honored to add my own endorsement and expression of best wishes.

To that end I could think of no more fitting expression than to share with my colleagues at this time President Johnson's own comments of praise in announcing Mr. Gronouski's appointment.

President Johnson's remarks follow:

GRONOUSKI APPOINTMENT

Early in 1964, speaking at V.M.I., I pledged my administration to a policy of building bridges across the gulf which had divided us for more than two decades from the people of Eastern Europe. I said then, "They will be"—I said—"bridges of increased trade, of ideas, of visitors, and of humanitarian aid."

Our hopes for these people of these countries are identical to their own aspirations for their own future. We want to strengthen their ability to shape their own society, and we seek to bring every European nation closer to its neighbors in the ties of peace.

And so today I am very pleased to announce one of the most important steps this Nation has yet taken to implement that policy. I am asking a member of my Cabinet, a vigorous, intelligent, highly trained and deeply committed public servant—Postmaster General John Gronouski—to serve as U.S. Ambassador to Poland.

I have discussed this assignment at great length with Secretary Rusk and other top key officials in the Department of State, and we believe that Mr. Gronouski's appointment reaffirms our strong desire for increased trust and friendly cooperation between Poland and the United States.

Mr. Gronouski is going to Warsaw to do everything in his power to further increase understanding and good will between Poland and our country.

He is a grand and a very warm human being who enjoys people. His background and his experience uniquely qualify him to translate American ideals to Poland and Polish ideals to America.

POLISH TIES CITED

I have asked Mr. Gronouski to say to the peoples and to the leaders of Poland that a deep and historic bond exists between Poland and the United States. Let, therefore, trust grow between us. Let us strengthen that bond, and let us work together for the peace and the liberty that we all seek for all peoples everywhere.

John Gronouski is the man, I think, that can carry that message. America is in his blood, but so is Poland. He was born the grandson of a Polish immigrant. He is a member of the Polish Institute of the Arts and Sciences of Chicago, a director of the Pulaski Foundation, the honorary chairman of the committee for an endowed chair in Polish studies at the University of Chicago. In 1963 he became Postmaster General by selection of President Kennedy. He was the first American of Polish descent to ever serve in the Cabinet, and it was my great pleasure to reappoint him to the post of Postmaster General last February.

But John Gronouski is more. He is one of the very few men with a doctor of philosophy degree ever to sit in the Cabinet. As an expert on international economics and on Government finance, he has established a most outstanding record in one of the great progressive States of the Union—Wisconsin. He is a talented administrator who has opened up new paths of progress for the postal service of the United States.

Just as another very extraordinary American who I'm delighted to see here with us today, Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, left the Supreme Court to accept—a very extraordinary, highly significant diplomatic assignment, John Gronouski is now leaving the Cabinet with a distinguished record and high honor to serve his President and his country.

And he is, by the way, enhancing a very noble and unique tradition, for the man who really set up our postal service, our first Postmaster General, also went on to later serve his country as Ambassador. His name was Benjamin Franklin.

The Nation's Future Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1965

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday the President signed into law Senate Joint Resolution 81, the authorization of $3 billion for the Interstate System for fiscal year 1967. On that occasion, Mr. Speaker, the President issued a statement which, in my opinion, was an outstanding expression of the position of the administration on the Nation's future highway program.

Because of the significance of these remarks of the Chief Executive, under unanimous consent, I include them at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

With the signing of this legislation, we are authorizing the largest single year apportionment of Federal aid to the States for highways.

The highways to be built and improved under the Federal aid highway program will save time, save money, and save the lives of motorists. They will strengthen our national economy and our national defense. They will increase the markets for the products of our farms and they will give flexibility to the movement of people and goods in our growing urban areas. They will broaden the travel and recreational opportunities for all Americans. They will permit everyone to see the beauty and grandeur of America conveniently, comfortably, and safely.

This legislation also provides for the study of the orderly continuation of the Federal aid highway program. Congress has asked that it be provided with regular estimates of the future highway needs of the Nation. This administration, through the Department of Commerce and its Bureau of Public Roads, has a study underway of our future highway needs. On the basis of that study, I will, in January 1968, consider legislation for a program of Federal aid to the States for highways to continue after the expiration of the present program in 1972.

This legislation also provides the tools for a coordinated national attack on highway accidents. It provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall develop uniform standards for State highway safety programs. The death of over 48,000 persons on our highways last year and the prospect of an even greater total this year give urgency to a national safety effort. The approach provided for by this legislation is in keeping with the traditional Federal-State relationship through which the Federal aid highway program has operated so successfully. It recognizes the primary responsibility of the States for highway safety and at the same time acknowledges the Federal Government's responsibility to lead and coordinate.

This legislation, however, is but part of what is needed to insure that our highways will be able to meet the increasing demands placed upon them. I have proposed to Congress legislation to insure that the highway trust fund will receive the revenue it needs so that the States might receive Federal aid sufficient for the timely completion of the Interstate Highway System. I have also submitted to Congress legislation that will insure that the enormous public investments in highways will be protected from roadside blight and that highways will serve the increasing public demand for the beautiful as well as the merely utilitarian. The everyday driving of Americans provides the greatest opportunity to see and enjoy the beauty of our Nation. The higher standard of living and the increased leisure time of Americans have created a demand for scenic and recreational roads. I anticipate that the Congress will shortly act on these needs.

This proposed legislation meets a public need, in reality a public necessity and is going to be pursued with all the vigor of the executive department until acted upon.

We are a nation of almost 100 million drivers and 90 million vehicles. By 1970 we will be driving a trillion miles a year in America. We cannot depend on the roads of yesterday to carry the motor traffic of today and tomorrow. The life and pocketbook of every American are affected by the efficiency of our motor transportation system. The legislation now before Congress is necessary if we are to meet the new needs essential to the progress of our motor transportation system.

I appeal to all patriotic citizens interested in the improvement and continued development of our highway system to unite to the end of making that system adequate, superior in construction and most important, attractive and beautiful.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with this verse of Scripture: Galatians 5: 14: *For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*

Eternal God, whose grace is the supply and strength of our life, receive us in our need and waken the song of faith and joy in our hearts.

Draw us nearer to Thyself than we have ever known before. By Thy divine power work in us both to will and do what is well-pleasing unto Thee. In lowliness of heart may we walk together in Thy way.

Purify our spirits that we may hallow in our hearts that Name which is above every name forever blessed in which our holiest longings find voice.

Help us to understand that our love for Thee and our fellow men are inseparably related and that if we refuse to be in Christ the brothers of men, we cannot be in Christ the sons of God.

We beseech Thee to complete our spiritual endeavors and may we accept life as a great gift with glorious possibilities and opportunities and prove ourselves to be good and faithful servants.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10342. An act to authorize the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, a Member of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of Officer in the French National Order of the Legion of Honor; and

H.J. Res.632. Joint resolution to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into an agreement with the University of Texas for the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Archival Depository, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 5688. An act relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia.

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

S. 950. An act to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes;

S. 2042. An act to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; and

S. 2232. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf," approved September 2, 1958, as amended, in order to further provide for a loan service of educational media for the deaf, and for other purposes.

CONFEREES ON H.R. 8283

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may be excused as a conferee on the bill H.R. 8283, an act to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and that the Speaker be authorized to appoint a Member to fill the vacancy.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain just what the purpose of this is?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yesterday conferees were named on the bill H.R. 8283, and unfortunately, and I hope unintentionally, a mistake was made in that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] was appointed as a conferee even though he is not a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor which handled this particular legislation. By tradition and otherwise the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], as ranking minority member of the full committee, should have been appointed as a conferee. As a result I have checked with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and he is willing to step aside. It is the intent and purpose of the resolution to substitute the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] as his replacement.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman from Mississippi, I believe, understands that the gentleman from Ohio is the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor and that it has been customary for the 15 years that I have been a Member of the House that the ranking Member be consulted, at least, for suggestions to be made to the Speaker on the appointment of conferees. I was not consulted and I did not know that the conferees had been named until I was called by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], a member of the committee, from the floor of the House.

In no way am I casting any aspersions on our great Speaker. He accepted the list that was given to him.

This is most unethical, most unorthodox, and most unusual.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement. In view of the fact that this was offered by the distinguished minority leader, of course I shall not object. I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I just believe that we ought to understand what is going on within the comity of the Chamber, and of the privileges of individual Members of the House, and the precedents which have been established concerning the appointment of conferees on matters as vital as extending the Economic Opportunity Act, the Area Redevelopment Act, and the accelerated public works program.

This seems unduly strange and uncommon. I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor would care to comment about the situation, under the reservation of objection, in view of the "bypass," which has obviously been worked here and what was the actual intent.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HALL. Yes, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Missouri that what happened yesterday was purely a combination of accidents, because the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is not only my esteemed friend but is also a distinguished colleague, and he is the leader of the minority side of the committee. On everything I have always tried to clear with him, and always will try to clear with him, in connection with the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HALL. But this was not done yesterday; is that true?

Mr. POWELL. That is correct. It was a combination of accidents, and I should like to apologize to my good friend from Ohio.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I do object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can assure the gentlemen, the Members of the House, that there was no motive other than what was pure. These things occasionally happen, and the matter is then rectified.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? The Chair hears none——

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I do object, as I stated awhile ago, under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does object?

Mr. HALL. I do object. I reserved my right, and I did object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this matter was called to my attention late, late yesterday afternoon. I sought to find out what had happened and why. I consulted with the Speaker. The Speaker, on being told the facts and circumstances, agreed with me we would try to remedy and rectify the situation this morning.

I believe it is most unfortunate that the incident occurred. I pass no judgment on how it happened or why it happened. However, I strongly feel that the RECORD ought to be clear that so far as the Speaker is concerned, he had no part, or no involvement, in this regrettable incident. Our distinguished Speaker has worked with me in trying to remedy and rectify the situation. I thank him for his help and cooperation.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished leader of the minority side of the Committee on Education and Labor may be added to the conferees. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I ask that there be one more conferee on the Republican side.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to have the gentleman from New York confer with him before submitting that request. The Chair at this moment suggests that.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF CONSENT CALENDAR AND SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar and the authority for the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules, in order on Monday, September 6, 1965, be transferred to Tuesday, September 7, 1965.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I hope I will not have to object, but I will until we can have the order of bills that may be called up under suspension so that we may know what legislation we can expect. Unless the gentleman withdraws his request with respect to bills under suspension rule, I will be constrained to object.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I cannot advise him of all of the bills at this time, because until the week closes and we are ready to submit the program, we will not be able to know just how many requests we will have.

Mr. GROSS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object.

TRANSFER OF DATE FOR MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, made the request, as I am sure all Members know, because Monday is Labor Day. We can meet Monday; we will have to meet Monday unless this permission is granted. And I might say to my good friend from Iowa that the matter of putting bills on the suspension list is within the exclusive power and jurisdiction of the Speaker. That jurisdiction lies with the Speaker.

The Speaker is not required under the rules or the customs of the House to make that announcement until he has finally made the decision. On the day on which suspensions of the rules are in order, the Speaker can recognize Members for that purpose as he deems fit. The only thing the gentleman can do, if he persists in his objection, is compel the House to meet on Monday, because the Speaker's jurisdiction is clear.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman recall when the bills to be called under suspension were not announced to the House prior to the call of the calendar?

Mr. ALBERT. No; and I will say that when the Speaker has made his decision they will be announced so far as I am concerned. Of course the whole matter is within the control of the Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that when the House is informed of the legislation to be brought up under suspension——

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is gaining nothing, because the Speaker's prerogatives are clear. The gentleman is gaining nothing except forcing the House to meet on Monday, if that is what he wants to do.

Mr. GROSS. Until we know the bills that are to be called up under suspension the gentleman will continue to object.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is not going to take over the prerogatives of the Speaker, even though he may attempt to take over the prerogatives of the minority leader. We desire to accommodate Members, but we cannot do so at the expense of the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JOELSON. 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, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 256]

Abernethy	Dow	Matthews
Anderson, Ill.	Evins, Tenn.	Miller
Andrews, George W.	Feighan	Morse
Baring	Hathaway	Mosher
Bates	Hébert	Pucinski
Blatnik	Holifield	Reifel
Bonner	Hungate	Resnick
Brock	Kee	Roncalio
Clawson, Del	Kornegay	Roosevelt
Collier	Landrum	Thomas
Craley	Lindsay	Thompson, N.J.
Denton	Long, La.	Toll
Devine	McDowell	Ullman
Dingell	McEwen	Willis
	Martin, Mass.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 385 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

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

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. HARRIS. 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. 3141) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes.

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. 3141, with Mrs. GRIFFITHS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] had 29 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] had 30 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chairman, I am greatly concerned over an amendment which the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, upon which I serve, has added to the bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, H.R. 3141. This rider, adopted in executive session without an opportunity for those parties affected to present their views, does not affect the Public Health Service Act at all, but proposes to amend title VIII of the Nurse Training Act of 1964. The committee, under section 843 pertaining to definitions, has amended the term "accredited" in a manner which I feel will be highly detrimental to the nurse training program. The American Nurses' Association, the National League for Nursing, the American Hospital Association, and the Department of Education are violently opposed to such change.

The Nurse Training Act at present provides that the Commissioner of Education is given authority to recognize any body or bodies for purposes of accrediting programs of nurse education. Under that act as it now stands, only nursing programs so accredited may qualify to receive Nurse Training Act funds. Pursuant to this authority, the Commissioner has recognized only the National League for Nursing as the accrediting body. The American Nurses' Association—160,000 members—the National Hospital Association—approximately 9,000 associated hospitals—and many other professional medical groups endorse the selection of the National League for Nursing as the sole accrediting body for specialized programs of nursing because it is the only experienced national accrediting body recognized in the field of nurse education.

The amendment of the committee to which I am opposed proposes to eliminate the present requirement of the Nurse Training Act with regard to accreditation. Instead, it would provide that collegiate or associate degree programs—2-year junior college nursing programs—could be approved or accredited by either a State approval agency or a regional accrediting agency. This change, in effect, removes these two groups of schools from the accrediting program of the National League for Nursing and removes from the Commissioner of Education the responsibility and decision as to the satisfactory accreditation of the collegiate and associate degree programs.

It is the consensus of opinion among informed professional medical groups of both practitioners and educators that this change would result in the weakening of the nationwide efforts being made

to strengthen and improve the quality of nurse training. National accreditation by the National League for Nursing has provided a strong incentive for nursing schools across the country to improve and maintain the quality of their nurse education programs. The associate director of the American Hospital Association, Mr. Kenneth Williamson, has stated his opposition to the proposed change in accreditation as follows:

> We have seen no evidence that the regional accrediting authorities which are responsible for accrediting institutions of higher learning in terms of their general educational quality are competent in the areas of professional nurse education. Their present programs and staff would have to be augmented extensively. The program developed by the National League for Nursing has fully demonstrated its competency.

The optional selection of State approval authority, of course, removes the requirement of accreditation entirely.

The question as to whether or not those programs of nurse education not specially accredited should be allowed to participate in the nurse training program was extensively discussed during the hearings in 1964 on the Nurse Training Act. At that time, after thorough consideration had been given to the matter, it was decided to maintain the administration bill intact in this regard and to limit NTA participation to those institutions which had secured proper accreditation. It was recognized then, as it is today, that many of the smaller nursing schools had not attained that minimum level of proficiency in the education of nurses to justify their continued existence at that level; these schools should be encouraged to improve their standards or to discontinue their nursing programs. National accreditation as a requirement of participation in the nurse training program provides the needed incentive to improve and maintain the quality of nurse training.

A letter which I received from Dr. John F. Gillespie, assistant professor of surgery at Georgetown University, in opposition to the proposed change in accreditation is typical of the hundreds of letters received by Members of this House from professional medical groups across the Nation. Speaking on behalf of himself and the dean of the Georgetown School of Nursing, Dr. Ann Douglas, he states in part:

> The nursing school dean and myself are further prepared to show facts that National League for Nursing accredited programs, admit, retain, and graduate the largest number of students, have the lowest proportion of failures on State board examinations, and attract better faculties. In my opinion, such an amendment * * * is a step backwards in nursing education as well as evidence of a lack of knowledge of the responsibilities nursing has, not only to the medical profession, but to the community as a whole.

I am constrained to agree with Dr. *Gillespie* and the many other professional people who have urgently requested me to oppose this ill-conceived change in the manner of accreditation for purposes of the Nurse Training Act.

Madam Chairman, when we debated the rule I stated that I was for the rule and for the bill, but there is a major flaw in the bill, and that is the purpose of my speaking now. This is called the Rogers amendment. It is a tail end provision of this bill and has nothing to do with the bill we are now discussing, H.R. 3141, as we know it. I first became concerned with the Rogers amendment to H.R. 3141 after receiving a letter from the director of nursing at the Nebraska University College of Nurses. After receiving that, I went into the matter in depth and I was amazed at the harm the Rogers amendment would inflict upon the nursing profession.

Madam Chairman, the amendment is a front for a handful of junior colleges. Out of thousands of junior colleges only slightly more than 100 have nursing schools. Compare this with the nearly 1,000 nursing schools which have been accredited.

Madam Chairman, this is the crux of the matter, accreditation. Junior colleges can be nationally accredited, if they qualify. Some of them have. The Rogers amendment, without doubt, does violence to our wonderful nurses and that great profession. They want to be the best in the world, and they are. Have you ever had, have the Members ever had, their "tender care" as a patient? Well, I have. The Rogers amendment will tend to destroy this wonderful profession, and this highly respected profession, because it will reduce the standards now prevailing in the nursing profession.

Madam Chairman, last year we passed a Nurse Training Act. We gave authority to the Office of Education to choose the accrediting agency for these nursing schools. The Office of Education chose the highly qualified National League for Nursing as the accrediting agency.

Now, Madam Chairman, the junior college lobby is the agency which is supporting the Rogers amendment, which is on the tail end of this very important bill.

Madam Chairman, there are only slightly more than 100 junior colleges out of approximately a thousand which have nurse training programs. These are 2-year courses. The high caliber of nurses we have and their needs cannot be provided with 2-year nurse training programs which are not nationally accredited. The Rogers amendment proposes to let the bars down, to allow the State agency to do the accrediting.

Madam Chairman, a State agency is not equipped or qualified to accredit a school of nursing, a highly technical school.

If this provision remains in the bill in its final form, you can be assured that the nursing profession as we know it will suffer irreparable harm.

Those against the Rogers amendment are many. Yesterday we had a splendid speech opposing the Rogers amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], and I believe one other, but there are a great number of very respected organizations which are violently opposed to the Rogers amendment. For example, the American Nurses Association with a membership of 160,000, the National League for Nursing which has a huge membership, and they are the accrediting agency that has been designated as such by the Office of Education. Others opposed to the Rogers amendment include the American Hospital Association with 9,000 affiliated hospitals, and I understand that over 50 hospital associations on the State level are against the Rogers amendment.

Madam Chairman, of great significance is the fact that the Office of Education under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is against the Rogers amendment. There are also hundreds of professional and medical groups who oppose it.

I might say also that the Rogers amendment is opposed to the President's program.

When we had the Nurses Training Act up last year, it was the administration's position that the accrediting of nursing schools should be under the Office of Education and HEW. In this bill we are going to destroy what the administration wants, and I want to support the administration in this matter.

When we go back into the House I will ask permission to include various letters of opposition to the Rogers amendment to which I have referred. If the Rogers amendment should prevail—and I certainly hope it will not—it means that at least 50 accrediting agencies—one in each of the 50 States—will do the accrediting. They are not equipped to accredit the highly complex nursing school.

These State agencies under the Rogers amendment can accredit a college as such, but when it comes down to the professional schools they are not equipped to pass on the accreditation of the nursing schools.

You will hear some arguments in favor of the Rogers amendment, but as far as I am concerned they are of little or no value. As I said, there is a little group of people, about 100, as I understand it, junior colleges that are back of the Rogers amendment.

Madam Chairman, I understand by the 160,000 members of the American Nurses' Association, highly qualified people, and I refer to them. They are the ones who give you "gentle care" if you are hospitalized. I stand with the 9,000 hospitals represented by the American Hospital Association. I stand by the administration and the Office of Education.

So in summary, Madam Chairman, may I say that this was snuck into this bill at the last minute with no hearings. There were no hearings on it to be sure. It was put in during an executive session, and it does damage to the great nursing profession, it does damage to the President's program.

What we need and what we must have in this country are highly qualified nurses, and the only way we can assure professional nurse's training is to not go along with the Rogers amendment but to leave accreditation to the National League of Nursing as it now is. I do hope that this amendment will be knocked out of the bill. I had originally proposed an amendment to do that, but I have so much respect and regard for my dear chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and we have had

some conversations and think we have another way of getting at this problem. But if the Rogers amendment stays in the final bill, and I feel it will not, you will see a downgrading of the wonderful women who are in the nursing profession.

So I hope that all of you here in this Chamber will take this to heart and will give the support that is needed because we want to continue to have excellent training for our nurses. We certainly will not get such training under the Rogers amendment.

As I said, I have all of these documents from the administration and from the departments—HEW, and so forth, and when we go back into the House, I will ask permission to insert them in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

Madam Chairman, I include at this point in the RECORD, the letters to which I have referred:

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
Omaha, Nebr., August 20, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Representative, U.S. Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I am concerned about the information received from the National League for Nursing about bill H.R. 3141, which includes an amendment to the Nurse Training Act, 1964 (Public Law 88–851, sec. 843–F). This amendment would replace professional accreditation of baccalaureate and associate degree programs in nursing with either regional accreditation or State approval of the educational institution. If this amendment has been considered in committee and reported to the House of Representatives for consideration, I hope you will consider the following points and plan to vote against the amendment.

As a member of both the American Nurses Association and the National League for Nursing as well as the director of the University of Nebraska School of Nursing, which is accredited, I believe the negative implications which this amendment has for continued high quality accreditation of nursing programs could be disastrous to the profession. It is to the best interest of the consumer of professional nursing, the public, as well as the nursing student for accreditation of schools of nursing to remain in the hands of the nationally approved agency which is the National League for Nursing.

Some statements in support of my beliefs are as follows:

1. The National League for Nursing is presently recognized by the National Commission on Accrediting, by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and by the American Nurses Association as the national accrediting agency for baccalaureate and higher degrees in nursing.

2. The accrediting agency of the National League for Nursing is staffed with experts in nursing and nursing education who are qualified to give the kind of guidance needed by schools of nursing in planning and improving their educational programs.

3. The National League for Nursing has established policies and procedures for accrediting all nursing programs which are of a quality to warrant immediate accreditation as well as for those who have the potential for achieving accreditation.

4. The National League for Nursing has taken steps which will give junior colleges with high quality programs the opportunity to achieve accreditation and thereby enable them to benefit from the Nurse Training Act.

5. A change in accrediting agencies would delay progress in nursing education at a time when nursing can least afford delays.

6. State and/or regional agencies do not have and probably could not get enough prepared people to carry out accreditation programs for professional schools of nursing.

7. The present accreditation policies of the National League for Nursing have controlled the quality of nursing education and hence the quality of nursing care. Nursing studies have shown that: the majority of nurses in 1964 graduated from NLN accredited schools, the best qualified faculty members are with NLN accredited schools, most State board failures are from nonaccredited schools, and the largest number of State board failures are from nonaccredited associate degree programs.

Your vote against the amendment to the Nurse Training Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–851, sec. 843–F) will retain the National League for Nursing as the professional agency for accrediting all nursing programs. I strongly urge your consideration and support.

Very truly yours,
IRMA M. KYLE, R.N.,
Director, School of Nursing.

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
August 25, 1965.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: This association strongly supported the new and progressive amendments to the Public Health Service Act which pertained to teaching facilities and the training of professional health personnel. We expressed our detailed support of the proposals embodied in the legislation (H.R. 3141) as it was being considered by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

We are greatly concerned, however, over an amendment which the House committee added to Title VIII of the nurse training program. The committee, under section 843 pertaining to definitions, has amended the term "accredited" in a manner in which we feel will be detrimental to the purpose of the program.

The act at present provides that the Commissioner of Education is given authority to recognize any body or bodies for purposes of accrediting programs of nurse education. He is, thereby, given authority to determine that an accrediting body is desirable and competent for accrediting programs of nurse education in collegiate, in 2-year junior college and in the 3-year hospital schools of nurse education.

The Commissioner of Education has recognized the accrediting program of the National League for Nursing. We endorse this selection as the league is the only experienced national accrediting body recognized in the field of nurse education.

The amendment adopted by the House committee provides that collegiate or associate degree (2-year junior college program) programs of nurse education must be approved or accredited by either a regional accrediting agency or a State approval agency. This change in effect removes these two groups of schools from the accrediting program conducted by the National League for Nursing, and it provides only that the 3-year hospital programs of nurse education will be under the accrediting program of the National League for Nursing. A definite weakening of the nationwide efforts being made to strengthen schools of nursing would result. The optional selection of State approval authority, of course, removes the requirement for accreditation entirely.

This amendment removes from the authority of the Commissioner of Education the responsibility and decision as to the satisfactory accreditation of the collegiate and 2-year schools; and in essence, breaks down the responsibility of the Federal Government for the conduct of the program.

It would be most unfortunate at this time for the Commissioner of Education to be forced to recognize multiple accrediting authorities. Such an approach would prove very detrimental to the development of one nationwide program of accreditation. It will likely result in different standards for schools and varying qualifications of their graduates. The products of these three schools of nursing all take the same qualifying examinations within the States. We believe, therefore, different basic accrediting of the schools makes no sense whatever and will prove to have an unfortunate effect upon the efforts being made to strengthen the 3-year hospital schools of nursing and to improve the programs of certain of those schools through the national accrediting efforts.

We have seen no evidence that the regional accrediting authorities which are responsible for accrediting institutions of higher learning in terms of their general educational quality are competent in the areas of professional nurse education. Their present programs and staff would have to be augmented extensively. The program developed by the National League for Nursing has fully demonstrated its competency.

There appears also to be a basic fallacy attached to the proposed amendment as it suggests that one accrediting authority has competency for all programs of education within a college or university including all the various highly specialized and professional schools. This basic policy suggests that one accrediting authority would be competent to cover not only the university in general but the school of law, the school of engineering, the school of medicine, the school of dentistry, the school of nursing, etc., etc. The regional accrediting authorities responsible for overall accreditation of an institution of higher learning may rely upon the certification of accrediting authorities for various professional schools within the university. However, schools of medicine are accredited by a voluntary program which is the same for all medical schools and which is carried out by a liaison committee between the Association of American Medical Colleges and the American Medical Association. The accreditation of schools of dentistry is carried out by the American Dental Association.

There has been expressed some concern on the part of the 2-year junior college programs of nursing education that they were required to pay the accrediting fees established by the National League for Nursing. This is, of course, a fact. Since the National League for Nursing is a voluntary program it must be supported by charges assessed to cover the costs of the accrediting program. Thus, the 2-year junior colleges, as well as the collegiate schools and the hospital schools, would each be required to pay a fee. The apparent desire of the junior colleges to avoid this fee seems a small justification for removing them from the requirement presently provided in the law. As we see it, it seems a very small price to pay in return for the substantial Federal assistance that is offered. It is, of course, necessary that all programs of nurse education covered under the act must face the cost of providing for their special accreditation. This means that the 2-year junior college programs would be faced with the same essential costs which would be required by a national accrediting authority and cannot expect to avoid costs of accrediting programs by attempting to place themselves under the authority of the various regional educational accrediting bodies.

Finally, I believe it is quite appropriate to compare the situation that would result from the proposed amendment to what would happen if we returned to the days of having a variety of accrediting or approval authorities for schools of medicine. No one familiar with the whole situation would suggest that

the future of medical education and the future health of the American people would be served by breaking down a single nationwide uniform approval program of such schools and substituting several possible approval authorities with the likelihood of widely differing standards and quality being the result.

We sincerely urge that the Senate committee not accept the amendment to section 843 and pertaining particularly to the term "accrediting," but that you retain the language presently in this section of the act. When the Congress passed the nurse education bill, it was quite specific in its intention to require the assurance which accreditation would provide to students in nursing education. There is every indication that a strong uniform accreditation program is needed and one which can exert its influence upon all schools of nurse education. It is important to realize that for the year 1963–64, of the graduates of baccalaureate programs which were not accredited, 19 percent failed to pass their State board examinations and 25 percent of the graduates of associate degree (2-year junior college) programs which were not accredited failed to pass their examinations. This would certainly seem to indicate the desirability of refraining from any weakening of accreditation requirements which must be met by all schools of nursing in order to be eligible to receive Federal funds.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH WILLIAMSON,
Associate Director,
American Hospital Association.

