	5,745,402	6,470,000	13.59	12,215,402	25.66	Virginia	11,697,224	10,670,000	11.01	22,367,224	23.08
Mississippi	6,987,925	7,820,000	13.50	14,807,925	25.58	New Jersey	15,153,317	13,825,000	11.01	28,978,317	23.08
Michigan	23,161,580	25,640,000	13.36	48,801,580	25.43	Georgia	12,578,794	11,345,000	10.88	23,933,794	22.95
Kansas	6,113,997	6,665,000	13.15	12,778,997	25.23	West Virginia	5,262,764	4,736,000	10.86	99,987,642	22.93
Wisconsin	10,036,841	10,310,000	12.40	20,346,841	24.47	Tennessee	10,435,411	9,280,000	10.73	19,715,411	22.80
Florida	14,297,593	14,600,000	12.32	28,897,593	24.39	Delaware	1,263,443	1,120,000	10.70	2,383,443	22.77
Arkansas	5,412,891	5,525,000	12.32	10,937,891	24.39	Kentucky	8,009,631	6,770,000	10.20	14,779,631	22.27
Idaho	2,082,480	2,120,000	12.28	4,202,480	24.36	Illinois	24,667,236	20,495,000	10.03	45,163,436	22.10
Indiana	13,281,372	13,535,000	12.30	26,817,372	24.43	Connecticut	6,761,273	5,475,000	9.77	12,236,273	21.84

See footnotes at end of table.

1st year (1 percent distribution)—Continued

State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]	State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]
Missouri	$11,448,022	$9,125,000	$9.62	$20,573,022	$21.69	Massachusetts	$11,988,328	$8,530,000	$8.58	$20,518,328	$20.66
Rhode Island	1,819,262	1,415,000	9.38	3,234,262	21.46	District of Columbia	1,706,932	960,000	6.78	2,666,932	18.86
Pennsylvania	26,706,764	20,400,000	9.22	47,106,764	21.29						

[1] Explanation of columns:
Col. 1: $500,000,000 divided up on a straight per student basis; $12.07 multiplied by number of enrolled students in the State.
Col. 2: Total dollar sum each State receives on EFFORT formula ($500,000,000).
Col. 3: Amount per student each State receives on EFFORT formula.
Col. 4: Total amount each State receives; addition of cols. 1 and 2.
Col. 5: Overall amount each State receives on a per student basis.

NOTES

1. The figures in col. 1 are taken from "Fall 1964, Statistics of Public Schools," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Number of enrolled students for fall 1964 divided into $500,000,000.

2. EFFORT is defined as the amount of gross personal income of each State spent on public elementary and secondary schools. This is taken from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition. Mathematics involved: EFFORT times enrolled students equals a "State product." Total dollars received in col. 2 under EFFORT section is determined by multiplying each State's percent of sum total of all "State products" times $500,000,000 (or amount authorized under EFFORT section).

2d year (2 percent distribution)

State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]	State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]
Utah	$6,823,842	$9,840,000	$34.81	$16,663,842	$58.95	Texas	$59,497,503	$59,390,000	$24.10	$118,887,503	$48.24
Montana	3,982,383	5,630,000	34.13	8,961,238	58.27	South Carolina	15,056,391	14,890,000	23.53	29,946,391	47.68
New Mexico	6,282,992	8,820,000	33.89	15,102,992	58.03	Oklahoma	14,486,400	14,030,000	23.38	28,516,400	47.52
Alaska	1,356,844	1,890,000	33.62	3,246,844	57.77	Hawaii	3,658,290	3,650,000	23.15	7,311,890	47.29
Wyoming	2,225,299	2,750,000	31.24	4,875,299	55.38	Maryland	17,764,478	17,060,000	23.18	34,824,478	47.32
Arizona	8,829,340	11,310,000	30.92	20,139,340	55.06	Nebraska	7,490,168	7,340,000	23.12	14,830,168	47.27
South Dakota	3,960,702	5,030,000	30.66	9,390,702	54.80	Ohio	53,844,113	51,050,000	22.88	104,894,113	47.03
Nevada	2,409,667	3,000,000	30.05	5,409,667	54.20	Alabama	19,815,922	18,740,000	22.83	38,555,922	46.97
Minnesota	19,026,002	23,490,000	29.80	42,516,002	53.95	North Carolina	28,453,969	26,790,000	22.73	55,243,969	46.87
Washington	17,349,250	21,330,000	29.68	38,679,250	53.82	New Hampshire	3,026,933	2,790,000	22.25	5,816,933	46.39
North Dakota	3,564,306	4,330,000	29.32	7,894,306	53.47	Maine	5,266,916	4,830,000	22.11	10,092,916	46.25
Oregon	10,644,389	12,850,000	29.14	23,494,389	53.28	Virginia	23,394,449	21,340,000	22.02	44,734,449	46.16
California	99,965,817	119,470,000	28.85	219,435,817	52.99	New Jersey	30,306,635	27,650,000	22.02	57,956,635	46.16
Louisiana	18,982,906	22,290,000	28.34	41,272,906	52.49	Georgia	25,157,589	22,690,000	21.77	47,867,589	45.91
Colorado	11,490,805	12,940,000	27.18	24,430,805	51.33	West Virginia	10,525,528	9,472,000	21.72	19,997,528	45.87
Mississippi	13,975,850	15,640,000	27.01	29,615,850	51.16	Tennessee	20,870,822	18,560,000	21.46	39,430,822	45.61
Michigan	46,323,161	51,280,000	26.72	97,603,161	50.86	Delaware	2,526,886	2,240,000	21.40	4,766,886	45.54
Kansas	12,227,994	13,330,000	26.31	25,557,994	50.46	Kentucky	16,019,263	13,540,000	20.40	29,559,263	44.54
Wisconsin	20,073,683	20,620,000	24.80	40,693,683	48.94	Illinois	49,334,473	40,990,000	20.06	90,326,873	44.20
Florida	28,595,187	29,200,000	24.65	57,795,187	48.79	Connecticut	13,522,547	10,950,000	19.54	24,472,547	43.69
Arkansas	10,825,783	11,050,000	24.64	21,875,783	48.78	Missouri	22,896,044	18,250,000	19.24	41,146,044	43.38
Idaho	4,164,960	4,240,000	24.57	8,404,960	48.72	Rhode Island	3,638,524	2,830,000	18.77	6,468,524	42.92
Indiana	26,562,274	27,070,000	24.60	53,634,745	48.74	Pennsylvania	53,413,529	40,800,000	18.44	94,213,529	42.58
New York	75,558,648	76,500,000	24.44	152,058,648	48.58	Massachusetts	23,976,657	17,060,000	17.17	41,036,657	41.20
Iowa	14,979,686	15,000,000	24.17	29,979,686	48.32	District of Columbia	3,413,864	1,920,000	13.57	5,333,864	37.72
Vermont	1,978,890	1,980,000	24.15	3,958,890	48.30						

[1] Explanation of columns:
Col. 1: $1,000,000,000 divided up on a straight per student basis.
Col. 2: Total dollar sum each State receives on EFFORT formula ($1,000,000,000).
Col. 3: Amount per student each State receives on EFFORT formula.
Col. 4: Total amount each State receives; addition of cols. 1 and 2.
Col. 5: Overall amount each State receives on a per student basis.

NOTES

1. The figures in col. 1 are taken from "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Number of enrolled students for fall 1964 divided into $1,000,000,000.

2. EFFORT is defined as the amount of gross personal income of each State spent on public elementary and secondary education. This is taken from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition. Mathematics involved: EFFORT times enrolled students equals a "State product." Total dollars received under this section (col. 2) is determined by multiplying each State's percent of sum total of all "State products" times $1,000,000,000 (or amount authorized under EFFORT section).

3d year (3 percent distribution)

State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]	State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]
Utah	$10,235,764	$14,760,000	$52.21	$24,995,764	$88.43	Texas	$89,246,255	$89,085,000	$36.15	$178,331,255	$72.36
Montana	5,973,575	8,445,000	51.19	14,418,575	87.41	South Carolina	22,584,586	22,335,000	35.30	44,919,586	71.52
New Mexico	9,424,489	13,230,000	50.83	22,654,489	87.05	Oklahoma	21,729,600	21,045,000	35.07	42,774,600	71.28
Alaska	2,035,266	2,835,000	50.44	4,870,266	86.65	Hawaii	5,492,836	5,475,000	34.72	10,967,836	70.94
Wyoming	3,187,949	4,125,000	46.86	7,312,949	83.07	Maryland	26,646,718	25,590,000	34.77	52,236,718	70.99
Arizona	13,244,010	16,965,000	46.38	30,209,010	82.60	Nebraska	11,235,253	11,010,000	34.69	22,245,253	70.90
South Dakota	5,941,053	7,545,000	45.99	14,086,053	82.20	Ohio	80,766,170	76,575,000	34.33	157,341,170	70.54
Nevada	3,614,501	4,500,000	45.08	8,114,501	81.30	Alabama	29,723,883	28,110,000	34.24	57,833,883	70.46
Minnesota	28,539,004	35,235,000	44.71	63,774,004	80.90	North Carolina	42,680,953	40,185,000	34.09	82,865,953	70.31
Washington	26,023,875	31,995,000	44.52	58,018,875	80.73	New Hampshire	4,540,399	4,185,000	33.37	8,725,399	69.59
North Dakota	5,346,459	6,495,000	43.99	11,841,459	80.20	Maine	7,900,375	7,245,000	33.16	15,139,375	69.38
Oregon	15,966,583	19,275,000	43.71	35,241,583	79.93	Virginia	35,091,673	32,010,000	33.03	67,101,673	69.25
California	149,948,726	179,205,000	43.27	329,153,726	79.49	New Jersey	45,459,952	41,475,000	33.03	86,934,952	69.25
Louisiana	28,474,359	33,435,000	42.52	61,909,359	78.73	Georgia	37,736,383	34,035,000	32.65	71,801,383	68.87
Colorado	17,236,208	19,410,000	40.78	36,646,208	76.99	West Virginia	15,788,292	14,208,000	32.58	29,996,292	68.80
Mississippi	20,963,776	23,460,000	40.52	44,423,776	76.74	Tennessee	31,306,233	27,840,000	32.20	59,146,623	68.41
Michigan	69,484,741	76,920,000	40.08	146,404,741	76.30	Delaware	3,790,330	3,360,000	32.10	7,150,330	68.31
Kansas	18,341,991	19,995,000	39.47	38,336,991	75.69	Kentucky	24,028,894	20,310,000	30.60	44,338,894	66.82
Wisconsin	30,110,525	30,930,000	37.20	61,040,525	73.41	Illinois	74,001,709	61,485,000	30.09	135,490,309	66.30
Florida	42,892,781	43,800,000	36.97	86,692,781	73.19	Connecticut	20,283,820	16,425,000	29.32	36,708,820	65.53
Arkansas	16,238,674	16,575,000	36.96	32,813,674	73.18	Missouri	34,344,067	27,375,000	28.86	61,719,067	65.08
Idaho	6,247,440	6,360,000	36.86	12,607,440	73.08	Rhode Island	5,457,787	4,245,000	28.16	9,702,787	64.38
Indiana	39,844,118	40,605,000	36.90	80,452,118	73.12	Pennsylvania	80,120,294	61,200,000	27.66	141,320,294	63.87
New York	113,337,972	114,750,000	36.66	228,087,972	72.88	Massachusetts	35,964,986	25,590,000	25.76	61,554,986	61.98
Iowa	22,469,529	22,500,000	36.26	44,969,529	72.48	District of Columbia	5,120,797	2,880,000	20.36	8,000,797	56.58
Vermont	2,968,335	2,970,000	36.23	5,938,335	72.45						

[1] Explanation of columns:
Col. 1: $1,500,000,000 divided up on a straight per student basis—enrolled students in public elementary and secondary schools.
Col. 2: Total dollar sum each State receives on EFFORT formula ($1,500,000,000).
Col. 3: Amount per student each State receives on EFFORT formula.
Col. 4: Total amount each State receives, addition of cols. 1 and 2.
Col. 5: Overall amount each State receives on a per student basis.

NOTES

1. The figures in col. 1 are taken from "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Number of enrolled students in public elementary and secondary schools for fall 1964 divided into $1,500,000,000.

2. EFFORT is defined as the amount of gross personal income of each State spent on public elementary and secondary education. This is taken from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition. Mathematics involved: EFFORT times enrolled students equals a "State product." Total dollars allocated to each State under this section of the bill is determined by multiplying each State's percent of sum total of all "State products" times $1,500,000,000 (or amount authorized under EFFORT section).

4th year (4 percent distribution)

State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]
Utah	$13,647,685	$19,680,000	$69.62	$33,327,685	$117.91
Montana	7,964,767	11,260,000	68.26	19,224,767	116.55
New Mexico	12,565,985	17,640,000	67.78	30,205,985	116.07
Alaska	2,713,688	3,780,000	67.25	6,493,688	115.54
Wyoming	4,250,599	5,500,000	62.48	9,750,599	110.76
Arizona	17,658,680	22,620,000	61.84	40,278,680	110.13
South Dakota	7,921,404	10,060,000	61.32	18,781,404	109.60
Nevada	4,819,335	6,000,000	60.11	10,819,335	108.40
Minnesota	38,052,005	46,980,000	59.61	85,032,005	107.90
Washington	34,698,500	42,660,000	59.36	77,358,500	107.64
North Dakota	7,128,612	8,660,000	58.65	15,788,612	106.94
Oregon	21,288,778	25,700,000	58.28	46,988,778	106.57
California	199,931,635	238,940,000	57.70	438,871,635	105.99
Louisiana	37,965,812	44,580,000	56.69	82,545,812	104.98
Colorado	22,981,611	25,880,000	54.37	48,861,611	102.66
Mississippi	27,951,701	31,280,000	54.03	59,231,701	102.32
Michigan	92,646,322	102,560,000	53.44	195,206,322	101.73
Kansas	24,455,988	26,660,000	52.63	51,115,988	100.92
Wisconsin	40,147,367	41,240,000	49.60	81,387,367	97.88
Florida	57,190,375	58,400,000	49.30	115,590,375	97.59
Arkansas	21,651,566	22,100,000	49.28	43,751,566	97.57
Idaho	8,329,920	8,480,000	49.15	16,809,920	97.44
Indiana	53,125,491	54,140,000	49.20	107,269,491	97.49
New York	151,117,296	153,000,000	48.88	304,117,296	97.17
Iowa	29,959,372	30,000,000	48.35	59,959,372	96.64
Vermont	3,957,780	3,960,000	48.31	7,917,780	96.60
Texas	$118,995,007	$118,780,000	$48.20	$237,755,007	$96.48
South Carolina	30,112,782	29,780,000	47.07	59,892,782	95.36
Oklahoma	28,972,800	28,060,000	46.76	57,032,800	95.04
Hawaii	7,323,781	7,300,000	46.30	14,623,781	94.56
Maryland	35,528,957	34,120,000	46.36	69,648,957	94.65
Nebraska	14,980,337	14,680,000	46.25	29,660,337	94.54
Ohio	107,688,227	102,100,000	45.77	209,788,227	94.06
Alabama	39,631,844	37,480,000	45.66	77,111,844	93.95
North Carolina	56,907,938	53,580,000	45.46	110,487,938	93.75
New Hampshire	6,053,866	5,850,000	44.50	11,633,866	92.79
Maine	10,533,833	9,660,000	44.22	20,185,833	92.51
Virginia	46,788,898	42,680,000	44.04	89,468,898	92.33
New Jersey	60,613,270	55,300,000	44.04	115,913,270	92.33
Georgia	50,315,178	45,380,000	43.54	95,735,178	91.83
West Virginia	21,051,056	18,944,000	43.44	39,995,056	91.73
Tennessee	41,741,644	37,120,000	42.93	78,861,644	91.22
Delaware	5,053,773	4,480,000	42.80	95,337,736	91.08
Kentucky	32,038,526	27,080,000	40.80	59,118,526	89.09
Illinois	98,668,946	81,980,000	40.12	180,653,746	88.40
Connecticut	27,045,094	21,900,000	39.09	48,945,094	87.38
Missouri	45,792,089	36,500,000	38.48	82,292,089	86.77
Rhode Island	7,277,049	5,660,000	37.55	12,937,049	85.84
Pennsylvania	106,827,059	81,600,000	36.88	188,427,059	85.16
Massachusetts	47,953,315	34,120,000	34.35	82,073,315	82.64
District of Columbia	6,827,729	3,840,000	27.15	10,667,729	75.44

[1] Explanation of columns:
Col. 1: $2,000,000,000 divided up on a straight per student basis. Enrolled students in public elementary and secondary schools.
Col. 2: Total dollar sum each State receives on EFFORT formula ($2,000,000,000).
Col. 3: Amount per student each receives on EFFORT formula.
Col. 4: Total amount each State receives; addition of cols 1 and 2.
Col. 5: Overall amount each State receives on a per student basis.

NOTES

1. The figures in col. 1 are taken from "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Number of enrolled students for fall 1964 divided into $2,000,000,000.
2. EFFORT is defined as the amount of gross personal income of each State spent on public elementary and secondary education. This is taken from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition. Mathematics involved: EFFORT times enrolled students equals a "State product." Total dollars received under this section (col. 2) is determined by multiplying each State's percent of sum total of all "State products" times $2,000,000,000 (or amount authorized under EFFORT section).

All succeeding years (5 percent distribution)

State	Col. 1 [1]	Col. 2 [1]	Col. 3 [1]	Col. 4 [1]	Col. 5 [1]
Utah	$17,059,607	$24,600,000	$87.03	$41,659,607	$147.39
Montana	9,955,959	14,075,000	85.33	24,030,959	145.69
New Mexico	15,707,482	22,050,000	84.73	37,757,482	145.09
Alaska	3,392,111	4,725,000	84.07	8,117,111	144.43
Wyoming	5,313,249	6,875,000	78.10	12,188,249	138.46
Arizona	22,073,350	28,275,000	77.31	50,348,350	137.67
South Dakota	9,901,756	12,575,000	76.65	23,476,756	137.01
Nevada	6,024,169	7,500,000	75.14	13,524,169	135.50
Minnesota	47,565,007	58,725,000	74.52	106,290,007	134.88
Washington	43,373,126	53,325,000	74.20	96,698,126	134.56
North Dakota	8,910,765	10,825,000	73.32	19,735,765	133.68
Oregon	26,610,973	32,125,000	72.86	58,735,973	133.22
California	249,914,544	298,675,000	72.13	548,589,544	132.49
Louisiana	47,457,265	55,725,000	70.87	103,182,265	131.23
Colorado	28,727,014	32,350,000	67.97	61,077,014	128.33
Mississippi	34,939,627	39,100,000	67.54	74,039,627	127.90
Michigan	115,807,903	128,200,000	66.81	244,007,903	127.17
Kansas	30,569,985	33,325,000	65.79	63,894,985	126.15
Wisconsin	50,184,209	51,550,000	62.00	101,734,209	122.36
Florida	71,487,969	73,000,000	61.63	144,487,969	121.99
Arkansas	27,064,458	27,625,000	61.61	54,689,458	121.97
Idaho	10,412,401	10,600,000	61.44	21,012,401	121.80
Indiana	66,406,864	67,675,000	61.51	134,086,864	121.87
New York	188,896,620	191,250,000	61.11	380,146,620	121.47
Iowa	37,449,215	37,500,000	60.44	74,949,215	120.80
Vermont	4,947,226	4,950,000	60.39	9,897,226	120.75
Texas	$148,743,759	$148,475,000	$60.25	$297,218,759	$120.61
South Carolina	37,640,978	37,225,000	58.84	74,865,978	119.20
Oklahoma	36,216,000	35,075,000	58.45	71,291,000	118.81
Hawaii	9,154,727	9,125,000	57.88	18,279,727	118.24
Maryland	44,411,197	42,650,000	57.96	87,061,197	118.32
Nebraska	18,725,422	18,350,000	57.82	37,075,422	118.18
Ohio	134,610,284	127,625,000	57.22	262,235,284	117.58
Alabama	49,539,806	46,850,000	57.08	96,389,806	117.44
North Carolina	71,134,923	66,975,000	56.83	138,109,923	117.19
New Hampshire	7,567,333	6,975,000	55.63	14,542,333	115.99
Maine	13,167,292	12,075,000	55.28	25,232,292	115.64
Virginia	58,486,123	53,350,000	55.05	111,836,123	115.42
New Jersey	75,766,588	69,125,000	55.06	144,891,588	115.42
Georgia	62,893,973	56,725,000	54.43	119,668,973	114.79
West Virginia	26,313,821	23,680,000	54.31	49,993,821	114.67
Tennessee	52,177,055	46,400,000	53.67	98,577,055	114.03
Delaware	6,317,217	5,600,000	53.50	11,917,217	113.86
Kentucky	40,048,158	33,850,000	51.01	73,898,158	111.37
Illinois	123,336,183	102,475,000	50.15	225,817,183	110.51
Connecticut	33,806,368	27,375,000	48.87	61,181,368	109.23
Missouri	57,240,112	45,625,000	48.11	102,865,112	108.47
Rhode Island	9,096,312	7,075,000	46.94	16,171,312	107.30
Pennsylvania	133,533,824	102,000,000	46.10	235,533,824	106.46
Massachusetts	59,941,644	42,650,000	42.94	102,591,644	103.30
District of Columbia	8,534,662	4,800,000	33.94	13,334,662	94.30

[1] Explanation of columns:
Col. 1: $2,500,000,000 divided up on a straight per student basis, $60.36 multiplied by number of enrolled students in the State.
Col. 2: Total dollar sum each State receives on EFFORT formula ($2,500,000,000).
Col. 3: Amount per student each State receives on EFFORT formula.
Col. 4: Total amount State receives; addition of cols. 1 and 2.
Col. 5: Amount overall that each State receives on a per student basis.

NOTES

1. The figures in col. 1 come from "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Number of enrolled students for fall 1964 divided into $2,500,000,000.
2. EFFORT is defined as the amount of Gross personal income of each State spent on public elementary and secondary education. This is taken from "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition. Mathematics involved: EFFORT × enrolled students equals a "State product." Each State's percent of sum total of all "State products" multiplied by $2,500,000,000 (or amount being authorized under this section) equals total dollars the State receives.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting here in the RECORD a table which ranks the States in terms of the estimates of total money each State will receive under the tax sharing for education bill when it is enacted and fully operational—that is, when 5 percent of the Federal revenue is being returned to the States:

Rankings of the States in terms of total money received under the Brock effort per student education plan, 1964 figures

	Amount
California	$548,589,544
New York	380,146,620
Texas	297,218,759
Ohio	262,235,284
Michigan	244,007,903

Rankings of the States in terms of total money received under the Brock effort per student education plan, 1964 figures—Con.

	Amount
Pennsylvania	$235,533,824
Illinois	225,817,183
New Jersey	144,891,588
Florida	144,487,969
North Carolina	138,109.923
Indiana	134,086,864
Georgia	119,668,973
Virginia	111,836,123
Minnesota	106,290,007
Louisiana	103,182,265
Missouri	102,865,112
Massachusetts	102,591,644
Wisconsin	101,734,209
Tennessee	98,577,055

Rankings of the States in terms of total money received under the Brock effort per student education plan, 1964 figures—Con.

	Amount
Washington	$96,698,126
Alabama	96,389,806
Maryland	87,061,197
Iowa	74,949,215
South Carolina	74,865,989
Mississippi	74,039,627
Kentucky	73,898,158
Oklahoma	71,291,000
Kansas	63,894,985
Connecticut	61,181,368
Colorado	61,077,014
Oregon	58,735,973
Arkansas	54,689,458
Arizona	50,348,350

Rankings of the States in terms of total money received under the Brock effort per student education plan, 1964 figures—Con.

	Amount
West Virginia	$49,488,821
Utah	41,659,607
New Mexico	37,757,482
Nebraska	37,075,422
Maine	25,232,292
Montana	24,030,959
South Dakota	23,476,756
Idaho	21,012,401
North Dakota	19,735,765
Hawaii	18,279,727
Rhode Island	16,171,312
New Hampshire	14,542,333
Nevada	13,524,169
District of Columbia	13,334,662
Wyoming	12,188,249
Delaware	11,917,217
Vermont	9,897,226
Alaska	8,117,111

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD two tables which indicate respectively, first, the rankings of the 50 States and the District of Columbia in terms of percent of gross personal income spent on public elementary and secondary education as available from the Office of Education for 1964–65, and second, the estimated expenditures for elementary and secondary education as available in the 1965 edition of the Digest of Educational Statistics in more detailed form. These tables, I feel, give a reasonably accurate index of the amount of effort each State is currently putting into education at the elementary and secondary level:

Rankings of the States in terms of percentage of gross personal income spent on elementary and secondary education, 1964–65

	Percent
Utah	6.89
Montana	6.76
New Mexico	6.71
Alaska	6.68
Wyoming	6.16
Arizona	6.12
South Dakota	6.07
Nevada	5.95
Minnesota	5.90
Washington	5.88
North Dakota	5.81
Oregon	5.77
California	5.71
Louisiana	5.61
Colorado	5.38
Mississippi	5.34
Michigan	5.29
Kansas	5.21
Wisconsin	4.91
Florida	4.88
Arkansas	4.88
Idaho	4.87
Indiana	4.87
New York	4.84
Iowa	4.80
Vermont	4.80
Texas	4.77
National average	4.74
South Carolina	4.66
Oklahoma	4.63
Hawaii	4.59
Maryland	4.59
Nebraska	4.58
Ohio	4.53
Alabama	4.52
North Carolina	4.50
New Hampshire	4.41
Maine	4.39
Virginia	4.36
New Jersey	4.36
Georgia	4.31
West Virginia	4.30
Tennessee	4.25

Rankings of the States in terms of percentage of gross personal income spent on elementary and secondary education, 1964–65—Continued

	Percent
Delaware	4.24
Kentucky	4.04
Illinois	3.97
Connecticut	3.87
Missouri	3.81
Rhode Island	3.72

Rankings of the States in terms of percentage of gross personal income spent on elementary and secondary education, 1964–65—Continued

	Percent
Pennsylvania	3.65
Massachusetts	3.40
District of Columbia	2.87

Source: Digest of Educational Statistics, 1965 edition, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

CHART 2

TABLE 43.—*Personal income, 1964, related to estimated expenditures for public elementary and secondary education, by region and State, 1964–65*

Region and State	Personal income		Estimated expenditures for public elementary and secondary education	
	Total (in millions)	Per capita	Total (in thousands) [1]	As a percent of personal income
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
United States	$487,881	$2,550	$23,106,854	4.74
North Atlantic	151,345		6,434,659	4.25
Connecticut	8,989	3,250	348,150	3.87
Delaware	1,682	3,426	71,343	4.24
Maine	2,107	2,130	92,525	4.39
Maryland	9,913	2,888	454,848	4.59
Massachusetts	15,598	2,922	530,000	3.40
New Hampshire	1,532	2,343	67,540	4.41
New Jersey	19,792	2,962	863,600	4.36
New York	56,240	3,139	2,722,000	4.84
Pennsylvania	29,509	2,575	1,067,824	3.65
Rhode Island	2,266	2,479	84,275	3.72
Vermont	877	2,144	42,096	4.80
District of Columbia	2,840	3,515	81,458	2.87
Great Lakes and Plains	140,043		6,538,511	4.67
Illinois	31,495	3,003	1,249,396	3.97
Indiana	12,201	2,529	594,470	4.87
Iowa	6,533	2,370	313,853	4.80
Kansas	5,141	2,311	263,000	5.21
Michigan	22,135	2,733	1,170,000	5.29
Minnesota	8,356	2,373	492,736	5.90
Missouri	11,441	2,595	435,500	3.81
Nebraska	3,407	2,302	156,100	4.58
North Dakota	1,298	2,012	75,450	5.81
Ohio	26,490	2,623	1,201,300	4.53
South Dakota	1,310	1,832	79,506	6.07
Wisconsin	10,236	2,492	502,200	4.91
Southeast	79,630		3,672,558	4.61
Alabama	5,918	1,737	267,533	4.52
Arkansas	3,157	1,633	153,952	4.88
Florida	13,008	2,280	635,222	4.88
Georgia	8,299	1,933	357,519	4.31
Kentucky	5,720	1,811	230,933	4.04
Louisiana	6,463	1,864	362,500	5.61
Mississippi	3,341	1,444	178,500	5.34
North Carolina	9,217	1,900	414,877	4.50
South Carolina	4,209	1,647	196,072	4.66
Tennessee	7,035	1,852	299,300	4.25
Virginia	9,738	2,224	424,500	4.36
West Virginia	3,525	1,962	151,650	4.30
West and Southwest	116,863		6,461,126	5.53
Alaska	782	3,128	52,253	6.68
Arizona	3,506	2,218	214,467	6.12
California	55,912	3,092	3,190,000	5.71
Colorado	5,093	2,591	274,205	5.38
Hawaii	1,777	2,579	81,541	4.59
Idaho	1,392	2,012	67,754	4.87
Montana	1,539	2,183	104,000	6.76
Nevada	1,325	3,248	78,861	5.95
New Mexico	2,026	2,010	135,985	6.71
Oklahoma	5,165	2,095	239,160	4.63
Oregon	4,868	2,602	280,800	5.77
Texas	22,611	2,175	1,079,000	4.77
Utah	2,157	2,174	148,600	6.89
Washington	7,861	2,634	462,200	5.88
Wyoming	849	2,475	52,300	6.16

[1] Includes current expenditures, capital outlay, and interest.

NOTE.—Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Sources: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, "Fall 1964 Statistics of Public Schools"; and U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics, "Survey of Current Business," April 1965.

(Source: A copy of page proof taken from U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education: "Digest of Educational Statistics," 1965 edition.)

COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DADDARIO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, since July 14, when I introduced H.R. 9848, a bill to create the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials, I have received a large volume of mail in support of the legislation and containing information that should be investigated without delay. I have, in fact, taken it upon myself to look into some of the complaints relative to indecent materials on display in the District of Columbia.

Responsible American citizens are indignant at the brash disregard for modesty and morality displayed by some—but not by any means all—newsstands, drugstores, and bookstore operators throughout too many communities of the land. Most of my correspondents recognize that flexible interpretations of the law by the courts have made it all but impossible for effective legal action against the guilty parties. Some, however, erroneously accuse police of laxity, whereas in most cases officers of the law are helpless either to arrest offenders or to require removal of objectionable materials.

You will be interested in the defiance exhibited by operators of a combined eating establishment and newsstand in Eatontown, N.J., during the past week. They not only publicly criticized a young man who objected to sales of pornographic literature, but had the temerity to write a warning to the borough council against an organized boycott. The letter follows:

> It may well be that some of these publications would be considered by a few individuals as not meeting their conception of good taste, but these publications are published and sold by the tens of millions throughout the length and breadth of this country and in practically every community in this country and State.
>
> They may be thought obscene and even prurient by having a lecherous imagination, but the Supreme Court of the land requires those so minded not to place obstacles in the way of others who wish to exercise their proper rights.
>
> We might also add that a recommended boycott of our business, or of the business of anyone else engaged in their lawful rights is unlawful and likewise un-American.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that lewd publications are sold by the tens of millions throughout the country, and this statistic alone should be enough to encourage quick enactment of H.R. 9848. It is also true that the Supreme Court makes it difficult to eliminate such materials from public view—another reason for creation of the Commission I recommend. Meanwhile, the general public should take note of the statement by Eatontown Mayor Herbert Werner after the merchants in question refused to remove objectionable material from the premises quoted from the Ashbury Park, N.J., Evening Press of August 19, 1965:

> The mayor said one course open to residents was to boycott the store. He added he was not advocating such a move.

As I suggested to Congress last month, alarmed citizens may be forced to utilize pickets against stores guilty of violating proper standards of morality.

I congratulate citizens of Eatontown who are determined to protect their children against the vile peddlers of filth and obscenity. I appreciate the interest indicated by the many honorable men and women who have encouraged my efforts in behalf of respectability and morality in communications media. I admit that I was shocked to receive the ugly details of a radio show relayed to me by an indignant resident of Michigan, and it is my intention to determine how the Federal Communications Commission will act in this regard.

But while we are waiting for the establishment and activation of the Commission, Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do about conditions in Washington, D.C? I have discussed the situation with a member of the Metropolitan Police Department, and I can assure you that he and his associates will cooperate in any way possible in the crusade to combat licentious literature.

President Johnson has appointed a blue-ribbon commission to conduct the war on crime, and I trust that one of its first forays will be against news dealers who defy decency.

J. Edgar Hoover has said:

> Sex-mad magazines are creating criminals faster than jails can be built to house them. I believe pornography is a major cause of sex violence. If we can eliminate the distribution of such items among impressionable school-age children, we shall greatly reduce our frightening sex crimes.

Where is the logical place to begin the war against pornography? Here in the District of Columbia, of course, for Washington should be the showplace of moral values for America and all the world. If we accept depravity and debauchery here, how can we provide the leadership that is so vital to the rest of the universe?

When I discussed this subject before the House on July 14, I received calls from several local reporters asking whether I would care to specify newsstands guilty of displaying the material I described. I did at that time indicate the locations of the accused, and now I should like to repeat those listings and at the same time add other repositories of filth in particularly prominent areas of Washington:

Newsstands at 14th Street and New York Avenue; on 14th Street between Eye and K; and across from the Treasury Department on 15th Street. At the latter site, two boys about 15 years of age were observed last Wednesday absorbing the contents of magazines that contained photographs of nude women in every imaginable position. This stand is just one block from the White House, and is therefore an attraction to those young boys and girls who may not have easy access to the dealers of pornography near hotels on 14th and K that are so popular with high school visitors from your constituency and mine.

Newsstands in the vicinity of 18th Street and Columbia Road NW., which is less than two blocks from a preparatory school and where many high school students transfer at bus stops. Here the young boy or girl may buy not only the latest indecent photographs, but also a variety of "party" records—disgusting monologs and dialogs designed to deprave young America.

A juke box and pinball game center at 13th Street and New York Avenue NW., a transfer stop for some high school students. Peepshows, at 10 and 25 cents, with women in the most lewd states of undress and indignity possible, are the attraction.

And the two squares of indecency—from D to F Streets on Ninth Street NW—provide the books, the peepshows and even the live acting on movie screens that comprise all the ingredients necessary for crime and immorality.

Because of the strategic locations of these dealerships in obscenity, local high school students will be able to take up the slack resulting from the decline in out-of-town traffic.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues and the press to visit these cesspots of pornography and perversion. With sufficient attendance, there is no doubt that H.R. 9848 will pass.

VIETNAM: SOME NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF THE HISTORICAL RECORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DADDARIO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Republican Committee on Planning and Research, I am proud of the prestigious and dedicated members of the committee who have worked to prepare a "white paper," entitled "Vietnam: Some Neglected Aspects of the Historical Record."

Members of the committee are Representative CATHERINE MAY of Washington, Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California, Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois, Representative ROBERT T. STAFFORD, of Vermont, Representative SAMUEL L. DEVINE, of Ohio, and Representative WILLIAM E. (BILL) BROCK, of Tennessee.

This paper is being issued by the Republican Committee on Planning and Research of the House of Representatives to recall facts which, while well known to specialists, have become obscured or forgotten in the mind of the public.

In the serious crisis in which the United States is now involved, support of the objective of stopping Communist aggression and safeguarding the freedom and independence of South Vietnam is the duty of all responsible people. Support of the President, who alone can lead the Nation to this objective, is a duty as long as the President holds to the objective and uses the means needed to attain it.

Support does not preclude examination of history to see how the Nation arrived at the present crisis and to evaluate past policy. That is the function of this report. A clear perspective on the past

is a first requisite to making the right decisions in the future.

The paper follows:

VIETNAM: SOME NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF THE HISTORICAL RECORD

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The involvement of the United States in Vietnam after World War II began with the decision of the Truman administration to provide economic and military aid in May 1950.

A fragile peace was brought to Vietnam by the Geneva Agreements of 1954, partitioning Vietnam into a Communist north and a non-Communist south. Contrary to most expectations, South Vietnam survived. Indeed, with generous aid from the United States, it achieved what the late President John F. Kennedy called a near miracle between 1954 and 1960. Secretary McNamara spoke of the history of South Vietnam in this period as "a success story."

When President Eisenhower left office, there was no crisis in South Vietnam. There were problems arising, particularly from a renewal of sporadic guerrilla activity by the Vietcong. The dimensions of the problems then compared with the present situation can be gauged from these facts:

1. In 1960, there were fewer than 700 American military personnel stationed in South Vietnam to train South Vietnamese; today, 125,000 troops are there or on their way there to fight.

2. In 1960, there were 5,000–6,000 Vietcong regulars in South Vietnam; today there are 70,000 regulars and 100,000 other Vietcong troops.[1]

3. In 1960, the cost of aiding South Vietnam to the United States was $250 million—72 percent of it economic aid; as of April 26, 1965, it was $1.5 billion on an annual basis, of which 25 percent was economic aid.[2]

4. In 1960, 2,000 South Vietnamese were killed or kidnaped by the Vietcong; in 1964, 11,349 were the victims of a similar fate.[3]

5. In 1960, exports from South Vietnam (a good barometer of economic activity) amounted to $86 million; in 1964, exports had dropped to $48 million.[4]

6. In 1960, and in 1962, more than 80 percent of the land area of South Vietnam was under the control of the South Vietnamese Government; today, it is 30 percent or less.

7. In 1960, two Americans had been killed by Vietcong action; as of August 19, 1965, 561 have been killed and more than 3,000 have been wounded, taken prisoner or are missing.[5]

The policy of the Democratic administration has too often been uncertain, providing a basis for miscalculation by the Communists. Policy has been altered abruptly. Conflicting statements have been issued. Deeds have not matched words. Among the specific features of policy subject to this criticism have been the whole handling of the problem of Laos, the reversal of the position of the United States toward the Diem regime, the cover-up of the gravity of the desperate dangers of the situation in Vietnam, President Johnson's campaign oratory of 1964, and the progressive dilution of official statements of the Nation's objective in Vietnam. The most generous recognition of the need for flexibility and change of policy in some circumstances cannot justify making a habit of inconstancy.

Both because it invites miscalculation and because it confuses the American public, the administration's lack of candor about the situation in Vietnam and about its own plans and actions is regrettable.

There should be no doubt that the American people will support the administration in the actions needed to establish the freedom and the security of South Vietnam. There will be greater national unity when the administration abandons the defects of substance and style noted in this report.

I. THE TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION

The involvement of the United States in the struggle in Vietnam that followed World War II dates from the Truman administration. It began with a decision announced by Secretary Acheson on May 8, 1950, to send "economic and military equipment to the Associated States of Indochina and to France in order to assist them in restoring stability and permitting these states to pursue their peaceful and democratic development."

The decision to aid the French in Vietnam was taken as part of a tardy and somewhat inconsistent policy of containment which the Truman administration put together after the fall of China to the Communists.

Aid to Vietnam under that policy implied no commitment to put more than arms and equipment and dollars into the conflict. This was clear from the authoritative statement of the Truman administration's Asiatic policy given by Secretary Acheson on January 12, 1950. The mild and equivocal warning which Mr. Acheson gave to the Asiatic aggressors in that speech drew a line in the Pacific Ocean marking the outermost limits of the defense perimeter of the United States. The islands east of that line were said to be vital to the security of this country and, Mr. Acheson implied, would be defended by the United States by force. The Asiatic mainland, including Indochina (and Korea) lay beyond the defense perimeter where, according to Secretary Acheson, an attack should be met by action of the United Nations.[6]

Although the policy enunciated in January was reversed in Korea 6 months later by the commitment of American forces in warfare, the Truman administration never considered providing manpower in Indochina. In fact, it twice rebuffed appeals from the French for a pledge of air and naval support in the event that the Chinese Communists provided manpower for the conflict in Indochina.[7] In response to such appeals, the Government of the United States said only that Chinese Communist aggression in southeast Asia "would require the most urgent and earnest consideration by the United Nations."

Involvement in a costly war in Korea did not, however, prevent the Truman administration from supplying substantial aid to save Indochina from Communist conquest. Approximately $375 million of military and economic assistance was channeled to southeast Asia by the American taxpayer through fiscal year 1953.

In August of 1950, an American military assistance advisory group of 35 personnel was sent to Indochina to advise on the use of American equipment. Despite this assistance, the situation of the French and their native forces continued to deteriorate. When President Truman left the White House, all of Vietnam above the 17th parallel except Hanoi, a narrow corridor connecting to a coastal strip around Haiphong, and a part of the northeastern T'ai Highlands were under control of the Communist Viet Minh. In addition, Viet Minh forces were in effective control of large areas south of the 17th parallel—the central highlands and the tip of the Camau Peninsula, the southernmost part of the country.

II. THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

President Eisenhower continued the program of military and economic aid to France and the Associated States of Indochina at levels set by the previous administration until the fall of 1953.[8] In September 1953, increased aid of $385 million through 1954 was promised by the United States after two modifications of French policy had been decided on—both of them measures designed to avert impending disaster.

Under the twin pressures of military reverses in Indochina and the prodding of the United States, France agreed on July 3, 1953, to take steps "to complete the independence and sovereignty of the Associated States * * * within the French Union." Although France, in 1949, by the Elysee Agreement had conferred a measure of self-government on the Associated States of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, too little was given to satisfy the thirst for independence. Secretary Dulles, hailing the belated French decision of July 1953, said, "The peoples of these countries needed something of their own for which to fight."[9] There was hope that the war, even at this late date, could be cleansed of the appearance of colonialism and would no longer seem to Asiatics to be an effort by France to hold on to her Asiatic possessions.

The second significant decision was incorporated in the Navarre plan—a plan of aggressive military action with increased French and native forces.

With these two conditions realized—a promise of independence for Indochina and the decision to intensify the military effort—the Eisenhower administration increased American assistance.

After the conclusion of the Korean armistice on July 27, 1953, keeping the Chinese Communists from active military participation in Indochina became one of the concerns of American policymakers. On the day of the armistice, the 16 members of the United Nations that had helped to defend South Korea issued a joint warning against Chinese Communist action in southeast Asia.[10] On September 2, Secretary Dulles warned that such aggression in Indochina "could not occur without grave consequences which might not be confined to Indochina."[11]

In the spring of 1954, as the French situation became desperate, the Eisenhower administration sought to persuade other nations with interests in southeast Asia to engage in a joint undertaking to stave off collapse. On April 4, President Eisenhower sent a letter to Winston Churchill suggesting "united action" on the part of the United States, England, France, the Associated States, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, and the Philippines. "The coalition," Mr. Eisenhower wrote, "must be strong and must be willing to join the fight if necessary."

If the forces of the United States were sent to southeast Asia, the President made it clear that they would go principally for purposes other than ground warfare. He told Churchill, "I do not envisage the need of any appreciable ground forces on your or our part." Shortly thereafter, in a letter to General Gruenther at NATO, President Eisenhower reaffirmed his intention to avoid commitment of American forces to ground warfare, writing, "Additional ground forces

[1] Vietcong strength in 1960 extrapolated from figures given in "A Threat," pp. 9–10. Present strength reported by McNamara, CBS News Special Report—Vietnam Perspectives, Aug. 9, 1965.

[2] "Background" p. 231; McNamara, "Background" p. 218. $800,000,000 of the current expenditure is for the support of U.S. forces in Vietnam.

[3] "A Threat," p. 13; "Aggression," p. 62.

[4] "International Financial Statistics" vol. XVIII, No. 7, (July 1965), International Monetary Fund, pp. 296–297.

[5] New York Times, Aug. 20, 1965.

[6] Department of State Bulletin, Jan. 23 and Mar. 27, 1950.

[7] New York Times, Sept. 14, 1951, Jan. 14, Jan. 29, 1952.

[8] "Background," p. 26.

[9] New York Times, July 18, 1953.

[10] New York Times, Aug. 8, 1953.

[11] New York Times, Sept. 3, 1953.

should come from Asiatic and European troops already in the region." [12]

On June 11, 1954, Secretary Dulles, in a speech delivered at Los Angeles, detailed the conditions under which the United States would consider additional help to the French: (1) a request for assistance from the states fighting the Communists; (2) clear assurance (from France) of complete independence to Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam; (3) an indication of concern and support on the part of the United Nations; (4) assurance of collective action by other nations along with the United States; and (5) a guarantee that France would not withdraw from the conflict once a further commitment was extended by others.

The last two conditions laid down by Secretary Dulles were the decisive obstacles to the formulation of any plan for intervention. Negotiations to bring about the formation of a coalition of nations to support the French failed because England was unwilling to participate and because France was unwilling to continue a fight which had gone on for 8 years and had cost more than 140,000 French casualties.

The Geneva Conference of 1954

In these circumstances the Geneva Conference opened. On May 6—the eve of the negotiations on Indochina and of the fall of Dien Bien Phu—Lyndon B. Johnson, Harry S. Truman, and other leading Democrats issued ill-timed statements condemning administration policy in southeast Asia on vague grounds. The New York Times of May 7, under the headline, "Democrats Open All-out Assault on Administration Foreign Policy," reported:

"An all-out Democratic attack on the Eisenhower administration's foreign policy, the first such attack since the President took office, was opened tonight.

"The effect was to put the administration on dual notice (1) that the bipartisanship of the last 16 months was breaking up and (2) that the congressional Democrats could not be counted upon for unquestioning general support in the field of world affairs."

The article quoted Mr. Johnson as saying:

"It is apparent only that American foreign policy has never in all its history suffered such a stunning reversal.

"We have been caught bluffing by our enemies. Our friends and allies are frightened and wondering, as we do, where we are headed.

"We stand in clear danger of being left naked and alone in a hostile world."

Despite this effort by the loyal opposition to pull the rug out from under the Eisenhower administration as the critical Geneva Conference opened, the United States attempted to salvage what could be saved.

Representatives of nine governments assembled at Geneva to ring down the curtain on the French empire in Asia—Great Britain, the Soviet Union, France, Communist China, the United States, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (north), the State of Vietnam (south), Cambodia, and Laos. Three similar armistice agreements were concluded relating to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and a declaration was issued.

Besides stipulations on the cessation of hostilities and pledges against resumption, the armistice agreements provided for withdrawal of foreign troops and prohibited Laos, Cambodia, and the two parts of Vietnam from joining any military alliance or granting military bases to foreign powers.

The Geneva Agreements in effect recognized as Communist territory Vietnam north of the 17th parallel and two provinces in northeastern Laos—Phongsaly and Sam-Neua.

Presenting the agreements to the French Parliament, Premier Mendes-France characterized them as "cruel because they sanction cruel facts." They reflected, he declared, "losses already suffered or made inevitable by the mililtary situation." [13]

If anything, the territorial settlement reached at Geneva was better than the non-Communists nations deserved on the basis of the existing military situation.

Vietnam, north of the 17th parallel, had already been almost totally occupied by the Viet Minh forces. The treaty provisions formalized this conquest, but they also required the Viet Minh to withdraw from South Vietnam, vast areas of which were under their control. Some 80,000 to 90,000 Viet Minh troops were moved out of South Vietnam in the execution of the agreement.[14] Perhaps 5,000 to 6,000 melted into the civilian population and remained in violation of the Geneva Agreement.[15]

The territorial arrangements contained in the agreements were, on their face, temporary. North and South Vietnam, like North and South Korea, were ostensibly established for primarily military reasons as zones for the orderly liquidation of hostilities and the beginning of peaceful reconstruction.

The armistice agreement relating to Vietnam reads that the 17th parallel "should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." The conference declaration envisaged the reunification of Vietnam, providing for the selection of a government for the entire country by free general elections to be held in 1956.

Similarly, the assignment of two northeastern provinces of Laos as sanctuaries for troops of the Communist Pathet Lao not wishing to be demobilized was, by the terms of the agreement, temporary—"pending a political settlement."

The United States did not sign any of the three treaties concluded at Geneva nor the conference declaration. Nor did South Vietnam.

At Geneva the United States issued a unilateral declaration pledging not to use force to disturb the agreements and warning that renewed aggression in violation of the agreements would be viewed as a threat to international peace and security. At the same time President Eisenhower announced that steps would be taken to establish collective defense against Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

The attitude of the U.S. Government toward Geneva was summarized by the President, "The agreement contains features which we do not like, but a great deal depends on how they work in practice." [16]

The chief flaw of the Geneva settlement lay in provisions relating to the International Control Commissions, set up to supervise the execution of the agreements. The Commissions, composed of representatives of Canada, India, and Poland, could act only by unanimous vote in cases involving violations of the territory covered by the agreements. A veto in the hands of a Communist representative was an instrument for sabotaging the execution of the agreements.

Reaction to Geneva

The negotiations at Geneva produced a flood of criticism of the Eisenhower administration's foreign policy.

Yet all of the critics flatly opposed the only step which remained to undo the Communist conquest in Indochina—the commitment of American troops to a long and costly war. General Ridgway estimated that 5 to 10 American combat divisions would have been required at the outset to win such a war.[17]

Critic MIKE MANSFIELD said, "Almost all opinions converged on one point: The United States should not become involved alone in a shooting war in Indochina." At another time, he said:

"No, I was never in favor of intervention and I am opposed to it now. I think it would be suicidal. I believe the worst thing that could happen to the United States would be to have our forces intervene in Indochina and then bog down in the jungles there." [18]

Senator John F. Kennedy said:

"I am frankly of the belief that no amount of American military assistance in Indochina can conquer an enemy which is everywhere and at the same time nowhere, an enemy of the people which has the sympathy and covert support of the people * * *. I do not think Indochina can be saved unless the other Asiatic nations * * * are willing to take their fair part in the struggle * * *. For the United States to intervene unilaterally and to send troops into the most difficult terrain in the world, with the Chinese able to pour in unlimited manpower, would mean that we would face a situation which would be more difficult than even that encountered in Korea. It seems to me it would be a hopeless situation." [19]

Senator Estes Kefauver had this to say:

"But if the decision is to be made to intervene, I say this Nation needs more than the help of Great Britain, of Australia, of New Zealand, and of France. It must have the moral and physical support, in addition to the Philippines and Thailand, of Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon, Pakistan, and if not the help, at least the understanding of India." [20]

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY said, "We have had our bluff called two or three times in the last month. We have been defeated at Geneva." Somewhat illogically, since he opposed military intervention by the United States, Senator HUMPHREY attributed the defeat at Geneva to cuts made by the Eisenhower administration in the defense budget." [21]

The critics were not in agreement on the basis for their attacks on the administration. Adlai Stevenson thought the United States was too rigid and inflexible in negotiations.[22] MIKE MANSFIELD thought the United States should not have negotiated at all but should have stayed away from the Geneva Conference [23] ignoring the fact that such provisions, as that permitting Vietnamese who wished to escape Communist control to move to South Vietnam, were the result of the bargaining effort of the representatives of this Nation.

Finally, the critics undermined their case by conceding that the war in Indochina was lost because of French colonialism and not because of anything the United States did or failed to do. Adlai Stevenson made the point when he declared, "Had France * * * granted genuine independence in orderly, sincere stages to Vietnam, there very likely would have been no war in Indochina."

The disputed election of 1956

The final declaration issued at Geneva in 1954 (subscribed to by neither the United States nor South Vietnam) called for free elections to unify all of Vietnam in 1956. Recently Senator FULBRIGHT and others have deplored the fact that the election was not held.

At Geneva the representatives of what was to be South Vietnam "vainly protested against the partition of the country and against the principle of general elections being agreed upon when more than half of

[12] Eisenhower, "Mandate for Changes," pp. 346–347, 353.

[13] New York Times, July 23, 1954.

[14] "Aggression," p. 26.

[15] Bernard B. Fall, "How the French Got Out of Vietnam," New York Times magazine, May 5, 1965, p. 113.