AUGUST 26, 1965.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: Congressman PAUL ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, recently introduced an amendment to the Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965 (H.R. 3141) which stated that a school in receipt of Nursing Training Funds will not be forced to be accredited by the National League for Nursing. The accreditation required would then only be regional or State approval of the educational institution.

On August 6, 1964, favorable testimony was given (at hearings on H.R. 11241) concerning accredited over nonaccredited nursing programs. Dr. Ann Douglas, dean of the Georgetown University School of Nursing, and I are prepared to testify on latest figures that not only reconfirm, but make even more impressive, the record of the accredited programs and reemphasize the need for public concern regarding the educational programs that are not accredited by the National League for Nursing.

The nursing school dean and myself are further prepared to show facts that National League for Nursing accredited programs, admit, retain, and graduate the largest number of students, have the lowest proportion of failures on State board examinations, and attract better prepared faculties.

In our opinion, such an amendment as introduced by Congressman ROGERS, is a step backward in nursing education as well as evidence of lack of knowledge of the responsibilities nursing has, not only to the medical profession, but to the community as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. GILLESPIE, M.D.,
Assistant Professor of Surgery,
Georgetown University.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you for offering me the opportunity to comment on the position of the Office of Education with reference to the designation of an accrediting agency for associate degree programs in nursing for purposes of the Nurse Training Act of 1964. We are enclosing a summary statement of issues and developments involved in an attempt to reconcile conflicting views.

Let us know if we may be of further service.

Sincerely yours,

PETER P. MUIRHEAD,
Associate Commissioner for Higher Education.

DESIGNATION OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR NURSING AS THE APPROPRIATE ACCREDITING AGENCY FOR THE PURPOSES OF PUBLIC LAW 88–581, THE NURSE TRAINING ACT OF 1964

The U.S. Commissioner of Education, pursuant to legislative authorization and on the basis of criteria established and published in October 1952, designated the National League for Nursing as the nationally recognized accrediting agency for the field of nurse education. When, in 1957, the league extended its accreditation to include evaluation of associate degree programs in nursing, the Commissioner of Education recognized this as a logical assumption of responsibility by the nationally recognized accrediting agency in the field of nurse education. Parallel situations appear in several other professional and specialized fields, e.g., accreditation of engineering technology programs by the Engineers' Council for Professional Development; accreditation of dental hygiene, dental technology, and dental assistant programs by the American Dental Association; accreditation of allied medical sciences such as medical technology, physical therapy, occupational therapy, and X-ray technology by the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association; and accreditation of programs in music at the junior college level by the National Association of Schools of Music.

The associate degree program in nursing is of fairly recent development, and many of the junior colleges offering the program had not, prior to the passage of Public Law 88–581, sought National League for Nursing accreditation. At the close of fiscal 1965, of the more than 100 associate degree programs in nursing, 3 had been accredited by the League and 37 had attained the status of "reasonable assurance" provided in section 843(f) of the act.

The institutions not qualifying for participation in the provisions of the act have voiced objection to the requirement of "specialized" accreditation for the associate degree program in nursing, suggesting that "general" accreditation by nationally recognized regional agencies or by State agencies should be considered adequate for specialized programs at the junior or community college level.

In November 1964, when the U.S. Commissioner reaffirmed his designation of the National League for Nursing as the appropriate agency for the accreditation of programs of nurse education at the baccalaureate and higher degree, associate degree, and diploma (hospital school) levels, it was with the reservation that it may be necessary to designate additional accrediting bodies for programs at the associate degree level at a later date. This reservation recognized the fact that there were honest differences of opinion between the junior colleges on the one hand and the professional leadership, practitioners and educators, on the other.

With the cooperation of the National Commission on Accrediting (the nongovernmental agency assuming responsibility for recognizing accrediting agencies in the interest of institutions of higher education), the Office of Education has explored with representatives of the junior colleges, the professional accrediting agencies accrediting programs in those colleges, representatives of State education departments, and the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education the factors involved and the problems in need of resolution. The results of the several conferences held have led to the conclusion that accreditation for general purposes by regional accrediting or State agencies will not guarantee the achievement of the goals of the act—to increase the quantity of nurses available for the care of patients and to improve the quality of training of nurses. Pertinent to this conclusion are the following facts:

The present policy of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education regarding accreditation of specialized programs within an institution is as follows:

"The general accreditation of the institution as a whole is not and should not be interpreted as being equivalent to specialized accreditation of each of the separate parts or programs of the institution."

Thus, while regional association accreditation implies attainment of minimum standards for the institution as a whole, it does not attempt to provide evaluation appropriate to a determination of satisfactory preparation in a professional field. This has been the long standing, institutionally accepted practice in the accreditation of baccalaureate programs, and there seems to be no defensible reason for inaugurating a different practice at the junior college level. Furthermore, the development of the associate degree program in nurse education is so recent that many of the institutions offering such programs have not had their regional accreditation reaffirmed since the institution of such program.

The procedures and standards for licensing of nurses and approval of programs of nurse education in the several States vary so widely that it does not seem feasible to identify State licensing or approval agencies for the purposes of the act. The States are concerned primarily with identifying individuals who are competent to perform professional duties. Licensure or certification by the State complements but affords no substitute for identifying well qualified institutions and helping to raise and maintain institutional standards.

The professional leadership in the field of nursing as represented by the California Nurses' Association, the American Nurses' Association, and the State and Territorial Directors of Nursing has indicated support of the Commissioner of Education's designation of the National League for Nursing for purposes of the Nursing Training Act of 1964 and expressed the conviction that it is the role of government to protect the safety of the public through State licensure of individual practitioners but that standards for educational preparation should be established by peer groups in the appropriate field and carried out through voluntary nationwide participation.

The Office of Education concurs in this point of view and supports the deletion of the proposed amendment to H.R. 3141 which would substitute "general" for "specialized" accreditation as establishing institutional eligibility for participation in the provisions of Public Law 88–581.

POSITION OF THE AMERICAN NURSES' ASSOCIATION ON ACCREDITATION OF ALL BASIC NURSING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The American Nurses' Association recognizes and supports the National League for Nursing as the national accrediting agency for all basic nursing education programs. National League for Nursing accreditation is directed toward strengthening and maintaining quality of nursing education for the protection of both the student and the public. Such accreditation, we believe, is most

essential at the present time for the effective development of associate degree programs which are providing rapidly increasing numbers of candidates for licensure as registered nurses.

We support the designation of the National League for Nursing as the accrediting agency for the purposes of awarding Federal funds for nursing education, and urge that National League for Nursing accreditation be maintained as a requirement for Federal assistance to associate degree and baccalaureate programs, as well as for diploma programs.

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE
NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
Columbia, S.C., August 25, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT T. ASHMORE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASHMORE: The South Carolina State Nurses' Association is very much concerned about and opposed to the technical amendment to H.R. 3141, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965.

This technical amendment calls for changes in the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide that funds be available to collegiate programs on the basis of regional or State approval rather than approval by the National League for Nursing as named by the Commissioner of Education.

You will understand that this matter is of the greatest concern to nurses in South Carolina. We have, together with State government and other citizens, sought to improve the preparation of nursing practitioners so that our people might have better nursing care. And we believe that definite standards must be adhered to if we are to insure sound education for nursing.

While regional accreditation is important, it testifies to general excellence of the educational institution rather than excellence of specific programs within the institution. Since nurses are so vitally concerned with health and often with matters of life and death, we believe that the nursing programs and clinical facilities used must be examined by those qualified to judge ability to prepare sound practioners of nursing.

Our experience in this State has shown that nationally accredited programs can attract faculty and students and that graduates of these programs make better, safer, practitioners of nursing. Since the National League for Nursing is the recognized accrediting body for basic nursing education programs, we believe that NLN accreditation (or reasonable assurance as provided) should be a requirement for schools to receive funds under the Nurse Training Act of 1964.

This association, therefore, urges you to oppose the technical amendment to H.R. 3141 when it comes up for debate in the House.

Very sincerely yours,
VIRGINIA COKER PHILLIPS.

LANSING, MICH., *August 26, 1965.*

Representative CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Michigan Hospital Association opposes those portions of H.R. 3141 which would remove collegiate and associate degree nurse training programs from present national accreditation requirements. Nurse training is vital to the health of our citizens and should meet uniform standards of quality as presently established through the National League for Nursing.

We endorse the position of the American Hospital Association on this subject and trust that your support of our opposition to this measure will be forthcoming.

Sincerely,
ALLAN BARTH,
Executive Director, Michigan Hospital Association.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3141, but vigorously oppose that portion of the committee amendment which modifies the language of section 843(f) of the Public Health Service Act. Under the present law, assistance is given to schools of nursing which are properly accredited by a recognized body approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education. The proposed modification would make eligible for assistance any school of nursing offering collegiate or associate degree programs, if the school is part of an educational institution approved or accredited by either a regional accreditation agency, or a State approval agency.

This modification was approved in subcommittee without hearing, and after little or no notice, notwithstanding the fact that it vitally affects the operation of our nurses training schools, and the profession generally. The American Nursing Association and the American Hospital Association are unqualifiedly opposed to this change in the present law.

If this amendatory language remains in the bill as finally approved, it will, in effect, make it no longer necessary for a school of nursing to meet the high standards prescribed by its officially designated accreditation organization, in order to qualify for assistance. It will weaken those professional nursing standards which have been carefully erected as citadels for the safety of the American people. It will expose those standards to erosion, resulting in projecting the nursing profession along a downward, rather than an upward, road.

By way of background, may I say that the junior colleges and senior colleges and universities in this country have organized themselves into six regional accreditation associations whose purpose it is to extend accreditation to member organizations. These regional associations, although performing a very useful function, are strictly limited. Their function is to accredit schools or universities, as a unit, rather than to pass on the merits of any constituent professional school. It is very possible, for example, that a regional accreditation association might approve a university, on its overall performance, even though its school of nursing might be conspicuously weak. The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education has admitted this itself, when, on October 14, 1964, it adopted a policy statement which reads in part as follows:

> The general accreditation of the institution as a whole is not and should not be interpreted as being equivalent to specialized accreditation of each of the several parts or programs of the institution.

It is these regional associations which the above-referred to amendment enthrones as the final authority on matters of accreditation and eligibility for Federal funds.

It is because of their inherent limitations that almost all of our professional schools have established their own professional accreditation associations for the purpose of establishing a higher standard of excellence than it is possible to maintain by the regional accreditation associations.

Thus, the nursing profession has organized the National League for Nursing for the purpose of establishing national and uniform standards of excellence. This league has been designated by the Commissioner of Education to establish accreditation for schools of nursing. It has done an excellent job, and succeeded in raising the standards of nursing throughout the Nation, so that to be a registered nurse, today, is to be accepted everywhere as a person of quality and competence.

If the above language remains in the bill, the vast progress made in raising standards of nursing will be compromised, and the hands of time will be set back many years.

Today's little lady with the lamp has come a long way since the Crimean War, over a hundred years ago, when Florence Nightingale brought care and comfort to the battered British soldiers. Today she still brings care and comfort, but on a plane of scientific enlightenment and skill which would have confounded the founder of modern nursing. Today's registered nurse, acting under doctor's instructions, but nevertheless relying entirely on her own skill, is licensed to administer any one of hundreds of drugs and narcotics, medications, blood transfusions, intravenous feedings, and oxygen. She is required to exercise skill, and judgment in the most professional sense of the word. It is probably not an exaggeration to state that today's registered nurse literally holds life and death power over more people than does any other professional person.

With each new advance in technology, there come new demands upon her knowledge and skill. Every year there are scores of new antibiotics, new serums, new narcotics, new medications, new machines and gadgets with which she must become thoroughly familiar.

It seems to me that we should move in the direction of raising standards, rather than lowering them. To leave in the present bill the language in question would without any question move us in the wrong direction. It would remove from hundreds of institutions the incentive to achieve accreditation. It would squander millions of dollars on programs foredoomed to turn out unduly large numbers of failures: that is, nursing candidates who fail to pass the State board examinations. The records show, for example, that last year 10 percent of those receiving an associate degree from accredited schools failed their State boards, but that 25 percent of those receiving the same degree from nonaccredited schools failed their examination.

Because of the incredible complexity of modern medicine, it is apparent to me that the least the public should expect is that those nurses who care for them in their illness should meet, not just the minimum standards prescribed by the

regional accreditation associations, but the much higher standards of competence and excellence prescribed by the National League for Nursing. A dying man should not be required to gamble on whether or not he will receive good nursing care.

Let me make it abundantly clear that the issue here is not one of whether or not the junior colleges should be allowed to participate in the nursing program. The answer is clear that they should, and are. They are not on trial. The National League for Nursing has already accredited 3 junior colleges, and has given 32 others reasonable assurance of receiving accreditation, which has made them eligible for Federal funds. Twenty-three more are in the process of review. All of this has been accomplished, in a year's time.

Nothing which I have said is intended to disparage the program of the junior colleges. The position which I take is merely that junior colleges should expect no preferential treatment where standards of professional excellence are concerned. If their courses meet the accreditation standards of the National League for Nursing, then they should become accredited; if they do not, they should not.

I cannot understand why the noble nursing profession has been singled out for this type of discriminatory treatment by the committee bill. On page 18 reference is made to the professions of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry. As to them, financial assistance shall be made conditional upon accreditation by a nationally recognized association approved by the Commissioner of Education. Why has an exception been carved out from the general rule, for nurses? Is it because a lower standard of excellence is required of them? This cannot be. Or is it because this is the opening salvo of a legislative barrage that will eventually batter down the standards for all the healing art professions? I believe that the Nation deserves answers to these questions.

No amendment is being offered to the committee bill at this time, frankly because the matter was so handled that insufficient time was allowed to publicize our point of view. I am confident that had committee hearings been allowed on this provision, it would never have survived.

I feel however that it is absolutely imperative that a record of opposition be established during the debate on this bill.

I will say frankly that although I approve the general purposes of this bill, and will support it on final roll call vote, I shall think a long time before approving the conference report if it shall still contain language which in my opinion is so repugnant to the public good.

The following material was prepared by the National League for Nursing, showing importance of maintaining National Accreditation standards for schools of nursing, dated August 6, 1965.

1. Accredited Programs Have the Largest Enrollments

1964

Seventy-five percent of all student nurses are enrolled in the 62 percent (707) of the professional nursing programs that are accredited by the NLN.

ENROLLMENT ON OCT. 15, 1963, AND ACCREDITATION STATUS OF PROGRAMS OF PROFESSIONAL NURSING ON JAN. 1, 1964

Accreditation status	Number of programs	Number of students enrolled	Average enrollment
Accredited	707	93,587	132.4
Not accredited	441	31,157	70.7
Total	1,148	124,744	

1965

	Students
Enrollments in accredited programs, increase	4,966
Enrollments in nonaccredited programs, decrease	540
Total gain	4,426

Seventy-six percent of all student nurses are enrolled in the 62 percent (717) of the professional nursing programs that are accredited by the NLN.

ENROLLMENT ON OCT. 15, 1964, AND ACCREDITATION STATUS OF PROGRAMS OF PROFESSIONAL NURSING ON JUNE 30, 1965

Accreditation status	Number of programs	Number of students enrolled	Average enrollment
Accredited	717	98,553	137.5
Not accredited	438	30,617	69.9
Total	1,155	129,170	

[Supplemental information]

ENROLLMENT ON OCT. 15, 1964, IN PROGRAMS ACCREDITED BY THE NLN AS OF JUNE 30, 1965

Baccalaureate	[1] 138	24,105	174.7
Associate degree	3	313	104.3
Diploma	576	74,135	128.7
Total	717	98,553	137.5

ENROLLMENT ON OCT. 15, 1964, IN PROGRAMS NOT ACCREDITED BY THE NLN [2]

Baccalaureate	38	2,936	77.3
Associate degree	96	5,872	61.2
Diploma	193	13,999	72.5
Total	327	22,807	69.7

[1] Includes 1 masters program preparing graduates for initial practice of nursing.
[2] The 111 programs that have been granted reasonable assurance of accreditation are not included.

2. Three-fourths of All Professional Nursing Students Graduate From NLN Accredited Programs

1964

Seventy-six percent of all graduates were from NLN accredited programs.

GRADUATIONS BY TYPE OF PROGRAM AND ACCREDITATION STATUS, SEPT. 1, 1962, TO AUG. 31, 1963

Type of program	Number of graduates from accredited programs	Number of graduates from not accredited programs
Baccalaureate	3,878	599
Associate degree	154	1,308
Diploma	20,366	5,872
Total	24,398	7,779

1965

Seventy-seven percent of all graduates were from NLN accredited programs.

GRADUATIONS BY TYPE OF PROGRAM AND ACCREDITATION STATUS, SEPT. 1, 1963, TO AUG. 31, 1964

Type of program	Number of graduates from accredited programs	Number of graduates from not accredited programs
Baccalaureate	4,445	544
Associate degree	114	1,331
Diploma	22,471	3,989
Total	27,030	5,864

3. Accredited Diploma Programs Are Less Costly Than Not-Accredited Diploma Programs

1964

The cost of nursing education programs varies inversely with the size of student enrollment. A study of costs of nursing education conducted by the Research and Studies Service of the National League for Nursing and published in 1964 provided dramatic evidence relating to cost, size of enrollment, and accreditation status of the 126 diploma schools that participated in the study. The larger the program, the lower the annual cost per student and the greater the likelihood that the program is accredited.

COST, ENROLLMENT, AND ACCREDITATION STATUS OF 126 DIPLOMA[1] PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR NURSING COST STUDY

Annual educational cost per student to the institution	Size of student enrollment	Percent of programs by size of enrollment	
		Accredited	Not accredited
$1,425	Under 70	0	50
$997	70 to 120	38	31
$908	More than 120	62	19

[1] The numbers of associate and baccalaureate degree programs that participated in he cost study were too small to provide comparable data.

1965

No additional data collected in 1965.

No additional data collected in 1965.

4. Accredited Programs Have Better Prepared Faculty

1964

The educational preparation of the faculty teaching in accredited programs is better (as evidenced by the highest earned degrees) than that of faculty teaching in non-accredited programs.

A. HIGHEST EARNED CREDENTIAL OF FULL-TIME NURSE FACULTY EMPLOYED IN 195 ACCREDITED AND NOT-ACCREDITED BACCALAUREATE AND HIGHER DEGREE PROGRAMS, AS OF JAN. 1, 1964

Highest earned credential	Total		Accredited		Not accredited	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Doctoral	145	4.6	130	4.8	15	4.0
Masters	2,502	80.0	2,242	81.3	260	69.9
Baccalaureate	475	15.2	381	13.8	94	25.3
Associate degree						
Diploma	6	.2	3	.1	3	.8
Total	3,128	100.0	2,756	100.0	372	100.0

B. HIGHEST EARNED CREDENTIAL OF FULL-TIME NURSE FACULTY EMPLOYED IN 82 ACCREDITED AND NOT-ACCREDITED ASSOCIATE DEGREE PROGRAMS, AS OF JAN. 1, 1964

Doctoral	8	1.6	2	3.5	6	1.4
Masters	336	67.8	47	81.0	289	66.0
Baccalaureate	132	26.6	9	15.5	123	28.1
Associate degree	16	3.2			16	3.6
Diploma	4	.8			4	.9
Total	496	100.0	58	100.0	438	100.0

C. HIGHEST EARNED CREDENTIAL OF FULL-TIME NURSE FACULTY EMPLOYED IN 801 ACCREDITED AND NOT-ACCREDITED DIPLOMA PROGRAMS, AS OF JAN. 1, 1964

Doctoral	11	0.1	11	0.2		
Masters	1,924	21.5	1,577	23.0	347	16.6
Baccalaureate	4,629	51.8	3,601	52.6	1,028	49.1
Associate degree	121	1.4	73	1.1	48	2.3
Diploma	2,254	25.2	1,584	23.1	670	32.0
Total	8,939	100.0	6,846	100.0	2,093	100.0

1965

No additional data collected.

5. A Higher Proportion of Graduates From Accredited Programs Enter Nursing Practice

A higher proportion of the graduates from accredited programs than from not-accredited programs pass State board examinations and are licensed to practice as registered nurses. It is only the graduates who are licensed and practice as registered nurses who swell the ranks of nurses to provide nursing service.

1964

NUMBER OF CANDIDATES AND PERCENT FAILING STATE BOARD EXAMINATIONS, 1961-62

Type of program	Accredited		Not accredited	
	Number of candidates	Percent of failures	Number of candidates	Percent of failures
Baccalaureate	3,127	4	664	7
Associate degree	121	6	772	21
Diploma	17,875	12	5,313	22

1965

NUMBER OF CANDIDATES AND PERCENT FAILING STATE BOARD EXAMINATIONS, 1963-64

Type of program	Accredited		Not accredited	
	Number of candidates	Percent of failures	Number of candidates	Percent of failures
Baccalaureate	3,696	6	744	19
Associate degree	144	10	1,133	25
Diploma	20,118	13	5,950	24

Mr. MOORHEAD. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Is it the position of the gentleman in the well that the same standards of accreditation should be in existence for all of the health professions, including the nursing profession?

Mr. KING of Utah. That is essentially true. It is my position that there should be national professional standards for all of the professions pertaining to the healing arts, as a requisite for receiving Federal aid.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I say it seems to me the gentleman's position is eminently sound.

Mr. KING of Utah. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MACHEN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MACHEN. I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman in the well for his statement in support of this bill and in opposition to the so-called Rogers amendment. I do want to associate myself with the gentleman from Utah's remarks in opposition to the Rogers amendment and in support of the bill.

Mr. KING of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. REDLIN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. REDLIN. Madam Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Utah has made an excellent presentation of the concern many of us have for protecting the high standards of the nursing profession. I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Madam Chairman, an evaluation of the standards of a profession is most meaningful coming from the experts in that particular profession.

In the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, this principle is applied to medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry. For each of these professions, the bill provides for the accreditation of schools and training programs by appropriate professional associations in determining eligibility for Federal assistance.

A technical amendment, the Rogers amendment, makes one exception—for the nursing profession. Its adoption would mean that accreditation by the National League for Nursing would no longer be a requirement for receiving Federal assistance under the Nurse Training Act of 1964.

Madam Chairman, the National League for Nursing has an excellent record in maintaining high standards in nursing education. Graduates from training programs accredited by the League have consistently made superior scores in State board examinations.

While I support the overall objectives of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, I believe deletion of the Rogers amendment would assist the cause of quality nursing care.

Mr. KING of Utah. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for his excellent contribution.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3141. However, I believe we should have a national accrediting agency for schools of nursing. It is quite evident that unless there is a significant increase in the number of medical school graduates and also an increase of medical personnel, technicians, and nurses, our Nation will face a critical shortage. Recent enactment of medicare will result in a greater demand for medical services. These needs must be met and H.R. 3141 will help toward that end. The student loan program, which will be extended for 3 years, is sound. Of 152 schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry, 147 have established student loan funds and there have been more than 10,000 student borrowers. The present cost of medical schooling is prohibitive to lower income groups. This cost averages over $3,700 per year. I see nothing wrong and much that is commendable in allotting scholarships up to $2,500 per year for those gifted individuals who have the ability but not the funds to attend medical schools. Four-fifths of graduate students in life sciences in 1962–63 received nonrefundable grants averaging $2,700. Less than one-third of our medical students received such grants and the average grant was only $760. Because of the impending great need for increased medical personnel, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3141. Otherwise we will be unable to supply the physicians and other personnel needed.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for his very constructive statement just made to the committee. The gentleman has been an active practicing doctor in the medical profession over the years and is familiar with the problems as one who has been schooled and trained and has had experience in the field of medicine. As such he has performed a great service. His work on the committee has been outstanding. I want not only the medical profession and the Members of this Congress but the people of the Nation to know that he has contributed tremendously to the work of the committee in these fields out of the abundance of knowledge and experience that he has brought with him to this Congress.

I congratulate him not only on the outstanding service he has rendered as a Member of Congress in these fields, but for the very thorough enunciation he has made here today in connection with this program and the recognized need of our people as we try to meet future demands.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the distinguished chairman for his very kind remarks.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I have felt for a number of years that we ought to have a practicing physician on this committee. We have been fortunate this year to have one on our side of the aisle. When these complicated questions come before the committee we usually have to get outside advice, but now we are able to get an immediate answer. I congratulate the gentleman not only on his excellent service in connection with this particular bill but also for his service on the committee in connection with the heart, stroke and cancer program which the committee is now considering and on which he has done an equally good job.

Madam Chairman, the gentleman should be commended for coming to the Congress in the capacity in which he did come and for the kind of service he has rendered.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the committee for his kind remarks.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Madam Chairman, as a member of this great committee I, too, am proud to appear on behalf of this legislation immediately following my esteemed colleague, Dr. CARTER. I am sure no one would suggest that there is a conflict of interest in a licensed physician addressing himself to the topics of this legislation. And no one would, other than facetiously, suggest that those few Members of the House who are married to registered nurses suffer from any conflict of interest in rising to speak to that portion of the bill which appears to have curtailed the eligibility of nursing organizations to maintain a high standard in the field of nurses' training.

I am one of those Members of the House who cheerfully accepted, 25 years ago this October, the conflict of interest that was imposed upon me by marriage to a registered nurse, and I must say that I recommend this conflict of interest to any of my bachelor colleagues who may now contemplate marriage.

Madam Chairman, I am also in receipt of a letter from the California Nurses Association which cites the long record of service performed by the National Nursing League in maintaining the standards of patient care at the nursing level through the accreditation of nurses training schools.

Madam Chairman, this letter makes the point that "the National League for Nursing has long and honorably carried out a national accreditation of nursing programs. It has proved its ability and its recognition of the responsibilities in-

herent in such an accreditation program."

These standards are essential if the sick and injured throughout the United States are to receive a comparable quality of professional nursing care and students of nursing throughout the United States are to be comparably prepared to give the needed nursing care. The California association enthusiastically supports the American Nurses Association in its efforts to remove from this legislation the amendment which puts an end to this historic role.

Madam Chairman, I would hope the 89th Congress, which has given this Nation medicare, community health programs, the Health Research Facilities Act, a mental health staffing program, and now this health professions educational assistance amendments legislation—and probably later a bold new approach to the old enemies of heart, stroke, and cancer—I hope it will not be said that we followed up this fine program for the health care of America, by leaving a surgical sponge inside the patient.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Madam Chairman, I want to congratulate my distinguished friend from California, the gentleman who preceded me in the well, for his belated discovery of this surgical sponge. It was not apparent to the gentleman at the time it was offered in committee as an amendment. In fact there was a noticeable lack of opposition to what I regarded then and regard now as an excellent amendment, a reasonable amendment, one consistent in every respect with the highest standards of training, one which permits the 74 junior colleges in my State and the more than 119 in the Nation desiring to engage in the program, aimed at increasing the supply of qualified nurses in this Nation, to undertake that very responsible role.

Madam Chairman, I have the privilege of representing one of the very oldest junior colleges in this Nation, the Sacramento Junior College. I was privileged to attend that junior college. It has had for many years a program of nursing, as have numerous other junior colleges in California. They are not going to be able to meet the heavy expenses—I am not even certain that they can participate fully—without major changes in State law. I do not believe those in opposition to the amendment today are qualified to tell me whether or not participation by the California junior college system would require major changes in the laws of the State. But these are institutions accredited as educational institutions. They have not heretofore been called upon to seek individually the accreditation of professional groups. They have not been required to do it in engineering or in medicine or in law or any of the other professional activities in which they engage.

They give only an associate degree and, contrary to the inference clearly indicated in many of the statements today, their graduates are unusually successful.

The difference between their showing on tests for licenses in my State and the scores achieved by the baccalaureate nurses and by those who train at the hospitals is of no significant percentage. Their performance in their profession evaluated by appropriate interviews 2 years after entering the profession finds that they are accepted as being as competent in every respect as those with whom they compete. One of the pressing problems in this Nation is to expand the number of institutions engaged in certain programs of training. One of the areas in which that expansion can take place most readily is at the community college level, and it will if we have no impairment of the ability of these institutions to fulfill their assigned task.

Mr. COHELAN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman has made a very fine statement, and has spoken at great length on our junior college program in California. But the gentleman is aware that the program as suggested by the amendment in the bill will, of course, have national implications and that the standards are not the same. The gentleman is aware of that?