[16] "Background," p. 60.

[17] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 8, p. 9999.

[18] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, loc. cit. and p. 10007.

[19] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 6, 1954.

[20] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 9, 1954.

[21] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1954.

[22] New York Times, Oct. 17, 1954.

[23] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 8, 1954.

the voters would be north of the 17th parallel. It vainly asked that the whole territory and population be placed under the control of the United Nations until the reestablishment of peace and security would permit the holding of really free general elections." [24]

The reasons for the refusal of South Vietnam to acquiesce in the holding of the election were stated by Prime Minister Diem on July 16, 1955:

"We did not sign the Geneva agreements. We are not bound in any way by these agreements entered into against the will of the Vietnamese people. Our policy is a policy of peace, but nothing will divert us from our goal: the unity of our country—a unity in freedom and not in slavery.

"We do not reject the principle of elections as a peaceful and democratic means to achieve unity. But elections can be one of the foundations of true democracy only on the condition that they are absolutely free. And we shall be skeptical about the possibility of achieving the conditions of free elections in the north under the regime of oppression carried on by the Vietminh." [25]

There was clearly no legal obligation on the Government of South Vietnam to abide by the terms of the final declaration. The position of South Vietnam on this point was sustained by the United Kingdom, one of the cochairmen of the Geneva conference, in the following statement:

"Her Majesty's government has always regarded it as desirable that these elections should be held and has advised the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to enter into consultations with the Vietminh authorities in order to insure that all the necessary conditions obtained for a free expression of the national will as a preliminary to holding free general elections by secret ballot. Nevertheless, Her Majesty's government does not agree that (South Vietnam) is legally obliged to follow the course. * * * It may be recalled that, at the final session of the Geneva Conference on Indochina * * * the Vietnamese Government formally protested 'against the hasty conclusion of the Armistice Agreements by the French and Vietminh high commands only' * * * and 'against the fact that the French high command was pleased to take the right, without a preliminary agreement of the delegation of (South Vietnam), to set the date of future elections." [26]

Among the stanchest opponents of the holding of the 1956 election was Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts. He issued "a plea that the United States never give its approval to the early nationwide elections called for by the Geneva Agreement of 1954. Neither the United States nor free Vietnam was a party to that agreement—and neither the United States nor free Vietnam is ever going to be a party to an election obviously stacked and subverted in advance, urged upon us by those who have already broken their own pledges under the agreement they now seek to enforce." [27]

Even Hans Morgenthau spoke against action to carry out the provisions of the Geneva declaration relating to elections:

"Free elections are very subtle instruments which require a dedication to certain moral values and the existence of certain moral conditions which are by no means prevalent throughout the world, and certainly not prevalent in either North or South Vietnam." [28]

Conditions in South Vietnam, 1954–60

As South Vietnam began its existence, the prospects for its survival were minimal. Independence was thrust upon a people without political experience and without political leadership. It had no sense of nationhood. It had no industry. And, by the Geneva declaration, it seemed doomed to being swallowed up by the Communist rulers of North Vietnam in 2 years.

Some of the difficulties facing the newly selected Prime Minister Ngo Dinh Diem were outlined by one observer in these words:

"The circumstances under which the man came to power were unbelievable. He faced the opposition of the Communists * * * he also had to deal with the open hostility of French military men and the remnants of the French colonial service, who regarded him as anti-French, and who expected him to last only a few weeks at the most. Then, as a consequence of a provision of the Geneva accords, authorizing free movement between the north and south zones for a limited period, more than 850,000 refugees came into South Vietnam from the Communist North Vietnam during the next 300 days, to be fed, clothed, and housed. In addition, he found that his 'full powers, civil and military,' an extraordinary grant which Bao Dai had conceded him as a condition of his acceptance of office, existed principally on paper." [29]

Yet when the Eisenhower administration left office, South Vietnam had a stable and established government.

Senator John F. Kennedy called the development "a near miracle." In his book, "Strategy of Peace," published in 1960, he said:

"In what everyone thought was the hour of total Communist triumph, we saw a near miracle take place * * * Today that brave little state (South Vietnam) is working in free and friendly association with the United States, whose economic and military aid has, in conditions of independence, proved effective." [30]

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, on February 26, 1960, reported as chairman of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

"By any measure Vietnam has made great progress under President Ngo Dinh Diem in the improvement of internal security, in the creation of the forms and institutions of popularly responsible government where before few existed, and in the advancement of the welfare of the people of Vietnam. The U.S. aid program has been an important factor in that progress. It is still an important factor." [31]

The State Department's white paper of December 1961, "A Threat to the Peace," contains the following analysis of progress in South Vietnam:

"The years 1956 to 1960 produced something close to an economic miracle in South Vietnam. Food production rose an average of 7 percent a year and prewar levels were achieved and passed. While per capita food production in the north was 10 percent lower in 1960 than it had been in 1956, it was 20 percent higher in the south. The output of textiles in the south jumped in only 1 year from 68 million meters (in 1958) to 83 million meters. Sugar production in the same 1-year span increased more than 100 percent, from 25,000 metric tons to 58,000 metric tons.

"Despite the vastly larger industrial plant inherited by the north when Vietnam was partitioned, gross national product is considerably larger in the south. In 1960 it was estimated at $110 per person in the south and $70 in the north. Foreigners who have visited both north and south testify to the higher living standards and much greater availability of consumer goods in the latter.

"The record of South Vietnam in these recent years is written in services and in improved welfare as well as in cold economic indexes. A massive resettlement program effectively integrated the 900,000 refugees from the north into the economic and social fabric of the south. An agrarian reform program was designed to give 300,000 tenant farmers a chance to buy the land they work for a modest price. Under the Government's agricultural credit program aimed at freeing the farmers from the hands of usurers, loans to peasant families increased fivefold between 1957 and 1959.

"Thousands of new schoolrooms were built and the elementary school population in South Vietnam increased from 400,000 in 1956 to 1,500,000 in 1960. A rural health program installed simple dispensaries in half of South Vietnam's 6,000 villages and hamlets. An elaborate malaria eradication program was launched to rid Vietnam of its most important infectious disease. Doctors and nurses went into training in South Vietnam and abroad to serve their people's health needs.

"This is a part, a very small part, of the setting against which the Vietcong launched their campaign of armed action, subversion, and terror against South Vietnam. It is a record of progress over a few brief years equaled by few young countries." [32]

Secretary McNamara added his testimony on March 26, 1964:

"The United States * * * provided help—largely economic.

"On the basis of this assistance and the brave, sustained efforts of the South Vietnamese people, the 5 years from 1954 to 1959 gave concrete evidence that South Vietnam was becoming a success story. By the end of this period, 140,000 landless peasant families had been given land under an agrarian reform program; the transportation system had been almost entirely rebuilt; rice production had reached the prewar annual average of 3.5 million metric tons—and leaped to over 5 million in 1960; rubber production had exceeded prewar totals; and construction was underway on several medium-size manufacturing plants, thus beginning the development of a base for industrial growth.

"In addition to such economic progress, school enrollments had tripled, the number of primary school teachers had increased from 30,000 to 90,000, and almost 3,000 medical aid stations and maternity clinics had been established throughout the country. And the South Vietnamese Government had gone far toward creating an effective apparatus for the administration of the nation. A National Institute of Administration had been established with our technical and financial assistance—a center for the training of a new generation of civil servants oriented toward careers of public service as opposed to the colonial concept of public rule." [33]

The progress which, by all this testimony, was made in South Vietnam between 1955 and 1960, was due in no small part to the assistance of the United States.

Without the support of the United States, South Vietnam would have been stillborn. During fiscal years 1955 through 1961, $2.3

[24] "Vietnam at the Crossroads of Asia," Embassy of Vietnam, D.C. 1960, p. 17.

[25] Francis J. Corley, "Vietnam Since Geneva," "Thought," vol. 33, No. 131 (winter 1958–59), p. 564.

[26] "Vietnam and the Geneva Agreements," London, May 1956, p. 9.

[27] "A Symposium on America's Stake in Vietnam" (American Friends of Vietnam, New York, 1956).

[28] Ibid.

[29] Wesley R. Fishel, "Free Vietnam Since Geneva," Yale Review (autumn 1959), p. 70.

[30] "Strategy of Peace," pp. 61–62.

[31] U.S. Aid Program in Vietnam, report of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Feb. 26, 1960, p. 1.

[32] "Threat," pp. 5–6.

[33] Department of State bulletin, Apr. 13, 1964, pp. 563–564.

billion—63 percent of it for economic purposes—was provided by the Eisenhower administration. Technical assistance was given on a large scale to increase and diversify the output of the country's economy and to spur the achievement of far-reaching social reforms, notably in the fields of education and diffusion of land ownership.

But a viable South Vietnam also required security from outside aggression and from terrorism and guerrilla activities within the country. To increase security, the Eisenhower administration proceeded promptly to form a regional defense organization, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and to bring South Vietnam, as well as Laos and Cambodia, within its protective cover.

Specifically to meet the threat of infiltration from North Vietnam and the depredations of guerrillas in the South, the United States provided military equipment and training to the forces of South Vietnam.

There can be no question that only the help of the United States made possible the survival of South Vietnam. Without it, everything south of the 17th parallel would have fallen to the Communists a decade ago.

No commitment of troops by Eisenhower

There is no merit in President Johnson's repeated explanation of the Nation's present military involvement in Vietnam as the result of President Eisenhower's letter of October 23, 1954, to Prime Minister Diem. The letter, as Secretary McNamara admitted on March 26, 1964, was in response to a request for "economic assistance." [34] It promised American help for the resettlement of refugees from North Vietnam and an exploration of "ways and means to permit our aid * * * to make a greater contribution to the welfare and stability of the Government of Vietnam." "* * * in the event such aid were supplied," President Eisenhower wrote, the United States would expect "assurances as to the standards of performance." The purpose of this conditional offer, he said, was "* * * to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." This was the extent of the commitment made in this letter.[35]

Any legal obligation which the United States might have to use its military force in defense of South Vietnam would result from the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty signed at Manila on September 8, 1954.

The framers of this treaty deliberately rejected the kind of automatic commitment incorporated in the NATO agreement summarized in the principle "an attack upon one is an attack upon all," requiring a military response by all parties to aggression against any signatory.

Article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty clearly reserves to each signatory the right to determine the nature of its response to armed aggression and does not commit in advance any signatory to use its armed forces to deal with the aggressor.[36]

Recognizing this fact, the Kennedy administration did not use American forces to repel Communist aggression in Laos. The legal commitment of the United States to South Vietnam is the same as its commitment to Laos. Both of these countries of southeast Asia were brought under the protection of SEATO.

Lyndon Johnson as Vice President made it clear in 1961 that the United States had not up to that time committed itself to an obligation that would require employment of its military forces. In a memorandum to President Kennedy dated May 23, 1961, right after his return from a tour of Asia, Johnson wrote:

"The fundamental decision required of the United States—and time is of the greatest importance—is whether we are to attempt to meet the challenge of Communist expansion now in southeast Asia by a major effort in support of the forces of freedom in the area or throw in the towel. This decision must be made in a full realization of the very heavy and continuing costs involved in terms of money, of effort, and of U.S. prestige. It must be made with the knowledge that at some point we may be faced with the further decision of whether we commit major U.S. forces to the area or cut our losses and withdraw should our efforts fail. We must remain master of this decision." [36a]

The New York Times of August 19, 1965, correctly stated the case when it said, "The shift from military assistance and combat advice to direct participation by American combat troops in the Vietnamese war has * * * been a unilateral American decision * * * by President Johnson."

The beginnings of the Communist offensive

Although the Government of South Vietnam never established unchallenged authority in the entire countryside, a period of relative peace and stability extended from 1955 to 1959. Late in the latter year the tempo of guerrilla attacks began to assume significant proportions.

During 1960 the armed forces of the Vietcong began to increase from the level of 3,000 at the beginning of the year. During this year the Vietcong assassinated or kidnaped more than 2,000 people—military and civilian. Acts of terrorism were directed particularly against local officials in rural areas to leave the countryside leaderless.

The signal from North Vietnam for intensification of the conflict came on September 10, 1960, at the Third Congress of the Communist Party of North Vietnam with a call for the liberation of the south from the "rule of the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen." In December the National Front for Liberation of South Vietnam was formed by Hanoi.

III. THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

The Democratic administration which took office in January of 1961 was confronted not only with problems in South Vietnam but with far more acute difficulties in the neighboring nation of Laos. In Vietnam sporadic guerrilla attacks were going on. In Laos, Communist Pathet Lao forces were engaged in a full-scale offensive that threatened the government of Premier Boun Oum.

LAOS

Recognizing the seriousness of the situation in Laos, President Kennedy addressed himself to this subject in a news conference on March 15, 1961. The President said:

"Recent attacks by rebel forces indicate that a small minority backed by personnel and supplies from outside is seeking to prevent the establishment of a neutral and independent country (of Laos). We are determined to support the government and the people of Laos in resisting this attempt."

On March 23 the President warned, "* * * if there is to be a peaceful solution, there must be a cessation of the present armed attacks by externally supported Communists * * *. No one should doubt our resolution on this point * * * all members of SEATO have undertaken special treaty responsibilities toward an aggression in Laos."

Sixteen months later the Government of the United States acquiesced in a settlement which terminated any responsibility which the SEATO powers had toward Laos and imposed on that country a coalition government including Communist representation. Acceptance of this settlement by the government of Laos which enjoyed recognition by the United States was brought about by suspension of American aid.

Although Government spokesmen said that the United States would not negotiate on the subject of Laos until a cease-fire was in effect, on May 16, 1961, Secretary Rusk appeared at the opening of the Geneva Conference ready to negotiate. A cease-fire had, it is true, been proclaimed on May 3 but the Communists kept on fighting. How spurious the announced cessation of hostilities was can be judged from the fact that the United States on May 30 submitted to the conferees at Geneva a list of 38 Communist breaches of the cease-fire agreement. Throughout the 14 months of the Geneva conference, violations continued. On May 7, 1962, the Pathet Lao captured the city of Nam Tha after a siege of 4 months. By May 12, the Communist forces completed the occupation of northwest Laos in a 100-mile advance beyond the cease-fire line that compelled the United States to send 5,000 military personnel to Thailand because of the "grave threat" to that country.

The United States continued to negotiate at Geneva. It no longer even protested violations of the cease-fire.

At the outset of the Geneva Conference on May 17, 1961, Secretary Rusk said that the United States would insist on "effective controls, effectively applied to maintain a genuinely independent Laos." As a "yardstick which will influence the attitude of the United States toward the work of this conference," he laid down five principles dealing with the operation of the body which would supervise the execution of the agreement.[37] They were inspired by unhappy experience with the international control commission's established to police the Geneva agreements of 1954.

In summary, Secretary Rusk's principles boiled down to these: that no member of the supervisory commission should possess a veto power by which it might prevent the execution of decisions of the majority of the commission and that the commission must enjoy full freedom of action and of movement throughout the territory in which it was to function.

The Declaration and Protocol on Neutrality in Laos, signed July 21, 1962 (the anniversary of the 1954 Geneva Agreement) proclaimed the neutrality of Laos, required the withdrawal of foreign troops, established a control commission composed of Poland, India, and Canada, but it showed no trace of the principles laid down by Secretary Rusk when the Conference opened. Each member of the Control Commission was to possess the power to veto any decision except a decision to initiate an investigation.

Six months before the Geneva Agreement of 1962 was signed, the State Department issued an anguished complaint about the failure of the Control Commission in Vietnam to function in dealing with 1,200 incidents of alleged Communist violation of the 1954 agreement.[38]

Nevertheless, Averell Harriman called the 1962 agreement "a good agreement—better than I thought we would work out." [39]

Mr. Harriman's appraisal makes interesting reading in the light of the following

[34] Ibid.

[35] Background, pp. 67–68.

[36] "The treaty does not oblige the United States either legally or morally to take any other course in southeast Asia than the course it might be expected to take if the treaty did not exist." W. MacMahon Ball, "A Political Reexamination of SEATO," International Organization (winter 1958).

[36a] Johnson memorandum appears in William S. White "The Professional; Lyndon B. Johnson (1964)" p. 243.

[37] Document on American Foreign Relations 1961, Council on Foreign Relations, 1962, pp. 311–318.

[38] "A Threat," p. 24.

[39] Washington Post, July 25, 1962.

remarks of Secretary Rusk 2 years later on June 14, 1964:

"What happened? The non-Communist nations complied with the agreements. North Vietnam and its Pathet Lao puppets did not. We promptly withdrew our 600-man military aid mission. North Vietnam kept several thousand troops and military technicians in Laos. North Vietnamese cadres are the backbone of almost every Pathet Lao battalion. This was, and is, of course, a major violation of the Geneva accords.

"Later, North Vietnam sent additional forces back into Laos—some of them in organized battalions—a second major violation.

"The North Vietnamese have continued to use, and improve, the corridor through Laos to reinforce and supply the Vietcong in South Vietnam—a third major violation.

"The Communists have continued to ship arms into Laos as well as through it—another major violation.

"The Pathet Lao and the North Vietnamese Communists have compounded these international felonies by denials that they were committing them.

"But there was another major violation which they could not deny. They barred freedom of access to the areas under their control, both to the Lao Government and to the International Control Commission. The Royal Lao Government, on the other hand, opened the areas under its control to access not only by the ICC but by all Lao factions.

"The Communists repeatedly fired at personnel and aircraft on legitimate missions under the authority of the Royal Lao Government. They even fired on ICC helicopters. They repeatedly violated the cease-fire agreement. And this spring they launched an assault on the neutralist forces of General Kong Le, driving them off the Plaine des Jarres, where they had been since early 1961.

"This, in bare summary, is the Communist record of aggression, bad faith, and deception in Laos." [40]

Laos today is ripe for picking by the Communists whenever they choose to use the force necessary to take over the entire country.

Communist control of large areas of Laos has had a direct bearing on military operations in South Vietnam. The State Department noted that Laos "provides not only a route into South Vietnam but also a safe haven from which Vietcong units operate." It also asserted that "the pace of infiltration of officers and men has jumped markedly since Pathet Lao victories in Laos have assured a relatively safe corridor through that country into western South Vietnam.[41]

The importance of Laos arises less from its military significance, however, than from the fact that it tested the resoluteness of the Government of the United States. When the administration retreated repeatedly from its announced positions in the case of Laos, the Communists might well have concluded that the United States would in time back down in South Vietnam.

Averell Harriman drew a distinction between the two nations, pointing out that Laos was landlocked and could be defended only by ground forces. "In Vietnam, on the other hand," he said in a statement that has an ironic ring today, "a decision to assist the Republic of Vietnam to defend itself against the sort of attack being waged in that country would not involve the deployment of U.S. combat forces and would not require the occupation of foreign territory by the United States or other Western forces." [42]

[40] Department of State bulletin, July 6, 1964, pp. 4–5.

[41] "A Threat," p. 10.

[42] "What We Are Doing in Southeast Asia," New York Times, May 27, 1962, p. 54.

Vietnam

In May of 1961 Vice President Johnson was sent to Vietnam. There he lavished praise on Prime Minister Diem, comparing his host to Washington, Jackson, Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill. He assured Diem that the United States was with him "all the way." [43]

The result of the Vice President's trip was a substantial increase in American aid for military, economic, and social purposes. American manpower, the Vice President reported, was not needed.

The Vice President's trip to Vietnam was the first of several by important Administration figures. It set a pattern which was to be followed without variation by the others—a rash of optimistic statements on the status and future prospects of the military struggle and an extension of American involvement either in the form of aid or manpower or both.

The year 1961 saw the development of the conflict in Vietnam from covert guerrilla action to open, if still small-scale, war. In that year for the first time the Vietcong committed forces of battalion size to combat. For the first time they launched an attack on a community as important as a provincial capital. The infiltration of Communist troops from the north, facilitated by unchallenged Communist control of eastern Laos, increased. By the end of 1961, the State Department estimated that between 8,000 and 12,000 regular Vietcong troops were in South Vietnam—at least double the number present there 1 year earlier. The United States doubled its forces of military advisors in South Vietnam from fewer than 700 stationed there when President Eisenhower left office to 1,364.

In the period 1961 to 1963 the number of American troops in South Vietnam grew from 1,364 to 16,575. The amount of aid, military and economic, was increased substantially, although the exact figures for military aid are classified after fiscal year 1962.

In the late summer and fall of 1963, the internal crisis in South Vietnam arising from conflict between the Diem regime and the Buddhists produced a deterioration of the military situation and a decision by the U.S. Government to encourage a change of horses. American aid was cut back. Official statements indicating lack of confidence in the Diem government and calling for a change of personnel and policy were issued. Diem was removed in a military coup and was assassinated along with his brother Nhu.

There is general agreement now that the coup of November 1963 led to chaos in South Vietnam and resulted in substantial Vietcong gains.

Strangely, the setbacks that occurred at the end of 1963 and the beginning of 1964 began only 1 month after Secretary McNamara and General Taylor returned from South Vietnam with an optimistic report. So strong was their optimism that an immediate reduction of the American force in South Vietnam by 1,000 men was announced and the prediction was made that virtually all American troops would be withdrawn by the end of 1965.

The text of the White House announcement of October 2, 1963, follows:

Major U.S. assistance in support of this military effort is needed only until the insurgency has been suppressed or until the national security forces of the Government of South Vietnam are capable of suppressing it. Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel. They reported that by the end of this year, the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point where 1,000 U.S. military personnel assigned to South Vietnam can be withdrawn." [44]

[43] Saigon Times, May 11–14, 1961.

IV. THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION

The administration of Lyndon Johnson has greatly increased the involvement of American military forces, raising the number of troops from 16,000 to 125,000 with further increases anticipated. In February of 1965, it began bombing targets in North Vietnam. In spite of protestations to the contrary, it is changing the nature of American participation in the war by committing substantial numbers of American troop units to ground combat with the Vietcong.

At the same time, the Johnson administration has taken extraordinary steps to bring about negotiations to end the fighting. It has announced its willingness to enter unconditional negotiations. It suspended bombing of North Vietnam for 6 days. It has blessed the efforts of other nations and of public and private intermediaries to bring about a conference to discuss peace. It has offered "a billion dollar American investment" for the regional development of southeast Asia including the development of the Mekong River—a plan similar to one proposed by the Eisenhower administration 10 years ago.

Deescalation of the objective of the United States

As the military effort of the United States in Vietnam has burgeoned, the pronouncements of President Johnson defining the objective of the United States have been progressively watered down.

On December 31, 1963, the President, in a letter to Gen. Duong Van Minh, said the objective was "achieving victory." On July 28, 1965, the President said "our goal * * * [is] * * * to convince the Communists that we cannot be defeated by force of arms."

In more specific terms, the President on April 20, 1964, expressed willingness to accept "any settlement which assures the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom to seek help for its protection." His speech of April 7, 1965, at Johns Hopkins University seemed to discard the freedom of South Vietnam to seek help for its protection, for on that occasion the President defined the objective in contradictory terms as "an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interference—tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country." Clearly South Vietnam would not have freedom to shape its relationship to other countries if it were barred from ties with alliances or from providing a military base to another country. Experience suggests that without an ally South Vietnam would not be securely guaranteed.

Finally, on July 28, 1965, the President seemed to discard the independence of South Vietnam as an objective. Declaring that the "purposes" of the 1954 Geneva agreements "are still our own," he asserted that "the people of South Vietnam shall have the right to shape their own destiny in free elections—in the South or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision. * * *" This raises the disquieting possibility of accepting now in Vietnam the type of election which the United States rejected a decade ago—an election which, in the words of John F. Kennedy, would be "stacked and subverted in advance."

Miscalculation

The President now tells the Nation, "This is really war."

To what degree miscalculation on the part of the enemy has bought about this state of affairs, no one can be sure. It is clear, however, that many of the words and deeds of the past 4 years could only have encouraged

[44] Background, p. 102.

underestimation of the constancy and firmness of the Nation in the pursuit of its foreign policy goals.

The whole handling of the problem of Laos could have no result other than the conclusion that the United States would not match its words with deeds.

The administration said that it would not permit aggression against Laos to succeed, but it did.

The administration said that it would not begin negotiating about Laos until a cease-fire had been put into effect, but it did.

The administration indicated that it would not accept a peace settlement in Laos which granted a veto to any member of the Commission established to supervise the peace, but it did.

Miscalculation was the natural result of the withdrawal of American backing for the Diem government. For the United States had pledged its support to Diem "all the way," in Lyndon Johnson's phrase in 1961. Abrupt reversal of policy leading to the overthrow of the leader whom the Government of the United States had been ardently supporting and whose downfall was a major Vietcong objective could appear only as evidence of weakening of the resolve of this Nation. Whether the error was the commitment to support Diem "all the way" or connivance in Diem's downfall, the net effect was to cast doubt on the value and durability of a pledge of support by the United States.

Miscalculation was encouraged by President Johnson's campaign oratory of 1964. In order to make his opponent appear reckless and trigger happy, the President in several statements set limits to American participation in the Vietnamese conflict. For example, on August 12, 1964, he said:

"Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do."

Again, on August 29, the President declared:

"I have had advice to load our planes with bombs and to drop them on certain areas that I think would enlarge the war, and result in our committing a good many American boys to fighting a war that I think ought to be fought by the boys of Asia to help protect their own land. And for that reason, I haven't chosen to enlarge the war."

In Hanoi and Peiping all this could be interpreted only as an assurance that they need not fear fuller use of the power of the United States in Vietnam beyond the type of assistance provided to the South Vietnamese in the summer of 1964.

"Perhaps," Secretary Rusk was quoted in the New York Times as saying, "the Communist world misunderstood our Presidential campaign."[45] Perhaps, indeed, it did. But whose fault was that?

Miscalculation is encouraged by threats that are not followed up by appropriate action.

Such was the case when President Johnson on February 21, 1964, said, "Those engaged in external direction and supply [in Vietnam] would do well to remember that this type of aggression is a deeply dangerous game." This remark was advertised as a major foreign policy declaration by White House aids who called the words "dangerous game" highly significant. The impression was given to the press that the President was suggesting a strike at North Vietnam. But nothing happened. The Communists did not slow down, and the administration did nothing to demonstrate the danger in their game.