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman is not willing to concede that that is necessarily so.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman will recall I discussed it at great length yesterday. There are 131 junior college programs in the United States, and out of the 131 programs there are 26 that are members of the National League for Nursing.

Mr. MOSS. Before I yield further, may I say that we did discuss this yesterday. The gentleman recognizes that we had an impossible task in reconciling the figures we were using. As a matter of fact, the figures just cited by the gentleman vary considerably from the figures he cited yesterday.

Mr. COHELAN. I merely want to say that I am perfectly willing to allow the figures to stand in the RECORD, and to be judged by any reasonable person, including the gentleman now in the well. I have no quarrel with the figures. But there is a very important issue of accreditation which pertains to junior college programs, because, unlike some of these other professions the gentleman referred to, in giving an associate arts degree and an R.N. after 2 years leads to the practice of nursing.

Mr. MOSS. I want to correct a statement just made. The receipt of the R.N. degree only gives a hunting license to go out and try to demonstrate competence and qualification through taking the same examination that would be given to a baccalaureate graduate in nursing. If they are able to do that, and it is a highly competitive area, and to do it with scores that compare favorably with those having had a 4-year course, then I think that is the test, the practical test of the adequacy of the program of training offered by the junior colleges.

Mr. COHELAN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman knows I am a strong supporter of the junior college program including the nursing program. The only thing that separates us is the issue of accreditation and the availability of Federal funds for this purpose. The reason this Member now speaking supports this so strongly is that I want to maintain the standards in this very important field of nursing. I may say to the gentleman, with all of his allegiance to the junior college program, he has not said one thing about why a junior college should not be accredited by the National League for Nursing.

Mr. MOSS. I do not know why the Government of the United States should require a private group to spell out the standards, when there is no evidence at hand of the lack of adequate standards, as a condition precedent to a public institution receiving funds to aid in the training of people in a profession when the demand for graduates and for qualified personnel is far greater than the supply, as it is at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chairman, I want to respond to the distinguished Member from California, if he would take the well.

Mr. MOSS. Go ahead and respond.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Would you take the well, I cannot hear you.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman, I thought, wanted to respond. I did not know he wanted conversation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman said the other day in committee that the California Nursing Association favored the Rogers amendment. Well, this is just not so.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman has had that explained to him and he impugns my integrity—the gentleman knows that on the word of my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], who had received a communication from the California League of Nursing and inadvertently represented to me as the California Nurses Association. I stated that. I told the gentleman since that was an error.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This is an unusual situation. The gentleman from California indicated that the present method of accreditation is quite unusual. I point out from the document from the Office of Education, it is not at all unusual. Engineers are accredited by the professional engineering development arm of their organization. Dental hygienists, dental technologists, and dental assistants programs are accredited by the

American Dental Association. Many medical sciences such as medical technology, physical therapy, et cetera, are given approval or accredited by the Council on Medical Education. So the gentleman from California is in error.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Madam Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am sure that all Members of the House subscribe wholeheartedly to the intent of the act under discussion, and that all of us agree we must in this country improve the medical education and the supply of doctors for our people.

I wonder, however, how many share my views that the intent and the purpose of this act are not adequately implemented.

I do not know how many share my experience, but in the 7 years that I have been a Member of this body, I found hundreds and hundreds of young qualified men and women seeking admission into medical schools who could not gain admission because there was no room for them, yet I have never found one who could gain admission who could not obtain the funds to pay for the tuition.

I have taken this time to discuss briefly one section of the bill, though I would like to discuss many features of the bill which I do not believe have received sufficient study. I wish to discuss the section in relation to scholarships.

As I read page 24 of the bill, subsection (c)(2) provides for scholarships to be awarded to students from low-income families, but there is nothing in the bill to describe what is meant by "low-income family."

I wonder, for example, if the criteria of a low-income family is the same criterion established under the so-called poverty bill. If it is, then I would certainly be the first to agree that this would be a fair norm, standard, and criteria.

I find nothing at all in the bill which indicates the basis upon which these scholarships are to be granted. Will it be by written examination? Will it be by nationwide examination? Will the examination be different in the east from what it is in the west, the north, or the south? Who will establish the criteria?

Ten percent of the students of a medical school are going to be entitled to an outright grant of $2,500 with no provision to repay, in spite of the fact that we all know that doctors in this country—justifiably, I might add—are of the highest income bracket, generally speaking, of all groups of citizens.

There is no provision to repay this grant. There is no provision that any of the recipients must participate in any particular field of medicine, even though I am sure the chairman of the committee and the learned Members of the House who are members of the medical profession recognize that today there is a crying need in the field of psychiatry.

There is no doubt that many of the fields of medicine today are undermanned. Many of the areas of our country today are understaffed. Many towns and communities in rural areas of our country today do not have physicians.

Yet there is nothing in this bill, as I read it, to make it necessary or mandatory for any recipient of any scholarship to serve in any of these areas or to participate in any specific branch of the medical field.

As a matter of fact, as I read this bill, a man could get a scholarship for $2,500 for 4 years and he could quit medicine. He could go to Europe to practice medicine. I do not see any prohibition in the bill which would prevent any recipient of this scholarship from practicing medicine in England or in Ireland or in Italy or in the islands.

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

Mr. CAHILL. I wonder if the gentleman could extend to me some additional time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I can yield the gentleman only 1 additional minute.

Mr. CAHILL. Madam Chairman, I shall ask for additional time under the 5-minute rule to discuss this, because I want to make clear to the committee that I favor scholarship programs. I think they are essential. I think the needy children of our country who want to become doctors should become doctors. But I do not think the criteria are spelled out in this bill. I do not think the safeguards and protections are in this bill.

Now, let me add one other thing. Do all of you in this committee realize that before a young man can receive this scholarship he first has to be enrolled in a medical school? Now, how is he going to get enrolled in a medical school if his family cannot afford to pay for it? Why would any boy make an application to go into a medical school when he knows in advance he does not have the money to pay for it? It seems to me that this scholarship should be established prior to acceptance in medical school so that all the boys of our country will know that they can go if they want to.

The scholarships are desirable; the criteria is not specified and the opportunity is not open to all qualified young men.

At an appropriate time I intend to offer an amendment to improve this portion of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Madam Chairman, of course, I rise in support of this legislation, and also I want to speak just briefly to the amendment regarding accreditation.

I think it is well for us to look at the present situation as to how we get nurses now. There are three programs. A young lady who wants to be a nurse can go to a junior college for 2 years and she comes out with an associate degree. She must then go, if she wants to become a registered nurse, to take her examination just like anybody else does. If she passes that examination, she then becomes a registered nurse. If not she cannot practice nursing.

Secondly, there is the college degree program called the baccalaureate degree, which means a young lady goes to a school for a 4-year program and gets her degree. Then she has to take a State examination. If she passes that examination, she may become an R.N. If she does not, she cannot be a nurse.

Then we have diploma schools where nurses are trained in hospital schools and as soon as they finish training here again they have to take an examination if they want to become a registered nurse. If one cannot pass that examination, she will not be a registered nurse.

It is these examinations that are setting the standards presently of our nurses. You would think from hearing the conversation here today that this junior college program was something that just cropped up with the passage of this bill last year. Well, that is not so. We have had this nurse training program going on for about 15 or 16 years. It has proved itself. These nurses are being used in hospitals today and are well accepted by the doctors and by the public. In fact, last year, 1964, saw 2,000 nurses come to help fill the critical need from the junior college program. 2,000. They passed their exam. Their quality was high, and they are now performing those duties just as any other nurse. I doubt if a patient is asking, once the nurse has passed the examination, "Did you come from an associate degree school or do you have a baccaulaureate degree, or did you come out of a hospital school?"

What we need are nurses, and that is what this bill is directed to. I had just felt in looking at the situation that if we are getting presently 2,000 nurses from the junior colleges, and do you know how many of those schools are accredited by the National League of Nurses? Three. We have been turning out nurses from junior colleges since 1950, and there are only 3 accredited out of 131 schools. We hope we will get about 55 more junior colleges right away to come into the program. These standards can be maintained high. However, I do not think we ought to make these junior colleges go to a private organization—a private organization—to get their clearance before tax dollars are given to the nursing schools and students to study nursing, or for them to set up a program of nursing when the critical need of nursing is so great that we cannot meet the estimated total that we have been told year after year in our committee would require 800,000 nurses by 1970.

Let me say this. The Surgeon General has said that we need 800,000 nurses in 1970. We cannot possibly fill that need. All we can hope to obtain is about 560,000.

Madam Chairman, I do not know how many Members have read Life magazine of this week. Life magazine says the medical doctor shortage in this country is critical and the nursing situation is even more critical. In the words of Life magazine—and you ought to read it—"the nursing situation is even worse than the doctor shortage. The nursing home situation is so critical that Congress has put off until January 1, 1967, the start of

the nursing home benefits under the law that we just passed." Think of that.

Do you know that they have just issued a call for nurses to go to Vietnam? Do you realize the demand that there is going to be as we crank into these programs—the old-age benefits and nursing homes? We need to produce every qualified nurse we can.

I do not want to let down standards. But I think where a junior college is accredited by a regional accrediting office, or by a State accrediting agency, that should be sufficient.

I do not think, with this critical situation, that we ought to require these junior colleges to join an organization and pay a fee to this private organization to come down and look over the school in the beginning before Federal funds can be used. The National League of Nursing sends two persons to look over the program, and I am sure they do a good job. Then 6 years later they check again.

However in the junior colleges most of these nursing programs are set up in close cooperation with State nursing groups. I know ours is in Florida.

Let me tell you what has happened in the State of Florida. They say these nursing programs do not turn out very well from the junior college. Let me tell you how junior college graduate nurses turned out in my State. In 1964 the result of the registered nurses exam showed that of the three competing schools of graduates, the associate degree students—that is, the junior college students—made the most impressive record. They finished above the other two types of graduates in two of the five categories on the exam; second in the other three; and their percentage of failure was lower than the baccalaureate degree for the entire exam, and only a fraction above the diploma schools.

The average that the associate degree nurses got was the highest in two of the five categories and the second highest in the other three. They were never last in any category or in any part of the exam.

Madam Chairman, we must meet a national need. We must have a realistic program. We need nurses, I say to my colleagues, and competent nurses. And if these young ladies can be trained as we envision it, we can help fill the need. They are going to have to pass the exam before they can take their place, and this is as it should be.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Madam Chairman, I rise to indicate my strong support for the Rogers amendment which has been incorporated in the committee bill, H.R. 3141, and to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Title I of the Nurse Training Act of 1964 provides assistance for construction and expansion of facilities for 2 years nursing programs. Titles II and III of the act provide that junior colleges which have associate nursing programs may receive certain special improvement project grants and student loan fund assistance.

Unfortunately, however, the act has been interpreted by the Commissioner of Education so as to require that a junior college must be accredited by a private organization, the National League for Nursing, in order to be eligible for such assistance.

In Michigan a number of junior colleges have associate degree nursing programs. They are, and they have been, turning out graduates who successfully pass the State examination, who meet State qualifications, and who are admitted as registered nurses.

Despite the fact that over a period of years these Michigan institutions of higher education have proved and established their qualifications to educate nurses in accordance with State standards, they are now precluded from participation in the Nurse Training Act because they are not accredited by the National League of Nursing. These same junior colleges are accredited to the extent required to meet State standards.

In my view, the interpretation placed on the present law by the Commissioner of Education, requiring accreditation by this private organization, is unduly restrictive and not in the public interest.

As a Nation, we need a great many more nurses. It is difficult to see how this pressing National need can possibly be met unless we fully utilize our junior colleges to help train nurses. Without question, the Nurse Training Act of 1964 will fall far short of its goal unless the Rogers amendment becomes law.

Accordingly, Madam Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] for his leadership on this important matter, and I hope that any effort to delete the Rogers amendment from the bill will be soundly defeated.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], I think we ought to get the record straight. He mentioned a fee for these junior colleges. Do you know what the fee is? I understand it is only $100.

Of course, we need nurses, but we want good, qualified nurses. And, I might say again that there are approximately 100 junior colleges that participate in nurse training. The National League for Nursing has only been able to fully accredit three of these because the colleges have not requested national accreditation. However, 32 additional programs have received reasonable assurance of accreditation.

Now, Madam Chairman, the whole problem here is that the junior colleges need national accreditation to enable them to turn out qualified nurses. They want to be accredited because they want funds from the Federal Government; that is the nub of the problem.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Madam Chairman, I had intended to introduce amendments to the Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965 to provide for participation by podiatry institutions in part (e)—grants to improve the quality of schools, and part (f)—scholarship grants to schools, but I have decided to fight on another and more propitious day.

Enactment of H.R. 3141 in its present form without providing podiatry institutions the opportunity to participate in all facets, creates real danger that the quality of education in podiatry will deteriorate and that the number of podiatrists that can be trained will not be sufficient to meet the foot health needs of the Nation. All parts of the bill should provide opportunity for participation by podiatry institutions as now do the sections on the extension of the construction program, and student loans.

It is not common knowledge that foot health problems are of serious proportions. A 1951 Public Health Service Report on the physical status of the men examined through selective service in World War II disclosed that twice as many registrants were rejected for foot problems, 1.4 percent, as were for dental problems, 0.7 percent. Of those examined, 90.1 per 1,000 registrants had foot defects as compared with 116.1 per 1,000 for dental defects.

While these numbers are significant, the incidence of foot problems in the rapidly expanding older population makes real demands on the podiatrists.

The 1961 White House Conference on Aging in one report stated: "The institutionalized or home-care patient once moving about with pain-free feet is more easily motivated for total rehabilitation. Eighty-five percent of these older people have foot problems." Over 40 percent of the practicing podiatrists serve the elderly in nursing homes, and one out of three serves homes for the aged.

From studies reported at the hearings on H.R. 3141, we learn that in 1978, if the present capacity of the colleges is unchanged, the deficit of podiatrists will be considerably more than 4,700. The situation cannot be changed materially until the facilities of the colleges are expanded. In order to care for the deficits in the number of podiatrists needed by 1980, and to improve the number needed to supply the profession in keeping with increases in population, the podiatry colleges will have to graduate about 600 students annually beginning with 1968. This is approximately three times their present capacity.

In 1960, the American Podiatry Association established a special commission on the status of podiatry education, to examine from a broad point of view the profession's educational program and advise on steps necessary to improve this program. Copies of the report, "Podiatry Education in the 1960's" were supplied Members of Congress in a previous session when hearings were being held on proposed legislation for assistance to health professions education. The special commission consisted of three educators from the field of higher education, an M.D. medical educator, and a practicing podiatrist, a member of the board of trustees of a podiatry college. A significant recommendation was "that the American Podiatry Association represent to the appropriate legislative and

executive officials of the Government the need and social advisability of making financial provisions for podiatry education, in ways similar to those made for the other health sciences."

The colleges were advised to strengthen their faculties with considerably more full-time teachers and administrative officers, and to provide salaries commensurate with their responsibilities. The commission also noted a need to markedly increase scholarships and loan funds for students.

At the hearings on H.R. 3141, information was provided on college operations over the past 5-year period. Enrollment is up over 40 percent; operating expenditures have risen 131 percent; the average cost of education per student has jumped from $980 to $1,680; the number of full-time instructors has increased 107 percent.

In 1966, the APA will devote almost 40 percent of its total budget to the improvement of podiatry education. Measures include scholarships, fellowships, faculty improvement grants and other matching grants to the schools.

The five podiatry colleges are all private, nonprofit institutions. None receive public funds in support of their operation. Without Federal support, podiatry colleges will not be able to train sufficient numbers of podiatrists and to train them well enough to meet the needs of our increasing population. The training program is a minimum of 6 years, 2 years of prepodiatry and 4 years in the professional school; and those desiring to develop special knowledges and skills, such as in foot surgery, will have to devote an additional year or two of study.

Scholarship grants are needed in colleges of podiatry for the same reasons as in other health professions schools; that is, to make it possible for the less affluent but highly capable young people to enter the profession. At present, scholarships are available to fewer than two percent of podiatry students. Without such financial aid, and with the rising costs of attending professional schools, there is great danger that these professions in the future will be manned by persons who can surmount the financial barrier, but who are not necessarily the most capable people.

Another reason for including colleges of podiatry in the provisions for scholarship grants is to provide freedom of choice for young people who wish to prepare for professional health service. Obviously, freedom of choice is narrowed when one field of study offers financial inducements while a competing field does not. It is sound policy to encourage young people to enter those fields of service in which their major interests lie and for which they have aptitude.

Furthermore, it should also be noted that many students, particularly the less affluent, will inevitably be attracted to professional fields which offer financial help, often regardless of their major interests. Thus, a lack of scholarships in podiatry, when other health fields have them, would seriously handicap the colleges of podiatry in their efforts to recruit a fair share of talent.

There is an incongruity in having colleges of podiatry excluded from the scholarship and educational improvement grants when they are included for construction grants and student loans.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support at an early date legislation helping the public through help to colleges of podiatry.

Mr. FINDLEY. Madam Chairman, the problem of providing America with enough good doctors deserves our attention.

Most doctors are already heavily loaded and doubtless will become more so as social security medicare becomes effective January 1. Advances in medical science and hospital technology fortunately enable each doctor to care for more patients. Doctors can usually serve emergency cases best in the hospital rather than the home, and this practice lets the doctor make better use of his own time. House calls have become almost a thing of the past.

But even these favorable trends will not suffice to provide America with enough good doctors.

About 7,500 new doctors begin practice each year. Our estimate puts at 11,000 the number of new doctors that will be needed each year by 1975.

Several years ago I proposed a nationwide program to stimulate interest in medical careers and to provide student financing where needed. I proposed "Junior Intern" clubs to be conducted by doctors in high schools to stimulate youthful interest in medical careers, also a private-financed revolving loan fund so medical students could borrow as much as needed for the long period of professional training.

The House bill would establish a revolving fund at low-interest rate, with repayment not to begin until 3 years after medical training is complete. Although I would have preferred a privately financed revolving fund, I consider the loan fund to be in the public interest.

Another feature, however, strikes me as totally unwise. It provides grants as high as $2,500 a year for medical students, with no obligation for repayment.

Doctors can well afford eventually to repay money advanced to them during student days. What is needed is loan money.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise as chairman of the Republican policy committee to report the action taken at our meeting Tuesday, August 31. The committee adopted a statement on the Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965, H.R. 3141, which I would now like to read:

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1965, H.R. 3141

Due to the rapid expansion of the U.S. population, it is apparent that unless there is a significant increase in the number of medical school graduates, this Nation will not have an adequate supply of medical personnel. Moreover, the recent enactment of the medical care for the aged legislation undoubtedly will result in new and greater demands for medical services. These needs must be met and the Republican Policy Committee continues to support legislation that will afford adequate and appropriate assistance to our medical, dental, and other health profession schools and students.

Therefore, we endorse the 3-year extension of the current program of matching grants to aid the construction, replacement, or rehabilitation of teaching facilities for the training of physicians, dentists, professional public health personnel, optometrists, pharmacists, and podiatrists. The current program which H.R. 3141 extends has funded 63 projects and has made possible 2,279 new first year places. It is the type of assistance that Republicans traditionally have supported and endorsed.

Similarly, the student loan program that is extended for 3 years is a sound and meritorious program. Of the 152 schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy and optometry that are eligible, 147 have established student loan funds and to date there have been more than 10,000 student borrowers.

We are especially concerned by the provisions of H.R. 3141 which provide basic and special improvement grants to medical schools which can be used for any purpose including salaries and administrative expenses. For the first time, the Federal Government may assume the responsibility for providing a portion of the operating funds of every school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry in this country. Every such school, rich or poor, large or small, public or private, that files an application for a basic grant, and gives reasonable assurances that it will increase its first year enrollment by 2½ percent or by five students, whichever is greater, will be paid $12,500 plus $250 for each full-time student the first year, and $25,000 plus $500 for each full-time student the next 3 years. And every such school that is recommended by the National Advisory Council and satisfies the Surgeon General that it will use the money to maintain or to provide for accreditation or specialized functions, will be paid a special grant not to exceed $100,000 the first year; $200,000 the second year; $300,000 the third year; or $400,000 the fourth year.

This is a dramatic shift from the present program of selective assistance to one of outright Federal subsidy. Furthermore, there is no participation or coordination by a State agency. All payments flow from the Surgeon General directly to the recipient school. Certainly these grants are significantly different from the brick and mortar grants and the specific grants that have until now constituted the Federal assistance to higher education. Therefore, we urge that these provisions be stricken from the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address myself for a moment to the provisions of this bill which will revise the current system of securing accreditation for schools of nursing under the Nurses Training Act of 1964.

The committee bill contains a provision which will allow the official accreditating body to be a regional accrediting agency or State approval agency in the case of schools which offer associate degree programs of nurse training. This provision will correct an obvious deficiency in the existing law which was even recognized by the Office of Education when it designated the National League for Nursing as the sole accrediting body for funds, under the act of 1964. At that time the Office of Education stated that amendment of the law might be necessary in view of the special circumstances which many of the junior colleges were in.

The part that the associate degree programs have been playing in our

country has been well documented in the general debate but I would like at this time to insert in the RECORD some statements, provided by the National Association of Junior Colleges, which reflect the feeling and need for the amendment which is contained in the committee bill:

STATEMENTS REGARDING QUALITY OF ADN PROGRAMS EXCERPTED FROM RECENT CORRESPONDENCE

Helen M. Wolfe, president, California League for Nursing, January 15, 1965:

"The quality of California associate degree programs in nursing can be documented by student performance on the licensing examination and in the work situation. This includes the following results in the California State test pool examination:

"1959 (967 examinees):

Mean for all five tests

Associate degree program	576
Diploma program	551
Baccalaureate program	582

1962 (1,263 examinees):

Associate degree program	544
Diploma program	548
Baccalaureate program	573"

Albert E. French, president, State University of New York, Agricultural and Technical College, Canton Branch, August 17, 1965:

"The community colleges in New York State have been successful in training registered nurses in associate degree programs. One such college had yet to have a failure in the State board examinations a year or so ago after more than 5 years of operation. The advisory committee at this college found general satisfaction among employers of nurses with graduates of associate degree programs."

James L. Wattenbarger, director, Division of Community Junior Colleges, State of Florida, Department of Education, August 17, 1965:

"The quality of these programs has been unquestioned from the start. We used guidelines developed by the nursing profession. We applied the same careful planning procedures and analysis of quality all along the way. The success of our programs may be in part measured by the success of the graduates in their State examination. The percentage of students who successfully pass their State board examinations is very high. The enclosed graph shows these facts for November 1964."

William G. Dwyer, president, Board of Regional Community Colleges, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, August 20, 1965:

"Since the early 1950's, community colleges have offered associate degree programs in Nursing. Students completing this course of study have enjoyed outstanding success in the State R.N. examinations. This approach to providing more nurses was developed under a Kellogg grant and represents a change in training from an apprenticeship (3-year diploma school program) to an educational program (2-year ADN at a junior/community college)."

Edward Simonsen, president, California Junior College Association, August 27, 1965:

"The success of associate in arts degree graduates in State licensure examinations has been excellent. Cooperating hospitals, the medical profession, and the communities have been most enthusiastic about the programs."

Preston N. Tanis, director, Northwestern Michigan College, August 24, 1965:

"During the past 3 years, we have been able to develop an associate degree nursing program which was badly needed for some time in this part of Michigan. To date, our graduates have satisfactorily passed their State board examinations and have been admitted without any difficulty as registered nurses."

Randolph Newman, president, Santa Rosa Junior College, August 19, 1965:

"Santa Rosa Junior College has had a program in professional nursing since 1945. The program is under our jurisdiction and is subject to accreditation by the State of California Board of Nursing Education and Nurse Registration. We have graduated 391 students from our program and its quality is indicated by the fact that during all of these years only four have failed to pass the licensing examination which would permit them to follow the profession in this State."

Roy F. Bergengren, Jr., president, Daytona Beach Junior College, August 24, 1965:

"We have an outstanding associate degree program in nursing education and have graduated highly successful classes. Ours is one of a number of Florida programs established with the assistance of the Kellogg Foundation and the State Board of Nursing."

Oscar H. Edinger, Jr., president, Mount San Antonio College, August 19, 1965:

"The quality of our nursing program and its enthusiastic community and professional support is amply attested to by the eagerness by which our graduates are sought, and by the enthusiastic participation of the advisory committee on which is represented almost every major medical facility in the district. We have maintained a 100 percent placement record of graduates, and many of them have rapidly risen to leadership and supervisory positions. The college placement office and the department chairman of nursing consistently receive more job orders than the number of students that can be accommodated in the program. It is common practice for doctors' offices, civil service agencies, and hospitals to send brochures, application forms, and descriptive materials describing the benefits to be derived from employment with their institutions as inducements for our students."

H. R. Buchser, president/superintendent, San Jose City College, August 23, 1965:

"That our nursing program is of high quality if reflected in our graduates' success in the RN examination, in which they have constantly scored in the top quarter in competition with graduates from all California schools of nursing. Our program is strongly supported by hospitals, the medical and nursing association, and the Citizens Advisory Committee in the community."

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, 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 this Act may be cited as the "Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965".

Educational improvement grants and scholarship grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry

SEC. 2. (a) Title VII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new parts:

"PART E—GRANTS TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE, DENTISTRY, OSTEOPATHY, AND OPTOMETRY

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 770. There are authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for grants under this part to assist schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry to improve the quality of their educational programs.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. I am sorry, Madam Chairman, but I do not recall the revisions of the rule, but is it the intention to read the entire amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Arkansas that the amendment is being read by section.

Mr. HARRIS. By section?

The CHAIRMAN. By section.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Basic improvement grants

"SEC. 771. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the Surgeon General may make basic improvement grants as follows:

"(1) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, each school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, or optometry whose application for a basic improvement grant for such year has been approved by the Surgeon General shall be paid the sum of $12,500 plus the product obtained by multiplying $250 by the number of full-time students in such school.

"(2) For each fiscal year in the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1969, each such school whose application has been approved for such a grant for such year shall be paid the sum of $25,000 plus the product obtained by multiplying $500 by the number of full-time students in such school.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall not make a grant under this section to any school unless the application for such grant contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that for the first school year beginning after the fiscal year for which such grant is made and each school year thereafter during which such a grant is made the first-year enrollment of full-time students in such school will exceed the highest first-year enrollment of such students in such school for any of the five school years during the period July 1, 1960, through July 1, 1965, by at least 2½ per centum of such highest first-year enrollment, or by five students, whichever is greater. The requirements of this subsection shall be in addition to the requirements of section 721(c)(2)(D) of this Act, where applicable.

"(c) For the purposes of this part and part F, regulations of the Surgeon General shall include provisions relating to determination of the number of students enrolled in a school, or in a particular year-class in a school, as the case may be, on the basis of estimates, or on the basis of the number of students enrolled in a school, or in a particular year-class in a school, in an earlier year, as the case may be, or on such basis as he deems appropriate for making such determination, and shall include methods of making such determinations when a school or a year-class was not in existence in an earlier year at a school.

"(d) For purposes of this part and part F, the term 'full-time students' (whether such term is used by itself or in connection with a particular year-class) means students pursuing a full-time course of study leading to a degree of doctor of medicine, doctor of dentistry or an equivalent degree, doctor of osteopathy, or doctor of optometry or an equivalent degree.

"Special improvement grants

"SEC. 772. (a) From the sums appropriated under section 770 for any fiscal year and not required for making grants under section 771, the Surgeon General may make an additional grant for such year to any school of

medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, or optometry which has an approved application therefor and for which an application has been approved under section 771, if he determines that the requirements of subsection (b) are satisfied in the case of such applicant.

"(b) No special improvement grant shall be made under this section unless such grant is recommended by the National Advisory Council on Medical, Dental, and Optometric Education and the Surgeon General determines that such grant will be utilized by the recipient school (1) to contribute toward the maintenance of, or to provide for, accreditation, or (2) to contribute toward the maintenance of, or to provide for, specialized functions which the school serves.

"(c) No grant to any school under this section may exceed $100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $200,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; $300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; or $400,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

"Applications for grants

"SEC. 773. (a) The Surgeon General may from time to time set dates (not earlier than in the fiscal year preceding the year for which a grant is sought) by which applications for basic or special grants under section 771 or 772 for any fiscal year must be filed.