In June of 1964, at Honolulu, Secretary Rusk asked newsmen to report that the U.S. commitment to Vietnam was unlimited, comparable with West Berlin. President Johnson declared, "If a nation is to keep its freedom, it must be prepared to risk war. When necessary, we will take that risk." These threats were followed up by the campaign oratory which set limits to the American commitment by appearing to rule out action against North Vietnam and any extension of the American role in combat.

Lack of candor on the part of the administration

Miscalculation is encouraged—and the American people are confused—when the administration glosses over a messy situation with optimistic pronouncements and predictions.

Consider such statements as the following:

Lyndon B. Johnson: "We do not have [a problem in] Laos." (Feb. 11, 1964.)

Robert S. McNamara:

"Actions taken there have proved effective and will prove more effective as time goes on." (Jan. 17, 1962.)

"Progress in the last 8 to 10 weeks has been great * * *. The Government has asked only for logistical support * * *. Nothing but progress and hopeful indications of further progress in the future." (May 12, 1962.)

"Our military assistance to Vietnam is paying off. I continue to be encouraged. There are many signs indicating progress." (July 25, 1962.)

"There is a 'new feeling of confidence' that victory is possible in South Vietnam." (Jan. 31, 1963.)

"The major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel." (Oct. 2, 1963.)

"We have every reason to believe that [U.S. military] plans will be successful in 1964." (Dec. 12, 1963.)

"With these further measures, we felt that a start could be made in reducing the number of U.S. military personnel in Vietnam as their training missions were completed. Accordingly, we announced that about 1,000 men were to be withdrawn by the end of 1963, and expressed the hope that the major part of the U.S. military task could be completed by the end of 1965, although we recognized that there might be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. advisory personnel." (Jan. 30, 1964.)

"We are confident these plans point the way to victory." (March 1964.)[46]

It would be tedious to detail the facts that showed how remote each of these pronouncements was from grim reality. One example will suffice. Secretary Rusk declared in the course of a visit to Vietnam on April 20, 1964, that things were showing "steady improvement." The headline in the New York Times 2 days later read, "Reds inflict heaviest toll on South Vietnam Army." It had been the bloodiest week of the war, the Times reported, with 1,000 Vietnamese Government and 23 American casualties.

Now once again, the public is being told by the White House that there is reason for "cautious optimism."

Neither the Congress nor the public is being accurately and fully informed about the Nation's involvement in Vietnam. American military personnel were called advisers long after they became combatants. Today their "primary mission," the Nation is told, "is to secure and safeguard important military installations like the airbase at Da Nang * * *."[47]

The Presdent announced on July 28 that the stationing of 125,000 American troops in Vietnam did "not imply any change in policy whatever."

Yet, Secretary McNamara testfied on August 4, 1965, "The principal role of U.S. ground combat forces will be to supplement this reserve [of the South Vietnamese Army] in support of the frontline forces of the South Vietnamese Army."

The able Saigon correspondent of the Los Angeles Times, Jack Foisie, has written:

"Although the decision to commit large-scale American combat units in Vietnam is apparent, and is obvious to the enemy through the buildup of logistical bases on the central coast, authorities in Washington try to pretend that we really are not committed to land warfare in Asia, to casualties as large or larger than suffered during the Korean war."[48]

As the military effort of the United States was stepped up, adequate funds for its support were not requested of the Congress. Now an attempt to hide the cost is made by asking for added funds in two installments—one now, the other in January of 1966.

The figures that are fed to the press and the public by the administration contradict each other and surpass belief. In June of 1965, Secretary Rusk gave a figure for South Vietnamese casualties since 1960 that was 50 percent higher than the figure General Wheeler gave 1 month earlier.[49] It is hard to believe that casualties in 1 month in 1965 increased so dramatically. It is hard, too, to accept estimates of Vietcong combat deaths which indicate that 20 to 25 percent of the estimated Vietcong military strength was wiped out in each of 2 successive recent years.

The astute correspondent of the Washington Post, Howard Margolies, after surveying casualty figures released by the administration, concludes:

"The impression all this leaves is that the publicly released statistics are more a selection of numbers intended to paint a picture that supports whatever the official view is at the moment than a realistic indication of how things are going."[50]

The greatest shortage which the Vietnamese war has so far produced is a shortage of candor and accuracy.

The Nation, by the President's admission, is now engaged in a war. All Americans must support whatever action is needed to put a stop to Communist aggression and to make safe the freedom and independence of South Vietnam.

Criticism of administration actions, when well-founded, is not inconsistent with support of this objective nor of the methods needed to attain it. Indeed, such criticism can help in the attainment of the Nation's objective without unnecessary loss or delay.

COLLECTIVIZING THE HOSPITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DADDARIO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it will be only a matter of time until hospitals throughout the Nation begin to feel the long arm of the Federal Government as they confront, one by one, directives and compliance orders which will be meted out by Federal bureaucrats. It was unbelievable to listen to those pa-

[45] Henry F. Graff, "How Johnson Makes Foreign Policy," New York Times magazine, July 4, 1965, p. 16.

[46] McNamara's statements were reported in the New York Times on the dates indicated.

[47] White House statement, Background, p. 230.

[48] Los Angeles Times, July 25, 1965.

[49] Rusk speech, American Foreign Service Association, Washington, D.C., June 23, 1965—"From 1961 to the present * * * South Vietnamese armed forces have lost some 25,000 dead and 51,000 wounded." Wheeler speech, San Francisco, May 7, 1965, "More than 50,000 South Vietnamese soldiers have been killed or wounded in battle since 1960."

[50] Washington Post, Aug. 16, 1965.

thetic liberal advocates of medicare who proclaimed that there were no controls in the bill. Just watch the controls that they unravel in this patchwork quilt of Federal regulation. They will start out in a subtle manner and soon become brazen. This has been the history of the agriculture bill, urban renewal, aid to education, and other Federal programs which have put the planners in full scale business.

One of the basic provisions in the medicare program adopted this year is the broad authority of the administrator of the program to set up criteria which will determine which hospitals may be used by medicare recipients. You see, this is the back-door approach. You give them benefits and services and then you determine the conditions under which they may receive these services and benefits. It is elementary to point out that in a program which anticipates the expenditure of billions of dollars, few hospitals which fail to comply to Federal directives would remain in existence very long. What will these directives cover? I suggest that it will only be a matter of time until they cover a wide range of factors from staffing privileges to charges for services. Those who told the doctors that they could not be controlled by medicare were not exactly truthful—or they were not careful with the truth—and as the program blossoms into what the liberal planners want, collectivized medical care, the real sting will be felt.

Regional medical centers have exactly the same overtones. Sooner or later they will serve as the unit for setting the cost of hospital services, doctors' services, prescription prices—yes, maybe even embalming and funeral expenses. My good friend, Russell Kirk, in his regular "From the Academy" column in the August 24, 1965, issue of National Review hit the nail right on the head. I certainly would recommend its reading to anyone who has one iota of interest in the direction we are heading as far as medical care and private choice is concerned:

COLLECTIVIZING THE HOSPITAL

(By Russell Kirk)

Medical attention and hospital care, on the face of things are intensely personal. One might expect that the mass age's passion for centralization and consolidation would affect the realm of medicine, therefore, only in the later stages of collectivism. But let me inform you, gentle reader, that American hospitals are in clear and present danger of falling under the total domination of bureaucracy and depersonalization. Many local, voluntary, and charitable hospitals will be abolished within the next 12 months—yes, as rapidly as all that—if no more effective opposition is roused.

Your servant became clearly aware of this movement toward what Dr. Wilhelm Roepke calls "the cult of the colossal" in hospitals only after he and his wife had undertaken a fund-raising drive for our local charitable hospital, Mecosta Memorial. This useful institution, serving a large rural area where most people have low incomes, is staffed by able doctors, is better equipped than many small hospitals, and is enthusiastically supported by the rural and village population round about. But it is under pressure from the Michigan department of health to improve and enlarge its physical facilities—or face the loss of its authorization to accept public welfare and Blue Cross patients (without which categories of patients, many hospitals cannot exist at all). Looking about for the money, we discovered that strong demand is being exerted by Federal officials, State agencies, certain large hospital associations, and certain large-scale civic charities, to compel the consolidation of hospitals into a few gigantic institutions.

The present general term for this movement—which often has ideological motives underlying it—is "areawide hospital controls," or "areawide hospital planning." Its chief promoters are gentlemen like Dr. Michael DeBakey, the Houston surgeon very friendly with Mr. Lyndon Johnson, who would like to establish vast Federal Government medical centers, centralize serious medical treatment in a few big hospitals, reduce most hospitals to "community centers for diagnosis and emergency medical care," and abolish large numbers of hospitals altogether. This scheme—stanchly opposed by the American Medical Association—was brought forward as early as 1910, but has made great strides only recently. New York and Michigan are the States where the arbitrary consolidation proceeds most rapidly.

CENTRALIZERS WARMING UP

Since the autumn of 1964, New York has had compulsory area-hospital planning, under the Metcalf-McCloskey Act. Already the centralizers are applying the screws. A few weeks ago, the Hospital and Planning Council of Southern New York decreed the closing of St. Francis Hospital in the Bronx, a genuinely charitable institution operated for a hundred years by the Franciscan Sisters of the Poor. It is a fairly big hospital, with 380 beds and 800 employees, treating 75,000 people—mostly of Puerto Rican origin—annually. But the area planners frown upon St. Francis, and so St. Francis must go. (One suspects that hospitals conducted by religious orders may have a harder and harder time with the public health bureaucracy and the zealots for various forms of State medicine.)

In Michigan, Anderson Memorial Hospital has been sentenced to death—despite its good situation and its modern equipment—by the Greater Detroit Area Hospital Council and the Blue Cross. In theory, it competes with other hospitals longer entrenched—so down the drain it goes. It is the curious argument of the hospital centralizers that we have a surplus of hospital beds in these United States—a contention popular with some of the very people who talk with alarm of the "population explosion." And some of the centralizers, who applaud every proposal for larger expenditures from the Federal treasury, nevertheless argue that this affluent society is unable to afford, any longer, the luxury of small hospitals on a humane scale.

If moderate-sized local hospitals are abolished—except that some may survive as emergency care centers—then the general practitioner will be forced to the wall. Already, some big hospitals are refusing to let any doctors except specialists practice on their premises. With the decline of the general practitioner, we may expect to see the decay of local medical attention outside the hospital, which has afflicted Soviet Russia for more than a generation, and which now plagues British medicine.

If sound medical practice were merely a matter of applying techniques to human units, there might, conceivably, be something in the centralizers' theory. But medicine is much more than the standard utilization of the latest scientific devices. Personal relationship with, and confidence in, the physician is a major part of successful treatment. Hospitalization in fairly familar surroundings, in a hospital that is not merely an enormous, well-scrubbed barracks, is another factor contributory to recovery of health.

So, friends, if legislation to establish compulsory planning of this sort is introduced in your State, set your face against it. (At the recent session of the Michigan Legislature, a sleeper bill was introduced which would have given central State authorities arbitrary power to grant or revoke all hospital franchises; happily it failed to pass.) And do everything in your power to maintain voluntary hospitals, local, and on a humane scale, by your money and your countenance. In the long run, a collectivist medical system would produce collective disorders.

HATE OR GROUP LIBEL MAIL

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have introduced legislation during past Congresses to declare papers, writings, pamphlets, and other similar matter containing defamatory and false statements which tend to expose persons identified by race or religion to hatred, contempt or ridicule, or which tend to cause them to be shunned, avoided, or injured in their business, to be declared nonmailable and not to be conveyed in the mails. This is intended to cover what is commonly known as hate or group libel mail.

In this Congress I introduced H.R. 837 for the same purpose. I believe such legislation is badly needed. Our postal service should be freed of the necessity of carrying such objectionable mail and our citizens freed of their annoyance.

During the 1965 session the group libel bill was overwhelmingly passed by both houses of the New York State Legislature only to be vetoed by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller. While I recognize that free speech is protected under our Constitution, I believe that libelous utterances do not come within that protection and certainly group libel should not come under the protection of free speech. By their very nature minority groups are usually victims of group libel material, and by libel it must be remembered we mean false and defamatory matter.

The Kings County Council, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, viewed Governor Rockefeller's veto of this legislation with utter dismay. They responded to the Governor's veto with the following item, which I commend to my colleagues' attention:

JEWISH WAR VETERANS DEPLORE GOVERNOR'S VETO OF GROUP LIBEL BILL

The Kings County Council of the Jewish War Veterans, under the leadership of Leon Deutsch, county commander, views with utter dismay, the veto by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of the group libel bill (S. introductory 4249, print 4748), overwhelmingly passed by both houses of the New York State Legislature at its 1965 session. This bill would have outlawed the dissemination, publication, exhibition or utterance of false and defamatory matter in respect to any racial, religious, national or ethnic group.

Commander Deutsch, speaking in behalf of Kings County Council Jewish War Veterans, noted that the late Mr. Justice Frankfurter, writing for the majority in *Beauharnais* v. *Illinois*, 343 U.S. 250; 72 S.C. 725, which upheld the constitutionality of a substantially similar statute in the State of Illinois, held: "The freedom of speech protected by the Constitution is not absolute at all times and under all circumstances, and there are well defined and narrowly limited classes of speech, the prevention and punishment of which does not raise any constitutional problem, including the lewd and obscene, the profane and the insulting, or fighting words, which by their very utterance inflict injury or tend to create an immediate breach of the peace. Libelous utterances are not within the area of constitutionally protected speech."

The Court, taking note that individual libel is punishable, continued, "If an utterance directed at an individual may be the object of communal sanctions, we cannot deny to a State power to punish the same utterance at a defined group."

The ends of group libel legislation are not designed to restrict peaceable and critical disputation and advocacy of ideas; it is designed to restrict the lunatic fringe from group vilification and vituperation, their utterance or publication of false, malicious, and defamatory matter in respect to defined groups; and from the incitement to the extermination of, or act of violence upon, a given class of citizens, which the legislature found and declared to constitute a clear and present danger to the welfare of the people of the State.

The community must set obstacles in the path of the hate mongers who, by means of lies, libels, vituperation and a doctrine of hatred and violence, incite to disorder, create disunity, poison minds, corrupt our society, and undermine the general welfare of the people of the State.

Commander Deutsch declared that, "The Kings County Council Jewish War Veterans will continue to press vigorously for the enactment of group libel legislation in 1966. We commend the legislature for its passage of this bill. We shall look to them again for such legislation next year. We denounce the Governor's veto of this bill. We shall demand in loud, unified voices, that the Governor, in 1966, exercise responsible leadership by signing such a bill into law. His failure to do so this year is a serious loss to the arsenal of weapons against the hate monger and the lunatic fringe. A similar veto in 1966, if that should be, will be considered by the Jewish War Veterans as indefensible and unforgivable."

The Jewish War Veterans is the oldest active war veterans organization in the United States.

SUPPORT FOR H.R. 2580

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering today, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, is long overdue. I am proud to be serving in the Congress that is going to pass this immigration bill.

H.R. 2580 is a good bill and with President Johnson behind it, I hope it will become law this session.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial in support of H.R. 2580 from the August 21, 1965, edition of the New York Journal American:

[From the New York Journal American, Aug. 21, 1965]

IMMIGRATION

Approval of the immigration bill by the House Rules Committee is a big stride toward removing the discriminatory restrictions that for decades have worked injustice—and offense—in many areas.

The measure, previously cleared by the Judiciary Committee, headed by Brooklyn's EMANUEL CELLER, now goes to floor debate.

It would open the door to 20,000 immigrants a year from all countries except the Western Hemisphere, which is excluded from the numerical ceiling. The current law, outmoded and the cause of bitter criticism both here and in other lands, sets up a system of admittance based on national origins.

The new bill, supported by the Johnson administration, establishes preference categories. Aliens closely related to persons resident in the United States would have priority consideration.

The decades of mass immigration are over. But it must not be forgotten that our extraordinary cosmopolitan population is a blend of many sources.

Except for the Indians, who are themselves reputed to have come from elsewhere, we are a nation derived from immigration. New York, the major port of entry, flowered from alien roots even as the Dutch opened a trading post in Nieuw Amsterdam. In the 1640's 19 tongues were spoken in its marts.

The new bill should pass, giving welcome to all nations, for we are the product of all nations.

TESTIMONY OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER IN SUPPORT OF A 4-YEAR TERM FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, 1965, it was my privilege to testify before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary in support of my resolution, House Joint Resolution 78, which would amend the Constitution to provide a 4-year term for the Members of this body.

A transcript of my testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE 13TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. I want to thank my distinguished colleague, Mr. TENZER, for yielding to me, and I want to thank the committee for the opportunity to be here and present my views.

If it is agreeable to you, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that my complete statement be made a part of the record, in full, and then I can devote my time to answering some of the questions that have been raised, and also indicate some differences of opinion with my very distinguished colleague from Kentucky, Mr. CHELF. I think that would serve a better purpose.

In principle, I think that Congressman CHELF has made a very complete and forceful statement on the subject. Anything that any of us will say from here on in in large part must necessarily be repetitious of what he has already said and said so well.

I might say to the committee that I have been introducing a resolution similar to my House Joint Resolution 78 since I first came to Congress in 1947. And in 1949 I conducted a poll of the membership of the House, and the result of that poll indicated that 319 Members were in favor of the 4-year proposal, the same as it is in the resolution before you now which I introduced this year, with only 110 against it. I believe, like Congressmen CHELF, that the principle of this measure of extending the term of office of the Members of the House is overwhelmingly supported, not only by Members but by the general public. I think the best poll to take on that subject would be by submitting this resolution to the people in the States and then having them act to ratify or not, as they may see fit. I think there, too, the overwhelming action by the States will be in support of this resolution, or a resolution similar to it extending the terms of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. MULTER, right there, you, I note, did take a poll of the membership of the House back in 1949. Have you also, as Mr. CHELF has done, surveyed your constituency to ascertain what their thinking might be on this important subject?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, not once but many times. I have had the same experiences as indicated by Mr. CHELF, with individuals. I have discussed this at civic organization meetings and fraternal organization meetings, veterans organizations, and political organizations. I daresay that if there were a vote on this in my district, the vote would be 10 to 1 in favor of it.

Now, Mr. CHELF has indicated how frequently some Members go home. During political campaigns, I am home in my district every night, even though I must be here on the floor every day or in committee every day.

Now, I know the men in Maryland, nearby Maryland, go home every night. I know that most the men in Philadelphia go home every night.

Now, there was one Member who served from Brooklyn for 14 years, and he said that he never slept in Washington a single night in the 14 years he served. And most of that service was during World War II. He went home every night.

Mr. RODINO. And this is in order that he try to keep as close contact as he possibly can with his constituents so he might know their thinking and help service them as well. And, of course, this is going to be a tremendously increasing problem as constituencies increase.

Mr. MULTER. The man who wants to be in touch with his people, and the people who want to be in touch with their Member have overnight letter service by mail; hourly service by telegram, minute service by telephone, and most of my people know they can call me collect—and they do. If they are anywhere within 400 miles, every Member knows that you never know when a constituent is going to walk in on you without an appointment.

So, in addition to our getting home frequently, we know how they are thinking, and they let us know how they are thinking by their constant contacts with us.

My district, like Mr. CHELF'S, has over 600,000 population, and I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I know how they are thinking, because they keep me advised, and I make it my business to know how they are thinking. Only recently, without any political campaign in progress we had 8 legislative days during a 2-week period. I was home 7 nights of the 8 legislative days, because it

was necessary for me to be there to know how these people were thinking and keep the engagements that I had made to meet with them.

We are closer to our people today than ever in the history of the country. We could not be any closer.

New, with reference to the legislative problem, or the state legislative reaction, the point that Mr. CORMAN raised: Our experience out of New York State, and we have 41 Members today out of New York State, is that most of our Members who come here to the House have served in the State legislature, either as an assemblyman or as a senator, and more frequently they serve first in the so-called lower house or assembly, then elected to the senate and then came here as Members of Congress. One of the reasons why we have had difficulty in increasing salaries of the Members of the Congress and increasing terms of office is that some of our colleagues say this is going to increase the competition for our seats. I think one reason the State legislators will vote for a 4-year term for us, while theirs may be 1, 2, or less, is because they have an eye on coming here. I say this is good, because we need experienced legislators coming here. The best men, I think, by and large, and this is not intended to be as any reflection because the gentleman sitting to my right, Mr. TENZER, is a first termer—he never served in the State legislature. He is one of our best Congressmen and one of our best representatives. But by and large the man who comes here with legislative experience on the local level makes a better Member of Congress.

So, if these men have an eye on our seats, so much the better. It will keep us on our toes, and the day that anybody in my district can take my seat by an election, good luck to him. If the people are tired of me, then it is time they retired me, and sent a better man here, or a man whom they thought was better.

This also brings me to the point about my distinguished friend's recommendation that in order to get the Senate to go along with this, let's not give them any competition. I said before the Joint Committee on Reorginization of the Congress the same thing I now say to this committee: If the only way we can get the Members of the body to go along with this recommendation is to assure them of no competition, then let's not have the amendment. I say, if there is a man in that body who does not want to or who is afraid to meet his constitutents and stand for reelection, because a Member of the House may be able to beat him and take his seat away from him, he does not deserve to be there. If that is what is going to stop this amendment from going through, then let's not have it. They have this competition now, because men who are running here every 2 years would rather run there for 6 years. They will have more competition that way than they will get by going along with a 4-year term for the Members of the House.

I can say this and say it so vigorously and forcefully, because I have no desire to stand for election to the other body, and this is not sour grapes, because nomination to the other body has been offered to me twice in my State, and rejected by me. I intend to continue and to complete my political service to my country in the House of Representatives if God spares me. So, this is entirely without any selfish interest on my part. I think this is the most undignified thing to say to any Member of Congress, present or future, that you come to the House of Representatives, and by doing it, you forgo your right to run for any other office. If a man, because of his service here, thinks that his people feel he will make a better public official in some other office, we ought not to, and certainly not by constitutional amendment, deprive him of that right to prepare himself for other office by his work here. I think this is basic to our democracy, that any man who stands for office, when elected should have a right to have his eye on a higher office or another office.

Now, if this means that he does not serve his constituency as well in the House of Representatives, they will catch on to it and they will very soon retire him. On the other hand, if by his service here he earns another office, they will give it to him.

The reason I oppose a staggering of the terms, or a 3-year term, is because I feel that if we believe in a two-party system, the only way you strengthen the two-party system is by having the term of office of the Member of the House coterminous with that of the President. I say the President should have a majority of the Members of the House of his party, and I say the majority of the Members of the House should have in the White House a member of their party. I do not go for this business of saying as it is so often said, that campaign planks or platforms are something to run on during election time and run away from after election time. I say that pledges made by way of platform planks and as pledges during a campaign are promises that are binding upon us, and if we do not keep those promises when the time comes for reelection, the electorate should turn us out. We should not have this division as we have had so many times of a President being able to run for reelection and saying: "Now, look, give me a House this time of my party. I did not have it in the last session of Congress, and, therefore, I could not give you what I promised you." And do not let Members of the House run for reelection on the pretense, or making the pretense, "Well, we do not have a man of my party in the White House and, therefore, I could not give you the legislation that you should have had." If we believe in the two-party system, then the man in the White House and the majority of the Congress should be of the same party to the fullest extent that the people want it, and then 4 years later they could go before the people and there would be no excuses that we could not deliver on our promises because there was an opposite party that was in control of the other branch of the Government.

This, gentlemen, I say is the reason why we should have a 4-year term coterminous with that of the President, and I do hope that when your deliberations are completed in executive session, you will bring forth a resolution or an amendment which will be submitted to the States for ratification which will give us a 4-year term. I personally will vote against a 3-year term. I personally would vote against any provision that would call for staggering of the offices. I personally would vote against any provision that would deprive a Member of the House of Representatives of the right to run for any other office because he is a Member of the House.

I know that those who have different opinions, whether it be Mr. CHELF or Mr. TENZER, or other Members, are voicing these opinions and putting forth their considerations just as conscientiously and with the same high motives as I am. When that is done and the resolution is brought before the House, and the House votes, I will bow to the majority, whatever it may be.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DONOHUE (presiding). Thank you.

Any questions?

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am somewhat persuaded by Mr. MULTER's argument about the 4-year term being coterminous with the President's election. I did not mean to indicate in my exchange with Mr. CHELF that I did not think that the State legislators ought not to be allowed to run for Congress. I would pose the question again, and I think it is a reasonable one. I do not believe three-fourths of the State legislators will approve of this constitutional amendment. I believe 50 of the States would, if the people themselves voted on it, and that is why I think we should give some consideration as to the method of ratification. And, of course, there is no question, though I did not come from our State legislature, our best Members are those who did. And that is a good training ground. But I seriously question whether State legislators, so many of them with 2-year terms, would ratify a 4-year term for us and whether we might be better off in getting public expression from the voters in a secret ballot.

Mr. MULTER. Frankly, Mr. CORMAN, I think this matter of ratification by State legislators is outmoded. This should be submitted to the people, whether it is this kind of a constitutional amendment, or any other.

Now, I agree with you that if this were submitted to the people of the 50 States, it would carry overwhelmingly. I am not sure that it would carry in the State legislatures, too, in the State legislative bodies, also, but if we can bring forth an amendment which will bypass the State legislative bodies, I am for it, not because I do not trust them, on the other hand, I feel that if we send this to the States, there will be enough pressure from the people on the State legislators to do this job, and they will be in fear of being confronted with a situation of "Look, if you do not go along with us, maybe you will not get elected next time." This is a matter that affects the people and I think they will take an interest in it. It is unlike some amendments where the legislative bodies may freely express their own opinion and disregard the opinions of the people in their States. This is not that kind of an issue. This is one where the people are going to be interested, and I think they will put the pressure on their State legislative bodies.

Mr. DONOHUE. Thank you, again.

We will include in the record at this point the prepared statement of Mr. MULTER'S.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. MULTER follows:)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate and thank you for the opportunity to come before your committee today in support of my resolution House Joint Resolution 78, which would amend the Constitution of the United States to provide that the term of the Members of the House shall be 4 years instead of 2 years.

At the outset you ought to know that the majority of the Members of the House favor this resolution. I have been in this fight a long time. I have introduced a bill for this purpose in every Congress, except one, since I came to Congress in 1947. Back in 1949 I took a poll of the Members on the issue of a 4-year term—319 Members voted in favor of the proposal and 110 against. I believe the support of this measure by Members and nonmembers alike is overwhelming.

The Nation is properly devoting much thought and discussion to the problem of fair representation in the House. I suggest that it is time we think about the problem of meaningful representation.

Not only is the citizen entitled to fair representation he is also entitled to full representation. When we deal with fair representation we are concerned that each man's vote shall be equal to his neighbor's. When we deal with full representation we are concerned with the quality of that representation. I believe we have solved the problem of fair representation and that we should now address ourselves to the problem of proper representation.

Consider the almost impossible burden that is placed on a Member. The bulk of the work of the Congress is in committee and logically previous congressional experience plays a large role in a Member's ability to perform as well as eventually serving as a

committee or subcommittee chairman. But to develop seniority he must get reelected.

With an election scheduled every 2 years he must be campaigning constantly. For his survival he must keep "one face" back in the district ready to meet the demands for constant service by the people. He must answer thousands of letters, as well as telephone, wire and personal requests on varied and sundry subjects. He is faced with endless demands on his time, effort and money for political activities.

All this is vital to survival but has little to do with the legislative business of the House. He is expected to know the complex parliamentary maze of the House, to consider thousands of bills, and hundreds of major items of foreign and domestic legislation, to study the committee reports, the messages from the President and from the departments. He must keep up with the work of his office, receiving delegations and reading and answering an ever increasing volume of mail. Running for office every 2 years takes him away from his legislative work. Before he can learn the duties and obligations of his office during the first term, it's time for him to go back home to seek reelection.

The framers of our Constitution were concerned that the Members of the House should be responsive to the people and believed that the 2-year term was the answer. They believed that a Member could take care of the work of the House with plenty of time left to spend in his district. The demands on his time for legislative work extended from 4 weeks to 12 weeks a year. It was possible then, when Government was small. No one could foresee that the time would come when our Government would be so large, its operations so complex, our military strength so mighty, our financial, military and moral commitments so extensive, and our economic influence so pervasive, that the business of the House, if it were to be wisely attended to by its Members would require great exertions and intense dedication and time without limit. Last Congress was in session until December 31.

Democracy is dedication of our elected representatives to their jobs, and what we must never forget, it is also the freedom of those representatives to do their job. Anything less is not democracy. A Member is not able to do the job, or at least to do it effectively when he must turn his energy for a large part of every 2 years to campaigning back home.

It is true that in a democracy every elected officer must periodically give an account of his stewardship to the people who may then either accept or reject him, and this is as it should be. But to ask a Member of this House to do this every 2 years impairs his effectiveness in office.

I know there are some who will say we urge this change for self-gain and for self-perpetuation in office. If they would but stop a moment and think, they would see that this is not true. To change the term of a Member of the House of Representatives requires a constitutional amendment and we know that this could take several years. By the terms of the resolution it cannot take effect until more than 1 calendar year after its ratification, and then only in the year in which the President's term begins. That means not before 1968.

The effect is to synchronize the terms of the President and the Members of the House. By the time this amendment becomes effective many of the Members of this House—and that does not exclude this speaker—may no longer be Members. But that should not change our position. If we can improve the effectiveness of future Congresses we should do so, even if we will not be part of them.

I would like to make one other important point about the 4-year term. I firmly believe that when you elect a person of one party as President, he ought to have the majority of his party in the Congress so that the responsibility is on the party, if we believe in the two-party system.

I know that it has occasionally happened that the President has been elected from one party and the majority from the other party are elected to Congress. In off years very frequently the control will change in the Congress so that we had a majority party different from that in the White House. But if we really want a strong two-party system and we believe in it, then the responsibility should be on the party and there shouldn't be this device of denial of responsibility when it comes to election time. The man in the White House and the majority should be of the same party.

Then if they don't live up to their pledges, if they don't do the job the people expected they can turn them out 4 years later. You avoid this divided responsibility. You don't give the Members the opportunity to say, "We don't have a member of our party in the White House," and you don't give the man in the White House the opportunity to say, "Those Members in the majority are of the opposite party and they are not going along with me." I think it would make for a stronger Government.

I urge this committee to favorably report House Joint Resolution 78.

THE U.S. ROLE IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made it unmistakably clear time and time again that the United States seeks peace—peace with honor—in Vietnam.

No one can deny that we face a most complex situation in southeast Asia. The answers are not easy.

The President, however, has been very frank in informing the American public of the problems we face there.

The result of Mr. Johnson's forthright leadership is overwhelming popular support throughout the Nation for our policies in Vietnam.

A fine editorial from the August 13, 1965, edition of the American Jewish World recently came to me. I think it reflects what most Americans feel.

The editorial pointed out:

It is our belief, and we state it here without reservation, that the great, vast body of American opinion is with the President in his conduct of this difficult, complex, frustrating, and misunderstood campaign in Vietnam.

The editorial went on to recall the dread lessons freemen learned in the past from the Hitler era. That lesson, as President Johnson so aptly said in his report to the Nation recently, is that aggression and tyranny breed on softness.

America must stand up to communism. America must uphold its commitments. America must defend freedom in its hour of need.

President Johnson is doing all of this. For this, every American should be thankful.

The editorial from the American Jewish World follows:

OUR NATION'S ROLE IN VIETNAM

"We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table." These are theme words—a credo symbolizing America's essential stance in the Vietnam struggle and expressing this Nation's thoughtful and resolute determination to fight for the sake of peace.

For 8 tense days late last month the Nation waited while President Johnson deliberated America's immediate course of action. The announcement, when it came, told of his program for a significant troop build-up in Vietnam, but the even keener significance of his statement lies in the limited nature of the increase, the limited objectives he set forth, and his heartening, profoundly responsible emphasis on a search for a peaceful solution "at the conference table."

It is our belief, and we state it here without reservation, that the great, vast body of American opinion is with the President in his conduct of this difficult, complex, frustrating, and misunderstood campaign in Vietnam. It is our corollary belief that, by and large, the American people feel and understand that what we are engaged in, in Vietnam, is a defense not of the Vietnamese alone—valid and vital as that is—but it is an action of commitment in defense of the very concept of life free of the grisly Communist embrace and the threat of its pressures.

One aspect of the situation that make us most responsive to our President's leadership in the Vietnam situation is that its action springs from the dread lessons of the Hitler era. It was silence and inaction on the part of the West that kept strengthening Hitler to the point of no return. We are grateful that we have a President who reads history aright—who has both the wisdom and the creative courage to avoid the Scylla of a Munich, the Charybdis of Ethiopia.

We, too, must look at contemporary events with an intelligent eye: discerning that where we have stood up to Communist aggressions—as in Greece, Turkey, Berlin, Korea, and Cuba—we have succeeded in stemming the tide. This is our role and responsibility in today's boiling world—and thank God we have a leader who sees it so clearly, who knows so deeply that there is no hope for a world of reason and sanity, of peace and growth, until the forces of wanton aggression and brazen lawlessness are checked and defeated.

America's difficult role in southeast Asia has been a severe testing time. We are speaking to the world in tones unmistakable: if they have been misinterpreted, it may be because here in America the voices of criticism have been amplified way out of proportion to the numbers they represent. And their loudness, in fact, is what may be persuading Hanoi and Peiping that the American President is pursuing an unpopular course. It is not one we can contemplate with pleasure, but we Americans have shown that we know how to confront unpleasant and hazardous situations with determination and how to proceed from resolve to victory.

The world, and particularly the Communist masters would do well to pay heed to the American character and to American history.

HIGHWAY TUNNELS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, along with construction of the rapid transit system recently approved by the House of Representatives, completion of the interstate highway system in the District of Columbia is a matter of urgent necessity. The rapid transit system will provide the best conceivable means of carrying great volumes of people into and out of the downtown area during the rush hours. The highway system, on the other hand, in addition to its many other uses, represents the most efficient means of routing motorists around the downtown area, away from surface streets.

Though all signs are that construction of the rapid transit system will forge ahead, the District highway program is in deep trouble. In part its problems are financial and these can only be solved by the passage of legislation increasing District gas taxes and borrowing authority. In part its problems are esthetic and social and the solution of these is far more complex.

Some people are against the District highway program because it represents change. In my view, those people are misguided for change is bound to occur and properly constructed highways are one means of assuring that the change is for the better.

Others resent the program because they fear it will destroy the appearance of the city and uproot thousands from their homes, in too many people who can afford to be uprooted. These fears, I am sorry to say, are all too well-founded, for the present District highway program is bound to mar the appearance of the city. And the sole blame rests with the highway engineers who have shown an appalling lack of imagination in designing and locating proposed sections of the Interstate Highway System in the District.

This is a period in which all of us are taking an increasing interest in the appearance of the National Capital. Our First Lady is leading a campaign to beautify the Capital. She has the solid support of all of us.

It is scarcely consistent with this campaign to inundate Washington with miles of surface and depressed multilane freeways. It does not require a great deal of esthetic sense to realize that such highways are bound to be ugly. And just as disturbing is the fact that they are bound to move thousands of low-income families out of their homes at the very time when Government at last has the tools to provide a much-needed increase in low-income housing.

In urban areas throughout the Nation, increasing attention is being paid to highway tunnels as a means of avoiding ugliness and the destruction of homes. San Francisco and New York are considering major highway tunnels. This kind of construction is bound to become increasingly popular. This is especially true because modern technology has substantially reduced the cost of constructing tunnels and additional technological advances are in sight which should reduce the costs still further.

Unfortunately, the District Highway Department does not seem to be able to read the signals. I know of only two occasions in recent times where it has been willing to construct highway tunnels and in both cases it was forced to do so by other units of Government. The first was the Lincoln Memorial tunnel which is being constructed at the insistence of the Department of the Interior. The second is the inner loop center leg tunnel which Congress itself demanded.

Otherwise the District Highway Department has been dragging its heels. I note that the Engineer Commissioner has stated recently that he opposes a tunnel for the south leg of the inner loop on grounds of cost.

It seems to me that when we talk about costs we ought to include the cost of lost parklands and of damage to individuals and neighborhoods. And we ought to talk about the cost to the Nation of having the appearance of its National Capital seriously damaged.

As dedicated as I am to the proposition that the interstate highway system must be completed in the District, I am equally committed to the view that this can and must be done without harm to the city. And I cannot be a fervent supporter of the District highway program until I am persuaded that the highway engineers have objectively considered ways of avoiding such harm, in particular through tunnel construction. I believe the House District Committee will do the Nation a just service by insisting that this be done.

The highway program is much too valuable to go down the drain because the engineers lack imagination. But that is precisely where it is headed and it is time the Highway Department woke up to that fact.

SPECIAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FOR SURVIVORS OF SERVICEMEN KILLED IN COMBAT ZONE

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 10630 which is a bill to provide special indemnity insurance for the survivors of servicemen killed or who die as a result of injuries suffered in a combat zone.

With the involvement we now have in world affairs, it is apparent that we will be called upon many times to give assistance to nations that are threatened by a Communist takeover. At the present time we are moving toward the commitment of 100,000 troops in Vietnam. These men are being called upon to place their lives on the line in the fight for freedom. It is not too much to ask their Nation to assure them that in the event of their death the family which they leave behind will at least be provided with a small amount of security.

I am aware that the whole matter of insurance for servicemen was given a long study and it was concluded that a compensation program would be more feasible than an insurance program. However, I feel that with the hazardous duties given these men and the fact that some insurance companies have a cancellation clause in their policies that we should do everything possible to remove a heavy mental strain now being imposed on these men. It is my hope that the Members of this body will support the passage of this bill.

OBJECT OF A SEARCH

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, few things give us more pleasure and inspiration than to see the development and the unfolding of the mind and spirit of a young man or a young woman; to see them wrestling with the great mysteries and challenges of life, to see them groping for truth through the maze which surrounds life, and to see them find their way through the labyrinth and come to the high, clear ground of a better understanding of life and of God with feet firmly planted upon this good earth.

I have seen the unfolding of such a story in my own family in a nephew, Branson H. Willis, Jr., son of my only sister. He, as an 18-year-old boy wrote, as a theme while he was a student at Fort Lauderdale Junior College, his story of search for the meaning of life, for truth, for God. He revealed his difficulties and his doubts as a searching boy, maturing into manhood, would do. This is what he wrote:

INTRODUCTION

This is my story. It is a story of search. It is a search of meaning, of value, of placement according to relativity. Time will bestow on me my goal. Will others be as fortunate? Others live with it and perhaps never realize their questions and wonderings. If they had the courage to realize their doubt and unsureness then they too would be searchers and ultimately finders of truth and knowledge.

I am a vagabond lured on by the vision of a splendor land somewhere; a maverick immune to any brand that accepts fences; the driftwood that knows only change is constant; the searcher who knows that treasure found is less than treasure sought. Something bigger, finer, and more wonderful than anything I have every known awaits me somewhere, somehow, sometime.

These are my ways of saying I am searching. I am trying to find. I must find.

It is hard to put into words my reasons for searching and my object of search. Maybe it is easy to fill a darkened room with light by pulling on a switch, but, ah, finding the light switch in a darkened room. Maybe it is easy to open a door by turning a key in the lock, but, ah, finding the right key on the key ring in the dark.

I am searching for the meaning of God. Not so I can be a Christian. I don't believe there are many Christians in the world today. There are, however, many acceptors. I am searching for God because he is the answer to truth, to beauty, and to peace. I'm not even sure if there is a God, or if I believe there is a God.

People believe that being a Christian means going to church, giving to their church, and believing in God. Therefore, they believe they will go to heaven (if there is a heaven—or hell). But, how many of these people have stopped to think and ask themselves, Is there a God? Is there? I have just always accepted it as something that is—and always has been.

Now I cannot just accept it. I have to know for sure what God means and who God is. Is God the crystal blue lake that sleeps peacefully at the foot of tall, strong pines? Is God the sunrise of a million breathtaking colors over a calm ocean? Is He the hands of a surgeon who delivers the small, fragile baby? Is He the darkling thrust who fills the desolate night air with blessed hope whereof he knows, and I am unaware?

Until I have the feeling, the realization of complete existence in God-consciousness, I am a separate entity appealing to a long-distance God, and am inclined to doubt whether my appeals can reach One who has so many sparrows to watch in their fallings.

There is a happy sequel to this story. Shortly after writing these words, my nephew joined the U.S. Air Force, of which he has been a part for more than 2 years. Now as a man—tall, straight, and strong.

He has not only found himself as a man, but he has found the things that make life meaningful to him. He is immeasurably proud of the Air Force, of America, and deeply dedicated to the service of his country and to the preservation and perpetuation of all that it *stands for*. And he has, too, found God, in church, in Sunday school, and in his private life.

I bring this matter to this RECORD somewhat to give encouragement to other boys who may be going through similar struggles but principally to pay tribute to the Air Force of our country for what it has done to make this troubled boy a strong, assured, God-fearing American man. For this additional contribution it is making in the spiritual realm to the strength of America, multiplied countless times, I am sure, in the lives of other boys and girls, we of this Congress and of this country who support this great Air Force, can take great pride.

SITUATION OF HUNGARIANS IN TRANSYLVANIA

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday my distinguished colleagues from several States, under the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] have discussed in detail the discrimination and repression of the Hungarian minority in Rumania, some 1.75 million strong, by the present Communist Rumanian regime. They provide ample evidence by reference to articles, and by submitting voluminous witness material on the situation.

I would like to express my complete agreement with their conclusions and remind us that abridgment of human and civil rights, and the forcible assimilation process against national minorities are a matter of concern for all free peoples, because peace like justice is indivisible. Of course, we are aware that Communist governments whatever their present stripe have oppressed and continue to oppress their citizens and that the ultimate solution must be the creation of free elected and responsible governments in these countries where communism was imported from the Soviet Union under Stalin in violation of the intentions and desires of the peoples. Yet, in 1965, the naked oppression of a minority which is occurring in a Communist country which tries to improve its standing and economic and cultural relations with the Western powers should not and must not be countenanced by us.

Mr. Speaker, we must take firm and unequivocal action in condemning these Communist Rumanian discriminatory measures. Not only the Hungarian minority which is the particular target of the persecution, but all of the Rumanian citizenry is suffering under an unenlightened police rule and I am raising my voice against the abridgment of human and civil rights of all Rumanian citizens, particularly the Hungarian minority. I know that the Foreign Affairs Committee will take action soon on my resolution House Resolution 51, and that we will soon have the opportunity to vote on this issue as a body.

LABOR SHORTAGE FACING PICKLE GROWERS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. RACE] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], addressed this body and outlined an alleged crisis now facing the pickle growers of his State. Mr. CEDERBERG pointed out that he has been contacted by pickle growers in his State who allegedly will suffer severe losses from unharvested crops caused by a severe labor shortage. I am afraid that the Michigan pickle growers have not told my good friend, Mr. CEDERBERG, the entire story.

I know that it is somewhat unusual for a Wisconsin Member to be so concerned over the Michigan pickle industry, but in this instance many young men in my district have suffered financial hardship at the hands of this group. And I have doubt that other young men in other parts of this country have also suffered.

Before I go on any further, I would like to bring to the attention of the Michigan pickle growers at least 14 young men from Wisconsin have expressed their desire to work in the fields, harvesting the pickle crop. They are:

John Moser, Rural Route 1, Allenton, Wis.

Edward Schoenecker, Rural Route 1, Allenton, Wis.

Richard Schuster, Rural Route 1, Allenton, Wis.

George Beder, Route 3, Hardford, Wis.

George Schaefer, 121 Storck Street, Slinger, Wis.

Roger Millerman, Route 1, Slinger, Wis.

Thomas Ruetlen, 215 South Washington Street, Slinger, Wis.

Terry Cowan, Route 1, Slinger, Wis.

Kieth Cowan, Route 1, Slinger, Wis.

Warren Retzlaff, 214 Lawndale Avenue, Slinger, Wis.

Bert Hultman, 206A North Washington, Slinger, Wis.

Jim Killeen, Route 1, Slinger, Wis.

Charles Tennies, 218 Lawndale Avenue, Slinger, Wis.

Gerald Fries, 111 Buchanan Street, Slinger, Wis.

These young men were part of the A-TEAM program—athletes in temporary employment as agricultural manpower. This program was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor to relieve the anticipated shortage of the agricultural workers after the expiration of Public Law 78. On June 24, 1965, the D. & B. Pickle Growers of Unionville, Mich., agreed to provide employment for these 14 young men and other A-TEAM members from Wisconsin. These youths were to report to work on July 29. The A-TEAM members were preparing to carry out their part of the contract. Other employment had been offered, but refused by these young men because the D. & B. Pickle Growers of Unionville had committed themselves by contract. But on July 27, the D. & B. Pickle Growers decided to break their contract with these young men.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the shock I experienced when I learned that these young men, many of whom need summer jobs to finance their education, were the wanton victims of an organization known as the D. & B. Pickle Growers.

I was even more shocked to learn that the D. & B. Pickle Growers canceled their contract because they "were not able to arrange satisfactory feeding arrangements as required for the use of A-TEAMS." I have further been advised by the Wisconsin Employment Service that:

Wisconsin A-TEAMS will not be used to harvest cucumbers (in Michigan). The various growers who previously used foreign workers to harvest their crops have either found sufficient local labor, interstate labor, or have reduced their acreage.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that no labor shortage exists in the cucumber fields of Michigan. What there is a shortage of, is the type of labor that can be forced to live in shacks and eat substandard meals. With the expiration of Public Law 78, Mexican nationals are no longer

available to be exploited. When the Michigan pickle growers finally come to accept this—I am certain the cucumbers will be harvested.

"EDUCATION FOR AN URBAN SOCIETY," A SIDNEY HILLMAN FOUNDATION LECTURE, TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House of Representatives is scheduled to consider H.R. 9567, the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Title I of this legislation is designed to enable colleges and universities in our country to establsh and maintain community services programs aimed at solving the problems of urban and suburban areas.

There can be no question that the capacity of our country to cope with the enormous problems caused by the increasing urbanization of America is directly related to our system of education. The enactment by Congress of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and more recently the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 are only two of the most important examples of the awareness of both President Johnson and the Congress of the significant relationship between education and the problems of urban life.

Earlier this year, on April 22, 1965, I had the honor of delivering a lecture at Temple University in Philadelphia under the auspices of the Sidney Hillman Foundation on the subject of "Education for an Urban Society."

In view of the higher education bill we are tomorrow to consider, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for whatever interest it may have for my colleagues.

The address follows:

EDUCATION FOR AN URBAN SOCIETY

(An address by Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS of Indiana, Sidney Hillman Foundation lecture series, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., Apr. 22, 1965)

INTRODUCTION

President Gladfelter, Mr. Whittier, members of the faculty and student body of Temple University, and friends, I am honored indeed to have been invited to speak to you today at this great University under the auspices of the Sidney Hillman Foundation.

When Sidney Hillman died in 1946, President Truman said of him, "* * * that he, an immigrant youth, could ride to eminence in the land of his adoption, is a tribute at once to his own ability and character and to the democratic ideals for which he fought."

As the son of an immigrant myself, it is with special feeling that I speak to you today of education, for education is the fuel that drives a society that is truly free and democratic. I think it is not inappropriate that an American Congressman of Greek descent should be discussing education in a series of lectures named after an American Jew, for if the Jews and the Greeks have one thing in common, aside of course from having invented civilization, it is their profound respect for education.

I come to you this morning as a practicing politician, one who sits on the Committee of the House of Representatives which is primarily responsible for legislation in the field of education. As a member of this committee during the last 7 years, I have had an opportunity to talk with school and university students and teachers here in our country as well as with young people in Buenos Aires and Berlin, London and Warsaw, Moscow, and Djakarta. I have, therefore, no hesitation in emulating the many speakers these days who assure you that winds of change are blowing across our troubled world.

Consider if you will that within our own lifetime advances in science and technology have made possible the beginnings of man's exploration of space, an adventure that short years ago seemed the stuff of science fiction.

Consider as well that within this same period man has learned to unleash against his fellow man destructive forces that are beyond the power of most of us to imagine.

And here at home, one long century after Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, our fellow Americans of color have burst into the national consciousness with volcanic dedication to insist that America make real the bright promise of freedom.

I suggest to you, therefore, that the perils and the opportunities facing us today are, I think it is no exaggeration to say, the greatest in the history of this country, indeed in the history of mankind. One is almost tempted to agree with the facetious comment of Bob Hope recently in a commencement address when he said that the only word of advice had for the graduating seniors about to go out into the world was: "Don't."

For the winds of scientific and technical change have brought with them vast and complex social and economic problems. Here are some examples. We still have in this country a continuing high level of unemployment, an alarming increase in the number of students who drop out of high school before finishing, a serious rise in youth delinquency and crime, a grave shortage of scientific and technological manpower, and an increasing deficiency of classrooms and teachers in our schools, colleges and universities. Clearly we cannot as a nation allow ourselves to be overwhelmed by these problems. It ought to be equally clear that our system of education is directly related to our capacity to resolve them.

IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION

We might generalize and say that today education serves three principal purposes in the American society. First, education enhances not only the income but also the quality of life of the individual. Second, education has become essential to our survival as a nation. Congress appropriates vast sums of money for defense, space exploration and the development of atomic power, and there must be educated men and women able to carry out these programs. Third, education is an indispensable key to the economic growth and development of our country. One authority has suggested that less than half the rise in this Nation's output since 1900 can be accounted for by increased amounts of capital and labor; the rest, he says, comes largely from improved skills and education of the labor force and advances in management.

These then are the chief reasons we must as a nation increase our investment not only in plant and equipment, important as they are. We must also increase greatly our investment in human beings.

The distinguished English philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead, put the matter in this way when he said in a celebrated essay in 1917:

"In the conditions of modern life, the rule is absolute—the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroisms, not all your social charm, not all your wit, and not all your victories on land and sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves; tomorrow, science will have moved forward yet one more step. And there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."

Some 45 years later, an eminent American natural scientist, President Lee Du Bridge of the California Institute of Technology, echoed Whitehead's warning when he said:

"The individual who is the best candidate for the unemployment rolls, the best candidate for being a misfit in our society, is the one whose educational experience has been improperly guided or prematurely interrupted."

Now, against the background of those general observations, I should like to discuss with you briefly some of the efforts which President Johnson and we in Congress have been making to increase our national investment in education in order to enable our country to cope more effectively with some of the extraordinarily difficult problems that I have enumerated. Because of the nature of our discussion here today, I address myself particularly to the role of education as it affects the urban sector of our society. Yet in doing so, I must warn you that this aspect of American experience, the urban aspect, is still hazy, still unclear, still undefined or ill-defined, for we are not yet really sure what urban society in the United States is, let alone how to deal with it.

FROM RURAL TO URBAN AMERICA

The American city today is the American Nation of tomorrow. We all know this. Between 1950 and 1960, the Census Bureau tells us, the urban population of America rose 26½ percent while rural areas decined by 1 percent. That decline may seem somewhat mild until you realize that the country as a whole increased its population by 18½ percent.

Let's take a closer look at the figures. For example, we have today in the United States 212 standard metropolitan statistical areas. One of these areas—an SMSA—is a county or group of counties in the center of which is a city of 50,000 people or more. There are 212 of these SMSA's in the United States today and they contain 84 percent of the total population of this country. Yet oddly enough, the SMSA's account for only half our counties. In the other half our dwindling rural population still lives. The pressures are clearly building up. Something called metropolitanization is transforming this country and altering the living habits of our citizens.