"(b) To be eligible for a grant under this part, the applicant must (1) be a public or other nonprofit school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, or optometry, and (2) be accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, except that the requirement of this clause (2) shall be deemed to be satisfied if, (A) in the case of a school which by reason of no, or an insufficient, period of operation is not, at the time of application for a grant under this part, eligible for such accreditation, the Commissioner finds, after consulation with the appropriate accreditation body or bodies, that there is reasonable assurance that the school will meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies prior to the beginning of the academic year following the normal graduation date of students who are in their first year of instruction at such school during the fiscal year in which the Surgeon General makes a final determination as to approval of the application, or (B) in the case of any other school, the Commissioner finds after such consultation and after consultation with the Surgeon General that there is reasonable ground to expect that, with the aid of a grant or grants under this part, having regard for the purposes of the grant sought, such school will meet such accreditation standards within a reasonable time.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall not approve or disapprove any application for a grant under this part except after consultation with the National Advisory Council of Medical, Dental, and Optometric Education (established by section 774).

"(d) A grant under this part may be made only if the application therefor—

"(1) is approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that the applicant meets the eligibility conditions set forth in subsection (b) of this section;

"(2) contains or is supported by assurances satisfactory to the Surgeon General that the applicant will expend in carrying out its functions as a school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, or optometry, as the case may be, during the fiscal year for which such grant is sought, an amount of funds (other than funds for construction as determined by the Surgeon General) from non-Federal sources which are at least as great as the average amount of funds expended by such applicant for such purpose in the three fiscal years immediately preceding the fiscal year for which such grant is sought;

"(3) contains such additional information as the Surgeon General may require to make the determinations required of him under this part and such assurances as he may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this part; and

"(4) provides for such fiscal-control and accounting procedures and reports, and access to the records of the applicant, as the Surgeon General may require to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this part.

"(e) In considering applications for grants under section 772, the Surgeon General shall take into consideration the relative financial need of the applicant for such a grant and the relative effectiveness of the applicant's plan in carrying out the purposes set forth in clauses (1) or (2) of subsection (b) of section 772 and in contributing to an equitable geographical distribution of schools offering high-quality training of physicians, dentists, and optometrists.

"National Advisory Council on Medical, Dental, and Optometric Education

"SEC. 774. (a) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a National Advistory Council on Medical, Dental, and Optometric Education consisting of the Surgeon General, who shall be Chairman, and twelve members appointed without regard to the civil service laws by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and such appointments may be made for specified staggered terms. The appointed members of the Council shall be selected from among leading authorities in the fields of medical, dental, and optometric education, respectively, except that not less than three of such members shall be selected from the general public.

"(b) The Council shall advise the Surgeon General in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part and part F, and in the review of applications under this part.

"(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to use the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters related to the administration of this part or part F, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

"(d) Appointed members of the Council, while attending conferences or meetings of the Council or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"PART F—SCHOLARSHIP GRANTS TO SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE, OSTEOPATHY, DENTISTRY, OR OPTOMETRY

"Scholarship grants

"SEC. 780. (a) The Surgeon General shall make grants as provided in this part to each public or other nonprofit school of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, or optometry, which is accredited as provided in section 721(b)(1)(B) or section 773(b)(2), for scholarships to be awarded annually by such school to students thereof.

"(b) The amount of the grant under subsection (a) to each such school shall be equal to $2,000 multiplied (1) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, by one-tenth of the number of full-time first-year students of such school; (2) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, by one-tenth of the number of full-time first-year students and second-year students of such school; (3) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, by one-tenth of the number of full-time first-year students, second-year students, and third-year students of such school; and (4) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, by one-tenth of the number of full-time students of such school. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the grant under subsection (a) shall be such amount as may be necessary to enable such school to continue making payments under scholarship awards to students who initially received such awards out of grants made to the school for fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1969.

"(c)(1) Scholarships may be awarded by schools from grants under subsection (a)—

"(A) only to individuals who have been accepted by them for enrollment as full-time first-year students, in the case of awards from such grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966;

"(B) only to individuals who have been so accepted, and individuals enrolled and in good standing as full-time second-year students, in the case of awards from such grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967;

"(C) only to individuals who have been so accepted, and individuals enrolled and in good standing as full-time second-year or third-year students, in the case of awards from such grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968;

"(D) only to individuals who have been so accepted, and individuals enrolled and in good standing as full-time students, in the case of awards from such grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and

"(E) only to individuals enrolled and in good standing as full-time students who initially received scholarship awards out of such grants for a fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1969, in the case of awards from such grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, or the two succeeding fiscal years.

"(2) Scholarships from grants under subsection (a) for any school year shall be awarded to students, particularly students from low-income families, on the basis of need for financial assistance in pursuing a course of study at the school for such year. Any such scholarship awarded for a school year shall cover such portion of the student's tuition, fees, books, equipment, and living expenses at the school making the award, but not to exceed $2,500 for any year, as such school may determine the student needs for such year on the basis of his requirements and financial resources.

"(d) Grants under subsection (a) shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Surgeon General after consultation with the National Advisory Council on Medical, Dental, and Optometric Education.

"(e) Grants under subsection (a) may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals as the Surgeon General may find necessary; and with appropriate adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made."

(b) Section 724 of such Act (containing definitions) is amended by striking out "As used in this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "As used in this part and parts C, E, and F"; and section 740(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "(as defined in section 724)".

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting reading of the section). Madam Chairman, in view of the fact that this section 2, which starts on the bottom of page 14 where the Clerk started reading and goes to the middle of page 25, is an amendment to title VII of the Public Health Service Act, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the section be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I take this time to clarify a couple of points in regard to the main arguments which we have been having here. In the heat of discussion we have overlooked some very important points.

Madam Chairman, I take this opportunity to supplement the remarks I made yesterday and in particular to provide additional information in support of my strong belief that the amendment of my good friend from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] which was added by the committee in executive session without any opportunity to have hearings, that it be deleted from this otherwise needed bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I asked the gentleman to yield, and I will get him some additional time if I take too much of his time.

There has been a very clear reference to the fact that the committee has apparently included an amendment to the bill which did not belong there, one that was not germane, and one which those who are interested did not have an opportunity to consider.

I would like to allay that contention. Certainly it appears some people may have not been consulted, but the committee did not include anything that was not germane. This is an amendment to the Nurses' Training Act of 1964. The committee, in my opinion, was within its rights in considering the amendment referred to. I did not want anyone to think that the committee has done something here without giving the proposal the consideration that the committee usually does.

Mr. COHELAN. I understand what the distinguished chairman is saying, but I wish as much time had been given for discussion of this subject in committee as has been generously granted on the floor yesterday and today.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like for the record to show that the committee did conduct hearings. It held extensive hearings on this entire subject matter, and afforded opportunity to anyone and anybody to discuss this matter as well as other provisions.

Mr. COHELAN. There was some misunderstanding about what the facts are in regard to this point. Let me finish, because I want to make the record in just the manner the chairman wanted me to yesterday.

As Members will recall, the Rogers amendment provides that in the field of nursing alone, of all the health professions, the accreditation of training programs would no longer be the responsibility of the recognized accrediting body within that profession. This, I believe, is a serious mistake, as I indicated in my remarks yesterday.

Madam Chairman, in response to several questions which have been raised, I would like to point out that since the passage of the Nurse Training Act in August of 1964, a total of 167 programs have applied for reasonable assurance of accreditation, the step which makes a school eligible for funds under this act. Of these 167 applications, 49 came from junior colleges and of these 49 junior college applications, 32 were granted reasonable assurance. It is my understanding that an additional 49 programs, 23 of them junior college programs, have submitted materials for the review panels which will meet later this month. From this breakdown, I think it should be perfectly clear that junior colleges are in no way being slighted; that their applications for accreditation are being considered promptly and fairly.

Madam Chairman, I would also like to comment on the matter of accreditation fees since certain questions have been raised and certain inaccurate conclusions have been drawn on this point.

In order to secure reasonable assurance, institutions offering new nursing programs are charged an accrediting fee of $100, plus travel and per diem expenses of two visitors. Institutions offering established nursing programs are charged only the accrediting fee of $100 since in most cases no field investigation is required.

Now Madam Chairman, the question has been raised about the $1,500 fee which is charged to those junior colleges which are not members of the National League for Nursing. Initially I think we should point out that 26 junior colleges are members and they, of course, pay only the fees I have already mentioned. The others, those that are not members, pay the $1,500 to assist in defraying the cost of the visit, convening the board of review, processing the necessary materials, corresponding with the school and listing the program. This $1,500 is paid only once every 6 years at the time of accreditation. Member schools incidentally, those who pay $100 at the time of accreditation, also pay annual dues of $575 and these dues, in part, defer the cost of accreditation. It should also be noted that through 1967 the National League of Nursing is offering a special annual dues rate to junior colleges, a dues rate of only $285 which is, of course, half the regular amount.

Again, Madam Chairman, I think the facts speak clearly to the need and to the fairness of eliminating this unnecessary and harmful amendment.

Mrs. BOLTON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Madam Chairman, I rise with a great deal of reluctance. I have worked in nursing and for nurses longer than some of you men have lived. I have watched the nursing profession pull itself out of apprentice training into educational training. I have helped them at every point. I have felt in recent years, that they have gone a little beyond where they should have gone. The pendulum usually swings too far when it starts swinging.

Madam Chairman, I do surprise myself to be standing here speaking in opposition to the League of Nursing accreditation program. But I know of one State where there were 38 schools of nursing—small, but excellent schools. The girls who trained there went back to their own areas and nursed the sick. They did not just fill out papers. There are now only five schools in that State, because of the accreditation. There had to be M.A.'s as teachers or nurses with doctoral degree. You could not have just a nurse who knew nursing from top to toe teaching in that school.

Some of the schools that have been examined for accreditation have been informed that they would receive partial accreditation. What girl is going to go 3 years to a school when she cannot get a license to nurse when she has finished? To me these things are tragic.

In 1956 I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives when my very good friend and our former colleague, Mr. Priest, was chairman of the subcommittee at that time. I had studied the whole situation of why girls do not go into nursing in the numbers that we want them to and why they do not stay in the field of nursing when they are there. I was in touch with nearly 12,000 people in this country—doctors, nurses, patients and so on—and I happened to be one of the patients myself. I know hospitals inside out and upside down. We found many very interesting things. Most of them are matters that the nurse cannot talk to the hospital superintendent about nor to the board of trustees. She is taught not to. It takes lay people who are trained through experience to go to the boards of hospitals and to go to the various areas that have to do with nursing and make the changes happen. A great deal of research had been done by nurses—magnificent research—but it had never been pulled together and made to produce. We wanted to pull it together.

So I asked for a Presidential Commission. On that Commission I placed two laymen. They were the patients who, surely, should have been heard. The nurses killed it in committee. The hierarchy—way up here—of nursing—whom I know very well and whom I admire, would not have any of us laymen—nonprofessionals—on the scene.

So the bill was killed. There was a Commission appointed. It did an excellent job of its kind, but it has produced no more nurses. It has not made it easier for nursing schools to give real bedside nursing training.

The last time I had figures compiled, we were short 85,000 bedside nurses.

How are we going to staff the new hospitals? How are we going to take care of the people who are sick in the districts?

The practical nurse has been a boon. She has been a wonderful addition when she has had proper training. She has to be overseen also by registered nurses of the right caliber and of the right training.

I am surprised at myself, as I said at the beginning, that I agree with the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] and its having been made a part of the bill.

My one suggestion is that it is going to be desperately important to uphold the standards of nursing training, and

this will have to be carefully watched. Standards in our 50 States vary. We cannot afford to have the high standards lowered. We must watch that with the utmost care and must find ways to lift the lesser ones. This, Madam Chairman, is an activity this subcommittee has assumed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent (on request of Mr. HARRIS), Mrs. BOLTON was granted permission to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Madam Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I wish to say that I certainly appreciate the very fine statement the gentlewoman just made. I believe it is an excellent one and puts the proper perspective on this problem.

No one wants to let down the standards of nursing. We want them raised all the time. But we do so badly need nurses for this country. The problem is being accentuated every day.

All we are trying to do is to get more nurses.

All of us who know of the wonderful work of the gentlewoman from Ohio in helping establish the great nursing profession in this country are grateful to her for her comments.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. I do want to say one amusing thing. This work has given me the chance to get equal rights for men.

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

Madam Chairman, I hesitate to take any additional time on this subject, because I believe it has been thoroughly discussed. There has been a record of great importance made. That was what we had in mind yesterday as we talked about this subject.

I am very glad the gentlewoman from Ohio did take the floor and speak on this subject. From my personal observation, I know she has contributed much to the welfare of the nursing profession through her efforts to bring to the attention of the people of this country the public service performed by the nurses. She is to be commended—and I do compliment her—for her sustained and continued interest over the years in this field. She has given me a lot of help, advice, and counsel, and has sustained me and other members of the committee in our efforts to try to reach a solution to the problems of nurse shortages in our traditional way in this Nation.

I wish to thank the gentlewoman publicly for the marvelous contribution she has made over these years.

I realize that this is a highly controversial issue. We did realize that in the committee. As was explained by the sponsor of the amendment, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] the committee believed there was some substance to the contention that was made that there were problems faced by junior colleges. On the other hand, I have nothing but the highest admiration for the National League for Nursing. The nursing organization has contributed much to the health and welfare of the people of this country.

I have only the highest commendation for them in their efforts to improve their own profession so as better to serve the people of this Nation.

In view of the fact that this issue has been brought up and in view of the fact that there are so many who are concerned with it, I reiterate what I said yesterday—namely, if the matter will go on to conference and we have an opportunity further to develop the facts in connection with this matter, it will be my purpose—and I am sure other members of the committee will join me in it—that we make every possible effort to work this matter out satisfactorily in conference.

There have already been some suggestions made as to how it can be done. We do not want to lower the standards or the criteria in the nursing profession. We want to utilize all of the educational facilities that are interested in training nurses, including the junior colleges. We have provided programs of nurse training, including a program of associate degree nurses, or nurses with 2 years of junior college education, a program of baccalaureate degrees, a program of diploma nursing, and then, of course, graduate nursing. It seems to me with the record that has been made here and the interest that has been shown, when we get to conference, or maybe when it is considered in the other body, we should come to some satisfactory solution of the problem.

Again I want to assure you, my colleagues, as I did yesterday, that I will make every effort to try to work this matter out as satisfactorily as possible. We can do it better in that way than we can do it here on the floor of this House.

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

Madam Chairman, I am pleased to hear from my distinguished chairman, that there is a problem here and it is not all black and white. As far as I am concerned, there is definitely a real problem. Reference has been made to the need for more nurses. There is not a member of this committee that does not realize we need more nurses. But we need qualified nurses, and you do not get qualified nurses under a 2-year program where the school has not been accerdited by the National League of Nursing.

I might say, as I have said before, that there are slightly more than 100 junior colleges that do have registered nurse training programs. When they graduate from these programs they have to take a State examination. The results of their examinations, in some instances, have been pitiful.

In conclusion I might say that we have this wonderful Nurse Training Act which we passed last year which was the administration bill. Now we have this bill, and we are in favor of all of the bill except this provision having to do with accrediting of nurses' schools.

We had no hearings. This was put in in executive session. I know that when you get into executive session you mark up a bill, but this was a major change from what we did last year. So I say we had no hearings, and it was not discussed at any length.

Madam Chairman, if this amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] stays in the bill, I am convinced that it will scuttle the National Nurses Training Act passed last year.

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

Madam Chairman, I have just listened to an amazing display of absolute inaccuracy. We have in junior colleges been training nurses for more than 35 years. San Jose Community College has been training nurses, I believe, for 35 years. Sacramento Junior College was training nurses or giving nursing education when I was a student there a long, long time ago.

The associate degree program has been underway for about 15 years. Hundreds of nurses who attended our junior colleges for their training are today rendering outstanding service in nursing.

Another bit of misinformation is the allegation that only three junior colleges are accredited today because of their pitifully inadequate standards. Three are accredited today; but the relationship of the number accredited to the number nonaccredited has absolutely no bearing upon their qualifications. Some 32 additional junior colleges have certificates of probable certification from the nurses accrediting group. It would be a great disservice to let the record stand as obfuscated as it was at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman who spoke before me.

The results of those attending the 2-year course in the license examinations given in the three larger States in this Union indicate that they compare in every respect favorably with the baccalaureate graduates and with the diploma graduates from the hospital schools of nursing.

The statement was made that no significant factor should be assigned to this matter of accreditation cost. I requested the staff of the subcommittee for a document setting forth the cost of accreditation supplied by the American Nurses Association themselves. What does accreditation cost? An accrediting fee for a nonagency member is $1,500 each 6 years.

There are annual dues of $285 for member institutions, agency members, for the years of 1965 through 1967 and in 1968 that fee goes up to $585.

Now, Madam Chairman, if an agency member seeks accreditation it must pay the fees covering the cost of visitors, and that appears to be significant, because in correspondence furnished to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] by Sister Anne Joachim, of St. Mary's Junior College, in Minneapolis, Minn., and I quote:

> The cost of this visit—
>
> Referring to an inspection visit—
>
> was $317. Added to our $600 payment to the NLN for our membership brings our payments themselves close to $1,000 for this year alone.

And, the good sister adds:

One is painfully reminded of the comments one frequently hears about the unreasonably high cost of the NLN visits and travel which are neither necessary nor fruitful.

Mr. KING of Utah. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I have taken this time to clear up one or two points.

I might say that I appreciated the very fair attitude of the distinguished chairman who is managing this bill, and approach this matter in the same spirit.

Madam Chairman, I believe some of the trouble into which we have run in discussing the matter of accreditation of nurses is due to the fact that we have become victims of what I might call a time fix. A time fix occurs when one develops a mental image, in the nature of a fixation, at a particular instance of time, relating to a particular set of circumstances. The circumstances then change, but the image lingers on, unchanged.

Some Europeans who go out to Utah, for example, are still looking for wild Indians running up and down our main street. They are disappointed when they do not find them. They are victims of a time fix.

And so many people still conceive of the role of nurses as essentially that of dressing wounds, washing bodies, taking pulse and temperature, and emptying bedpans. This is the image which became accepted 40 years ago. But today, Madam Chairman, we must call to mind the image of a lady who sits behind her work desk on which are lined up hundreds of bottles containing narcotics and medications of every description. These bottles carry with them life, or death, depending on how they are used. The lady with the lamp has now become the lady with the hypodermic needle, and woe unto the poor patient upon whom that needle is used improperly.

What I am saying is that the nurses today are professional women who are required to exercise judgment and skill in the highest sense of the word. So, when we emphasize the need for upholding nursing standards, our position is not something artificially contrived. It is in full accord with realities of modern life.

Now, I am a little distressed that so much of the debate on this subject has dealt with the question of whether or not junior colleges are competent to train nurses.

In my opinion this is not the issue. I am perfectly willing to concede for the sake of argument that many, perhaps most, of the junior colleges are quite competent to turn out excellent nurses. Since this may well be true, it seems to me all the more logical that they should be willing to accept the same standards as do other institutions.

If the junior colleges can turn out such good nurses, then why should they ask for special privileges? Why should we give them special treatment, which we do not accord to others?

Madam Chairman, the issue is not whether or not the junior colleges are competent to do the job. They are not on trial. The indispensable service which they offer the Nation is a matter of public record. The issue is simply whether we shall have nationally enforced professional standards, to the end that those institutions which receive Federal funds shall be limited to those which are giving competent nursing instruction. By so doing, patients may have the assurance that they will receive the best care which training can provide.

This, it seems to me, is the issue, and everything else is irrelevant. For that reason, I reiterate, I feel that the best interests of this bill can be served by the conference committee going to conference with the intent of eliminating this language which jeopardizes the high standards that have been so successfully established.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 15, line 1, strike out all of part E from page 15, line 1 through line 11 on page 22.

Mr. QUIE. Madam Chairman, I offer this amendment to strike part E of the bill because to me it sets a new precedent that is going to affect all of the legislation that confronts us in the Committee on Education and Labor in the future in regard to education. This part E provides money for current operating expenses in medical schools. We have chosen not to do this in the Committee on Education and Labor for colleges and universities, in fact, in a previous Congress, there were efforts to include a sum of money to go toward current expenses whenever a Federal scholarship was granted. We felt that was unwise.

We did take a big step in the last Congress toward providing grant money for the construction of academic facilities. We felt that based on previous Federal assistance acts, the aid should go to both public and private institutions of higher learning we would not get into the constitutional question of church-state relationship, or into the question of the operation of the schools when we provided "bricks and mortar money" only.

We provided only construction money in the medical school bill in the last Congress as well.

Now, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has in effect set a precedent. As I mentioned in yesterday's debate there are 13 of the 84 medical schools which are church-related, there are 11 of the 47 dental schools which are church-related. I believe that whenever we assist any institution of higher learning, we should treat them all alike whether they are public or private church-related.

We have tried very carefully in all the areas of Federal assistance coming from the Education and Labor Committee in an effort to make certain that we kept it absolutely constitutional, and develop a national policy that we could live with in future years. If we, then, in our committee could point to the efforts that are being made now by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to provide a substantial amount of money for the operation of medical, dental schools, schools of osteopathy, and so forth, for salaries, administrative costs, in the medical schools of the country, as necessary as the committee claims it to be, we have little reason not to provide the same kind of money for the other colleges and universities in order that they may pay their salaries and meet their administrative costs. I just want you to know that the private colleges and universities are in as great a need as any other and I shall maintain when the time comes that all be equitably treated.

Many of the administrators of colleges and universities, especially public colleges and universities, have come to us and said—We are going to need more than scholarship money, more than tax credits for students and their families, and more than any of these other funds you are talking about on the Federal level. What they need is money for operating expenses. If the Federal Government would pay all the operating expenses, it would not cost the student anything to go to college. So here we see the first step being made, I believe, in a substantial change in Federal education policy in the country. It is true the institutions of higher learning do receive operating expenses, assistance in graduate education indirectly in research grants, and it amounts to better than 50 percent of all expenses of colleges and universities. However, in this case the universities and colleges utilize the services of a researcher to spend part of his time teaching and they have drawn tremendous benefits from these research grants which, on the most part, are project-oriented research grants. However, this would be the first time it was done directly. I do not believe it is wise for us to set this precedent without thorough study for its total education implications. Medical, dental, osteopathic, pharmacy schools, and podiatry schools policy will affect all of our colleges and universities. I think this aid ought to be deleted from the bill and this question should be considered by both the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I believe the need is as great in many other disciplines as it is in medical schools. The need for our country is not only in the health field but also the other areas of knowledge. Our country does have a shortage of brainpower and we need to do everything we possibly can. However, I think this is an unwise step without at the same time looking at other colleges and other disciplines. I might point out if we do take that further step another year, using this as a precedent providing grant money for current operating expenses in all our colleges and universities, can we make certain that Federal influence and standardization will not be the outcome? So I just point this out to you. If you want to look down the pike a ways and want to spend a little bit more time in thorough study and analyzing what we ought to do I would hope you would support and adopt my amendment to delete part E and pass a bill with just the student assistance and construction money.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chairman, now the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has given the very best it has in developing a program to try to meet a very great need. There is no one in this country who will tell you there is not a very great need in this field. If you strike out this provision, you are going to take away the principal part of this bill which is designed to meet this need—the need for trained people in the health professions.

The gentleman talks about precedent. I remind you in the recent Higher Education Act of 1965, which passed the House last Thursday, August 26, there is authorized a 5-year program of project grants to institutions of higher education and to teaching fellows to assist in raising "the quality of developing institutions." The college must, among other things, be "seriously hampered in its efforts to improve staff and services by lack of financial resources and a shortage of qualified personnel." The main purpose of the legislation is to assist the institutions which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life.

Two general mechanisms are provided for in strengthening developing institutions: First, project grants to support cooperative arrangements aimed at building up these colleges; and, second, a national teaching fellowship program to graduate students and junior faculty members to encourage them to teach at developing institutions.

What we have been trying to do with these programs is to do something about these medical institutions. There are some 12 medical schools that right now are dangling on the brink as to whether or not they are going to continue. This is not fiction. There are 10 of these medical schools that are in a serious situation as to what is going to happen to them. Madam Chairman, there are six of these medical schools that are not going to make it, if some way is not provided to help them. How can we say we are going to establish a program, as we are providing in this bill, to increase the number of medical institutions by at least 10 new schools and then permit a dozen old established medical schools to go by the way. It just is not practicable.

This is not a new precedent.

The precedent for Federal support of institutions serving a clear and pressing need of the people of this country was established long ago in relation to land grant colleges.

Every medical school serves in part as a national institution. Its graduates spread out to all parts of the country and serve the total range of needs for medical care. It is worthy of some emphasis that accomplishing the missions of the Department of Defense, the Public Health Service, and the Veterans' Administration now requires the annual intake of about 3,900 physicians, or more than half as many as graduate from all the medical schools. They serve for an average of about 4 years, and about 22,000, or 12 percent of all the physicians in the country, are on full-time duty with these three agencies.

Improvement grants—basic or special—under the proposed legislation can be awarded only if the school "sets forth plans for using the grants which the Surgeon General finds give reasonable promise of strengthening and improving the school's faculty and curriculum." Thus, expansion of the school alone will not entitle a school to aid.

There are several precedents for Federal grants to strengthen and improve teaching programs for professional health personnel:

Under section 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act, the Surgeon General is authorized to make grants for the support of graduate and specialized public health training in the Nation's several accredited schools of public health—currently 12 in number. The current annual appropriation of $2.5 million for this purpose is divided among the schools as follows: One-third of the funds are allotted equally among eligible schools and the remaining two-thirds on a 3-year average of the number of federally sponsored students.

Under section 309 of the Public Health Service Act as amended, the Surgeon General is authorized to make project grants to any public or private nonprofit institution which provides graduate or specialized training in public health, for the purpose of strengthening or expanding graduate public health training. Appropriations for fiscal year 1965 for this purpose were $2.5 million.

Under the Nurse Training Act of 1964, the Surgeon General is authorized to make payments to diploma schools of nursing to defray a portion of the cost of training students of nursing whose enrollment in such schools can be reasonably attributed to the provisions of the act. Payments are determined on the basis of first, the increase in the full-time enrollment for the current year over the average for the 3 preceding years; and, second, the number of students enrolled in the school who have received loans under the Nurse Training Act.

Under various sections of the Public Health Service Act, all of the Institutes of NIH make training grants to public and other nonprofit educational institutions to support graduate training leading toward careers in research in sciences relating to medicine and health or toward increased competence in the treatment of disease. The grants, awarded to establish, expand, or improve training opportunities, provide sums both for the support of the institution's program and for stipends to students.

So it can be seen that this is not really a new program—there are many precedents already established for Federal assistance to schools serving a national purpose.

Our medical schools serve a national purpose, and Madam Chairman, their needs are great.

We must face the fact that high operating costs and shortages of operating funds are jeopardizing our health professions educational system. Several underfinanced medical and dental schools are threatened with failure to meet educational standards. New schools are slow to start even when construction funds are available, due to lack of operating funds.

A strong system of medical education requires adequate financial support that is continuing and stable. Universities with budgets already under great stress will be unable to maintain, improve, or expand their existing medical programs or to establish new medical schools or new educational programs unless sources of additional operating funds are found. It is reasonable and proper that the Federal Government should provide together with other national and local sources the needed additional operating funds.

The medical schools of this country vary enormously, not only in age and location but also in strength and stability. At one end of the spectrum are a small number of schools so weak and poorly financed that it is doubtful they can continue to provide acceptable education without more institutional support. The grants proposed in this legislation will be enormously helpful to them. At the other end of the spectrum are 15 or 20 very fine, well-established institutions with large and complex programs. The grants proposed will be modest in relation to their total expenditures, but they will make it possible for these fine institutions to continue to pioneer in the development of programs in which newly developed knowledge offers great promise. In the middle are the majority of schools with hardly enough money to keep their present programs going and under great pressure to correct their known weaknesses, institute programs of proven value, and expand enrollments. The grants proposed will be of great help toward doing some or all of those things.

It may not be always realized, but there are some medical schools in this country at any given time, 10 to 15, who are in very serious financial difficulty. They barely have enough money to keep going, and the strain is so great that their concern is as to whether they can continue or not. For institutions in this category the sort of institutional grants provided in this legislation will really be a lifesaver.

At the other end of the spectrum we are fortunate in having 15 or 20 medical schools that are very well established and very sophisticated and fine institutions. Institutional grants to those strong schools will be rather small compared to what they are already spending, but those are the schools who can pioneer in developing new programs where new knowledge makes it sensible and which pioneering can then be helpful to all schools.