It is not only population growth, however, that is making today's city tomorrow's nation. Indeed, population congestion as such is slowly being relieved. In 1960, for example, our urban land requirements, including parks, totaled 21 million acres. In 15 years, this figure will rise to 32 million acres. The American city is reaching out and annexing new land for present and future uses.

I may be somewhat preoccupied by land and this may be traceable to my boyhood in Indiana. That was almost 40 years ago. Mishawaka is still there, although it is increasingly difficult to tell where South Bend on the West and Elkhart on the East leave off and Mishawaka begins.

I have checked with the experts to see what the next 40 years might hold. Within the next 40 years, they tell me, the United States will add as much urban population and will create as much urbanized land as it has in the past 190 years. Yet this urbanized land

will not come about through annexing Mexico or Canada, or by colonizing the oceans. We will continue to convert, as we have been converting, the constant acreage of America. We will be doing so at approximately 4½ times the rate of land conversion that has taken place so far.

When I was a boy, there were about 22 acres of land per person in this country. Today, each American draws upon the goods and services of only 12½ acres of land, or three average city blocks of about 25 comfortable suburban house lots. By the time I become 80 years old, there will be only 7½ acres of land per American, according to the most educated guesses. Of course, this 7½ acres will include some of the Rocky Mountains, the Everglades and Death Valley, as well as Philadelphia and Mishawaka.

I think you may now have the feeling about our Nation's future that I have, about its increasingly urban character. You may also share with me the deep feeling about land that we have inherited from the early settlers and pioneers of this country. We have been a very land-conscious people and we continue to be so. We understand land, the buying and selling and developing of land; and we can be sure of the figures I have set before you. But we cannot be sure of much else about the future of our increasingly urbanized metropolitanized country. For what after all is an American city? What is the urban experience we share together?

The answers to these questions must go beyond the measurements of so many parcels of land. The American city is also characterized by what may seem to be irrelevancies—scraps of poetry from Sandburg and William Carlos Williams, by the tailors who organized the rights of labor here in the streets of Philadelphia, by ticker tape parades and foreign restaurants, elevated railways and subways, the festivals of Little Italy and Chinatown, the floodlit Wrigley Building and candelit Brown Palace Hotel. None of these impressions makes much sense of itself, yet the notion of an American city without such images as these makes even less.

Here in Philadelphia, where so much care and attention have been given to modernization and growth, your civic leaders and planners have provided for the pleasant incongruities and historic surprises that make Philadelphia a community different from any other on earth. I am grateful, for example, that your city's leaders have opened up the area around Independence Hall to enable all citizens to see it and pay homage to those who once used it for noble purposes. Indeed, I should like nothing better than to ramble on about what you at Temple described as the "Acres of Diamonds" which the American city offers to its citizens.

PROBLEMS OF THE CITY

But I cannot and still be honest with you, for there is yet another side to urban living—the bitter and cruel, that has no glitter and no gold. It is the dark side of the city that is the cause of my misgivings. For if we become an urban Nation, as we nearly are now, will it mean a liberation of the spirit of our citizens or will the city become a prison of the spirit?

Here in this great university you will collect data year by year. We will get all the reports in Washington and elsewhere. Other centers will tabulate the statistics of metropolitan decay and we will keep well informed about the speed and direction and condition of our collapsing urban culture.

Even now we have the most complete statistics on urban crime ever compiled. We know so much about urban vehicular accidents that the adjustment of insurance claims is now practically automatic. We can predict almost to the day and hour when city reservoirs will be so low that water will have to be rationed. We can measure the lethal potential of smog and predict the cases of heart seizure, blindness, and outright suffocation that will ensue. I confess to you a deep fear that our magnificent contribution to civilization, the American city, this revolutionary way of living and working together which we devised about a century ago, is hovering between life and death.

We cannot, however, turn back to a more quiet pastoral society, as some would like to do. For we are a nation of cities, we are converting our land into metropolitan complexes at an increasing rate, and we are not suddenly going to throw the whole process into reverse.

As the president of this university said in 1963:

"To retreat from the city would be to contradict our tradition, our growth, and our potential as a university in an urban setting and to deny the mood of the times which is a vast population shift to the Nation's urban centers."

As President Gladfelter recognized, the urban era is upon us. We must then confront the problems that urbanization brings and not run away from them.

POVERTY

I speak, for example, of the problem of poverty which has just loomed into the awareness of many millions of our fellow citizens. Today's urban poor are the parents of tomorrow's urban poor, certainly not by design but at least by default. We have locked two generations of our fellow citizens into a hopeless, bitter cycle of poverty. We have created within the American culture of freedom and opportunity a tragic subculture of dependency.

Since 1960, we have been examining the data on poverty and have discovered that 1 in 5 American families is poor. This means their annual income is less than $3,000. Of these 9 million poor families, over half live in urban areas. To be specific, there were over 5 million such poor urban families according to our last census, and of these, about one-third are headed by an unemployed person.

In one-sixth of these impoverished urban families, there are three or more children of school age. These children are unlikely to be stimulated or encouraged to continue their education. For we know that three-fourths, actually 78 percent, of their families are headed by someone who did not finish high school.

Let me expand on this subject of education, for I think we in the United States have begun to realize that the cycle of poverty—the inheritance of poverty, if you will—can be broken only by education. Yet we also recognize that education and educators have barely scratched the surface of this problem.

If a father has had less than 8 years of schooling and earns less than $3,000 a year—and there are 6 million such families in this country—the chances are 6 to 4 that his teenage child will be a year behind in school. These are terrible odds to live with. About half the teenagers in such families never finish high school though they do manage to get a year or two beyond the eighth grade level attained by their parents. About 1 million young Americans drop out of school every year. Eventually 25 percent or so will find work, but the rest will still stand around street corners with nothing to do, soon to become ciphers in the statistics of the adult unemployed. They too begin to want families and children because they are made of the same human stuff as the rest of this country's citizens. But shortly, they will become charges of the city's welfare establishments.

We have all kinds of comments to make these days about polluted air and polluted water and these are, of course, terribly serious problems in our urban areas. But I want to suggest to you that at least 5 million impoverished urban families in this country know polluted hope and polluted ambition as well. When we see some of the statistics I have set forth to you, I think we can understand the extent of our ignorance about urban society.

We have not yet learned to make the best use of our land. We are fledgling land planters at best. We do not know how to move traffic, lay in utilities, distribute social services or protect human lives in our great cities. Experiments are now being conducted in Boston, New Haven, St. Louis, Chicago, Atlanta, Cleveland, and Detroit to see if our rich natural resources can be placed at the service of our precious human resources as America becomes metropolitanized. We do not yet know if we can solve all these problems. We are not really sure that we can. But we know that as a Nation, we must begin.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

I am pleased to say that Congress and the President have taken at least some first steps toward meeting some of our most pressing urban problems. With the strong support and imaginative programs recommended by President Johnson and by President Kennedy before him, we are moving ahead to expand and preserve and enrich the greatness of this country.

Let me cite, for example, two historic breakthroughs made by the 88th Congress. I speak of the Economic Opportunity Act, which authorizes the war on poverty, and the Civil Rights Act. Both these measures employed in part what seems to be the fundamental instrument for fostering revitalization of our urban communities. That instrument, of course, is education.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

A number of Job Corps centers have been established under the Economic Opportunity Act for the purpose of providing work experience and job training for many disadvantaged teenage men and women. Work training and work study programs have already begun, and young people who have salvaged hope and ambition from the slums of their childhood will, under these programs, be given a chance.

Under the community action program of the war on poverty 100,000 slum children will get a "Head Start" this year in nursery schools. Congress has appropriated $249 million for community action programs, and already three-fourths of these have built into them some kind of preschool activity. Through these preschool programs, children will learn, many of them for the first time fundamentals that most of us in this hall this morning take for granted. They will learn about telephones, pens and pencils, the different kinds of chairs you can sit in; they will learn about their names. They will be led out of the slums and taken on buses to see what their city is like. For it may come as a surprise to many of you to learn that many of our slum youngsters have never ventured beyond the three or four blocks surrounding their tenements.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

The 1964 Civil Rights Act represents, of course, another stroke of leadership. Eight million Negroes, nearly half the Negro population of the United States, earn less than $3,000 a year. They are poor. A third of the Negro poor live in southern cities; nearly half live in northern cities like Philadelphia. The rest live in rural wastelands.

The American Negro is now waging a historic battle to insure that this country fulfills the shining promise of freedom and justice for all our citizens. But I can tell you that the American Negro is winning that battle, not only because he is fighting for declarations of rights or negotiated liberties; he is fighting for his very survival.

Penned into our rotting inner city cores, the Negro's share of per capita income is actually falling, while the share of the whites is on the rise. Fifteen years ago, for example, in Michigan, a Negro generally earned 87 percent as much as the white man earned. Five years ago in that State a Negro earned only 75 percent as much as the white man. In North Carolina, 15 years ago, a Negro could earn 54 percent as much as a white man. Five years ago, it dropped to 43 percent.

This dismal litany of poverty and discrimination will someday be brought to an end—and it must end right here in our cities, for that is where almost two-thirds of the Negro citizens of this country are and where they are likely to remain.

EDUCATION ACT

The greatest opportunity for leadership, it seems to me, is soon to come to the educators in our urban schools, colleges, and universities. The President's Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides over $1 billion aimed directly at helping the children of poverty. Over 12 percent of our school age population, the some 5 million children in the United States who belong to families whose annual income is $3,000 or less, will benefit from title I of this act. The assistance provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which the President signed in Johnson City on April 10, 1965, will affect more than 90 percent of this country's operating school districts.

It is our hope in Congress that the schoolteachers and administrators of this country will rise to the opportunity this new bill presents and will put together imaginative programs to provide special facilities and special teaching devices for children of the poor. We anticipate that school superintendents in our urban areas will develop better school health services, story hours, special teacher training, tutoring services, remedial reading, mobile learning centers, summer schools, Saturday schools, work experience programs, field trips, and other programs to enrich the learning experience of these young people. We hope this kind of action will enable the 5 million schoolchildren from poverty-stricken families to begin their education with a minimum of hardship and a maximum of benefit. We hope this kind of action will convince the disadvantaged schoolchildren of this country that education is on their side and not against them.

President Johnson has not spelled out detailed programs for local city educators to follow nor has the Commissioner of Education written rigid guidelines for carrying out this historic act. Nor have we in Congress. But all of us from the President down are hopeful that local initiative, local imagination, and local vigor will mark the administration of this pioneering effort to bring America's schoolchildren into the mainstream of education. I have great confidence that local leadership will meet this challenge.

Already we see cities moving ahead on their own without Federal support. Cleveland's Community Action Program for Youth, now in its second year, has a preschool program, an extended day reading program for elementary school youngsters, a chapter of Future Teachers of America at work in the high schools as teachers aids, and a youth corps involved in neighborhood cleanup and charity drives.

In Minneapolis, volunteer reading ladies are helping children in the early grades gain proficiency in the basic skills of reading and speaking. In Boston, tutoring services are provided in settlement houses, churches, and other facilities throughout the city. Similar projects are underway in Norfolk, Baltimore, New York, Los Angeles, New Haven, Miami, Denver, and Oakland. In all these cities educators and ordinary concerned citizens have been utilizing this magnificent instrument—education—for lifting the level of opportunity for the young people of this country.

THE ROLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

And so, as President Kennedy might have put it, we have begun. But let us not delude ourselves; there is an immense amount of work still to do. Worthy as these several individual projects may be, they in no way satisfy the pressing national need for better urban planning. I might suggest, therefore, that before we look for new devices and new governmental machinery to help us improve urban living, we recall those exciting years of the 19th century when the modern American city as we know it was just being built.

Electrification was coming in, so was the elevator; mass public transportation was being introduced. You didn't have to move in among strangers every time you changed jobs, and many new jobs were being created because cities were growing, just as America itself was expanding.

This was the great period of the institute, the advance guard of higher education in urban America. Teacher training institutes sprang up in most cities. Vocational schools of all kinds flourished to give the new city dweller, especially the immigrant, valuable skills in manual arts, home economics, retail business, pharmacy, printing, law, accounting, and insurance, to name only a few.

The urban environment was spreading laterally and also vertically. Only vast regiments of skilled men and women could hold it together as a functioning unit. Now our urban centers already know about higher education and the contribution that it can make to the resolution of urban problems. It is true that today we are concerned less about woodworkers and saddlemakers and more about demographers and psychiatric social workers and computer programers. Yet the situation is really much the same, for the city looks to the colleges and universities to help train and retrain the manpower that it requires to survive.

When we were primarily a rural nation it took no great amount of thought to understand that university facilities and personnel could help farm families manage their crops more effectively, devise better methods of budgeting their resources, fight pests and blight, repair machinery, and function intelligently in the marketplace. This was an additional assignment, heavily underwritten by the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Education, to supplement the regular academic catalog at our great land grant universities and colleges. But now we are a nation essentially urban and it should be evident that this process of rapid urbanization means new challenges and responsibilities for the colleges and universities in the urban areas of America.

If urban communities are not to be overwhelmed by the problems of housing, transportation, taxation, education, and local government, the urban university must produce large numbers of men and women trained to handle the issues of city life. Although only 10 percent of all American colleges and universities are now in urban areas, they enroll 50 percent of all college students. With such strength, therefore, higher education cannot ignore its central role in meeting the thorny responsibilities of urban life.

By 1970, it is estimated that the population of the United States will reach the 214 million mark and by 1980 this figure will leap to 260 million. Urban communities must turn to colleges and universities for the manpower essential to meet the needs of this enormously expanded population. Universities can provide local and regional governments with training and consulting services; they can offer adult education services to the aging and handicapped, programs for women reentering the labor market, and leadership seminars for social service agencies.

In this connection, let me tell you that within a few days the House Education and Labor Committee, of which I am a member, will resume consideration of President Johnson's proposed higher education bill. That bill includes a 5-year program to support university extension and continuing education. Under this title of the proposed bill, some $25 million (and I plan to offer an amendment to double this figure to $50 million) will become available to help colleges and universities, like Temple University, bolster adult education and extension programs. In addition, these funds will provide strengthened resources for meeting the problems of urban and suburban communities, just as the land-grant colleges helped find answers to many of the problems of American rural life. As President Johnson said in his education message to Congress in January, "The time has come for us to help the universities to face problems of the city as they once faced problems of the farm."

Now you may ask, will this new agenda of responsibility interfere with the university's traditional program of academic studies? I know that both Adm. Hyman Rickover and Logan Wilson, the head of the American Council of Education, in testifying before our committee, expressed that concern. Their apprehensions may have some basis. Yet there is no reason, it seems to me, for great colleges and universities in urban areas to turn their backs on the traditional central role of an institution of higher learning, first class teaching and first class research. After all, the concept of community service is not a revolutionary idea being thrust upon unsuspecting colleges and universities.

Here at Temple University, you have made assistance available to the Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement. Harvard and MIT already operate a joint center of urban studies. The University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee, in extending the famous Wisconsin idea of university service to the people of that State, recently established a department of urban affairs.

Dr. Fred Harrington, president of the University of Wisconsin and a representative of the 97-member National Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, testified before our committee a few days ago in support of President Johnson's higher education bill. Dr. Harrington said he considered it appropriate: "* * * for university experts to identify immediate public problems and help bring to focus on a solution of those problems all existing institutional resources, or to create special educational programs in concert with other appropriate professional, educational and lay agencies."

"The university," said Dr. Harrington, "is perhaps one of the few remaining institutions in American society that can see its problems as a whole, that can relate the contributions of the various specialized disciplines into some rational pattern."

I endorse Dr. Harrington's viewpoint. As I have said, we know too little about the problems of American cities. What little we do know seems only to help us identify more and more problems rather than to find solutions to the ones we already understand.

Some in despair, might advocate escape to the suburbs; or worse still, remain in the city but shut off the city from our minds and hearts. But neither of these approaches has any appeal to me, and I fervently hope that neither finds favor with educators. For in my judgment, urban educators at the elementary and secondary level as well as at the college and university level have one of the greatest opportunities for leadership in America today.

The Federal Government, though such programs as the recently enacted Elementary

and Secondary School Act, the Vocational Education and Higher Education Acts of 1963, the Higher Education Act that we will pass in 1965, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Medical School Construction Act, the National Defense Education Act, and other important measures which Congress has enacted in recent years can provide much needed support for the enterprise of urban education. Yet these Federal programs will succeed only if there is intelligent, imaginative and dedicated leadership by State and local school leaders and colleges and universities in the urban areas of the Nation.

Let me, in conclusion, recall to you the words of Professor Whitehead: "In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute—The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed."

The conditions of modern life in America are urban, and if we are not to be doomed, we must train all the intelligence we can.

In the year 1891, just 7 years after the founding of Temple University, the introduction to a book published in this country read:

"What shall we do with our great cities? What will our great cities do with us? These are the two problems which confront every thoughtful American.

"For the question involved in these two questions does not concern the city alone. The whole country is affected, if indeed its character and history are not determined by the condition of its great cities." [1]

I would respectfully suggest to you that in turn, the condition of our great cities and, therefore, of our country, will in large measure be determined by the educators and educational institutions of urban America.

[1] Lyman Abbott, "Introduction," Helen Campbell et al., "Darkness and Daylight" (Hartford, 1891), pp. 40, 42, cited in Arthur M. Schlesinger, "The Rise of the City," 1878–1898 (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933), front matter.

PRESENT INADEQUATE TIME SITUATION IN MONTANA

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, Montana is entirely in the mountain zone and generally observes year-round mountain standard time which is based on the 105th meridian and gives the State a standard time which is as much as 44 minutes faster than local sun time. Nevertheless, we have had a daylight saving problem.

Paradoxically, the only point in the State now actually observing daylight saving time is Butte, Mont., in the western point of the State, for which the advance of 1 hour under daylight saving time, gives it a time more than an hour and a half faster than sun time. As almost all of the State is above the 45th parallel, we are blessed with abundant sunshine in the warmer months. We have longer periods of summer daylight than most States.

The argument for daylight saving time is an industrial one. Mining is one of our great industries and the Butte area has more underground workers than any other western community. It is said that the miners like to have an extra hour of sunshine in the evening after being underground all day.

In years past a number of other cities of the State have joined Butte in observing the fast time. Missoula has been on daylight saving time, but not the county, resulting in a conflict between the times on which the city and county offices operated.

In 1964, Anaconda, Belgrade, Bozeman, and Livingston observed daylight saving from Memorial Day to Labor Day. In 1965, the voters in several cities rejected proposals to follow suit, including Billings, Great Falls, and Livingston. The Bozeman ordinance has been repealed. As a result, this year, Butte is the only city officially on the fast time. The city of Anaconda, about 23 miles northwest of Butte, did not go on daylight saving this year, following an unfavorable vote by the city residents. However, the Anaconda company and many city merchants have advanced their working hours by 1 hour.

A compromise bill passed by the State legislature would have forbidden the adoption of daylight saving time in the State, except for the Butte-Anaconda area. However, Governor Babcock vetoed the bill.

An effort is being made in this session to have the Congress undertake to restore some semblance of order to the chaotic time situation. Bills have been introduced which would smooth out some of the obvious deficiencies in the present inadequate Standard Time Act, and would also eliminate one of the features of the present situation which is most productive of confusion; namely, the widely differing periods of observance.

Even the daylight saving advocates in Butte seem to favor handling this problem on a national basis. While I would prefer more comprehensive legislation, the provision in the pending bills that would confine the observance of daylight saving to a standard period from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in October has my support.

COMPENSATION FOR RAILROAD WAGE LOSS CAUSED BY THE CONSTRUCTION OF LIBBY DAM

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the construction of the Libby Dam in northwestern Montana will cause an economic upheaval in the area. The project envisages an expenditure of millions of dollars in materials and wages over a period of many years. This massive dose of money will do wonders for all of western Montana.

The plans for the dam have caused many economic disruptions of the present facilities in the area, but the Federal Government has adopted the policy of compensating all private economic losses caused by the construction of the dam. Private land to be covered by the water has been purchased by the Government. State highways will be relocated at Federal expense. Bridges will be rebuilt and an entire town will be moved from the reservoir area. In addition, miles of railroad track will be rebuilt above the water level.

The Government has done a fine job in compensating the economic losses of the propertied interests, but it has overlooked and ignored a vital nonpropertied economic interest—this is the wage loss incurred by the railroad employee of the area.

As you know, the wages earned by the railroad worker are determined by the number of miles he travels each day. The new route of relocated track will shorten the trip by some 15 miles, and this will result in a loss of $3 in wages each day to each worker. This sum is minimal for 1 day, but when it is multiplied by the length of a railroad career, the loss to the individual worker, and to the economy in the area, is significant. To the individual worker, it can mean the difference of a car payment, or a house payment at the end of the month. In view of the Government policy of compensating all private economic losses caused by the dam, it is clear that this wage loss deserves equal treatment.

WORDS OF WISDOM FROM SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY HENRY H. FOWLER.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, Eugene Patterson is a native Georgian and a distinguished newspaper editor. Recently he wrote a column about our region in which he quoted a Virginian, Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler. The thoughts expressed in this column by these men are not only worthy of consideration by every citizen of our region, but they deserve the consideration of every American.

The editorial follows:

SEEK TO BIND, NOT TO BREAK

(By Eugene Patterson)

In a period of appalling shocks to American hopes for racial reason, a Virginian spoke quietly in Alabama yesterday about some national strengths that overtower the weaknesses. He was the southern Secretary of the Treasury—Henry H. Fowler—in a southern President's Cabinet, and he began his Birmingham speech by surveying a sturdy American economy that is in its 54th straight month of expansion.

This unparalleled prosperity bears witness to a lesson, he said—"the lesson that, in economic affairs as in all others, we are strongest when we work to broaden the areas of cooperation; we are weakest when we seek to widen areas of conflict."

And this lesson, he said, "has a special relevance" to his native South.

"The South has a strong nucleus of capital, plant and technical and business know-how," he went on. "Its possibilities for development are limited only by the depth of the desire and determination of its people to create the kind of conditions, the kind of atmosphere, not only in which this nucleus of native resources can grow and prosper, but which will draw new capital, new plants, new technology, and new brainpower to the South as a place where both men and industry can flourish.

"To meet that challenge will not be easy. It will require that men of responsibility here in the South carefully encourage the growth of that same strong partnership for prosperity between all segments of your economy that has worked so well on the national level.

"It will require that men of responsibility here in the South refuse to relinquish the initiative to those who would divert your energies and your resources away from the great opportunity before you into the blind and bitter path of divisiveness and of hatred and of fear."

If the South's promise is to be fulfilled, he said, "then the South must enter the closing decades of this century inspired by the same quality and kind of vision unveiled before the South by two of her greatest sons"—Henry W. Grady and Robert E. Lee.

They spoke out in times more troubled than these, and were not shaken from their hold on enduring truths by momentary angers and alarms.

"These were men," said Mr. Fowler, "who understood that the future belongs to those who seek to build, not to destroy; who seek to bind, not to break; who seek to heal, not to hurt.

"These were men who understood that the perpetuation of hatred and division and violence could only prevent the South from becoming what all who loved her wanted her to be, and knew she could be—a region of abounding plenty where men and men's dreams can live and thrive."

SEA LEVEL CANAL COMMISSION—FIRST ANNUAL REPORT A MONSTROSITY

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on July 31, 1965, the President sent to the Congress a letter transmitting the first annual report of the agency created under Public Law 88-609, 88th Congress, approved September 22, 1964—78 Stat. 990—touching upon the administrative proposal for a canal at sea level across the Central American Isthmus—House Document No. 253, 89th Congress, 1st session. I can guess who the people were who prepared it.

This report is so filled with errors, miscalculations, evasions, and concealment of facts that, because of the grave importance of the subject involved, it requires an examination, analysis and exposition.

In such connection, I have made a careful study of the report, I have sought to consider it objectively and I now desire to express my views upon it. In so doing, I shall quote certain excerpts from the report, comment upon each, and give a summation of my conclusions.

First. "Ferdinand de Lesseps persuaded the International Congress for Consideration of an Interoceanic Canal—1879—to vote to build a sea level canal in Panama."

Comment: A grossly incomplete statement, De Lesseps did this against the specific advice of Godin de Lépinay, the only member of that body who had adequately studied the problems involved and developed a reasoned plan for construction of the Panama Canal—the one eventually adopted in 1906 by the United States. De Lesseps based his conclusions on his experience with the Suez Canal across a dry, sandy area, which involved radically different problems from those of the Panama Canal located in one of the most forbidding areas in the world. He thereby made failure inevitable before starting by not adopting the only solution that might have proved a success. The realities in the situation finally forced shifting to the high-level plan to save time and money. But, by that date, it was too late and the French attempt ended in an inevitable failure precisely as predicted by De Lépinay.

Second. "Roosevelt's Board of Consulting Engineers."

Comment: The use of President Roosevelt's name as done here is highly misleading for it implies that this advisory body was his main reliance for professional advice. This board was an Executive appointed International Board of Consulting Engineers with five Europeans on it. In addition there was the congressionally authorized Isthmian Canal Commission charged with direct responsibility for construction of the Panama Canal.

In the Board's report on January 10, 1906, its members split—eight, including the five Europeans, voting for sea-level which, in fact, included a tidal lock near the Pacific end of the Canal; and the five remaining Americans voting for the high-level lock type.

Notwithstanding this report, President Roosevelt sided with the views of Chief Engineer Stevens, which, with the support of the Isthmian Canal Commission and Secretary of War Taft, prevailed. See President Roosevelt's message of February 19, 1906, transmitting to the Congress the reports of the Board and the Commission.

Third. "Until the advent of modern aircraft carriers, tankers, and ore carriers."

Comment: The dimensions of certain naval vessels planned before 1939 were beyond the capacity of the Panama Canal locks. The third locks project was designed to overcome this limitation.

After this project failed, the Navy eliminated transit of the Panama Canal as a feature in the design of large war vessels, and the builders of large tankers and ore carriers seem to have done likewise. This invites the query as to how many of the latter are on routes which could use the Panama Canal.

Fourth. "Congress authorized the construction of a third set of locks whose 1,200 feet by 140 feet chambers with 50 feet depth of water would admit the largest U.S. aircraft carriers."

Comment: This project, authorized without ample study, especially of the problems of operations, was a navigational monstrosity that would have compounded the difficulties in the Pacific sector, which is by far the most hazardous part of the canal.

Fifth. "The study upon which this decision was based, however, recommended the construction of these locks as an interim measure with conversion to a sea-level canal as the ultimate goal."

Comment: This proposal was an undisclosed objective in the document cited in the legislation for the third locks project and this statement is an admission of this fact. The Congress did not authorize it nor had it been adequately studied.

The sea-level canal then contemplated would have followed the present high-level lake channel in a serpentine cut 30 miles long and would have been a navigational menace. See House Document No. 210, 76th Congress, paragraph 37.

Sixth. "World War II demands for labor and materials forced the suspension of the third locks project in 1942."

Comment: This is largely true but not until after some $75 million was expended on the project, mainly on excavations for lock sites at Gatun and Miraflores, which sum is not mentioned. Construction was stopped on protests from maritime interests. If the third locks project had been properly studied and planned, and not left to routine administrators without navigational experience or advice, it is probable that these interests would have supported the completion of the project despite the war. As it was, they saw no need for completing it as part of war activities because it could not have been completed before the end of the war.

The collapse of the third locks project, after the expenditure of more than $75 million, was one of the greatest engineering fiascoes in history. Had civilians brought about this abortive result they would have been severely criticized and castigated.

Seventh. "The advent of the atomic bomb made any lock canal highly vulnerable."

Comment: The atomic bomb was seized upon by advocates of the sea-level scheme at Panama as a "lever" with which to delude and browbeat the people of the Nation and the Congress. The statement that the atomic bomb made "any lock canal highly vulnerable" is misleading and so intended.

In 1905-06, it was the alleged vulnerability to destruction by naval gunfire that was the basis of arguments by sea level partisans. In 1945, it was "security" from atomic attack that they alleged could only be provided by excavating a sea level canal in the Canal Zone. These advocates never mention the fact that the high central mass of the Canal Zone in treacherous cucaracha slide formations is a point of major vulnerability in any type of canal, especially so in the sea level type, which would be much deeper and have greater lengths of slide

areas subject to closure from nuclear bombing.

Respected atomic warfare experts, military, naval and civilian, have expressed the view that any type of canal can be destroyed beyond any hope of timely restoration and that nuclear weapons are irrelevant in the design of navigational projects. See letter of Maj. Gen. Thomas F. Farrell, AUS, retired, quoted in statement by Thomas E. Martin on "Panama Canal Improvements: Views of Experienced Engineers," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 4, 1956; and the address, "What of the Panama Canal?" by Representative Willis W. Bradley, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 10, April 21, 1948, page A2449.

Eighth. "Work was never resumed on the third locks."

Comment: Unfortunately, this is true. It should have been resumed according to the modified plan that provides for the elimination of Pedro Miguel Locks, the consolidation of all Pacific locks at one place, and the creation of a summit level anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that at Gatun. Failure to complete this project as modified has denied the world a modernized Panama Canal with adequate capacity.

Ninth. "Capacity and security of the Panama Canal."

Comment: The bill for Public Law 280, 79th Congress—59 stat. 665—was prepared in the canal organization by those who later directed the inquiry under it. They injected the "security" factor for the purpose of enabling them to advance their objective of a canal at sea level by interpreting this factor as paramount and controlling, thereby making their recommendation for only the sea level project appear as a compliance with a mandate of the Congress. This they did in a massive propaganda campaign which failed.

Some of the fallacies in the 1947 sea level proposal were clarified in the executive departments and the report did not receive the approval of the President, who transmitted it to the Congress without comment or recommendation. The fallacies behind the security hypothesis were exposed in the Congress and the report was neither published nor acted upon by the Congress.

Tenth. "The only means of meeting adequately the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense by converting the present Panama Canal to sea level."

Comment: The "national defense" factor was used as a means for excluding from serious consideration the proposal that independent engineers consider to be best when the problem is evaluated from all vital angles.

In this connection, Governor Edgerton, of the Panama Canal, when reporting to the Secretary of War in January 1944 on the elimination of the Pedro Miguel locks, warned him that advocates of the sea level plan would "oppose unjustifiably" any major improvement in the existing canal on the ground that it would delay securing authorization for a canal at sea level.

Eleventh. "Two and one-quarter billion, exclusive of any tidal regulating structures."

Comment: During the 1946–48 inquiry, the estimates for the sea level plan were kept down and those for the high level were loaded with maximum defense features until the two appeared nearly equal. Public clarification of this feature resulted in reduction in the high level lock estimate by about $1 billion.

Even more significant as regards the sea level estimate, this does not allow for an indemnity for Panama, which, under present conditions, would be vast. The concealment over the years of the cash indemnity feature by advocates of the sea level proposal is not only a failure to take this important diplomatic factor into consideration but a wicked and malicious effort to deceive the Congress and the people at large concerning this tremendously important feature.

Many independent engineers and others conversant with the problems, including canal Governors, have held that improvement of the existing canal by the comparatively simple and inexpensive expedients of constructing additional locks and installing a plant for pumping sea water with Gatun Lake to be the obvious solutions. Among the most competent Governors with such views were Morrow and Burgess. See House Document No. 139, 72d Congress, page 44.

Twelfth. "Conversion of the existing canal to sea level if nuclear methods are not developed by the early 1970's."

Comment: This recommendation by the 1960 Board of Consultants reflects the determination to adhere to the 1947 sea level project, regardless of the costs or consequences, and indicates that a major part of that Board's work was done in the executive department. In this connection, it is most significant that Mr. E. S. Randolph, an experienced Panama Canal engineer, initially a member of this Board, after making major contributions in the preparation of the 1958 preliminary short-range report, withdrew from that inquiry, thus leaving him free to evaluate its final report. This, he had done, and such evaluation appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 29 as one of the documents appended to my address that day on the "Interoceanic Canal Problem: Inquiry or Cover Up?—Sequel." See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 29, 1965, pages 18747–18767.

Thirteenth. "The ultimate solution of the basic problem of increasing capacity is probably a sea level canal, but its construction should await a traffic volume that can support the large cost."

Comment: This statement is quoted from paragraph 15 of the 1960 report—House Report No. 1960, 86th Congress. The key words are "ultimate," "probably," and "a." Because the statement is entirely inconsistent with other conclusions in paragraph 13 and 16 of this report, it impresses as an injection from ex parte sources. "Ultimate" means a long, long time; "probably" reflects uncertainty and "a" suggests a location outside the Canal Zone.

In any event, this single paragraph 15, always quoted out of context, is the only sentence in the 1960 report habitually used by administration publicists in their propaganda for furthering their scheme.

Fourteenth. "Board—1960—expressed doubt of the stability of the slopes proposed therein during the short period of unwatering the present lakes."

Comment: This is one of the most important conclusions of the 1960 report but even here it is taken out of context. The 1960 Board report express the further opinion that "slides of the first magnitude could easily result" and that it was "doubtful if any reasonable plan to construct a sea level canal in the Canal Zone could be carried through without serious danger of a long interruption to traffic at the time of cut over." Therefore, the present agency's concealment of facts about this finding of the Board is reprehensible in the highest degree.

Fifteen. "Hearings were held soon—after the January 1964 riots—and Public Law 88–609 was passed by the Congress and signed by the President on September 22, 1964."

Comments: Hearings in both House and Senate committees were altogether superficial and those on June 4, 1964, before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when I was a witness, were never published although there was an ernest demand in the Congress for such publication. The Senate passed the bill by voice vote without debate and the House did so under gag rule procedure. This bill became the law now cited as authority—a law passed to justify the predetermined conclusions of a small professional group and to exclude consideration of all other proposals except the old idea of a sea level canal, which has been thoroughly debated and disposed of on previous occasions in the Congress.

Sixteen. "Three sea-level canal routes: the present Canal Zone, the Darien region of Panama, and northwest Colombia."

Comment: In all the discussions about these three, there has been little or no consideration given to their relative navigational conditions, such as fog, rain, lengths of channel, and suitable terminals. Notwithstanding the projected mapping of the Nicaragua route, the treatment in this first report clearly suggests the exclusion of that site, the ancient rival of Panama and the once preferred site of the United States, from all serious consideration.

In sum, the inevitable conclusion of those, in and out of the Congress, who are well informed and fairminded, is that this entire sea-level canal drive is based upon errors in facts and the willful concealment of the truth as regards the most vital features involved in the gravely important and necessary effort required for the consideration of increased transisthmian transit facilities.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would stress that the President does not actually know the facts and depends solely on advisers who surround him and throw around him an impenetrable "iron curtain." Only by the creation of and study by an independent and broadly based Interoceanic Canals Commission, as proposed in current bills, can all the

cruicial facts be elicited and a wise solution obtained.

For those not impressed by managed news and who seek reliable information on the canal subject, I would invite attention to my address on April 1, 1965, on the "Interoceanic Canal Problem: Inquiry or Coverup?" and a sequel address on July 29 on the same subject, especially the documentation attached to each. In addition, I would invite attention to a comprehensive bibliography on the "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Documentation, 1955–64," prepared by my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON], in the RECORD of September 2, 1964.

Finally, when the above-mentioned first annual report of the current canal study is appraised in the light of the extensive information now available, it is mendacious, brazen, reckless, evasive, irresponsible, and utterly at variance with the best interests of our country and the world at large.

In view of the misleading reference in the first annual report under discussion—House Document No. 253, 89th Congress—in reference to the 1905–06 International Board of Consulting Engineers as to the type of canal, I quote President Roosevelt's 1906 message to the Congress as part of my remarks:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I submit herewith the letter of the Secretary of War transmitting the report of the Board of Consulting Engineers on the Panama Canal and the report of the Isthmian Canal Commission thereon, together with a letter written to the chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission by Chief Engineer Stevens. Both the Board of Consulting Engineers and the Canal Commission divide in their report. The majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers, eight in number, including the five foreign engineers, favor a sea level canal, and one member of the Canal Commission, Admiral Endicott, takes the same view. Five of the eight American members of the Board of Consulting Engineers and five members of the Isthmian Canal Commission favor the lock canal, and so does Chief Engineer Stevens. The Secretary of War recommends a lock canal pursuant to the recommendation of the minority of the Board of Consulting Engineers and of the majority of the Canal Commission. After careful study of the papers submitted and full and exhaustive consideration of the whole subject, I concur in this recommendation.

It will be noticed that the American engineers on the Consulting Board and on the Commission, by more than 2 to 1 majority, favor the lock canal, whereas the foreign engineers are a unit against it. I think this is partly to be explained by the fact that the great traffic canal of the Old World is the Suez Canal, a sea level canal, whereas the great traffic canal of the New World is the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, a lock canal. Although the latter, the Soo, is closed to navigation during the winter months, it carries annually three times the traffic of the Suez Canal. In my judgment, the very able argument of the majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers is vitiated by their failure to pay proper heed to the lessons taught by the construction and operations of the Soo Canal. It must be borne in mind, as the Commission points out, that there is no question of building what has been picturesquely termed "the Straits of Panama;" that is, a waterway through which the largest vessels could go with safety at uninterrupted high speed. Both the sea level canal and the proposed lock canal would be too narrow and shallow to be called with any truthfulness a strait, or to have any of the properties of a wide, deep water strip. Both of them would be canals, pure and simple. Each type has certain disadvantages and certain advantages. But, in my judgment, the disadvantages are fewer and the advantages very much greater in the case of a lock canal substantially as proposed in the papers forwarded herewith; and I call especial attention to the fact that the chief engineer, who will be mainly responsible for the success of this mighty engineering feat, and who has therefore a peculiar personal interest in judging a right, is emphatically and earnestly in favor of the lock-canal project and against the sea level project.

A careful study of the reports seem to establish a strong probability that the following are the facts: The sea level canal would be slightly less exposed to damage in the event of war, the running expenses, apart from the heavy cost of interest on the amount employed to build it, would be less, and for small ships the time of transit would probably be less. On the other hand, the lock canal at a level of 80 feet or thereabouts would not cost much more than half as much to build and could be built in about half the time, while there would be very much less risk connected with building it, and for large ships the transit would be quicker; while, taking into account the interest on the amount saved in building, the actual cost of maintenance would be less. After being built, it would be easier to enlarge the lock canal than the sea level canal. Moreover, what has been actually demonstrated in making and operating the great lock canal, the Soo, a more important artery of traffic than the great sea level canal, the Suez, goes to support the opinion of the minority of the Consulting Board of Engineers and of the majority of the Isthmian Canal Commission as to the superior safety, feasibility, and desirability of building a lock canal at Panama.

The law now on our statute books seems to contemplate a lock canal. In my judgment, a lock canal, as herein recommended, is advisable. If the Congress directs that a sea level canal be constructed, its direction will, of course, be carried out. Otherwise, the canal will be built on substantially the plan for a lock canal outlined by the accompanying papers, such changes being made, of course, as may be found actually necessary, including possibly the change recommended by the Secretary of War as to the site of the dam on the Pacific side.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 19, 1906.*

ARAB REFUGEES

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks we have listened to a number of distinguished gentlemen describe the various strategies and tactics pursued by the Arab States of the Middle East in their determination to destroy the state of Israel which flourishes nearby. We have heard how the Arabs attacked Israel with Soviet-made weapons, and how they were soundly repulsed by a brave people determined to defend their homeland. We have heard how the Arabs persistently carried out their plans to divert Israel's rightful supply of Jordan River water, in the hope of rendering her fertile valleys a parched wasteland. Today I would like to comment briefly upon a third method being utilized by the Arabs in their methodical effort to bring about strife and bloodshed in the Middle East. I would like to speak briefly about the coldblooded use of the Arab refugees as political pawns in the Arab chess game of aggression.

The story of how some 550,000 Arab refugees left their homes in that part of Palestine partitioned to the state of Israel by the United Nations in 1947 is now ancient history. They did not have to leave. They were not driven out. They were welcome to remain and participate in the building of a strong and free new nation in cooperation with the Jewish pioneers. But they chose to relocate in Arab lands, and a number of refugee camps were set up by the United Nations to temporarily assist them in finding new homes and in reshaping their lives.

I would like to stress that word "temporarily." It was never intended that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency should remain in existence today, two decades later, having cost a total of over $4 billion, and having cost the taxpayers of the United States over $2 billion, and worst of all, having contributed little more than the preservation of the status quo. In fact, there are over 1 million refugees now under the jurisdiction of UNRWA, when once there were some 550,000. The refugee rolls have continued to swell as a result of new births, but also because a large number of people who never lived in the territory of what is today Israel have claimed to be refugees in order to get ration cards.

Thus the Arab refugee problem is still with us, and the primary reason is that there has been an almost total lack of interest on the part of the Arab States in seeking ways to provide for a permanent solution. The Arab States have adopted an unswerving policy of resistance to all attempts by other countries to provide such a solution.

How callous, how base of the Arab States to pitilessly use these stateless, homeless, hopeless people for shortsighted political ends. In order to foster a misguided Arab nationalism, the Arab leaders have on purpose created a festering emotional and political sore which doubtless will cause grave difficulties in the future if nothing is done to heal it.

In my capacity as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I made an effort to visit these UNRWA refugee camps in 1962, but was advised against doing so. I learned, however, how hostility and hatred had been encouraged for base political reasons. More than half of the refugee population today has grown up in these camps, and therefore has little recollection of, or attachment to the home of their parents in Palestine. But the young refugees are constantly reminded by their families and by the nationalist propaganda of the Arab host governments that they are Palestinians. At the same time, many of the older refugees have remained bitter over their

status; and some have refused permanent housing, employment, and other means for furthering their relocation.

If a final solution is to be found for these homeless refugees, the Arab States must participate willingly in the planning. But the Arabs find it to their advantage to keep these people in the camps, in a temporary and transitory situation, thus refusing to acknowledge that the State of Israel is a permanent addition to the international scene. By keeping these people in the camps, the Arabs foster the illusion that some day the Israelis will be driven out and the territory will revert to the Arab States. Any Arab leader who called for integration of the refugees into other Arab countries, in areas where there is both the space and the need for additional people and the labor and skills which they represent, would be denounced as a traitor to the "cause" that demands the destruction of Israel.

Given the intransigence of the Arabs, it appears to me that the refugee problem will be self-perpetuating for many years unless some real progress is made in gradually closing down the camps and relocating the occupants. I submit that the United States can accomplish this transition relatively easily, simply by a gradual phasing-out of our financial contribution to the U.N. agency administering the camps.

As I pointed out earlier, the United States has, to date, poured over $2 billion into these refugee camps, and we have seen precious little progress for our money. It seems clear to me that as long as we contribute our unlimited resources to the upkeep of these camps, that is how long the Arabs will procrastinate, and that is how long the problem will remain unsolved. If we gradually withdraw our funds, the Arab States will be put on notice that we expect them to take care of their own people to the extent that they are able to do so. They will be put on notice that while humanitarian considerations have induced us to play their game so far, the Congress is in no mood to play it much longer.

I introduced an amendment to this year's foreign aid authorization bill providing for a reduction of 5 percent per year for the next 20 years in our funding of the refugee camps. This, to me, seemed the best way to gradually phase the camps out of existence, without causing undue burden either upon the refugees or upon the Arab States. A substitute amendment was accepted reducing by 5 percent only this year's contribution to UNRWA. I supported the latter amendment, though I do not feel it goes far enough, because I believe it is the first step, the first indication that the Congress of the United States wants swift action toward the dissolution of the refugee camps.

But a definitive phasing-out program, while absolutely essential, is only one part of a two-pronged approach which must be utilized in dealing with this problem. Until we can get the camps closed and the refugees relocated, we must see that a shift in the emphasis of UNRWA programs is accomplished in order to take account of the changes which have taken place over the past few years in the character and age of the refugees.

During the first few years, when a majority of the refugees were older people, it was quite logical that the U.N. programs concentrated on providing these people with shelter, clothing, and food which they required. Many were too old to make a new life for themselves.

But most of the individuals in the camps today have no direct knowledge of their former homes and do not desire to remain there for the rest of their lives, waiting and hoping for an event that will never occur. While the camps are gradually being closed down, these young people should be taught the skills and trades which will permit them to become self-supporting, self-respecting individuals. Even now they flock to the vocational schools which were recently founded by the U.N. and other private organizations, hoping there to find the education which will permit them to break free of their present meaningless existence.

There must be greater emphasis on vocational training, education, job training, and the like if these young people are to make a go of it on their own after the camps are closed. At the present time only a small percentage of our dollars are allocated for this end; by far the greater amount goes for the three essentials—food, shelter, and clothing.

By cutting this year's aid authorization to the refugee camps, I believe we have begun to contribute to a meaningful and permanent solution to the problem. I hope that in future years we will not permit ourselves to be duped into shouldering a burden which rightfully should be borne by the Arab States, who are guilty of shameful and inhumane treatment of their own peoples. Only when these refugee camps are gone, only when the Arab States are no longer able to use their occupants as political symbols in their all-out fight against Israel, will there be hope for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION TO REDUCE VOTING AGE TO 18

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on August 11, I introduced House Joint Resolution 620 to amend the Constitution to reduce the voting age to 18. It provides:

> No citizen of the United States who is 18 years of age or older shall be denied the right to vote by reason of age.

I take considerable pride in the fact that the State of Georgia, over 20 years ago, became the first State in the Union to extend the franchise to young Americans between the ages of 18 and 20.

Today the American Institute of Public Opinion reports that 57 percent of Americans now agree with the historic step taken by the State of Georgia in 1943, and with the goal of my amendment.

I offer the attached report for inclusion in the RECORD:

THE GALLUP POLL: VOTING AT 18 IS FAVORED BY MAJORITY

PRINCETON, N.J., August 24.— A majority of America's adults believe that the voting age should be lowered, to permit persons 18, 19, and 20 years old to vote. This is a question that always arises when young men in increasing numbers are called to combat duty, as now in Vietnam.

In the latest survey, this question was asked:

"Do you think that persons 18, 19, and 20 years old should be permitted to vote, or not?"

The replies:	*Percent*
Yes	57
No	39
No opinion	4

The vote has remained consistent over 11 years. In 1954, after President Eisenhower recommended that the voting age be lowered to permit persons 18, 19, and 20 to vote, 58 percent said "yes," 34 percent said "no," and 8 percent had no opinion.

The first time the Gallup poll posed this question, in 1939, 17 percent were in favor, 83 percent opposed.

OVERHEAD TRANSMISSION LINES

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, last month 125 Members of the House rallied to the support of the community of Woodside, Calif., in its futile attempt to get the Atomic Energy Commission to put its high-voltage lines underground. This was dramatic evidence of the widespread public interest in the admittedly complex but vitally important problem of reconciling technology with scenic and conservation values.

In furtherance of this public interest, Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced three bills to attack the problem of overhead transmission lines which more and more are challenging our efforts to save and restore the natural beauty of the Nation.

The first bill I have introduced would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake an immediate program to compile necessary information as to the extent of the overhead transmission line problem and the effect of such lines upon the health and welfare of citizens, community planning and zoning, real estate values and tax revenues, and the natural beauty of our country.

My second bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake an immediate program of research and development to encourage the use of underground transmission of electrical power and to undertake projects to evaluate and demonstrate the economical

and technical feasibility of such transmission.

The bill also directs the Secretary of the Interior to undertake demonstration projects and to make certain grants and loans to non-Federal systems to enable them to take part in this program.

The third bill amends the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide effective tax incentives to private power companies to start immediately on the underground installation of lines.

Last February, in his message on natural beauty, President Johnson said:

> The tradition of our past is equal to today's threat to that beauty. Our land will be attractive tomorrow only if we organize for action and rebuild and reclaim the beauty we inherited. Our stewardship will be judged by the foresight with which we carry out these programs. We must rescue our cities and countryside from blight with the same purpose and vigor which, in other areas, we moved to save the forests and the soil.

The President has made natural beauty a national goal. To that end, Mr. Speaker, this Congress should make clear the desirability of more intensive research into techniques for placing high-voltage lines underground at costs that would not be prohibitive. Unless we begin to recognize how tragically the face of America is being changed, how rapidly we are gutting out landscape, polluting the very air we breathe and the water we drink, it will be too late to salvage much more than a fragment of the unparalleled grandeur and beauty that a few generations ago stretched from ocean to ocean.

Experience has shown us the folly of penny wise, pound foolish spending on important national programs such as this. When the Federal Highway Act was passed in 1950, there were many who urged that it include additional appropriations for clearing up, restoring, and beautifying our highways. They were not heeded. In this session of Congress we are asked to spend about $90 million a year to correct what could have been prevented by modest expenditures 15 years ago. Furthermore, just 2 weeks ago the President signed into law a new urban beautification program authorizing $100 million in matching Federal funds to encourage local communities to undertake park improvements, tree planting, playgrounds, and upgrading of malls and city squares. It must be recognized, Mr. Speaker, that the tremendous expansion of overhead lines in the future will not be spread out all over the Nation. It will be concentrated where industry and people are—in the growing cities of the Nation and their all-important suburbs. Within 15 years, unless we act now, a forest of steel towers and unsightly wooden poles and high-voltage lines will be knifing through the very areas where dwindling reserves of land and an expanding population are posing the greatest challenge to the President's program of natural beauty.

Quite obviously, as indicated by the power panel at the White House Beauty Conference, the power industry itself is not prepared to act on its own. This can be seen in the report issued by the power panel. The responsible Federal agencies have not assumed the necessary leadership. In such a situation, the ultimate responsibility rests with the Congress. There is no question that with proper incentives, the power industry can develop economically feasible methods of underground transmission.

First and foremost, we need information. We must begin to compile the statistics and projections that will enable us to cope with the problem. For that reason, my first bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a comprehensive program of research into the extent and impact of overhead transmission and to report to the President and the Congress at the opening of the next session.

Next we need direct action. The second bill I have introduced directs the Secretary of the Interior to enter into research, development and demonstration projects. This will apply to the 20,000 miles of overhead transmission lines under the Secretary's direction as well as other non-Federal systems.

My third bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide real economic incentive to the power companies to start building underground powerlines. The incentive, in the form of a rapid writeoff and an increased tax credit, will—according to preliminary estimates—bring the costs of underground transmission down almost to parity with overhead construction cost. While it is difficult to accurately assess the cost of these tax credits, the Treasury Department has estimated that it will cost the Treasury approximately $250 million a year over the next 10 years.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize strongly that the problem of overhead transmission lines is not just a simple question of esthetics. It is an issue of the utmost economic importance and one that affects particularly our spreading urban complexes and the health and welfare of citizens who live in and around these growing metropolitan centers. Today more than 300,000 miles of overhead transmission lines cut across the open spaces and through the towns and villages of America. These lines eat up a total of nearly 7 million acres and have a detrimental effect on millions more. The Federal Power Commission estimates that present transmission facilities will be more than trebled by 1980. This means close to 1 million miles of overhead lines in the United States in 15 years. It also means that nearly 20 million acres of our Nation's land—nearly twice as much as is now preserved in our entire national park system—will be eaten up as right-of-way for power corridors.

We know what the problem is. We know what must be done. We must act in time. Now.

PIPELINE BONANZA BILL

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I call my colleagues' attention to certain revelations in the Washington Post and by Drew Pearson, which, if true, will be a blow to the consumers of natural gas in the Northeast and Midwest and result in higher monthly gas bills.

I have just checked with the Senate Finance Committee and have verified the fact in the newspaper articles that amendment No. 418 has been offered to H.R. 7502, the disaster relief tax bill which passed the House on August 3. The chairman of the committee has ordered public hearings to be held next Tuesday and Wednesday on amendment No. 418. I certainly hope that these public hearings will bring about clarification of the meaning and import of this amendment.