The majority of medical schools are in between these extremes. They are finding it nip and tuck to have enough money to operate. This sort of grant can help them correct deficiencies that may exist and build strengths where they know they need it and can greatly help them meet the need to expand all of their activity. For example, Dr. F. J. Ebaugh, dean of the Boston University Medical School, testified before my committee that by 1966, this outstanding institution is expected to run a deficit of $113,000 and that by 1972 the deficit will increase to $152,000. Dr. Ebaugh stated that thus

far his school has been able to stay in operation by means of committed grants from three foundations and gifts, and that the school will be able to remain solvent in this manner for approximately 4 years. However, the deficit which is anticipated by 1972 can be met only through Government support of the kind proposed by this bill plus support from private foundations which is not yet committed. The alternative to such support, Dr. Ebaugh states eloquently in these terms:

Now if we are to remain financially solvent, we could triple our tuition. This is unthinkable. We could decrease the number of our faculty and hence the quality of our education. This is also unthinkable. Or we could decrease the number of students which would be completely against the interests of the Nation. The answer would lie, it seems to me, in the proposed grants in aid under the bill 3141 to supplement the operating budget of the school * * * and to continue to solicit gifts and foundation support for our operation.

Dr. Douglas M. Surgenor, dean of the School of Medicine, State University of New York at Buffalo, made the following statement before my committee:

At Buffalo, we find that our resources, despite excellent support from the State University of New York, are completely committed to catching up in faculty strength for our basic program, and to related matters, with the result that we simply cannot fund new and important curriculum changes that the faculty has already agreed to. For example, we have developed a plan to provide a better educational transition between the basic science years and the clinical years of the medical curriculum. Tentatively entitled "Mechanisms and Manifestations of Disease," this course involves a new approach in which a team of physicians and scientists will introduce the medical student to the basic principles of clinical medicine. It is this kind of improvement in the curriculum which would be greatly expedited by the support envisioned in the bill. I could name several other areas of urgent need in my school which would also be aided by new Federal support.

Madam Chairman, my State of Arkansas is not going to get anything from this for its medical school, so I have nothing personal involved so far as my State is concerned. Our medical school is not one of those in trouble. It will get its share under the general basic improvement grants, but my own State does not have a school in serious trouble. We have a fairly new set-up there, and a very fine one of which we are proud. There are some schools in the Nation we are trying to save.

Therefore I urge, Madam Chairman, that the amendment not be approved.

Mr. LEGGETT. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Madam Chairman, I wish to point up to the committee that there is pending now before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee legislation to expand the scope of the pending bill to the allied field of veterinary medicine.

Authors of this legislation, other than myself, are Congressman ANDREWS of Alabama, Congressman STEPHENS of Georgia, Congressman ANDREWS of North Dakota, Congressman JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Congressman STEED of Oklahoma, Congressman ROBISON of New York, Congressman MATTHEWS of Florida, Congressman PEPPER of Florida.

Many of these authors, including Vice President HUMPHREY while he was a Member of the other body, introduced legislation to extend the coverage of this act to the allied profession of veterinary medicine starting in the 86th Congress, 87th, 88th, and the current Congress.

It is my understanding that reports from the Bureau of the Budget are imminent on the legislation which we have all jointly coauthored and for that reason I do not intend to offer an amendment at this time to perhaps prematurely expand the coverage of the act.

The national need for additional veterinarians is patent.

NATIONAL NEED FOR VETERINARIANS

The nationwide demand for veterinarians is at an alltime high and is growing very rapidly. It exceeds the supply by threefold or fourfold. There is a critical need for veterinarians particularly in public health activities and for food animal disease control. The following statement taken from the summary of the Centennial Evaluations of the Veterinary Division of the American Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges still accurately reflects numerous nationwide surveys on the need for veterinarians:

The demand for veterinarians is at an alltime high and is constantly growing. The best estimates based on current needs indicate that the number of veterinarians in the country should be trebled by 1980. This means that over 40,000 new veterinarians must be graduated in the next 20 years. It means that in order to accomplish this the capacity of all the present veterinary medical colleges must be doubled and at least five new veterinary medical colleges established immediately.

Although every effort has been made to expand the enrollment of veterinary medical colleges throughout the country, very little expansion can be accomplished without constructing new classrooms and laboratories for these programs. The very high cost of establishing a school of veterinary medicine mitigates against the establishment of the vitally needed new schools.

There are only 18 schools of veterinary medicine in the entire country. Veterinary medical schools are, therefore, truly national resources. There are only 3 schools that serve the entire 12 Western States. Consequently it seems more than appropriate that universities having veterinary medical schools receive some national support to maintain their programs.

VETERINARY MEDICINE'S CONTRIBUTION TO HUMAN HEALTH AND WELFARE

Veterinary medicine makes significant contributions to the health and welfare of all the people of the country. Veterinary medicine is the science that deals with diseases of all the kinds of animals useful to man. All kinds of animals includes not only the food-producing and draft animals, but also pet animals, zoo animals, wild animals, and laboratory animals used for research. Veterinarians have been given primary responsibility to control the host of animal diseases that are transmissible to people. All species of animals have important diseases that can affect people. This is particularly true of the many exotic pets that Americans are currently so interested in. Unless trained veterinarians are available throughout the Nation to minister to the health needs of all these kinds of animals, including pets, great numbers of people will be exposed to needless pain and suffering from animal diseases.

A great number of veterinarians are needed to care for the vast numbers of animals used in biological and medical research. Much of the medical research in the Nation today is conducted on animals. A great deal of this research is not truly significant because it has been conducted on animals afflicted with various diseases. Consequently the veterinarian plays a most important indirect role in human health and welfare by maintaining the health of these animals.

Without any doubt, the greatest contribution made by veterinary medical science to human health is through research which contributes to our understanding of disease and disease processes. Most of the diseases that affect people also occur in some species of animal. Many of these animals are much better suited for research on these diseases than are people. Consequently the veterinarian, skilled in animal biology and medicine, has been placed in a key position to make significant contributions to all of medical science. Many of his findings relate as directly to human welfare as they do to the immediate welfare of animals. Veterinarians in all aspects of professional activities from practice to basic research, make these kinds of contributions.

The veterinarian is a unique medical scientist. No other group of biological and medical scientists can do what he is trained to do. He is a vitally needed medical scientist. The health and welfare of the people to no small extent depend upon the effectiveness of the service that he provides to the community.

DEMANDS FOR VETERINARY MEDICAL EDUCATION

At the University of California at Davis, Calif., in my congressional district, by the end of the current year approximately 5,000 students will have written letters to the dean's office requesting information on a veterinary medical education. They already have received over 400 completed applications from students who have completed their undergraduate education and wish to continue in veterinary medicine. They accept approximately 50 students in each class. This means that the vast majority of these young men and women must change their objectives and go into some other profession or field. This is true even though the demands for graduated veterinarians exceeds the supply in California by at least five times. It is indeed a tragic situation that so few truly qualified people may enter a profession which provides society with such important service merely because educational facilities are not adequate to handle them.

DEMAND FOR VETERINARIANS

Last year approximately 250 positions were available for veterinarians in the

State. This included requests for individuals in laboratory animal medicine, animal disease control programs for State, municipal and Federal Government, the California board of health's research and zoonoses control program, research and teaching positions on the various campuses of the University of California, medical research organizations, the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of Wildlife and Fisheries, as well as many opportunities in private practice.

Out of the 43 veterinarians that graduated from our school last year, 8 currently are in the armed services, 5 have gone directly into research and research training programs, for example, in cancer research at the McArdle Institute at Madison, Wis.; University of Chicago's Biochemistry Department; U.S. Public Health Service's Rocky Mountain Laboratory; the California Department of Public Health and the University of California. Two are in clinical internship programs to prepare themselves for academic careers in veterinary medical science, two have accepted positions in fish disease programs, while the others are in internships that may eventually lead to private practice. Most of our graduates go into positions which contribute to the general health and welfare of the populace.

We must import nearly 75 percent of the veterinarians who go to work each year in our State. If recent trends on immigration of veterinarians is a true indication of the future, the number of veterinarians immigrating will be reduced in the years ahead.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

There is a very strong demand for graduate education in veterinary medical science. Individuals completing graduate education go into the schools and colleges to teach and conduct research in many aspects of veterinary medicine. There is a critical and important shortage of qualified teachers and researchers. Support and expansion of the graduate program is essential if we hope to supply teachers and researchers vitally needed by the Nation.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The University of California is currently embarking on a major veterinary medical expansion program. They hope to expand the program of the school so that they may eventually accept 120 veterinary medical students each year and provide graduate education for over 200. In order to do this, however, we must expand our physical plant tremendously. We have estimated that this will cost between $20 and $30 million. It is not possible to do this with funds available from State sources. Federal support for veterinary medical education is vitally needed.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE MEDICAL SCHOOL AT UCD

A new medical school soon will be established at the University of California at Davis. It is the fond hope of the university that the School of Veterinary Medicine and School of Human Medicine will be closely related. There is no doubt that each can contribute significantly to the quality and efficiency of the program of the other. They are hopeful that close integration may be accomplished so that both veterinary medicine and human medicine will profit from the association. These two branches of medicine have too long been separated. It is their hope that they will be able to bring them together.

In summary, I would respectfully request that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce exercise every effort to see that this very important companion legislation is passed out of committee and brought to the floor of the Congress with the same support as has been given to the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Madam Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Madam Chairman, I am not a prophet of doom and gloom, but I think we need to call attention to some things that are happening. I read some excerpts from the current issue of U.S. News & World Report:

Creeping rise in prices, gaining some momentum, is a cause of reviving official concern about inflation pressures; is influencing money policies.

Prices of commodities, overall, are in a continuing rise. Industrial products, in turn, begin to rise with wage costs and costs of materials.

Skilled workers are in short supply now. Unemployment of men over age 20 is down to 3.1 percent; of men over age 25 is down to 2.8 percent.

The base is there for an upward price push.

It's against that background that cash spending of Government is set.

In this year, ending June 30 next, Federal spending of cash will rise by about $7.8 billion to above $130 billion. Probable deficit: $5.6 billion.

Next year, beginning July 1, cash spending will rise about $13 billion to above $143 billion, up $20.7 billion in 2 years. Probable deficit: $8.1 billion. That's without any big increase in arms spending for war in Vietnam. Big rise ahead is to be in welfare programs of many and proliferating kinds.

I would predicate the statement I am about to make on the statement I have read: In this bill we are setting up a new program which goes about giving away money that we do not have in order to accomplish a purpose for which the giving of that money is not necessary. I am referring to the scholarship grants provided in this bill for the first time. I think what we are trying to do by offering grants, gifts, doles, welfare, or whatever else you want to call it, to a young man just because he is ambitious to become a doctor is helping to destroy his self-respect by giving him this help when there are available enough scholarships from outside the Government and enough loans are available both from the Government and from outside the Government to enable any young person who has the ability, the intellect, and ambition to fill every medical college that is now existent or which will be provided under the expanded program in this bill.

We need more doctors. I said that at the time that the medicare bill was passed. One of the greatest disappointments I predict will be on July 1 of next year when these great numbers of people who are eligible for hospital and nursing home care will try to get services that are not available. That is the reason why I am supporting this bill with the exception of this section, part F, scholarship grants. If this amendment which I will offer to remove the scholarships grant provisions is not adopted, I will feel forced to vote against the entire bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Madam Chairman, if I may, I would at this time like to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 22, line 12, strike out line 12 and all that follows on page 22, page 23, page 24, and lines 1 through 12 on page 25.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Madam Chairman, I think I have explained the purpose of this amendment, but I should like to go into further detail. This is not a great amount of money as compared with the other features of the bill. The bill itself, of course, is going to provide close to $1 billion. So this is not a large item.

I am offering this amendment as a matter of principle. I feel that we are not going to recruit or entice another person into the medical schools or schools of related professions that are provided in this bill by offering this money. I think any young man or young woman who wants to enter these professions would welcome the opportunity to get a loan that they would be glad to repay. I think we are destroying some of the initiative and self-respect of these people whom we are making wards of the Government, so to speak, by offering these grants.

This money comes from the taxpayers. I do not think anybody here will disagree with me when I say that of all the professions there is none that has a greater potential for earnings than the medical profession. Many doctors have made sacrifices, but they had a goal that they could look forward to and they could see not only the good that they were going to do, but also the financial security at the end of that time.

The report speaks of the fact that it costs from $20,000 to $30,000 for the 8 to 12 years that a person would have to be in school. By the time he is out of school, in 3 or 4, or at most 5 years, he will be making more money than that in any one year.

I think most of us recognize that the young man who comes out of a medical school today with a diploma, who is ready to hang up his shingle as an M.D., has the certainty that he is going to earn at least $1,000 a month to start with and in the year following it will be more than that.

There is another thing about this bill that was brought out by the gentleman from New Jersey awhile ago, and that is the fact that we have no requirements concerning this grant that we give this person to go to a medical school. We have no assurance that he is even going

to continue in the practice of medicine in this country. At least we should expect, if we are going to give him some money, that he have a requirement and an obligation to go to some section of the country where there is not sufficient medical service now. They do that under the teachers program. We say that if they are going to teach school we will forgive a part of the loan. Here we are giving them a grant with no strings attached. I think that is entirely wrong. I see no need for it, because it means that we are just throwing the money away. For that reason I think the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. We have tried to work out a practical and realistic program to meet the needs in this area. If I believed that what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] has said was the fact, I would have a different point of view. I am sure the gentleman believes on the basis of the information that he has, that the statements he recounted here are true. But those are not the facts as we understand them.

The facts are that we have, through programs beginning a good many years ago, through the National Science Foundation and now NASA and the National Defense Education Act provided a great incentive to many of the better students. Of course, we needed scientists. All of us remember that we became concerned about scientists several years ago because we thought Russia was moving ahead of us in that field. And the first thing we knew, we had many people going into that field, so that the better class of students have been going into other fields and they have not been keeping up in the field of medicine, dentistry, and the other health professions.

The information which we developed throughout the course of the hearings and which came to us indicated that there are innumerable students that would be interested in going into the field of medicine if they could just see a way to afford it.

Madam Chairman, it takes 10 years to make a doctor, at high cost. So, the student gets beyond the capability of his family many times. Many of these medical students, as is well known—everyone knows it—get married and have their own family. They give up in despair, saying "There is no way I can get into the field of medicine, because it takes too long; I am obligated to my family; I cannot do it and therefore I am going to do something else."

Madam Chairman, what we are trying to do is to use this method of approach here where we say to a given school, "If you perform a service here, we will give you some help and assistance and incentive for doing it." So, we take the figure of $2,000 and one-tenth of the total medical students of the school and multiply these two amounts, and that is the amount that that particular school has allocated to it from this program to apply on scholarships.

Now, Madam Chairman, that institution then has within the framework of that total amount certain parts of it to allocate—maybe $500 or maybe $2,500—to a worthy and needy student. In this way with loans, foundation grants, and other help they may get applications from many of these students. This will help the institution improve the quality of students that comes to the school for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does the gentleman from Arkansas know of any worthy student who could not obtain a loan for that same purpose?

Mr. HARRIS. Our information comes to us from the medical schools who screen the students themselves, the people who do the actual basic work. They tell us that they have many students that come to them with a high academic rating but when they look at that 10 years ahead of them and the high cost involved, they pass up medical school.

Yes, we have information that there are innumerable students that come within that category.

Madam Chairman, I hope the Committee will not approve this amendment.

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

Madam Chairman and Members of the Committee, I have asked for this time not because I fully agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] that the entire section should be stricken, but because I disagree with the distinguished chairman of the committee as to the implementation of this most desirable section providing scholarships.

Madam Chairman, during the general debate, I pointed out that in this legislation there are no criteria established as to what is a needy boy; there are no criteria established as to what is a bright boy. Each individual medical school in this country under this bill has a right to establish what is a needy boy and what is a bright boy.

There is nothing in this legislation that requires a written examination. There is nothing in this bill, as I understand it, that provides as to whether a young man has to be a member of a family that qualifies, for example, under the poverty program, and most importantly, there is nothing in this legislation as I read it which makes this a national criteria. In other words, it might be different in New Jersey than it is in Missouri or than it is in Arkansas.

I do not know of anything in this bill which requires any recipient of a scholarship to do one thing. Most recipients of a scholarship either have to perform some services around the school, some have to play football, some have to answer the telephone, some have to wait on tables, but there is nothing in this bill that requires them to work in the laboratories of the medical school, for instance or to perform any task whatsoever, the recipients do not have to pay the money back, and most important, they do not even have to practice medicine in the United States of America. After they have received their full education they can leave the medical profession and enter the teaching profession or work for some of the drug companies in this country. There is nothing that says they have to go into any part of this country where there is an acute need of doctors and perform any services. Those are my objections, and when the proper time comes I intend to offer an amendment which I hope will correct this. I believe scholarships are necessary, I think they are good, but I object to the criteria.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to remind the gentleman that committees that we maintain in the Congress, so far as I know, have been very insistent that the matter of its administration, its curriculum, the handling of students and the applications for entrance and everything be left to the educational institution within the States. We have consistently adhered to that policy and, certainly, I do not think we should go beyond what we have already provided for the institutions themselves.

Mr. CAHILL. As I understand it, what we are doing here is granting $2,500 a year to 10 percent of the pupils of the school—an outright grant. There would be nothing as I read it that a medical school must determine as to what a needy student is. Perhaps he could be the son of a medical man who had passed away. If in the opinion of the adminstrators of the medical school this boy is a needy boy under this legislation as I read it he would get a scholarship. As I read the legislation a boy has to be enrolled in the medical school first before he can even be eligible. So, if that is the case, how can the boy get in if he has no finances prior to acceptance. Under this bill, before he gets a scholarship he must be enrolled before he is eligible. How ridiculous.

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

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. HARRIS), Mr. CAHILL was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARRIS. We provide a lump-sum—a total amount under the formula—which goes to a given school. We leave it as the responsibility of that school to determine that these criteria and standards are met, that a particular student is a needy student, that he cannot meet his costs from other sources. I believe we have a built-in criterion here in keeping with the concept that we are trying to provide assistance, and at the same time leaving with the recipient institution the running of that school and determining what students are eligible, and on what basis they are accepted.

Mr. CAHILL. If I may respond to the gentleman, there is nothing spelled out in here which binds any school anywhere in the country as to what is a minimum. For example, a boy could come from a family where the father is a postal worker, or a Member of Congress, and if in the opinion of the medical school that boy came from a needy family that school would have every right in the

world under this legislation to award him a scholarship.

I am not saying it will happen. I am just saying there is nothing spelled out in this bill. So that we are giving every administrator of every medical school in this country an opportunity to hand out scholarships to 10 percent of the student body on any basis he pleases.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, in view of the fact that there is other legislation on the program for today, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment cease in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Chairman, I have been listening with interest to the explanation of the distinguished chairman in which he said there are many potential doctors who would be discouraged because they would get a loan that they would have to pay back and they might not pursue a medical education unless they got a grant. It seems to me, if this is the type of motivation a young person has and if he has this little zeal to become a doctor, I think the medical profession could well do without him because he would be better advised to open a store some place.

I think that doctors are widely known to make a good income and if we had a general grant program for educational purposes, I would not be constrained to object to providing one for doctors. Under our National Defense Education Act, however, we do not have grants in these fields and we are training people without the economic potential, training people who might for instance go into forestry or many other professions where they will be making very little money and we require them to pay back. I must say it escapes me why we should favor a doctor who will be making big money and not ask him to pay back when we are asking the student who will be going into a rather limited profession financially to do otherwise.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARRIS. I would not want anyone to get the erroneous impression that the door is open here for scholarships—that is not the case. You pay students going to an institution of higher learning and he gets his basic college training. Under the programs we have now, if he wants to go on in the field of science, he has a grant made available to him. That student is favored under this program just as much as we are trying to do here for a scholarship provision for doctors, to encourage them to go no additional years at a cost that is much greater than in any other profession that he might undertake to get into. What we are trying to do is to encourage people with a high IQ or with the intellectual ability to be interested in it. Now you talk about favoritism. We all know we wanted to do something for our GI's and we provided a GI program for them. I venture to say there are people on the floor of the House who received the benefit of that program and if that program had not been made available to them, where would they have been? We are not doing any more for the doctors to meet the needs than we have done for other people.

Mr. JOELSON. I am sure if the gentleman would limit the grant program to GI's even the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] would support it.

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

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

Mr. CAHILL. I would like to have the gentleman's observation as to what he believes would be the attitude of 90 percent of the students of the medical schools who do not receive scholarships but who either receive loans which they must pay back or who are working part time; or perhaps whose parents are working two jobs to send them to medical school. What does the gentleman think this will do when 10 percent get scholarships and others are compelled to pay the money back?

Mr. JOELSON. The gentleman has answered the question by merely formulating it. I am sure they would be very unhappy.

Mr. CAHILL. Does not the gentleman then believe that whatever criteria or whatever norm is established by the medical school, there will be an effort in the following year to increase it upward so that perhaps another 10 percent can qualify? And so on, ad infinitum, until we would find the Government giving out scholarships to all medical students.

Mr. JOELSON. I should not be surprised.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey that in the living sciences, 81 percent of all graduate students receive fellowships, which are the same as scholarships, in the sum of $2,500. At the present time the scholarship program, for going to medical school, is something like $700, from what is available.

What we are trying to do is to equalize the situation.

When the time comes, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] will offer an amendment to provide that this will go "only to students from low income families who, without such financial assistance could not pursue"—and so on. I intend to support that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes, 21, noes, 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 24, line 15, strike out all after the word "awarded," strike out all of line 16, and on line 17 strike out the words "financial assistance in pursuing" and insert in lieu thereof "only to students from low income families who, without such financial assistance could not pursue"

Mr. QUIE. Madam Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to change the wording so that we will make absolutely certain what I understand to be the intent of the committee, judging from the report; that is, only the young people with such low incomes, or who come from such low income families, that they cannot find the money to go to a medical school, will receive these scholarships.

This language would limit the aid to those, and it would be in conformity with the efforts we made in what we call the economic opportunity grants, which were in the bill that came before the House last week from the Education and Labor Committee. Those grants will go only to the exceptionally needy students who could not go to college without that kind of special grant even though they could get loans.

The purpose of my amendment is to make this bill conform in its purpose to reach the exceptionally needy medical students as the purpose of the Higher Education Act was to reach the exceptionally needy undergraduate.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I correctly understand that the language would read as follows:

(2) Scholarships from grants under subsection (a) for any school year shall be awarded only to students from low income families who, without such financial assistance, could not pursue a course of study at the school for such year.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the gentleman have in mind that this would require a needs test, as has been acknowledged in connection with other programs and in other discussions?

Mr. QUIE. We do not consider this as a needs test, and did not consider that a needs test as such was in the bill passed last week for undergraduate higher education. What it would do is require the Surgeon General to give guidelines to the medical institution. The main point is that without this grant a student would not be able to attend or remain in the medical school which accepts him. An institution would make its decision as to who were the low income students.

Mr. HARRIS. That was the second question I wanted to ask. Would it be understood that the institution itself would make the decision?

Mr. QUIE. Each medical institution would make that decision, and they would know from the law if my amendment is adopted and the regulations set up by the Surgeon General.

Mr. HARRIS. I have talked to several other members of the committee with whom I had a chance to discuss this, and we are willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CURTIS. I certainly thank the gentleman. There are several questions I would like to ask, and before the vote on this amendment I hope I will have an opportunity to take a few minutes to ask some questions and raise some points.

Mr. NELSEN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I wish to point out that the amendment that the gentleman offers is in keeping with what the intent of the committee really is. I think it is a service to the committee and to this House that he spells it out as he does in the language which he has offered. I find the suggestion a very good one, and I agree with the gentleman in the well.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I understood from talking to the gentleman that this puts this act in conformance with the bill that came from the Committee on Education and Labor. Is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. In regard to the type of low-income individual to whom the grants would be made available.

Mr. SPRINGER. On that basis I am for the amendment and I hope it is adopted.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman, because it seems to me if there is any group of young people whom we want to get into the medical schools and we want to use this money for, it would be those who cannot go even with the loans available in this bill and the private grants that are available. So this means the institution first offers him the grant money which they have available and the loan money. If even then a student finds it is impossible for him for economic reasons to go to medical school and if you have a high-caliber individual that the medical schools want, then the school would be able to use this money as a grant to induce such a student to go to their medical school and therefore increase the number of M.D.'s which this legislation has as its basic purpose. I understand that medical schools are getting fewer A students, the same number of B students and more C students than they did a decade ago.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL. Is it required that the applicant already be in the medical school under your amendment before he is eligible?

Mr. QUIE. As I would understand it, even though the requirement that he be accepted by the medical school comes previous to my amendment in subsection (c), these would go simultaneously. The institution would find the student acceptable as a first-year student for entrance and would be admitting them, but then the student would say, "Well, without this financial help I will not be able to do it." In subsequent years, they would not be able to remain in medical school without the scholarship grants in this bill.

Mr. CAHILL. Is it the intent of this legislation, as you have suggested in your amendment, that the medical schools which are going to be eligible will get this information across to all of the young men and women of that area prior to enrollment so that they will know they are eligible even though they have not been accepted by the medical school?

Mr. QUIE. No. They will have to be acceptable to the medical school but be of such low income that without this grant money, they could not attend the school. I do not see how the medical school can grant them the money unless the student was acceptable to them in the first place.

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

Madam Chairman, I am taking this time because it seems to me as though we are mixing apples and oranges. As I listen to this discussion, most of the talk is as if you are talking about students who are going to college. These are graduate students. These are students who are not the young 18-year-olds, but we are talking about people 21, 22, and 23 years old.

As the chairman of the committee has been pointing out before, the difficulty here is the graduate students. When you start talking in terms of whether they come from low-income families and so on, you are talking about young people who are 21 or 22 years of age. In the National Defense Education Act I did my best to get in the graduate fellow programs. These are grants and, as the gentleman from Illinois has been pointing out, the various science foundations have grants and scholarships. What I fear is by getting confused with the two types of students, one the student going on to college to get his A.B. degree and the other kind, the ones we are talking about here, those who have already gotten their A.B. degree, we will become confused in this issue, because I do not know very many medical schools that you can get into unless you have your A.B. degree. Look at what happened in the student work program in the colleges when you limited it to the so-called poverty class. There were very few students who could qualify because of it. I fear, although the committee wants to accommodate the gentleman offering the amendment—and I am most pleased with what the gentleman from Minnesota is trying to do, to coordinate the actions taken by the Committee on Education and Labor with this bill—I am afraid that you are confusing the two different categories of students and that this would be a very damaging amendment to accomplish what you seek.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAHILL

Mr. CAHILL. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAHILL: On page 23, in line 14, strike out "Scholarships" and insert in lieu thereof "Subject to subsections (d) and (e) of this section, scholarships".

Beginning with line 24 on page 24, strike out all down through line 2 on page 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d)(1) There is hereby established a National Commission on Medical, Dental, and Optometric Scholarships which shall consist of seven members appointed by the President. Members of such Commission shall serve without compensation, but members of the Commission while attending meetings of the Commission and traveling to and from such meetings may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(2) Such Commission shall prepare, administer, and evaluate the results of a national examination which shall be taken by any person desiring to receive a scholarship under this part. No school shall award a scholarship under the provisions of this part to any individual unless such individual is approved therefor by the Commission as having requisite qualifications and as meeting criteria of financial need which shall be established by the Commission.

"(e) Before awarding a scholarship to any individual under this part, the school awarding such scholarship shall require such individual to agree in writing to serve for at least one year in an area which the Surgeon General designates as having a shortage of personnel having the training for which such scholarship is awarded. Such service shall be performed by such individual upon the completion of such training."

On page 25, line — strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, as I understand from listening to the reading of the amendment, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] would establish a national commission or board for the purpose of establishing national scholarships and to determine who would receive scholarships under the program proposed here. Under the program proposed here the funds to be appropriated would be allocated to a school. Under the procedure the school would make the determination under a regularly established policy of the Congress as to which student under the program would receive a scholarship.

The gentleman's amendment sets up an entirely different program, apart from any program that we have, an entirely new national program which is not contemplated and is not a part of this bill. So it goes beyond the purview of this program and of this proposed legislation and imposes additional duties upon the Surgeon General to provide information that would determine the matter of scholarships, which is not a part of this program at all.

I would say that that being true, it would not be germane to this program that is established by this proposed bill and, therefore, in my judgment should be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CAHILL. I do, Madam Chairman.

Madam Chairman, I would respectfully point out to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that that is not the purpose nor do I believe the effect of this amendment.

The only purpose of this amendment is to have a board appointed by the President, consisting of seven members, to prepare an examination and to establish the criteria, which the bill fails to do. Then it places upon the medical schools which will receive the money and which will make the award of the scholarship only one prohibition, and that is that they may not award the scholarship to anyone who is not certified as eligible by this board.

Madam Chairman, the schools receive the money under the bill, the schools award the scholarships under the bill, and under the bill, as a matter of fact, the Surgeon General is given some authority to set up norms and standards. That is the provision that we are striking out here or are proposing to strike.

All we are trying to do, in effect, is say that every boy in New Jersey that wants to be a doctor, every boy in Arkansas that wants to be a doctor and every boy in California that wants to be a doctor takes an examination. He knows then whether he is going to be eligible or not. He does not have to wait until he makes an application and is accepted by a medical school, because I respectfully point out to the Chairman that most of the needy boys do not even make the application to get in, because they know they cannot afford it.

Madam Chairman, this would permit all of the boys to take an examination and it would permit them to establish to the satisfaction of a board appointed by the President of the United States that they have the eligibility from the standpoint of need. All it would do, the only restriction it would place upon them for the rest of their lives is to make them serve 1 year in areas of this country certified by the Surgeon General as being an acute shortage area for doctors.

Madam Chairman, it seems to me this is the least we can expect from a boy who receives an outright grant of $10,000 during his medical school training.

So, I submit that this is germane, it is relevant to the very issue, and all we are proposing to do through this amendment in my judgment at least is to set up criteria, standards and norms that were omitted in the bill of making the scholarships available to boys before they are enrolled in medical school. I have never heard anything so ridiculous in my life as to say you must first be accepted by a medical school before you are eligible for one of these scholarships. It is the boys that have the need who are not in medical schools and have not been accepted.

So I submit, Madam Chairman, that the amendment is germane and ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN (Mrs. GRIFFITHS). The Chair will rule that the bill deals with scholarships and that the amendment as offered deals with a method of establishing scholarships. It is, therefore, germane and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CAHILL. Madam Chairman and Members of the Committee, first of all let me try if I may and distinguish between the scholarships alluded to by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the science scholarships. As I understand it we have given these scholarships because we cannot find enough qualified men to enter that particular field. Here we are granting scholarships in a field where we have literally 10 times as many applicants as we have seats for them in the medical schools of our country.

I have never heard, as I said before, in my experience, of any young man who wanted to go to medical school who could not go because of money. Loans as we all know are readily available from many sources.

But I have heard of hundreds who could not go, even though they were qualified and had the money, because there was no room for them.

How many Members of this House have had the experience I had in talking to medical school officials and saying "Here is a boy who is an A student," or "here is a boy who is a B-plus student," "here is a boy who is dedicated and wants to be a doctor," and having them say to you "That is true, but we only have so many seats here. If you fellows in Washington would give us some more money we would put up new schools, and we could increase our quotas."

But never once have they said "Give us the money for the scholarships." What we need in this country are more medical schools. If we are going to give scholarships it seems to me there ought to be a criteria, there ought to be a standard, so that every boy in this country who wants to go to a medical school knows he can go if he is bright enough.

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

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

Mr. JONAS. First let me say I am glad the gentleman has offered this amendment, and I would like to associate myself with his arguments. They are sound, they are reasonable, and they ought to be adopted, in my opinion.

And, secondly, let me say with respect to the National Science Foundation fellowships, since that subject has been brought up, the purpose of those fellowships is to permit talented people to engage in basic research, the product of which will become available to all of the people of the United States, and not merely for professional training which will directly benefit the individual, and in the future may benefit humanity if he practices medicine in the United States.

There is a great deal of difference between the National Foundation fellowships in basic research than in a fellowship to a professional student to qualify to practice a profession.

Mr. CAHILL. I would like to add this point: I would certainly have to believe that the 90 percent of the students of the medical schools who do not get scholarships and who are faced with paying the loans they have made throughout the country or through other private sources, are going to be resentful of this type of legislation. I would have to believe if a medical school in my State, for instance, says, "If your family makes less than $10,000 a year you are eligible," the boy whose family makes $11,000 or $12,000 is going to feel he has been prejudiced against, and there is going to be an effort made to raise it to $12,000. If $12,000, why not $14,000? If 50 percent, why not 100 percent?

What we are doing by the very lack of clarity in this legislation, in my judgment, is opening the door for a full scholarship for all students who want to go to a medical school, and that, in my judgment, is fairer than the act as now written.

I hope, therefore, that the committee will recognize that all this amendment does is to make scholarships available to all students in the country under a norm established by a commission appointed by the President and require the recipients to serve 1 year in an area designated by the Surgeon General.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments to this section close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Madam Chairman, this amendment is a perfect example of the difficulty of objectively proposing solutions to imagined deficiencies in the Committee of the Whole on the floor of the House. I do not know what the amendment does. It appoints or rather it directs the President to appoint a seven-man commission. I do not know what type of staff they are going to have; and I do not know whether the staff is subject to civil service laws or not. I do not know the precise limits upon their power. But they are going to be instructed, I think, to propose criteria and I am not at all certain in which area. But under that criteria they would conduct an examination to establish: first, either ability, or second, financial need.

If it is to establish ability or competence or qualifications, all in the world it would do would be to satisfy the examining board that they met certain qualifications. It would not satisfy the individual medical schools who reserve their right, as they should, to determine which students are qualified to meet their criteria.

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

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL. I think the gentleman misunderstands the amendment. This does not make it mandatory.

Mr. MOSS. I yielded to the gentleman to ask a question. I do not have the time to indulge the gentleman beyond that point.

Mr. CAHILL. Then let me ask a question. Does the gentleman understand that the medical schools have the absolute right to accept anyone they want and that the only prohibition against them is if they do not meet the requirements?

Mr. MOSS. Madam Chairman, I do not yield further because it is obvious that the medical schools in the final analysis are going to determine the qualifications of the applicants and therefore why in the world do we subject them to this intermediate level of examination. If it is to determine the criteria of economic eligibility, then are we going to consider the varying fees that are charged by the various schools in this country, and are we in fact going to have this board proliferate its examination so that it undertakes individual examinations to determine economic eligibility in each and every medical school in the Nation?

Madam Chairman, rarely have I seen a more perfect example of the impossibility of amending a bill, a bill that has been as carefully studied as this one has been studied, on the basis of assumed defects—not defects in evidence at all but merely on the basis of assumed defects, assumptions that have no sound basis.

Madam Chairman, the committee has with great care and deliberation brought this proposal to the House. The gentleman's amendment would not improve it but would only create confusion and make a hopeless situation for this board with its indefinite and undefined and undelineated responsibilities.

Madam Chairman, I strongly urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to the section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Extension of construction program for medical, dental, and other health profession schools

SEC. 3. (a) Effective with respect to appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966, section 720 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 720. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $480,000,000 for the three fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1969, of which not more than $160,000,000 may be available for grants before July 1, 1967, and not more than $320,000,000 may be available for grants before July 1, 1968, for—

"(1) grants to assist in the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, or professional public health personnel;

"(2) grants to assist in the construction of new teaching facilities for the training of dentists; and

"(3) grants to assist in the replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, professional public health personnel, or dentists.

Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 721 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Surgeon General may from time to time set dates (not earlier than in the fiscal year preceding the year for which a grant is sought) by which applications for grants under this part for any fiscal year must be filed."

(c) Section 721(c)(2)(D) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", and the requirements of this clause (D) shall be in addition to the requirements of section 771(b) of this Act, where applicable".

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section conclude in 5 minutes, and that the time be allotted to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Madam Chairman, before the Committee rises, I want to state my strong support for this measure and to commend the able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the excellent job he and his associates have done in bringing the legislation to the House and I hope shortly to the country.

I wanted to associate myself with the remarks made by the able gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT]. While the degree of need is not as great for assistance for schools of veterinary medicine and for students of veterinary medicine, there is a need similar in character to the need which impels this House, I hope shortly, to favorable consideration of this measure.

I sincerely hope that at the beginning of the next session this distinguished committee will give due consideration to this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Extension of, and improvements in, program for student loans

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (b)(4) of section 740 of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1969".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 741 of such Act is amended by striking out "may not exceed $2,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "may not exceed $2,500".

(c) Subsection (a) of section 742 of such Act is amended (1) by inserting "(other than section 744)" after "to carry out this part", and (2) by striking out that part of the first sentence that follows "June 30, 1966", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and $25,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years. There are further authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan under this part for any academic year ending before July 1, 1969, to continue or complete their education."

(d) Section 743 of such Act is amended by striking out "1969" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1972".

(e) Section 744 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, but not to exceed a total of $1,500,000. Loans made by the Surgeon General under this section shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Surgeon General to be appropriate in each case, but not exceeding fifteen years."

(f)(1) Subsection (a) of section 740 of such Act is amended by inserting "pharmacy, podiatry," immediately after "dentistry,".

(2) Subsection (b)(4) of section 740 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after "doctor of osteopathy," the following: "bachelor of science in pharmacy or doctor of pharmacy, doctor of podiatry or doctor of surgical chiropody,".

(3) Subsection (b) of section 741 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after "doctor of osteopathy," the following: "bachelor of science in pharmacy or doctor of pharmacy, doctor of podiatry or doctor of surgical chiropody,".

(4) Subsection (c) of such section 741 is amended by inserting "pharmacy, podiatry," immediately after "dentistry,".

(5) The amendments made by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection shall only be effective with respect to periods beginning on or after July 1, 1966.

Technical amendments

SEC. 5. (a) Clause (B) of section 721(b)(1) of such Act (relating to the accreditation of new schools of medicine, etc.) is amended by (1) striking out ", upon completion of such facility," and (2) inserting the following after "meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies": "(i) prior to the beginning of the academic year following the normal graduation date of the first entering class in such school or (ii) if later, upon completion of the project for which assistance is requested and other projects (if any) under construction or planned and to be commenced within a reasonable time."

(b) Section 843(f) of such Act (relating to accreditation of new schools of nursing), is amended (1) by striking out "any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "any program of nurse education, offered by a diploma school of nursing, means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education and, when applied to any collegiate or associate degree program of nurse education, means a program provided by an educational institution approved or accredited by either a regional accrediting agency or a State approval agency", and (2) by striking out "new school" and the remainder of such clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "new school (which shall include a school that has not had a sufficient period of operation to be eligible for accreditation), (A) upon completion of such project and other construction projects (if any) then under construction or planned and to be commenced within a reasonable time, or (B) if later, then prior to the beginning of the first academic year following the normal graduation date of the first entering class in such school;".

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading). Madam Chairman, in view of the fact that the section previously read is an extension of present law and is authorization for construction, and section 4 is an extension of the present law on student loans, and section 5 merely covers technical amendments which are necessary, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill may be dispensed with and that the remainder of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

Mr. CLEVELAND. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVELAND: On page 27, line 1, insert "(1)" immediately after "(B)", and after line 3, insert the following:

(2) Section 741 of such Act is further amended (A) by redesignating subsections "(f)", "(g)", and "(h)" thereof as subsections "(g)", "(h)", and "(i)", respectively, and (B) by adding immediately after subsection (e) thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Where any person who obtained one or more loans from a loan fund established under this part—

"(1) engages in the practice of medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy in an area in a State determined by the appropriate State health authority to have a shortage of and need for physicians or dentists; and

"(2) the appropriate State health authority certifies to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in such form and at such times as the Secretary may prescribe that such practice helps to meet the shortage of and need for physicians or dentists in the area where the practice occurs; then 10 per centum of the total of such loans, plus accrued interest on such amount, which are unpaid as of the date that such practice begins, shall be canceled thereafter for each year of such practice, up to a total of 50 per centum of such total, plus accrued interest thereon."

Mr. CLEVELAND (interrupting the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment may be dispensed with and that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Madam Chairman, the amendment can be explained simply, as follows: The amendment would permit doctors under certain circumstances, who go to rural areas where there is a shortage of doctors, to have up to half of their student loans excused.

This measure is no stranger to the committee. I understand it was in the bill which was reported in 1963.

This proposal has been passed by the Senate. Senator COTTON and other Senators have introduced such legislation, and it has passed the Senate.

I might go a step further. I hope the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, will agree to this amendment, because he thinks so highly of it and thought so highly of his former colleague and good friend, Senator COTTON, that he brought this very amendment in the form of a separate bill to the floor of the House last year. He did so at my request and at the request of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] who with me had introduced the bill in the House. To my great discomfort, and I am sure to his discomfort, and through a misunderstanding the bill was voted down last year.

Now that the distinguished chairman is leaving these hallowed halls for the judiciary, it seems to me only appropriate that as one of his final "judicial" acts here he should agree to this amendment, and this body, should adopt my amendment out of respect to the chairman. We should right the wrong which occurred last year when this bill got waylaid in jurisdictional disputes with our distinguished educators and was voted down.

We talk a great deal about the needs of rural America. Across a broad spectrum of the legislative panorama we are moving to help rural America. Here is a small way in which we can help rural America, by encouraging young doctors and dentists to start out their practice there and, hopefully, stay for the rest of their practice in rural America. This is a simple matter and easy to explain and will certainly put the stamp of congressional approval on the fact that we would like to encourage some of these doctors to go out and practice in rural America where the need is so obvious and so great. This matter has been approved by the committee on two separate occasions. It was approved once by the Senate, and the Senate bill, which passed the Senate, has now been referred to the committee. I am waiting for the distinguished chairman of the committee to stand up and say he is going to accept this amendment. I feel confident he is going to, so I will not waste any more of your time.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for his very generous and kind remarks. May I ask him if this is precisely the bill that the committee reported out during the last Congress and which was considered here on the floor of the House and which lost by a few votes?

Mr. CLEVELAND. This is exactly the same language.

Mr. HARRIS. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman. I know he is going to have a long and illustrious career on the bench, and I hope some day to have the pleasure of seeing him there.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say for the benefit of all my other colleagues that at one time last year I had this provision in the bill and withdrew it in order to get the bill through the House. May I say at least two gentlemen I know of on that side have introduced similar legislation at various times. Those of us who have lived in rural areas and where there is a shortage of doctors I know believe it would be a distinct help in getting doctors there. Therefore I do support the gentleman's amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, 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. 3141) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes pursuant to House Resolution 535, she 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.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The question was taken.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 340, nays 47, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

YEAS—340

Adair	Callan	Ellsworth
Adams	Cameron	Erlenborn
Addabbo	Carey	Evans, Colo.
Albert	Carter	Everett
Anderson, Tenn.	Casey	Fallon
	Celler	Farbstein
Andrews, Glenn	Chamberlain	Farnsley
	Chelf	Farnum
Andrews, N. Dak.	Clark	Fascell
	Clausen, Don H.	Fino
Annunzio		Fisher
Arends	Cleveland	Flood
Ashley	Clevenger	Flynt
Ashmore	Cohelan	Fogarty
Aspinall	Conable	Foley
Ayres	Conte	Fountain
Baldwin	Cooley	Fraser
Bandstra	Corbett	Frelinghuysen
Barrett	Cramer	Friedel
Battin	Culver	Fulton, Pa.
Beckworth	Cunningham	Fulton, Tenn.
Bell	Curtin	Fuqua
Bennett	Curtis	Gallagher
Berry	Daddario	Garmatz
Betts	Dague	Gathings
Bingham	Daniels	Gettys
Blatnik	Davis, Ga.	Giaimo
Boggs	Dawson	Gibbons
Boland	de la Garza	Gilbert
Bolling	Delaney	Gilligan
Bow	Dent	Gonzalez
Brademas	Denton	Grabowski
Bray	Dickinson	Gray
Brooks	Diggs	Green, Oreg.
Broomfield	Donohue	Green, Pa.
Brown, Calif.	Dorn	Greigg
Broyhill, N.C.	Dow	Grider
Broyhill, Va.	Dowdy	Griffin
Burke	Downing	Griffiths
Burleson	Dulski	Grover
Burton, Calif.	Duncan, Oreg.	Gubser
Burton, Utah	Dwyer	Gurney
Byrne, Pa.	Dyal	Hagan, Ga.
Cabell	Edmondson	Hagen, Calif.
Cahill	Edwards, Calif.	Haley

Halleck	Martin, Nebr.	Roush
Hamilton	Matsunaga	Roybal
Hanley	May	Rumsfeld
Hanna	Meeds	Ryan
Hansen, Iowa	Mills	Satterfield
Hansen, Wash.	Minish	St Germain
Hardy	Mink	St. Onge
Harris	Mize	Scheuer
Harsha	Moeller	Schmidhauser
Harvey, Ind.	Monagan	Schneebeli
Harvey, Mich.	Moore	Schweiker
Hathaway	Moorhead	Scott
Hawkins	Morgan	Secrest
Hechler	Morris	Selden
Helstoski	Morrison	Senner
Henderson	Morton	Shipley
Herlong	Moss	Shriver
Hicks	Multer	Sickles
Holifield	Murphy, Ill.	Sikes
Holland	Murphy, N.Y.	Sisk
Horton	Murray	Slack
Hosmer	Natcher	Smith, Iowa
Howard	Nedzi	Smith, N.Y.
Hull	Nelsen	Smith, Va.
Huot	Nix	Springer
Ichord	O'Brien	Stafford
Irwin	O'Hara, Ill.	Staggers
Jacobs	O'Hara, Mich.	Stalbaum
Jarman	O'Konski	Stanton
Jennings	Olsen, Mont.	Steed
Joelson	Olson, Minn.	Stephens
Johnson, Calif.	O'Neill, Mass.	Stratton
Johnson, Okla.	Ottinger	Stubblefield
Johnson, Pa.	Patman	Sullivan
Jonas	Patten	Sweeney
Jones, Ala.	Pelly	Talcott
Karsten	Pepper	Taylor
Karth	Perkins	Teague, Tex.
Kastenmeier	Philbin	Tenzer
Keith	Pickle	Thompson, Tex.
Kelly	Pike	Thomson, Wis.
Keogh	Pirnie	Todd
King, Calif.	Poage	Trimble
King, Utah	Pool	Tunney
Kirwan	Powell	Tuten
Kluczynski	Price	Udall
Krebs	Purcell	Van Deerlin
Kunkel	Quie	Vanik
Langen	Race	Vigorito
Latta	Randall	Vivian
Leggett	Redlin	Walker, N. Mex.
Lennon	Reid, N.Y.	Watkins
Long, Md.	Reifel	Watts
Love	Reinecke	Weltner
McCarthy	Reuss	Whalley
McCulloch	Rhodes, Ariz.	White, Idaho
McDade	Rhodes, Pa.	White, Tex.
McDowell	Rivers, Alaska	Whitener
McFall	Roberts	Whitten
McGrath	Robison	Widnall
McMillan	Rodino	Wilson,
McVicker	Rogers, Colo.	Charles H.
Macdonald	Rogers, Fla.	Wolff
MacGregor	Rogers, Tex.	Wright
Machen	Ronan	Wyatt
Mackay	Rooney, N.Y.	Wydler
Mackie	Rooney, Pa.	Yates
Madden	Rosenthal	Young
Mahon	Rostenkowski	Younger
Mailliard	Roudebush	Zablocki

NAYS—47

Abbitt	Findley	O'Neal, Ga.
Ashbrook	Ford, Gerald R.	Passman
Belcher	Goodell	Poff
Bolton	Gross	Quillen
Brock	Hall	Reid, Ill.
Buchanan	Hansen, Idaho	Skubitz
Byrnes, Wis.	Hutchinson	Smith, Calif.
Callaway	Jones, Mo.	Teague, Calif.
Cederberg	King, N.Y.	Tuck
Clancy	Laird	Utt
Colmer	Lipscomb	Waggonner
Davis, Wis.	McClory	Walker, Miss.
Derwinski	Marsh	Watson
Dole	Martin, Ala.	Williams
Duncan, Tenn.	Michel	Wilson, Bob
Edwards, Ala.	Minshall	

NOT VOTING—45

Abernethy	Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.
Anderson, Ill.	Feighan	Mathias
Andrews, George W.	Ford, William D.	Matthews
Baring	Halpern	Miller
Bates	Hays	Morse
Bonner	Hébert	Mosher
Clawson, Del	Hungate	Pucinski
Collier	Kee	Resnick
Conyers	Kornegay	Rivers, S.C.
Corman	Landrum	Roncalio
Craley	Lindsay	Roosevelt
Devine	Long, La.	Saylor
Dingell	McEwen	Schisler
Thompson, N.J.	Tupper	Thomas
Toll	Ullman	Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Miller with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Devine.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Pucinski wth Mr. Roosevelt.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Craley.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Willis with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Lindsay.

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

Messrs. HANSEN of Idaho, DOLE, and SKUBITZ changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with regret that I submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, effective this date.

It has been a privilege and an honor for me to work with the many fine members of this committee during the 89th Congress. My association and participation in the deliberations of this group will remain a pleasant and rewarding experience.

Sincerely yours,

DELBERT L. LATTA,
Representative to Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 3141.

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

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 561, Rept. No. 945), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 561

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2294) to amend section 2 of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 562, Rept. No. 946), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 562

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1903) to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–736). After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TO AMEND THE FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 563, Rept. No. 947), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 563

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6277) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the

bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. As the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 548 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 548

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3420) to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] and pending that yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 548 provides for consideration of H.R. 3420, a bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

H.R. 3420 would authorize a 3-year program of matching Federal grants to the States in a cooperative effort to disseminate the findings of science and technology throughout American business, commerce, and industry. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to speed industrial and economic growth of the States and the country through an improved application of technical and scientific knowledge. The achievement of an improved application of technical and scientific knowledge under this program and with the cooperation of universities, communities, and industries will to three objectives: First, strengthening the Nation's economy by upgrading industries through the utilization of advanced technology, thereby generally expanding the industrial base; second, increasing employment by facilitating industrial use of technology and the manufacturing of new products which result; and third, enhancing the competitive position of U.S. products in world markets.

The emphasis of the proposed legislation is on State participation in technical services programs, planned locally, and designed specifically to place findings of science and technology into the hands of local businesses and industries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 548.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the able gentleman from New York has explained, House Resolution 548 provides for the consideration of H.R. 3420 under an open rule with 2 hours of debate. The committee substitute is made in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the rule.

Mr. Speaker, none can quarrel with the stated purpose of H.R. 3420, to make available, essentially to small businesses, commerce, and industry, applied technical and scientific knowledge. The reported bill authorizes a 3-year program of matching Federal grants to the States in a cooperative effort to strengthen our economy, increase employment, and improve our competitive position in world markets.

To qualify for Federal matching funds a State must designate an agency responsible for the administration of its program. Such agency must then prepare a 5-year plan outlining how a technical services program could be used. The sum of $25,000 a year in Federal funds for the first 3 years on a nonmatching basis can be made available to any State to assist in the plan preparation. All qualified institutions of higher learning are to submit proposals for consideration of inclusion in the State plan, which is to outline a budget and assign responsibilities to schools participating. The Secretary of Commerce must approve submitted plans, based on reasonable criteria, and make funds available directly to the States. He has authority to fix maximum amounts based on population, industrial and economic development, and the technical resources and productive efficiency available within a State. He has informed the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the smaller States may receive up to $150,000 annually and the largest up to $2 million. None can receive more.

The program has a life of 3 years and authorizations for fiscal 1966 of $10 million, of $20 million for 1967, and of $30 million for 1968.

Additional views are signed by seven Members. They approve the purpose of the bill and generally support it but are worried by the lack of matching funds in the planning stages of the program. They fear this may tend to place the States in a secondary position during the planning period.

They also believe that before the program moves to the implementation stage a more careful assessment of State and regional needs must be made, and provisions made for active participation and cooperation with Federal programs now in existence; that is, Commerce Clearinghouse for Scientific and Technical Information and the Presidential Commission on Automation and Economic Progress among many, along with non-Federal efforts such as those of MIT and some 28 existing State university programs.

The program must be extended or die after 3 years, giving Congress a chance to assess its value and correct any difficulties. Moneys must be appropriated each year and a ceiling is fixed.

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

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3420) to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3420, with Mr. RODINO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy, with other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to bring this bill, H.R. 3420, to the attention of the House, and to urge favorable consideration of it.

In my judgment this is one of the most important bills that we have brought to the House for its consideration.

Our entire future, as well as our past, depends on the strength of the economy and the economic growth of our country. This bill has for its purpose the strengthening of our economy, and it will give us opportunities for greater economic growth in order that we can improve under our system of free enterprise.

This bill was brought to us from the Department of Commerce. It is sponsored by the administration; it is considered to be one of the facets of our program to make a well-rounded approach to the problems that we are daily encountering.

The subcommittee held rather extensive hearings. The subcommittee was chaired by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD]. The committee did an excellent job with the

hearings, and in working out the bill in order to make it the kind of a program we were told was desired. I think it would be fair to say that as the bill came to us it was rather loosely drawn, if I might use that term.

We had some difficulties in analyzing it to determine just what would be accomplished under it. But after a full explanation and development during the course of the hearings of the program to be implemented, the subcommittee then proceeded to work out a good, practical, and sound bill to accomplish the purposes desired.

I would like to compliment the subcommittee highly for the very fine work it has performed and for bringing to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and thus to the House what I consider to be a very fine bill.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD], chairman of the subcommittee who labored along with the other members of that committee and who did such a magnificent job in presenting here a program that I believe, after it is fully explained, will be overwhelmingly accepted by the House.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD] 15 minutes.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3420 which is now before the House for consideration is a broad and imaginative program which can be used to promote economic growth and increase employment throughout the United States. In addition to these two vital purposes, the bill has as its third major goal the improvement of the competitive position of U.S. products throughout the world.

As originally introduced, the bill called for the establishment of technical service programs whereby each State would have been able to organize programs primarily through land-grant institutions and receive matching funds from the Federal Government without any fixed limitation as to the time such programs could run, and without any identified sum as a maximum authorization on the part of the Congress. The Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance and later the full House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in public and executive sessions, took a very close and careful look at these and the other provisions of the bill as originally sponsored by the Department of Commerce and the administration. I believe, and my belief is supported by the report and the hearings on this bill, that the substitute amendment which I wholeheartedly endorse here today, is a much more desirable bill than the one which was originally introduced.

The committee amendment should go a long way to meet the commendable purposes of the original bill, but it does not suffer from the failure to include limitations and reasonable controls which was a considerable problem when we first had the bill under committee consideration.

Before outlining for you the manner in which we amended and tightened the original bill, let me first describe in some detail just how the State technical services programs will operate.

A State which is to participate in the program will, through its Governor, designate an agency to administer the program. This agency may be a component of the State government or a State university, a land-grant college or any other appropriate agency. This designated agency will prepare a plan which will describe the technical and economic situation in the particular State. It will also describe the State's business and industrial problems and the means proposed to assist in the solution of such problems. The designated agency will prepare an annual technical services program which will cover the objectives for the first year. It will set up a budget and the responsibilities which are to be assigned to each qualified institution which is to participate in the program. The qualified institutions in turn are defined as those of higher learning with a program leading to a degree in science, engineering, or business administration. These schools must be accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association which will be listed by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

A second form of qualified institution is a State agency or a nonprofit institution which meets criteria of competence established by the Secretary of Commerce.

Each State will have but one designated agency. However, as you can see from the description which I have just given as to qualified institutions, each State may have many such institutions.

Every qualified institution within a State must be invited to submit a proposal for that State's technical services program. This does not mean, of course, that every qualified institution will be a participant but it does mean that each such institution can have a voice in the creation and execution of the State programs.

When the Governor of a State which has a program submits the annual program and the State's overall plan to the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary will be required to review the plan, and where it is found to comply with the regulations and criteria set by the Secretary and to otherwise accomplish the purposes of the act, the plan will be approved.

Once in operation, there is a wide variety of technical services which might be offered by the various institutions participating in the program within a particular State. For example, a program oriented to the needs and problems of a specific industry dominant in one State might offer workshops, seminars, and demonstrations in order to bring existing technology to local business and industry interests for use in plants within the State. A technology dissemination and referral center could offer two types of services: First, technical reports, abstracts, bibliographies, reviews, microfilm, computer tapes and the like; and second, referral to sources of scientific and engineering expertise in the fields of interest to the local industry. These examples by no means exhaust the list of possible technical services that might be offered in any State program. The range of services can be as wide as the range of industrial and technological interests in this country.

There is also a provision for programs which may be administered, coordinated, and executed by two or more States. Similar procedures for approval of these interstate or multistate programs are provided for.