The newspaper revelations by Drew Pearson yesterday and the Washington Post today indicate that the real purpose of the amendment is to give the big gas transmission line corporations a tax break so they can apply to the Federal Power Commission for a rate increase. This, in effect, would amount to a further picking of the pockets and pocketbooks of consumers in my area who were glibly promised low monthly rates when natural gas was introduced into New England 14 years ago.

I hope that the entire issue will be clarified in the Senate Finance Committee. But, if it is not, I want to serve notice now that I intend to vigorously fight against such an amendment when the bill comes back to the House for further consideration. New Englanders are taxed enough without having to pay higher taxes under the guise of natural gas rate increases.

NEED FOR ACHIEVING ECONOMIES IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, considerable concern has been raised in this body—particularly in recent months—over the need for achieving economies in Government that will make it possible to continue established programs and to take on new and expanding activities without imposing an undue burden on the American taxpayer.

Obviously, the Government must be responsive to the needs of the American people insofar as the provision of adequate services is concerned. It is equally obvious that this responsiveness must be accompanied by a sense of responsibility on the part of department and agency heads—and, in fact, on the part of everyone who works for the Government—so that the American people will have the confidence that they are receiving a dollar's services for a dollar spent.

In discussing economies, many people propose that we husband our tax dollars by limiting the size of the Federal payroll. To some extent there is considerable logic to this view. We will serve the taxpayers poorly, indeed, if we use their dollars to build empires in the executive branch, thus encouraging more bureaucratic sprawl.

But a reduced Federal payroll is not necessarily economical, nor is an enlarged Federal payroll necessarily wasteful. The House Manpower Subcommittee, for example, has detailed some of the glaring examples of waste that have occurred in Government when, in pursuit of a policy of maintaining unrealistically low ceilings on the number of people on the Federal payroll, Government agencies have turned to the private sector of the economy to procure services which cost far more than it would to have additional direct-hire civil service employees working for the Government.

Expressing considerable concern over this issue, the Government Employees' Council of the AFL–CIO has submitted to the President a detailed plan which it contends will save an estimated $2 billion a year by converting the contracting-out of the normal Government functions to direct-hire civil service. This plan by 31 unions, with members in the postal, classified and wage-board areas, merits the careful attention of every Member of this body. It offers one possible approach to the problem of conserving tax dollars without doing violence to our concept of service to the American people. The Government Employees' Council deserves the commendation of the Congress for helping to put this issue into focus and for bringing it to the attention of the American people.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of the letter to the President, signed by E. C. Hallbeck, chairman of the Government Employees' Council, together with a background statement by the GEC which spells out, in some detail, the position of this group of AFL–CIO Unions.

I would hope that each of my colleagues will take the time to acquaint themselves with the arguments raised by the Government Employees' Council on this vital issue—an issue which, I am sure, will occupy our increasing attention in the months and years ahead:

A BACKGROUND STATEMENT BY THE GEC

The Government Employees' Council of the AFL–CIO has no quarrel with the private enterprise system on which the American economy is based. We welcome free enterprise; we concede its right to grow and prosper; we salute it for the enormous contribution it has made to the progress of our country.

We subscribe to the principle that Government should not compete with private enterprise. However, we do not interpret this to mean that the Government must be rendered impotent or that it must cede its duties and responsibilities to private firms. We feel that the Government has certain historic functions to perform, and that free enterprise has totally different functions to perform.

We believe this subject of competition should be a two-way street. If Government should not compete with private enterprise, it follows that private enterprise should not insist on competing with Government. We see no justification for an approach in which the business community says "what's mine is mine, and what's yours is supposed to be contracted out."

It would make as much sense for the Government to contract out to private firms the raising, training, and equipping of our Armed Forces—in the manner of the Hessians of generations past—as it does to say that the Government, to prove it is noncompetitive, must turn over to profit-oriented firms those duties that have been performed successfully by Government employees over the course of years. This is, of course, patently ridiculous.

There is no rationale for contracting with private firms to do the jobs which can be done cheaper, and better, through the use of direct-hire employees on the Federal payroll. If this present procedure is pursued further—particularly at a time when the administration is engaged in what it calls a war on waste—the American people are going to be misled. They will be told that reductions in the Federal payroll are being made in the interests of economy—but will they be told, as well, that to achieve this goal, more money is being expended to purchase the same services (or even services of lesser quality) from private firms?

The trend toward contracting out is the inevitable byproduct of restrictive personnel levels in the Federal service, aggravated by a policy directive issued in 1959, and still in force, which virtually commands agency heads to give preferential treatment to private contractors, as opposed to direct-hire employees, irrespective of the cost.

Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60–2 sets forth the views of a prior administration on this question of competition between the Government and private enterprise. It states, as its credo, the principle that "the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial-industrial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels."

In pursuit of this policy, the bulletin instructs agency officials to overlook even "relatively large and disproportionately higher costs" of commercial sources, and states as a general rule that agencies should have "a presumption in favor * * * of commercial sources"—even, the bulletin says, when these are "more costly commercial sources."

This is a curious policy. It is a "damn-the-cost-full-procurement-ahead" concept. It may fit some administrators' notions of how to get along with free enterprise, but it certainly is at odds with any high-flown promises about prudent management of Government affairs.

Yet the policy continues to exist, and the Bureau of the Budget, which promised the House Manpower Subcommittee a year ago that it would revise the bulletin, still has done nothing.

When you add to this bulletin the unrealistic ceilings on personnel with which Government agencies are saddled by the Whitten amendment, you create the kind of situation that agency administrators must find it hard to resist. On the one hand you have increasing demands for services from departments and agencies of Government; on the other hand you have strict directives on the number of people you are allowed. Increased efficiency and greater productivity from all Government workers—classified, postal and wage board—have performed miracles in terms of getting a quality job done, but this has not been enough in the face of new programs and new directions for Federal agencies.

What is an administrator going to do? He's going to have the work done by a private firm, which charges not only for the people it supplies, but which also charges overhead and profit. Government directives say that agencies should not use contracting out procedures to circumvent personnel ceilings. But given the problems, these directives are going to be honored more in the breach than in the observance.

The record of the Manpower Subcommittee is replete with evidence to sustain this point. In its report issued earlier this year, Representative DAVID N. HENDERSON, subcommittee chairman, said this: "The Federal Government is paying about $1.4 billion annually more than would be necessary if this work were being handled by civil service employees on the direct payroll of the Federal Government."

The subcommittee went on to say: "It is not good business for the Federal Government to contract with private interests to furnish to the Government people to perform work that currently is and historically has been successfully handled by Government personnel. This, in the opinion of the subcommittee * * * is unwarranted (and) is false economy."

The report centered exclusively on the contracting out procedures of the Defense Department. If its findings were to be applied on a governmentwide basis—and, after all, the contracting out is being conducted in virtually every department and agency of the executive branch—then it is easy to see how the figure on waste would reach, or exceed, our $2 billion estimate.

The subcommittee criticized the fact that "no one in the Government knows how many man-years are being bought from private industry to work in the Department of Defense nor does anyone know exactly how much it is costing." In other words, not only is the practice widespread, no one has apparently taken the time to discover its wasteful nature relying on Bulletin No. 60–2's presumption in favor of the private contractor, irrespective of disproportionately higher cost. The subcommittee ventured the opinion that the cost of contractor employees "may be as much as 100 percent more than a similar staff of civil service personnel doing a similar job."

The subcommittee said it had found "many examples * * * proving that restrictive civil service personnel ceilings are a major reason for using contractor personnel," and said its members were "shocked at the degree of inefficiency and waste of Government funds" involved.

As to Bulletin No. 60–2, the subcommittee said this policy "does lean heavily on the side of commercial sources irrespective of costs." It added: "In consideration of the dynamic nature of our economy, plus the changing concepts of our defense effort, it is rather difficult to imagine a policy of this import not having been revised" since its adoption in September 1959.

The record shows only one type of contracting out which has resulted in any appreciable savings—but ironically these savings have been at the expense of another administration principle: its war on poverty. The subcommittee produced evidence showing that, when janitorial services were turned over to private contractors, the latter often hired workers at substandard wages—often below the minimum wage level. We deplore this type of situation which pits the worker on the lowest rung of the economic ladder against the Government employee—to the detriment of both, and of the country, as well.

Representative HENDERSON, expressing concern over this situation, quoted from testimony by Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson before the House Education and Labor Committee, when she said: "The Federal Government cannot afford to save money at the expense of those who are among the most unskilled, the weakest, and the poorest of our citizens. This result is directly contrary to one of our most fre-

quently expressed ideals. Contributions to our Federal Treasury from the pockets of those living in the depths of poverty are too costly."

We heartily endorse this view. We hope that the officials who head the various Federal agencies will pay heed to Mrs. Peterson.

In recent weeks, there have been signs that the administration is taking a hard, new look at this problem. We particularly applaud the pledges by Norman Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, that thousands of jobs usurped by military personnel will be returned to regular civil service employees, and that other technical jobs now filled by employees of private contractors likewise will be returned to career civil servants. This is a welcome start. Now it must be implemented and enlarged upon throughout Government.

GEC opposition to contracting out is nothing new. Back in 1961 we had this to say on the subject: "This policy has led to * * * the discharge of thousands of career civil service employees before they have become eligible for retirement, and at an age where industry and other governmental agencies are unwilling to employ their services. The policy has caused the waste of valuable skills and loss of the effective utilization of hundreds of millions of dollars invested in plant facilities and tools. It has caused thousands of families and hundreds of local communities to suffer adverse economic adjustment and hardships. It has also fostered and promoted higher defense costs to the taxpayer and has been responsible for the adequacy and quality of our country's defense posture to be vested in the profit-motivated segment of our economy, instead of under the control of the Congress and the administration, as required by our Constitution."

Our commitment to frugality is nothing new, either. Our 31 affiliated unions and their members have long been pledged to the war on waste—pledged to it, in fact, before it was really fashionable. Proof of our commitment has been the wholehearted participation of our members in the Federal employees' incentive award program. Over the past 10 years, hundreds of thousands of their ideas have been accepted by the Government, resulting in savings running to the hundred of millions of dollars.

Vital as these savings have been, they pale by comparison with the $2 billion a year which can be saved by the revised personnel procedures which we have recommended to the President.

(Following is a text of a letter to President Johnson, dated August 18, 1965.)

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The 31 unions comprising the Government Employes' Council, AFL–CIO, are conscious of your keen desire to achieve sound economies in the Federal service. We are aware also of your deep interest in the well-being of the men and women who devote their careers to public service in various Federal agencies.

For these reasons, we offer several suggestions to save the Government as much as $2 billion each fiscal year, without impairing any essential services to the American people.

Earlier this year, you will recall, the Subcommittee on Manpower of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, issued a report on the personnel practices of the Department of Defense. In this report, the subcommittee estimated that as much as $1,400 million was being lost annually by contracting to private companies work which had been historically and successfully handled by civil service employees.

The subcommittee's report concentrated exclusively on the Department of Defense—which, by the nature of its huge budget, is probably the largest user of these contracts. But there is considerable evidence which could be adduced to show similar examples in other executive departments and agencies—the Post Office Department, the National Aeronautical and Space Agency, and the General Services Administration, to name just a few. These practices in nondefense agencies could add up to as much as $600 million more each year.

The Government Employes' Council proposes four steps to alleviate the situation:

1. Withdrawal or substantial modification of Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60–2. This document was issued in 1959 by another administration, setting forth, as official policy, the concept that the Government should not perform services and functions which can be provided by private firms. Regrettably, this document has not been revised in succeeding years. It specifically permits agency officials to purchase services from private firms even when they are far more costly to the taxpayers than the use of direct-hire civil service personnel. We believe this flies in the face of your administration's efforts to achieve meaningful economies.

2. Ending entirely the use of military personnel to perform civilian functions. This has proven quite costly in tax dollars on the basis of the House subcommittee hearings. Just a few days ago, Representative DAVID N. HENDERSON, the subcommittee chairman, estimated that "at least 50,000 active-duty military men in our armed services (are) performing civilian-type work." This is detrimental to our defense posture as well as harmful to your economy efforts. Particularly now, in view of the serious military situation in the Far East, we believe these personnel should be released to combat duty, and their civilian functions—carpenters, painters, chauffeurs, typists, stock clerks, statisticians, etc.—be returned to the civil service category where they previously belonged.

3. Repeal of the Whitten amendment, which has placed unrealistic ceilings on Federal agencies. The council was gratified with your action of August 6, 1965, signing H.R. 6622 into law. The new statute helps relieve a critical situation by exempting the Post Office Department from the personnel restrictions of the Whitten amendment. However, as long as Korean war-type ceilings are placed on other agencies—ceilings which do not take into account the additional demands generated by an ever-increasing population, and the additional services required by new statutes and expanding agency functions—these restrictions will serve as an open invitation to agencies to purchase untold numbers of man-years of service outside the Government in order to achieve agency missions. Procurement of these services from private companies results in far higher costs to the taxpayers than does the direct hire of additional civil service employees.

4. A review in depth of Defense Department plans to close or consolidate military installations. While there may be some activities which are no longer essential because of changing defense requirements, the Government Employes' Council believes that the determination to close many facilities constitutes false economy. The military hardware being produced at some of these installations remains vital to the defense of freedom, and the Defense Department will be forced to obtain this hardware from private firms. This will lead, inevitably, to greater expenditure of taxpayers' dollars. The Manpower Subcommittee has indicated it plans to hold hearings on the base-closure question. We hope the administration will join with us in a serious review of this matter before the subcommittee in the interest of sound fiscal management.

While welcoming this administration's efforts toward economy, the Government Employes' Council is concerned that it might be turned in the direction of merely reducing the size of the Government payroll. In years gone by, Federal employees have been the "whipping boys" for many a so-called economy drive, for it has long been popular to regard Federal employment as some evil that must be avoided at all costs. We are confident that your administration has no such thought in mind, but we are concerned that overzealous officials at lower levels in the executive department might construe the frugality drive as open season on civil service employees.

If this should prove to be the case—if the tactics at the agency level should be to slash payrolls and then turn work over to private contractors—then the administration's efforts toward economy not only will be illusory but we will all suffer, for there will be a lessening of service to the American people and a marked reduction in its quality.

Let me once again pledge to you, Mr. President—on behalf of the Federal employees in the classified, postal and wage board services whom our 31 affiliated unions represent—that the Government Employes' Council wholeheartedly supports your goal of a Federal establishment which will provide the American people a maximum of service at a minimum of cost. This has been the historic position of the Government employee; it will continue to be our policy.

Because we are most anxious to join more fully in the administration's efforts to achieve meaningful savings throughout Government, we look forward to an early opportunity for a small committee to discuss our proposals in greater detail with you or your designated representatives.

Respectfully,

E. C. HALLBECK,
Chairman.

THE AMERICAN PATRIOT

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about a vanishing species, the American patriot.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, patriotism seems to have been lost in the shuffle. Time was when flag-waving was not reserved for bandstand orators. When young men marched proudly to the music of patriotic songs. When obtrusive patriotism was fashionable. When you did not have to apologize for wearing burning patriotism on one's sleeve. Time was when all Americans celebrated the Nation's greatness, revered patriotism as a virtue, treasured America's glorious traditions, idolized the great Americans of the past.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time patriotism made a comeback. In this time of strife, when patriotism is so sorely needed, a series of patriotic booster shots for the American public is indeed called for. For decades most of our patriotic fervor has radiated from the entertainment industry. An outstanding example is currently on display in the Nation's entertainment capital, Las Vegas, Nev.

I have reference to the Las Vegas Desert Inn's musical extravaganza, "Hello America," which will celebrate its first anniversary in September.

For more than 700 sellout performances "Hello America," with its clean and wholesome appeal to the entire family, has initiated and perpetuated a

patriotic spirit that has given a new look to the entertainment field.

Its stirring message of love of country and flag is a dramatic reminder of the ideals which brought this Nation into being. It teaches us the value of the things our men have bled and died for. It blatantly decries our mystifying proneness for apologizing for waving the most beautiful banner that flies.

Because it does all of these things, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that congressional recognition and commendation be accorded "Hello America" as a patriotic venture of the highest order and that these remarks be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

IS SMUT ON WAY OUT?

(By Earl Wilson)

LAS VEGAS.—There's a lot of good, clean entertainment around—the reason we don't hear much about it is, nobody's looking for it.

I don't know how long it's been since I heard a guy say, "Pssst, hey, fellas, how about tonight we dig up some good clean wholesome entertainment?"

Why, right here where men are men and women are nude, the Desert Inn has a smash show, "Hello, America," that bares no bosom and has no smutty jokes. Cary Grant and Dyan Cannon saw it three times—then got married.

I brought my beautiful wife here to celebrate a birthday that shall be nameless and also numberless.

"You'll enjoy the nostalgia," I told the B.W. "It'll remind you of your teens * * *

"They show Teddy Roosevelt's raid on San Juan Hill," I informed her, "The Chicago World's Fair of 1893.

"Your favorite high school dances and songs * * * The Bunny Hug and Turkey Trot * * * 'Bertha the Sewing Machine Girl' * * * 'I Don't Care,' * * * 'I'll Take You Home, Kathleen.' "

After the B.W. belted me for that joke, we enjoyed the show, especially a tremendous dog act, with the dogs wearing American flags—just before they climaxed it with the Statue of Liberty.

Sophisticates might call it a bit of flag-waving. But the current surge of patriotism makes it seem timely. Ed Sullivan thinks it should be on TV. The management talks of taking it to London to show Europe that America's cleaner than a beagle's tooth.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARVEY of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) on account of death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SAYLOR, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) for today, for 30 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ), for today, of 10 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. GRIDER), for 1 hour, on August 26; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GRIDER), for 30 minutes, on August 30; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. GRIDER), for 30 minutes, on September 1; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. GRIDER), for 30 minutes, on September 1; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FINO.

Mr. MAHON during his remarks on the continuing resolution and to include certain tabular material.

Mr. MACGREGOR in his remarks in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and to include a more extensive copy of the text of the editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press to which he referred.

Mr. BROCK to revise and extend his remarks made in special order today and to include charts and tables and other pertinent material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. BROCK in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRIDER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. MACKIE in two instances.

Mr. RESNICK.

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. NIX.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 356. An act for the relief of Miloye M. Sokitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2263. An act to establish a traffic branch of the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to provide for the appointment to such court of five additional judges; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 485. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws;

H.R. 1481. An act for the relief of the estate of Donovan C. Moffett;

H.R. 1763. An act to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28 for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis;

H.R. 3750. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 3990. An act to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors;

H.R. 3992. An act to amend section 753(f) of title 28, United States Code, relating to transcrips furnished by court reporters for the district courts;

H.R. 3997. An act to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means;

H.R. 4719. An act for the relief of Josephine C. Rumley, administratrix of the estate of George S. Rumley;

H.R. 5497. An act to amend paragraphs b and c of section 14 of the Bankruptcy Act;

H.R. 9544. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 620,000 long tons of natural rubber from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 5401. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 26, 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:

1507. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 29, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on, and a survey of the Trinity River and tributaries, Tex., made pursuant to several congressional authorizations listed in the report (H. Doc. 276); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations and appendixes.

1508. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting proposed supplementary appropriations for the Treasury Department, Bureau of the Mint, for fiscal year 1966, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1509. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period January 1, 1965, to June 30, 1965, pursuant to section 105 of Public Law 88-454; to the Committee on House Administration.

1510. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 516. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 133; with amendment (Rept. No. 851). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 517. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 133; with amendment (Rept. No. 852). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 514. Resolution to amend House Resolution 142 relating to expenses of investigations conducted by the Committee on Public Works; with amendment (Rept. No. 853). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 526. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 118; without amendment (Rept. No. 854). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 537. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; without amendment (Rept. No. 855). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 639. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10518. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 879. An act for the relief of Kim Sa Suk; without amendment (Rept. No. 857). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1104. An act for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian; with amendment (Rept. No. 858). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1111. An act for the relief of Pola Bodenstein; without amendment (Rept. No. 859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1170. An act for the relief of Chung J. Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1186. An act for the relief of Kris Ann Larsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 861). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Constantinus Agganis; with amendment (Rept. No. 862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Eligio Ciardiello; without amendment (Rept. No. 863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2752. A bill for the relief of Kock Kong Fong; without amendment (Rept. No. 864). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2906. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lily Ning Sheehan; without amendment (Rept. No. 865). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3082. A bill for the relief of Yester Arpacioglugil; with amendment (Rept. No. 866). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3288. A bill for the relief of Hwang Tai Shik; without amendment (Rept. No. 867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3515. A bill for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6229. A bill for the relief of Kim Sun Ho; without amendment (Rept. No. 869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6235. A bill for the relief of Chun Soo Kim; without amendment (Rept. No. 870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elena Vassiliou; with amendment (Rept. No. 872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7345. A bill for the relief of Jennifer Ellen Johnson Mojdara; without amendment (Rept. No. 873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7453. A bill for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth and Frederick Henry Todd; with amendment (Rept. No. 874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9526. A bill for the relief of Raffaella Achilli; without amendment (Rept. No. 875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10663. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research and development to encourage the use of underground transmission of electrical power and to undertake projects to evaluate and demonstrate the economical and technical feasibility of such transmission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10664. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research regarding overhead electric transmission lines and the effect of such lines upon the health and welfare of citizens, community planning and zoning, real estate values and tax revenues, and the natural beauty of our country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10665. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for an amortization deduction and an increased tax credit for certain underground electrical transmission lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 10666. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit for tuition expenses of the taxpayer or his spouse or a dependent at an institution of higher education, and an additional credit for gifts or contributions to any institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 10667. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 10668. A bill to establish the national water resources trust fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 10669. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 10670. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 10671. A bill to authorize the President to maintain reserve inventories of feeds, and fibers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 10672. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey to determine the justification for a channel at Indian Pass in Apalachicola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 10673. A bill to authorize the release of certain quantities of platinum from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 10674. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 10675. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of their surviving spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 10676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a full tax deduction for child care expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 10677. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 10678. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 10679. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10680. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 10681. A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10682. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend to graduates of the War Department Transportation Corps Marine Officers School, New Orleans port of embarkation, the preference in Government civilian employment provided by such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 10683. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code, "Copyrights", to bar actions for infringements of copyright in certain instances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 10684. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States and other nations in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 639. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.J. Res. 640. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25 in each year as National Parkinson Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 545. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to study the problems of urban areas; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 546. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 10518, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 10685. A bill to provide for the free entry of a pipe organ for the use of St. Mark's Cathedral, Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 10686. A bill for the relief of Masako Ammons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 10687. A bill for the relief of Joseph Koenig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 10688. A bill for the relief of Voyislav Bobic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10689. A bill for the relief of Gordana Topalovich, Dragana Topalovich, and Svetlana Topalovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 10690. A bill for the relief of Nikolas Koutsoumaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 10691. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helga M. Kimball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 10692. A bill to provide for the compensation of certain operating employees of the Great Northern Railway for losses occasioned by the construction of Libby Dam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 10693. A bill to provide for the free entry of a pipe organ for the use of St. Mark's Cathedral, Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 10694. A bill for the relief of Ignazio and Rosa DeLeonardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 10695. A bill for the relief of George Yussef Karma, his wife, Angele Karma, and their minor son, Frederick Karma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

264. Mr. COHELAN presented a petition of 150 residents of Berkeley and Oakland, Calif., urging that the Challenge of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party be brought before the House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Library of Congress Analyzes Tax Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 25, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an excellent analysis of the Federal revenue sharing proposal which is the base of my tax sharing for the education bill.

This analysis prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress looks into both sides of the tax sharing plan very carefully. It also outlines some of the history this plan has made. I feel it deserves the attention of every Member of Congress.

ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PROPOSAL TO SHARE RISING TAX REVENUES WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

One proposal which may receive serious consideration by the 89th Congress and which may stir up considerable controversy is the recommendation that the Federal Government channel excess Federal revenues to State and local governments.

This proposal is not new. More recently it has been espoused by Dr. Walter W. Heller, who recently resigned his official position as chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. As far back as in June of 1960, while still chairman of the Economics Department of the University of Minnesota, he proposed that rising Federal revenues be distributed to State and local governments with little or no Federal strings attached.

This recommendation did not begin to receive serious attention by the Democratic administration until last spring. This was because other more pressing fiscal measures, such as the tax reduction bill, were receiving primary consideration, and also due to the fact that the Federal budget has been running chronic deficits since 1960. However, our expanding economy, spurred on by enactment of the Revenue Act of 1964 early this year, now holds promise of possible budget surpluses within the next 2 years and makes serious consideration of this proposal possible.

The Democratic Party platform adopted last summer specifically stated that the Federal Government should give consideration to the "development of fiscal policies which would provide revenue sources to hard-pressed State and local governments to assist them with their responsibilities." The Republican Presidential nominee, Senator Barry Goldwater, also recommended that a portion of Federal income taxes be returned to the States and that these governments be given a larger share of revenues derived from inheritance taxes.

In a statement issued on October 28, 1964 President Johnson declared the intention of the administration to carry out the pledge the Democratic Party had made to seek ways of providing additional help to State and local governments. As a means of carrying out this intention he proposed that the Federal Government should make available to State and local governments "some part of our great and growing Federal tax revenues—over and above existing aids." [1]

President Johnson then appointed a task force composed of individuals from Government and business and headed by Joseph A. Pechman, Director of Economics at the Brookings Institution, to study the possibility of setting aside a fixed percentage of Federal revenues each year in a trust fund for distribution to State and local governments. A report has just been made by this task force and submitted to the White House, but most of its details have been kept confidential.

Two basic considerations have prompted the administration to consider the possibility of sharing additional Federal revenues with State and local governments.

First of all, the steady and the more recent rapid growth of our gross national product and the leveling off of defense expenditures due to the closing down of certain military installations is expected to produce a budgetary surplus by the end of fiscal year 1966. It is feared by administration economists that the realization of these surpluses before full employment of manpower and resources is achieved will cause a fiscal drag

[1] Presidential statement No. 6 on economic issues, "Strengthening State-Local Government," Oct. 28, 1964.