Contrary to the request and arguments of the Department of Commerce we have cut the Federal authorization back from a 5-year program to a 3-year program. Section 10 now provides for $10 million for the first fiscal year, $20 million for the second fiscal year, and $30 million for the third fiscal year. The Department had sought a fourth and fifth year, each at a $40-million level.

The Secretary of Commerce will be authorized to make an annual payment to each designated agency, participating institution, or person authorized to receive payments in support of each approved technical services program. Maximum amounts will be fixed, and population, business, commercial, industrial, and economic development, and productive efficiency, as well as the individual State's technical resources will be used as criteria in the formulation of regulations.

We have been advised by the Department and it is part of the report—page 23—that the least populous State may receive an annual amount up to $150,000, and that the most populous State will not receive an annual amount exceeding $2 million. From the total amounts available, there is a provision, section 10, which would allow the Secretary to reserve up to 20 percent each year, and to make payments from this 20-percent reserve to any designated agency or participating institution for technical services programs which the Secretary determines have special merit, or he may within the limits of this reserve, make payments to any qualified institution for additional program which the Secretary determines are necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

The direct expenses of administering the act are limited to not more than 5 percent of the appropriated amount for each year.

In order to assist in the creation of technical services programs, the Secretary may pay an amount up to $25,000 for each of the first 3 fiscal years to each designated State agency. These are the only funds which are to be authorized on a nonmatching fund basis. Apart from this "start up" or "seed" money, all Federal funds will have to be matched at least dollar for dollar by State or other non-Federal funds.

The committee in section 5(e) and section 10(2) included language which would prohibit competition with private enterprise and duplication of similar activities or programs which are readily available in particular States.

And we deleted section 11(e) of the bill as introduced. This provision would have made available to the Secretary of Commerce as additions to the 20-percent reserve for special programs all

amounts appropriated for payments to the States which were not obligated at the end of the fiscal year for which appropriated. These additions to the reserve would have been available until expended. By deletion of this provision, any amounts appropriated for payment to the States but not obligated will revert to the Treasury.

In section 14 and section 15 we have added requirements which call for annual reports and which provide for a complete evaluation after a 3-year period.

With these significant changes that I have discussed, it is my opinion that this Federal-State program should be undertaken. Through these means, business and industries will have a new and important pipeline of commercial information. This can serve as a vital stimulus particularly to the smaller and less sophisticated businesses and industries.

We have provided the necessary protections to see that the program does not get out of hand and we have called for a complete review after a 3-year experimental period. Under these circumstances, I strenuously urge the passage of H.R. 3420.

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

Mr. MACDONALD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Would this apply to an existing organization as well as to one which would be formed after this legislation goes into effect?

Mr. MACDONALD. In the case of Connecticut, if the State of Connecticut were to do this, any college or institution in the State which gives a degree of bachelor of science, a degree in business administration, or a degree in engineering, would qualify.

Mr. MONAGAN. Even though it is in existence at the present time?

Mr. MACDONALD. We are looking forward to the fact that they will use existing facilities.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MACDONALD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Could the gentleman inform me what information these centers would disseminate?

Mr. MACDONALD. The information to be disseminated would be the information that is sought in the plan adopted by the agency in the various States. The States themselves, not the Federal Government or the Department of Commerce, will determine in which areas they feel the money which will be spent and the information which will be gathered should be concentrated. In the gentleman's home State, they might seek a plan for one industry.

In my home State and in my home region perhaps they would go into the modern methods of fisheries, and so forth. Therefore, when somebody in the fishing business wanted to know some of the problems that have been tackled and overcome by the fishermen in Oregon or the fishermen in Florida, then this information would be made available to them and they would save themselves money by being able to take advantage of the technological improvements that have been worked out in other regions or other States.

Mr. WYDLER. If the gentleman will explain, where would the school or the agency get the information that they were going to disseminate?

Mr. MACDONALD. I tried to explain to the gentleman, and if he will follow this, I will state it again.

Let us say in the State of Massachusetts the Governor decided that the agency he wanted to perform this function of gathering information would be the University of Massachusetts rather than MIT.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. MACDONALD. The reason why I asked for this additional time is I think it goes directly to the heart of the problem that at first baffled some of the people on our subcommittee.

The Governor designates the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as his agency to formulate a plan which would be sent to the Secretary of Commerce. In the doing the people from MIT would get together with the people from other colleges and universities or technological people and decide what is the greatest interest economically for Massachusetts. They may decide to investigate and correlate the information on all of the methods that have gone into being not necessarily in Massachusetts but any place in the country as to new methods of fishing. Now, it is up to the Governor and his agency to determine what information they are going to correlate.

Mr. WYDLER. I follow the gentleman on that, but what I do not follow is this: When they have decided that they want to get information on fishing so that they can disseminate it to someone who wants that information, where do they get that information on fishing from?

Mr. MACDONALD. After they submit their plan to the Secretary of Commerce there is a clearinghouse, or there will be a clearinghouse, here in Washington, D.C., in the Department of Commerce, which will serve as a clearinghouse for information coming in on all of these subjects. This would be done, I imagine, in a computer-type fashion. The information about fisheries would come in and, would be filed under that subject, under the letter "F" in the alphabet, and when called upon they will furnish this information to the State agency.

Mr. WYDLER. If the gentleman will try to follow me, that is exactly what I thought you were describing. It appears to me all we are doing with this bill is setting up another place to keep the same information that is already available to people who want information on fisheries or any other matter. What does this bill do that is not done already?

Mr. MACDONALD. If the gentleman will permit me to answer him, I can just point out to the gentleman that he could not be more wrong. There is a section in the bill—and I do not have it here before me, I think section e–2—which specifically prohibits this duplication of information or effort.

Mr. WYDLER. But you just described the fact that when you have one of these agencies operating they will write to Washington and say, "Send us the information you now have so we can send it to somebody else." That is just exactly the situation you described.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is correct, because it is done not on a State basis but on a regional basis. If the gentleman will try to understand, I am sure he can. The problems which beset the fishing industry in Massachusetts are also common to the fishing industry in Florida or on the west coast. If the plan that is submitted by the Massachusetts people is accepted and it is acceptable that they shall go into the problems of fishing in Massachusetts, then they go to the fishing industry in Massachusetts. When they have collated the information they have gathered from Massachusetts, as a byproduct they send the information to Washington where it is made available to anybody who has a similar problem. It does not seem to me to be a very difficult thing to understand.

Mr. WYDLER. It is not difficult to understand. It is difficult to understand the reason for it.

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

Mr. Chairman, no one could object to the lofty aims of the State technical services bill. I agree with and support the stated purpose, which is "to promote economic growth and support State and regional technical service centers which will make available a wide variety of scientific and technical knowledge to American business, enterprise, commerce, and industry."

All of us realize the serious need for a solution to the problems of disseminating information from the wealth of scientific and technical knowledge available. We can sympathize with the problems of technical people and management in keeping abreast of day-to-day advances in science and technology. Although this bill will neither solve all of the problems nor meet all of the needs of the States most lacking in ability to put such scientific knowledge to the best use, it will be an important step in the right direction.

Although I originally objected to the vagueness of the bill, I think the wording now tightens it up considerably. For example, the first draft failed to provide for an annual review. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce inserted a provision for an annual review, and I am satisfied that the program will be monitored satisfactorily.

I can appreciate the dilemma the Department of Commerce faces in proposing a Federal-State program. It is the same dilemma the Congress faces in trying to assure that control remains in State and local hands when up to half the funds are Federal in origin. For

example, I would favor more detailed assessment of the definite needs of the individual States and/or regions for the technical services authorized in this legislation. Yet the determination of the problems a State or region faces must be left in the hands of a designated agency, selected by the Governor to develop plans and programs for the State. In our annual reviews, the Congress must weigh the needs and judge whether the programs are directed toward substantive problems.

One of the possibilities which I shall be on the lookout for is unnecessary duplication of existing private and/or institutional programs already successfully furnishing technical services to business and industry. Many universities make technical information available for a fee, as in the Associates Plan of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Nonprofit organizations, such as Stanford Research Institute and Midwest Research Institute, offer the results of their research and development programs in various seminars, publications, and reports. We have a right to be concerned that we not simply duplicate some or all of this activity.

Having pointed out those cautions, let me conclude by stating that my original cautions have been heeded, and I favor the bill. Properly administered, the State technical services program can contribute greatly to the increased efficiency of the industrial sector of our economy. Proper administration will be in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce. It will require careful attention by him to the spirit as well as the mechanics embodied in the State plans approved by him. I would encourage the Secretary to extend every effort toward consolidation of Government activities in the field of technical services. The Congress will give a searching look at the first report to Congress required under section 14 of the bill.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I think perhaps it should be said in that respect that the Farm Extension Service, as the gentleman has pointed out, is a joint Federal-State office, so to speak. It has technical information available to it which it disseminates to the farmers for their use. This program, to state it succinctly and briefly, would provide a State agency, or someone designated by the Governor—I will put it that way so that it can be understood more easily—which coordinates the information within the States. It obtains the technical and scientific information from the more advanced and more successful businesses, as well as from research and other places, and assembles it in order that it may be distributed to the smaller businesses who do not have the benefit of it.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say in reply to my distinguished chairman, it is my understanding that in this very highly competitive age, when engineers come out of college, say at the end of a 10-year period, an engineer should go back to college for 2 years to refresh his knowledge of his particular field.

Now, a portion of what is in this bill is an attempt to keep that engineer in that industry, whatever it is, up to date on what is happening in his particular field or in the particular kind of a concern with which he is connected. If he keeps in touch with this and keeps up to date he should not have to go back to the university to find out what advancements have been taking place, but should be able to do this on a rather current basis through the provisions of this bill.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. We are talking about small businesses.

A spirit of competition exists among small businesses. If you are going to send a college professor or a college engineer or somebody from a State agency around from business to business, how much real information do you suppose he is going to be able to garner from the businessman who really is not particularly interested in divulging his techniques and his ways of doing things to his competitors?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not believe we anticipate that we are going to ask anybody for any information, say, in your State, but we are going to compile a tremendous amount of scientific information which is available every place but it has not been brought together at a place where industry can consult with someone else about what is available. He might not even know where it is. That is more or less the purpose of this bill. If it were in your State of Michigan your people in small industry would have a place or someone to whom they could go to find out the situation with reference to, for instance, industry problems and where he can improve his situation competitively by using the latest techniques.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, these procedures and techniques that would be divulged to him would be the procedures and techniques which have been worked out in the professional community rather than in the business community.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think you cannot forever keep those techniques a secret, except perhaps in the drug industry, you might, but not in the industrial field. This information would be open to the public. Under this program all of this information would be open to the public. The purpose of the State agency is to get these things or this information to the points where they would be needed in that State or accumulate them, we will say, at either the University of Michigan as in your State; whereas, in some other State such as Massachusetts, they might have an entirely different problem. But they would accumulate in Michigan a catalog of all the things that would affect industry in Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. We have trade associations such as the hardware people have an association, by way of illustration, and they have conventions. It has been my understanding that in those get-togethers, people interested in that business are able to pick up other information from people similarly engaged.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would say that is true, but this goes much deeper than that. For instance, there would be gathered together all of the information for the last 10 years in the hardware business and it would be put together at a place where one engaged in that business could go and find it under a catalog, and you would have the advice of the person at that location who could get this information out and who would have it in his hand and who could explain it.

I do not anticipate that this will be of much service to large firms. Large firms such as General Motors or United States Steel or the Caterpillar Company or Allis-Chalmers, I do not believe this would fit that kind of business, but it would fit the smaller businesses and I think it could be of considerable service to them.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his explanation, but there are still doubts in my mind.

Mr. SPRINGER. This is not an easy bill to explain. It took us many hours and several days of executive meetings and discussions of it to come to a clear understanding of whether or not we felt the bill would have enough in it that it should be brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, it is true, as my colleague from Massachusetts and my chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, have said, that we have worked long and hard on this bill in an effort to bring to the floor of the House a measure that will truly contribute to the dynamic growth of our country, and particularly, to the share in that growth, of small business, industries, and commerce in our several States.

There have been one or two questions raised which I hope to be able to shed some light on. In the first place, it has been said that this is a 3-year program. Actually, it is a 5-year program, but we take a look at it after 3 years. The programs that are to be developed within the States are to be 5 years in length, and must meet with approval in order to obtain the matching funds of the Secretary of Commerce. The eventual scope of the program is $40 million a year. So we are not talking about $60 million—we are talking about an annual expenditure of at least $40 million, and if we live up to our history in this respect the program will probably be expanded in years to come.

The gentleman from Connecticut asked a question of my chairman as to the ability of the State of Connecticut to participate in this program. I believe that the State of Connecticut has such a program underway, which is probably under the Department of Commerce; is that correct?

Mr. MONAGAN. There is a program that is underway. I am not sure which State department has jurisdiction.

Mr. KEITH. The Department of Commerce could be designated the agency for the formulation of the program, but the qualified institutions

which participate in the program itself will largely be in the educational field.

They could be directed by an agency of the State government, and it could either be a land-grant college or some other educational institution that has been approved for that purpose, or any other State agency as described on page 17 of the bill, which says:

SELECTION OF DESIGNATED AGENCY

SEC. 3. The Governor of any State which wishes to receive Federal payments under this Act in support of its existing or planned technical services program shall designate, under appropriate State laws and regulations, an institution or agency to administer and coordinate that program and to prepare and submit a plan and programs to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under this Act.

The Governor then selects an institution to coordinate the program and to prepare and submit a plan to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under this act. I believe the Department of Commerce could qualify as the designated agency in that respect.

As was indicated earlier, the maximum amount a State could receive in this program would be $25,000. That is $25,000 a year for each year, or $75,000 for 3 years, that a State could get grants without any matching requirements on the part of the State for planning purposes. It is my intention to offer an amendment to make these matching fund requirements a part of the planning phase as well as the operational phase.

The gentleman from New York asked a question concerning duplication. I believe he had in mind duplication on the selection and dissemination of scientific material. The response was made from the floor that the fishing industry was a good illustration of the kind of services that could be rendered by the proposed regional technical service center. I posed this question of Mr. Hollomon, and he responded with the fishing industry.

So I called on the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries which certainly is more qualified to estimate and understand the problems of the fishing industry and about the nature of their services and I found literally there were dozens of services that they rendered to those who are interested in the fishing industry in addition to those concerned with the actual catching of the fish.

I list here for the RECORD some of those services which are already available to the several States through the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:

TECHNICAL SERVICES TO INDUSTRY PROVIDED BY THE BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

1. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries publishes daily—in seven different cities—a fisheries market news report with a free distribution of 10,000. It is sent to fishermen, fish processors, and banks. Its information includes landings for the day, prices, and other news of marketing interest.

2. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries provides $700,000 per year for a marketing service wherein it recruits the assistance of press, TV, and radio media for public service time for the purpose of advertising the feasibility of fish usages.

3. The Bureau also has a home economist service which provides advice and technical assistance to schools, hospitals and other institutions regarding fish diet and preparation of fish foods.

4. The Bureau provides a large technological program for the inspection of fishery products and methods for assisting the fish industry to improve fish processing.

5. The Bureau develops Government standards for fish products.

6. The Bureau is currently developing a large program for the processing and possible consumption of FPC.

7. A similar program is being run for the purpose of determining new uses of fish meal and fish oils.

8. The Bureau publishes a monthly magazine called the Commercial Fisheries Review which has a free circulation of approximately 6,000. Averaging 125 pages in length, the magazine includes information concerning fishing, fisheries research, fish locating techniques, fish catching techniques, new fishing gear being developed, fish storage techniques, fish processing techniques, fish marketing techniques, and home and commercial preparation of fish food products. It also has a large section on developments in various foreign fisheries programs.

9. The Bureau also has a large program devoted to new fish locating equipment and the development of new equipment, nets, etc., for the catching of fish.

10. The Bureau has various financial assistance programs which entail: (a) loans to vessel owners; (b) mortgage insurance programs; (c) fishery vessel construction subsidies.

My point is that in my view the State of Massachusetts would be wasting its money if it, in conjunction with another State or on its own, attempted to duplicate services offered to us by the very competent, hard-working, and the very informed Bureau of Commercial Fisheries which has offices in the major fishing ports of our country.

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

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is it not true, and I am sure the gentleman would not want to say otherwise by inference, that if the State of Massachusetts is being serviced in the field of fisheries, obviously it would not come into the plan that would be submitted by the agency through the Governor to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. KEITH. I would think it would be true. It is a matter of law. Although where we state that there shall be no duplication, we neglect to mention as I read the act and it extends to all governmental services. It possibly could be that governmental services are available and that there might be a duplication.

On pages 18 and 19, section 5, it says:

The Secretary shall not accept an annual technical services program for review and approval under this act unless the designated agency has, as certified thereto by the Governor or his designee—

(e) determined that such technical services program does not provide a service which on the date of such certification is economically and readily available in such State from private technical services, professional consultants, or private institutions.

It is conceivable a State could have a duplication of services that would be available under Government auspices.

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

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD. Since the gentleman has raised this subject, I call your attention to page 23, section (e)(2):

No funds appropriated pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be paid to any designated agency, participating institution, or person on account of any such agency or institution, to carry out any technical services activity or program in any State if such activity or program duplicates any activity or program readily available in such State from Federal or State agencies, including publicly supported institutions of higher learning in such State.

Mr. KEITH. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for pointing that out. It does clarify the problem.

I would state that the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hollomon, used the fishing industry, as did the gentleman, as an example of a service which could be provided under this act.

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

Mr. KEITH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. The gentleman has fairly well disposed of the illustration given as to the need for this agency in the fishing industry. I come back to my original question. Where will this agency or this institution get the information it is going to make available to small business? Where will the information come from?

Mr. KEITH. As I visualize the operation of the agency, the duties of collection and dissemination of information which would be made available to business and commerce in a particular State would be the responsibility of the participating institutions which, for the most part, will be educational institutions.

For example, if there were to be some collection of information for small textile plants, they might very well use the Lowell Textile Institute or the Southeastern Massachusetts Institute of Technology, both of which are located close by small textile firms. These institutions would have a role to play in the collection of information and, in turn, the distribution of it.

Mr. WYDLER. The gentleman still has not answered my question.

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

Mr. KEITH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Let me see if I can help the gentleman. I hope I shall be able to.

The reason this was designed for an agency was that under the laws of the various States the Governor, in many instances, is the person on whom the responsibility falls. It turned out, however, that in some States, under the State laws, there were other groups or organizations, boards and so forth, which have such responsibility. For that reason, we made this a responsibility to a designated agency within the State. That agency within the State would be designated for a particular purpose. The purpose would be to try to coordinate with the educational institutions of the State, with the business community and with research people and others involved, for the purpose of obtaining this information and

making it available to those in the business community who could not otherwise obtain it.

In a particular State, a designated agency might be MIT, as mentioned, or some other educational institution which would have responsibility for the program. That institution could then go to other institutions in the State. All of these institutions have their business schools and are now in the business of accumulating information in cooperation with business, research analysts, and so forth.

It is contemplated that with the funds here to be allocated on a matching basis to the States, these institutions about which we are talking—whether it be one or a dozen, if they work cooperatively together in the program—would, in working together, assimilate all the information and bring it to one central location within the State to be so designated. In that region, the information would be made available to all in business who might be interested in any particular problem.

That is, very briefly, a description of how this is expected to work.

Mr. KEITH. In my view, there is one most important flaw which I should like to discuss for 5 more minutes, if I may.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to consider for a moment a serious and costly flaw in an important piece of legislation, a flaw which could undermine the effectiveness of the proposal from its outset, a flaw which is unfair to the taxpayer, disparaging of our State governments, and which could perpetuate the unhealthy big brother trend in Federal assistance legislation. I am referring to H.R. 3420, the State Technical Services Act of 1965.

This act, as you have heard, proposes a 3-year program to disseminate, via the offices of the Secretary of Commerce and through regional technical service centers, "the findings of science and technology throughout the American business, commerce, and industrial community." The price tag on this ambitious program will ultimately reach $40 million or more a year.

In many respects, Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent bill. Many of us have labored long and hard in committee to insure its workability. But there is a basic and potentially destructive flaw. During the all-important planning stages of this program, the period which will be most decisive as to the program's success or failure, the Federal Government will, in many cases, assume too much responsibility in the financing of the program. It is even possible that where the planning for the program is modest the Federal Government will have assumed the entire cost.

Experience should have taught us that, with few exceptions, this is not a good practice. In my opinion, it is not good government, and it certainly is not good business.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those who believe the Governors and State legislatures need Uncle Sam to guide them at every turn of government. I know that governors and legislators, like Congressmen, are human beings. If they contribute to a plan by helping to pay for it, they are going to take an interest and work to get the most out of that investment. In a word, contribution means interest. Lack of contribution or responsibility can just as surely lead to a lack of interest. A beneficial return on the tax dollar, success or failure of the program, can certainly hinge on such factors.

Every stockholder in a business knows he has a bread-and-butter motive for concerning himself with that business. Besides, for some reason, people do not seem to appreciate, fully at least, what they get handed them for nothing. On the other hand, they retain a high degree of working interest in a project in which they have a fundamental investment.

I saw a perfect example of this paradox in the town of Marshfield in my district just last week. The occasion was the dedication of a new school, being named for one of the teachers who, after many years of devoted service, was retiring.

When he rose to acknowledge this honor, his remarks touched on the fact that the construction of the school was the result of hard work and sacrifice on the part of the citizens of the town. Their faith in the future and in their youngsters had been the propellant for their mortgaging themselves to an extensive amount for more than a decade to come. This was something that the town wanted and had planned for, and therefore the town gave of itself willingly.

Can any of us say their interest and devotion would have been as complete and extensive had they had no part in the planning stages of this project? I doubt it.

Such, Mr. Chairman, is the unfortunate prospect that looms for this proposal should the State legislatures not be involved in any way with the planning phases of the State technical services program. Will they be as anxious to appropriate the money that will be required to implement the plans, which may have been financed entirely by Federal grants, if they have not been consulted beforehand?

It has been argued that a Governor with an unfriendly legislature might be hamstrung by their unwillingness to cooperate with him even in the planning stage. I ask, then, would such a legislature be any more willing to appropriate the necessary money called for in the operational phase? Would they be any more willing to appropriate the money if those plans were drawn up, say, by a pet agency of the Governor's? Again, this hardly seems likely.

Mr. Chairman, I have faith in the legislatures of the 50 States of our great country. They are concerned with the needs of their citizens. They will put forth every necessary effort to obtain assistance, if it is worthwhile, in both the planning and the operational phases of this proposed program.

Now, it has been suggested that these outright grants are particularly necessary in some of the poorer States. And it has further been said that, therefore, the $25,000 as an outright grant for planning purposes is vital because some of these States cannot even afford to match half that amount. If a State cannot afford $12,500, how can it possibly afford the many thousands that will be required in the operational phases of the program? If a State is not willing or cannot afford to match funds in the planning stage, where is the money to come from for the program itself? Is the Federal Government merely going to pay out $75,000 for plans that will never be implemented? Is it not unfair to the taxpayers of the country as a whole to invest money that will bring no return, even to the citizens of one State?

Three or four years ago we had before us a bill providing for Federal assistance to educational TV. This bill provided a $10,000 grant to every State regardless of their need or regardless of their interest in the program.

Every State was authorized under the original proposal to collect $10,000 from the Federal Government for planning purposes. We in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce amended that proposal and required that the grant to the State must be on a matching basis. We felt that a lot of the States would not undertake educational TV programs, and if they were going to undertake such an expensive program, they should be able to come forward with matching funds in the grant phase of the operation.

What happened? The House accepted the recommendation of the committee on participation in the planning stage. It went over to the Senate and, believe it or not, the Senate knocked out the grants for the planning phases entirely. So I think we really have a lesson to be learned from that particular incident and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should have the planning phase on a matching-grant basis.

Mr. Chairman, there are 28 States that have gone ahead on their own, and are in various stages of this kind of activity at the moment. Most of their planning has already been accomplished. All of it has been done at State expense. With the amendment which I shall offer later on, we can still say to those who have further planning to do, "We will help you underwrite your planning." To those who have not yet been able to begin, we can say, "With our help, you can now afford to plan." While to those who have concluded their plans we can say, "There will be more money available for sharing the operational costs—you can, in effect, go further than you hoped."

Inasmuch as the Federal Government is going to make, under this legislation, very substantial commitments which eventually will amount to $40 million per year and perhaps much more, we have an obligation to make certain that only those programs which are essential are undertaken. And the best way to make sure that they are essential is to require the maximum amount of State participation and interest.

All of us recognize that there is always a "broker's fee" for doing business through the Federal Government. We

know that the income tax has preempted the tax resources of all of our States. The existence of a matching fund requirement in the planning phase of this legislation will, in my view, serve as a further check on the drain of tax dollars for plans that may never be implemented.

Mr. Chairman, Federal grants-in-aid have been one of the most beneficial factors in preserving the balance in the federal system. When these grants require State participation, particularly in the planning phases, they can help to meet essential social and economic needs. And, by their emphasis on State participation, they can, while achieving worthwhile purposes, help to avert and retard the growth of arbitrary central authority.

In our additional views published in the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on this bill, several of my colleagues, and I, stated:

> One of the act's more serious drawbacks is the lack of provision for matching funds in the planning stages outlined in the bill. It is our feeling that such a provision would enable the State governments to become involved in the program from the beginning and to make more certain that the money would be wisely spent.

My amendment offers this practical incentive. It will give each State the opportunity for self-improvement through a system of matching grants.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, my amendment requiring matching funds in the planning stages of this proposal before us will, in the final analysis, result in better technical service centers for the business, commerce, and industry of the several States.

We will get more thoughtful planning, a better understanding of the program on the part of the State governments and more knowledge of the purposes and functions of the technical service centers by those who hopefully will ultimately benefit from their services.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for yielding this time to me.

Within a week's time there are new opportunities for union and management to arrive at a meeting of the minds. They must resolve their differences and reach a just and equitable settlement.

There is much at stake as negotiations continue. It is clear that a strike of the great steel industry would be inexcusable—and unforgivable—in this period of great crisis.

And this is why it is appropriate to go back to 1959 and 1956 for a moment, the years of the last steel strikes. Let no one forget the lessons of these steel strikes and the damage they caused to our economy and to our national growth. They serve as a constant reminder.

First. The idleness of workers on strike is a costly waste which neither they nor their country can afford. The 116-day steel strike in 1959 directly cost 42 million man-days of work. This was the equivalent of a 5-percent increase in the Nation's unemployment for a year and represented nearly 1 day off for every male worker in the country. Even the 36-day strike of 1956 cost this Nation directly 12 million man-days of work. And it is important to keep in mind that in the entire post-Korean period no labor dispute has come close to these steel strikes in causing idleness.

Second. A steel strike can put as big a dent in our economy in a couple of months as recession does in 8 or 9 months. During the steel strike in 1959, industrial production fell 6.5 percent from June to October, while during the recession from May 1960 to February 1961, the decline was 5.7 percent. Because of the steel strike, personal disposable income showed no rise whatsoever in the third quarter of 1959.

Third: In 1959 the effects of the steel strike spread to many industries and communities resulting in sharp production cutbacks. For example, there was a 12-percent reduction in fabricated metals production; a 45-percent reduction in motor vehicles and parts; and a $5 billion drop in the rate of overall real gross national product, the first and only nonrecession decline since 1956 steel strike. In particular localities, the effects of the 1959 steel strike were especially severe. Manufacturing payrolls fell by an estimated 73 percent in Johnstown, Pa.; 62 percent in Youngstown, Ohio; and 35 percent in Pittsburgh.

Fourth. The 1959 steel strike nipped in the bud a possible surge in business investment. Actual plant and equipment outlays in the third quarter of 1959 fell 3 percent below the plans previously reported when businessmen found they could not get deliveries of steel equipment.

In December 1959, the Commerce Department reported:

> Supply shortages and uncertainties over near-term deliveries of capital goods have become major limiting factors affecting current movements in plant and equipment programs of business. The OBE–SEC survey of 3 months ago had pointed to some acceleration in the recovery in plant and equipment outlays; the latest survey indicates that seasonally adjusted these are expected to rise only slightly over this quarter and the next.

Finally, the rebound following the steel strike in 1959 built the economy up for a let down. When inventories were being restored in 1960, everything looked rosy—so rosy that nobody could see the recession coming. In fact, this misreading of the fundamental economic situation is the basis for the case that the strike was one of the major causes of the 1960–61 recession.

These are strong lessons and they are hard lessons. But we must profit by them. This Nation must not be condemned to repeat the experience of 1959 and 1956. In a real sense there are three parties represented at the conference table—the union, management, and the American people.

I am confident that the wise and distinguished leaders of the steel industry and the steelworkers union through their concerted efforts to reach a satisfactory agreement will not let the American people down.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCVICKER].

Mr. MCVICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3420, the State Technical Service Act of 1965.

The infusion into our industrial potential of American know-how and advanced science is best undertaken by local institutions specifically oriented to local industrial and economic problems.

This bill has the enthusiastic support of the business community of my area. I have had a number of meetings with businessmen and university leaders in my district discussing my own bill, H.R. 7335, which corresponds to the bill before the House.

From these meetings, I can report to the Congress that the overwhelming support for this measure, the awareness of its need, and the anticipation of its application gives tangible evidence of the leadership shown by the great State of Colorado in forging new paths of economic greatness for our country.

This bill would permit the Federal Government to join with State governments, universities, and local industry in stimulating the industrial and economic growth of States and regions in the Nation through the application of science and technology.

The bill is addressed to the economic problems about which we read every day—long-term unemployment, regional pockets of poverty, industries which are losing their competitive positions, and increasing foreign competition in both domestic and world markets. These problems point to the increasing need for developing mechanisms to bring the latest developments in technology into the production lines and plants of our local industry.

Just as the problems are local, so should be their solution. This bill would establish mechanisms concentrated on the local level, utilizing local leadership, local initiative, local resources, and local participation. Federal funds, on a matching basis, would be used to encourage the establishment or expansion of local institutions specifically designed to meet the needs of the local economy.

A State wishing to participate in the program would designate an institution, either a State university or agency, to administer and coordinate the State's technical services program. This institution would prepare a 5-year plan, outlining the technological and economic situation in the State, the major regional and industrial problems, and the means to be used in assisting in their solution. The institution would also prepare an annual technical services program, including the objectives for the first year, the budget, and the responsibilities assigned to each qualified institution participating in the program.

The 5-year plan and the annual program would be submitted to the Secre-

tary of Commerce. Federal matching funds would be made available to the designated institution to support eligible programs. The Secretary of Commerce would establish a formula designating the maximum annual Federal payment, taking the following criteria into consideration: First, population; second, level of industrial and economic development and productive efficiency; and third, technical resources.

His formula will be weighted to provide funds to States and regions where industrial development has lagged behind its potential and where technical resources are weak. The population criteria will be applied in a manner which will permit even the smallest and least populous States to participate in a meaningful and profitable program.

There are a variety of effective programs of university-industry cooperation in operation in 28 States at the present time. One especially notable program is conducted under the auspices of the Denver Research Institute, an integral part of the University of Denver which engages in sponsored research for government and industry. This institute offers ample evidence of the potential effectiveness of programs that the subcommittee is now considering. To stimulate the process of technology transfer, the DRI has developed a highly motivated staff of engineer-economists, engaged in effectively interpreting the significance of scientific and technological advancements to the commercial entrepreneur. These economists are studying new techniques for coupling technological innovations with potential users in industry, thereby providing the bridge between the generation of advanced technology and its use in technologically oriented as well as underdeveloped industries. In addition, these men are carrying out fundamental research on the processes by which technology is diffused and applied, seeking new ways to accelerate the transfer of knowledge into use.

The Denver Research Institute consists of seven operating divisions: Chemistry, electronics, electromagnetic propagation, industrial economics, mechanics, metallurgy, and physics. Research interests in these divisions cover a complete spectrum from basic investigations to directed developmental efforts. A number of large research programs are also conducted by the institute outside the divisional structure.

But such programs, effective as they are, are still small in comparison to the need and opportunity in their regions. If we are to promote our economic growth to the fullest possible extent, if we are to achieve and sustain a high level of employment throughout our Nation, and if we are to improve our competitive position in world trade—the hiatus between the technological developments in our laboratories and their application in our industries must be erased. I believe this bill will accomplish much toward the end of nurturing our economic growth and prosperity.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to propound a question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I had several mental reservations about this bill when we started to consider it, but, by amendment, they have been largely dissipated.

There is one feature of the bill, however, on which I would like some additional information from our distinguished chairman. I feel that in their enthusiasm, these designated agencies, provided for in the legislation, may go beyond the bounds of dissemination of existing information and go into research and development programs. I would like the opinion of the chairman as to the possibility of this happening under the terms of this bill.

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

Mr. CURTIN. I yield to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman refers to section 5, paragraph (e), and I think it would be advisable to quote it. This has reference to the duties and responsibilities of the Secretary, meaning the Secretary of Commerce, with reference to his acceptance of the program for review and approval. I would also call this to the attention of the gentleman from New York who was speaking with me about this a few minutes ago.

The Secretary shall not accept a plan unless it has been "determined that such technical services program does not provide a service which on the date of such certification is economically and readily available in such State from private technical services, professional consultants, or private institutions."

In other words, this is to make it abundantly clear the program is not to interfere with the traditional type of program made available on a consulting basis, or by private agencies or institutions.

Mr. CURTIN. That answers the question as to whether or not this particular legislation would permit competition of these governmental agencies with private firms. However, I would further ask whether it is not the intent of this committee that the legislation is to provide only for the dissemination of existing information and is not to go into the field of research and development?

Mr. HARRIS. There is no intention at all that this program will go into either research or development. It does provide, if the gentleman will recall, that under the program the agency designated shall hold seminars and such meetings with appropriate businesses for the purpose of advising these businesses on what is available, and so forth, such as was explained by the gentleman from Illinois earlier in connection with a particular farm program.

But insofar as research and development is concerned there is none intended. I think the gentleman is probably referring to the report on page 4.

Mr. CURTIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE], a member of the committee.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3420, a vital measure which will help coordinate the dissemination of business and scientific data to interested business and governmental agencies.

This bill is designed to place the findings of science into the hands of American enterprise more effectively and efficiently. It would provide vital clearinghouses for the compilation and distribution of significant research data that our free enterprise system is constantly demanding.

This bill does not create competition within the business world, or competition between free enterprise and Government. Rather, it will achieve a more effective application of the findings of scientific research, and thereby improve our Nation's competitive position in world markets. I am glad that groups like the engineering profession have joined with other business interests to recommend that these services be supplied.

In my own district, I am most familiar with the availability and interest of the University of Texas in participating in this program. That university is a rapidly growing research center and is constantly engaged in valuable scientific studies. When efficiently assembled and compiled in a research center or clearinghouse, these findings could be disseminated throughout our State for the use and benefit of all segments of our economy.

The University of Texas is only one example of many fine research institutions throughout the country which could contribute much to the success of this program. I hope this important legislation will be promptly enacted.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS], one of the cosponsors of this program.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I think it is a fine program for America. My State is now cooperating in the pilot efforts and I urge that this legislation be given favorable consideration by the Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER], who is one of the cosponsors of this legislation, such time as he may require.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the State Technical Services Act of 1965.

The proposed State Technical Services Act of 1965 would enable the Federal Government to make grants to the States in support of programs to achieve better commercial use of the latest findings of science and technology. Such programs, planned and carried out locally, would place these findings in the hands of local business and industry.

Such a national program is not only in the best traditions of America, it is in the best traditions of science. You may remember that Louis Pasteur, the great 19th century French bacteriologist discovered an understanding of the process of fermentation, with the practical

method of control which we call pasteurization, while working in the 1850's on behalf of French beer and winemakers. Joseph Lister, an Englishman, saw the applicability of Pasteur's discoveries to medicine, and in 1865, he first sterilized incisions in surgery.

Pasteur went on to save the silk industry of France and other silk-producing countries by developing controls for silkworm disease. Then he produced successful inoculations against cattle anthrax and chicken cholera. These methods he called vaccination, which was his way of paying tribute to Edward Jenner, another Englishman, who had given that name to his discovery of the means of protecting man against smallpox. Pasteur also perfected the preventive vaccine against rabies in man and animals.

But even before those achievements, T. H. Huxley had described Pasteur's discoveries as having been so valuable as to have reimbursed the whole cost of the war indemnity paid by France to Germany in 1870.

Science was understandably crude, and the application of research results correspondingly simple, in Pasteur's day, 100 years ago. Even so, the dissemination of Pasteur's results was crucial to Lister; scientists have always exchanged information freely. Today, by contrast, science and technology are complex, and getting access to pertinent and useful information is, at best, difficult for business and industry. Even with our high level of education and our mass media of communications, we are losing the battle of the transfer of technology to the places where it is needed.

Since the outbreak of World War II, the Nation has spent more than $100 billion on scientific research and development. Only a small portion of that total has been directed toward civilian-oriented activities, yet from such R. & D. comes the greatest stimulus to economic growth. The rewards for a higher level of technology, in terms of economic growth, higher standards of living, and gains in employment, are surely worth seeking. Clearly, one sure way of seeking those rewards would be to pass the State Technical Services Act of 1965.

I am interested in this bill, first, because I come from an agricultural State. That is why the Pasteur story holds so much significance for me. I am interested in it, second, because there are several contemporary precedents for this State technical services program, and I am proud to say that one of them is located in my own State of Iowa. Briefly, the Iowa Legislature in 1953 appropriated $250,000 for the first 2 years' operation of a Center for Industrial Research and Services as a part of the College of Engineering at the Iowa State University. CIRAS, as it is called, assists industry in a variety of ways. Primarily it coordinates the transfer of technological information. Actual solutions may be developed by Iowa State University, the State University of Iowa, other State educational institutions or agencies, Federal Government agencies, or even private organizations.

Of course, the State Technical Services Act would not authorize support for research, but it would stimulate and encourage the dissemination of research results. Even the great discoveries of Pasteur were worthless until they were brought out of the laboratory and put into practice by industry or the medical profession.

Breakthroughs could not necessarily be expected to result from a modest program such as Iowa's—but it is always possible. The dozens of letters I have seen directed to CIRAS by grateful businessmen convinces me that a mechanism such as the State technical services program must be made available nationally.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3420 whereby the Federal Government would provide assistance, through State and regional agencies, to enable business and industry to take better advantage of the fruits of existing research and technology. In my opinion, it is far too seldom that we in this body have an opportunity to act on a program that embraces both the visionary and the utterly practical, that is both completely unprecedented and completely feasible. The plan proposed in H.R. 3420 makes a great deal more sense to me than a lot of the aid and assistance programs that have come before us in recent months under the banner of the Great Society.

I have been among the strongest supporters of this program since its conception and was one of the cosponsors of the original bill, my bill being H.R. 7708.

There is little of a revolutionary nature in this plan, and yet it is a refreshing departure from what appears to be the present way of doing things. Here is no wild-eyed dream program, no half-baked scheme calling for the outlay of billions of tax dollars with only theoretical gains as justification. This is no sudden cure-all for an ailing society, no new and revolutionary welfare program; and it requires no new bureaucratic empire.

This is rather a simple, practical, feasible, efficient and effective means whereby we can make better, more effective use of what we have already bought and paid for.

The proposed State technical services plan does credit to its innovators because it acknowledges a principle in which I also believe very strongly—namely, that local or regional problems are best evaluated and best resolved at the local or regional level. The matching assistance funds which would be made available under this plan would be spent by the local institutions under which these services would be performed. Users of the service, local business and industry for the most part, would be dealing with an institution which has a thorough practical and academic knowledge of the specific local economic factors with which industrialists and businessmen must deal from day to day.

In my own State of Massachusetts, there has been optimistic speculation that the University of Massachusetts, with its superb faculty and excellent facilities, would be named the appropriate institution to administer this program for the Commonwealth. I might add that the president of this fine university, Dr. John Lederle, has expressed keen interest and support for the idea personally to me. I am confident there would be ample enthusiasm at the University of Massachusetts to assure success for the program.

I would also like to point out that among the earliest and most enthusiastic supporters of the concepts embodied in H.R. 3420 is Prof. Sydney T. Maunder, an electrical engineer and visiting lecturer in the electrical engineering department at the University of Massachusetts. Professor Maunder's faith in the idea was strong enough to bring him to Washington at his own expense to testify on behalf of the bill, his testimony appearing on page 64 of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Professor Maunder's testimony contains much food for thought and, perhaps surprising because he is a man of science, is couched in practical, meaningful terms. I strongly recommend the reading of his testimony to all of my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, among those who would benefit most from this program are the small, independent merchants and industrialists. Both in my capacity as representative for a great many small businessmen in my district, and as a member of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I am ever more keenly aware of the restraints and roadblocks that stand in the way of prosperity and success for many of these independent businessmen. Certainly not the least of these is their limited capacity to take proper advantage of the vast technological advances which our society has generated.

There are endless examples of floundering and failing business ventures whose fault lies solely with the inability of management to keep pace with new techniques and industrial innovations. The impact of bypassing technology is nowhere greater than in the area of small business.

The program proposed in H.R. 3420 goes straight to the heart of this situation. It would provide locally oriented machinery to bring this technology to these businessmen, and to put it in practical, useful terms for them.

In my opinion, the State Technical Services Act of 1965 is an exciting new prospect, a new, broad-scale approach to solving the persistent and chronic problems of small business. It is my fervent hope that H.R. 3420 will be passed without delay.

In closing, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the chairman and the ranking minority member of Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for their leadership in bringing this fine piece of legislation to the floor of the House. I refer especially to my good colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD].

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think this State technical services program is wonderful. Some people will think it is only the Government spending

money. In this case it is not spending money but investing money, because this money will come bouncing back many times over in increased tax revenues. I cannot see anything wrong with the State technical services program.

We are all familiar with the Agricultural Extension Service, which has certainly paid for itself over and over again during the 51 years it has been in operation. It has long seemed unfair to me that there was not a service available to business and industry that parallels the service available to the farmer. Especially the system which takes the results of research and channels it through the county agent to every farmer or homemaker who wants to know the latest.

Now, in the State technical services program, we have an opportunity to use this same tested and proven system for putting to use the scientific and technical information resulting from our Nation's annual $20 billion research and development investment.

Approximately 28 States are now operating programs of technical assistance to industry. Of these, perhaps five can be considered comprehensive efforts of the type promised by the State Technical Services Act. They have been proven to work well. In fact, all of them have been expanded, industry has endorsed them enthusiastically, and if you have occasion to write and ask what they are doing, you will be quite impressed with the information they can furnish you on any specific subject in which they specialize. This information is in the form of reports, publications, training films, proceedings of conferences, and so forth.

I mentioned that there are 28 States which now have some kind of technical assistance to industry. Aside from the top five, which are pathfinding in complete programs, the rest are either limited because of insufficient funds or staffs, or they are more heavily oriented toward industrial research or technological education. My own Commonwealth of Kentucky is a good example of a limited activity.

The University of Kentucky College of Engineering includes an engineering experiment station. Its objectives are: First, to organize, initiate, and promote engineering research of special interest to the State; Second, to aid and consult with industry regarding its research problems; third, to promote the conservation and utilization of the State's resources; and, fourth, to provide support for research and education in the fundamental and applied sciences.

My own alma mater, the University of Louisville, also has an outstanding and well-qualified College of Engineering and an engineering experiment station. The University of Louisville got its land grant from the Commonwealth of Kentucky in 1798.

In many sections of the country, industry has felt the need for catalytic institutions other than the universities, so local interests have founded nonprofit research institutes to supplement, without in any way competing with, the services of the universities and their research programs. My own Commonwealth of Kentucky is no exception. Civic and industrial leaders have founded, at Lexington, the Spindletop Research Institute. It is patterned on the lines of Midwest Research Institute at Kansas City, Southern Research Institute at Birmingham, and Southwest Research Institute at San Antonio.

As the State technical services program is implemented, the Governor of a given State would name a State institution or a State agency to prepare and administer a technical services plan for his State. Two or more States could join in a cooperative program and name a regional institution. This would be known as the "designated agency."

But the actual work could be done at any qualified institution. This would be a college or university which is accredited in science, engineering, or business administration, or a competent nonprofit organization, or a State agency. Thus, in Kentucky, the Governor might designate the University of Kentucky as the designated agency. It would prepare a 5-year plan outlining a technical service program to solve the most pressing problems. It would listen to all kinds of advice before it prepared that plan. All qualified institutions in the State would be invited to participate in the planning. So I would expect the University of Louisville, Berea College, and the other fine liberal arts colleges of the State of Kentucky, as well as the Spindletop Research Institute and several State departments to participate in the planning and to receive assignments in the program.

In conclusion, in my State as well as many other States, there is already a wealth of fine institutions, already engaged in the types of activities outlined as technical services in the proposed legislation. But their funds are limited, and they are not able to scratch the surface of what needs to be done. The State Technical Services Act is absolutely essential to tie together all the information that is available already, and present it to business in a way that businessmen can use it immediately.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, on February 15, I introduced H.R. 4879 to the Congress, a bill similar to the one presently under discussion and introduced by Mr. HARRIS, the distinguished chairman of my committee.

The committee substitute, I believe, strengthens the basic reason why such a measure should be enacted into law. By placing new ideas and findings into the hands of local industrial and business concerns, the backbone of our economic structure is reinforced.

Arguments may be heard concerning increasing Federal involvement in our Nation's private economy. However, these arguments, when applied to this legislation, are not applicable due to the tight and specific guarantee of strict local and State authorization and implementation of a State technical services program.

Basically, this bill provides for the use of Federal funds by a State designated educational institution under a State plan to enhance the economic posture of that State. It is explicitly stated that the Secretary of Commerce shall not even review or approve a proposal unless the Governor of a State first submits his endorsement of the program.

This bill as applied to my State of New Hampshire will help assure the existence of a stable economic base.

As I stated on February 17 on the floor of the House, New Hampshire is faced with an economic challenge for the future.

There are now less than 700,000 people now residing in the Granite State. Of our 10 counties, 3 are presently designated as depressed areas by the Area Redevelopment Administration. The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, whose existence affects over 100,000 people, either directly or indirectly has been scheduled for closure by a Department of Defense announcement last November. The problems of the shoe industry, a major factor in New Hampshire's economy, are well known to this Congress and textile industrial activity in New Hampshire has been decreasing at a steady pace for the past 10 years.

These problems in New Hampshire are not unique, but I believe are typical of many areas in the United States.

To provide existing industries, both large and small, with useful information and new techniques would be a stimulant for expansion and would aid in the unemployment situation now realized in certain areas. It would also act as an inducement for the establishment of new concerns.

The appropriation of $60 million by this Congress over a 3-year period would be a very important investment for strengthening our economic base. This program has been indorsed by the Department of Commerce, by numerous private concerns, and by a multitude of educational institutions. It is a positive program for the future which I again believe is essential and urge this House to take immediate and positive action.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3420. Each year the Federal Government spends millions upon millions of dollars in financing basic scientific research and development work by universities, nonprofit institutions, and industry. The bill now under consideration is aimed at maximizing the application of the results of this research by bringing it to bear on local industrial and economic problems. Its goal is the dissemination of information from our growing wealth of scientific and technical knowledge Research in 1965 moves so quickly that today's innovation was obsolete yesterday. It is exceedingly difficult for the scientific and industrial community to keep abreast of day-to-day advances in the technical disciplines. The proposed legislation authorizes $60 million for a 3-year program of matching grants to States to support State or regional programs to achieve more effective commercial use of scientific discoveries. It will operate through local technical service programs specifically designed to inform local businessmen and enterprises about the most current technological advances. This bill will add muscle to the national

economy by enriching industry through the application of advanced technology. It will inspire employment by providing industry with new techniques and new products. It will strengthen the position of American products in the international marketplace. Yankee ingenuity—long the foundation of our economic preeminence—does us no good while hidden under the proverbial bushel basket. This bill permits us to remove that basket and put our new ideas onto the production line.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, this bill would initiate the first comprehensive effort to make the tremendous benefits of national research activities available to American business, commerce, and industry throughout the country. This would be an effort beneficial to many localities, to American enterprise and to the whole American economy.

This is in the best sense a cooperative, grassroots program. It encourages States to mobilize their industries and institutions to make full technico-economic surveys and to formulate long-range economic plans. Many agencies in my own State of Maryland are already engaged in such planning, and this legislation would further those efforts and help other States to begin similar projects. The planning aspects of this bill could also have many "spin-off" effects in promoting increased cooperation among industries and institutions on innumerable local tasks.

The programs developed on the basis of such preliminary planning will be pinpointed to meet the problems of free enterprise within each State. The types of technical assistance which can be utilized are limited only by the perception and imagination of the committees involved. Through technical advice, through seminars and discussions, through the dissemination of information, local industries will be lifted into enhanced competitive positions as they begin to take full advantage of the technological advances of recent years.

I share the view, expressed in the additional views in the committee report, that every care should be taken to avoid duplicating present programs of technical assistance. But I share the entire committee's hope that this program will reach far beyond existing efforts, and will enable local businessmen throughout the Nation to acquire knowledge and information not readily available from any other source.

As the sponsor of a similar bill, H.R. 7474, introduced on April 14 of this year, I commend the committee for its prompt action in reporting this measure to the House, and I urge its enactment.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for 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,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. That Congress finds that wider diffusion and more effective application of science and technology in business, commerce, and industry are essential to the growth of the economy, to higher levels of employment, and to the competitive position of United States products in world markets. The Congress also finds that the benefits of federally financed research, as well as other research, must be placed more effectively in the hands of American business, commerce, and industrial establishments. The Congress further finds that the several States through cooperation with universities, communities, and industries can contribute significantly to these purposes by providing technical services designed to encourage a more effective application of science and technology to both new and established business, commerce, and industrial establishments. The Congress, therefore, declares that the purpose of this Act is to provide a national program of incentives and support for the several States individually and in cooperation with each other in their establishing and maintaining State and interstate technical service programs designed to achieve these ends.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) "Technical services" means activities or programs designed to enable businesses, commerce, and industrial establishments to acquire and use scientific and engineering information more effectively through such means as—

(1) preparing and disseminating technical reports, abstracts, computer tapes, microfilm, reviews, and similar scientific or engineering information, including the establishment of State or interstate technical information centers for this purpose;

(2) providing a reference service to identify sources of engineering and other scientific expertise; and

(3) sponsoring industrial workshops, seminars, training programs, extension courses, demonstrations, and field visits designed to encourage the more effective application of scientific and engineering information.

(b) "Designated agency" means the institution or agency which has been designated as administrator of the program for any State or States under section 3 or section 7 of this Act.

(c) "Qualified institution" means (1) an institution of higher learning with a program leading to a degree in science, engineering, or business administration which is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association to be listed by the United States Commissioner of Education, or such an institution which is listed separately after evaluation by the United States Commissioner of Education pursuant to this subsection; or (2) a State agency or a private, nonprofit institution which meets criteria of competence established by the Secretary of Commerce and published in the Federal Register. For the purpose of this subsection the United States Commissioner of Education shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of science, engineering, or business education or training offered. When the Commissioner determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such programs, he shall publish a list of institutions he finds qualified after prior evaluation by an advisory committee, composed of persons he determines to be specially qualified to evaluate the training provided under such programs.

(d) "Participating institution" means each qualified institution in a State, which participates in the administration or execution of the State technical services program as provided by this Act.

(e) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(f) "State" means one of the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

(g) "Governor", in the case of the District of Columbia, means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SELECTION OF DESIGNATED AGENCY

SEC. 3. The Governor of any State which wishes to receive Federal payments under this Act in support of its existing or planned technical services program shall designate, under appropriate State laws and regulations, an institution or agency to administer and coordinate that program and to prepare and submit a plan and programs to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under this Act.

PLANS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 4. The designated agency shall prepare and submit to the Secretary in accordance with such regulations as he may publish—

(a) A five-year plan which may be revised annually and which shall: (1) outline the technological and economic conditions of the State, taking into account its region, business, commerce, and its industrial potential and identify the major regional and industrial problems; (2) identify the general approaches and methods to be used in the solution of these problems and outline the means for measuring the impact of such assistance on the State or regional economy; and (3) explain the methods to be used in administering and coordinating the technical services program.

(b) An annual technical services program which shall (1) identify specific methods, which may include contracts, for accomplishing particular goals and outline the likely impact of these methods in terms of the five-year plan; (2) contain a detailed budget, together with procedures for adequate fiscal control, fund accounting, and auditing, to assure proper disbursement for funds paid to the State under this Act; and (3) indicate the specific responsibilities assigned to each participating institution in the State.

REVIEW OF PLANS AND PROGRAMS BY SECRETARY

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall not accept the five-year plan of a State for review and approval under this Act unless the Governor of the State or his designee determines and certifies that the plan is consistent with State policies and objectives; and the Secretary shall not accept an annual technical services program for review and approval under this Act unless the designated agency has, as certified thereto by the Governor or his designee—

(a) invited all qualified institutions in the State to submit proposals for providing technical services under the Act;

(b) coordinated its programs with other States and with other publicly supported activities within the State, as appropriate;

(c) establish adequate rules to insure that no officer or employee of the State, the designated agency, or any participating institution, shall receive compensation for technical services he performs, for which funds are provided under this Act, from sources other than his employer, and shall not otherwise maintain any private interest in conflict with his public responsibility;

(d) determined that matching funds will be available from State or other non-Federal sources;

(e) determined that such technical services program does not provide a service which on the date of such certification is economically and readily available in such State from private technical services, professional consultants, or private institutions;

(f) planned no services specially related to a particular firm or company, public work, or other capital project except insofar as the services are of general concern to the industry and commerce of the community, State, or region;

(g) provided for making public all reports prepared in the course of furnishing technical services supported under this Act or for making them available at cost to any person on request.

APPROVAL BY SECRETARY

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall review the five-year plan and each annual program submitted by a designated agency under section 4 or section 7, and shall approve only those which (1) bear the certification required by the Governor or his designee under section 5; (2) comply with regulations and meet criteria that the Secretary shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register; and (3) otherwise accomplish the purposes of this Act.

INTERSTATE PROGRAMS

SEC. 7. Two or more States may cooperate in administering and coordinating their plans and programs supported under this Act, in which event all or part of the sums authorized and payable under section 10 to all of the cooperating States may be paid to the designated agency, participating institutions, or persons authorized to receive them under the terms of the agreement between the cooperating States. When the cooperative agreement designates an interstate agency to act on behalf of all of the cooperating States, it shall submit to the Secretary for review and approval under section 6 an interstate five-year plan and an annual interstate technical services program which, as nearly as practicable, shall meet the requirements of section 4 and section 5.

CONSENT OF CONGRESS

SEC. 8. (a) The consent of the Congress is given to any two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance and in designating agencies, under section 7, for accomplishing the purposes of this Act.

(b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section, or consent granted by this section, is expressly reserved.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 9. Each designated agency shall appoint an advisory council for technical services, the members of which shall represent broad community interests and shall be qualified to evaluate programs submitted under section 4. The advisory council shall review each annual program, evaluate its relation to the purposes of this Act, and report its findings to the designated agency and the Governor or his designee. Each report of each advisory council shall be available to the Secretary on request. Members of any such advisory council shall not be compensated for serving as such, but may be reimbursed for necessary expenses incurred by them in connection with attending meetings of any advisory council of which they are members.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 10. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

(b) From these amounts, the Secretary is authorized to make an annual payment to each designated agency, participating institution, or person authorized to receive payments in support of each approved technical services program. Maximum amounts which may be paid to the States under this subsection shall be fixed in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register from time to time, considering (1) population according to the last decennial census; (2) business, commercial, industrial and economic development and productive efficiency; and (3) technical resources.

(c) The Secretary may reserve an amount equal to not more than 20 per centum of the total amount appropriated for each year under this section and is authorized to make payments from such amount to any designated agency or participating institution for technical services programs which he determines have special merit or to any qualified institution for additional programs which he determines are necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, under criteria and regulations that he shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register.

(d) An amount equal to not more than 5 per centum of the total amount appropriated each year under this section shall be available to the Secretary for the direct expenses of administering this Act.

(e) (1) No amount paid for any technical services program under subsection (b) or (c) shall exceed the amount of non-Federal funds expended to carry out such program: *Provided,* That the Secretary may pay an amount not to exceed $25,000 a year for each of the first three fiscal years to each designated agency, other than a designated agency under section 7, to assist in the preparation of the five-year plan and the initial annual technical services programs, without regard to any of the preceding requirements of this section.

(2) No funds appropriated pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be paid to any designated agency, participating institution, or person on account of any such agency or institution, to carry out any technical services activity or program in any State if such activity or program duplicates any activity or program readily available in such State from Federal or State agencies, including publicly supported institutions of higher learning in such State.

ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY

SEC. 11. The Secretary is authorized and directed to aid designated agencies in carrying out their technical services programs by providing reference services which a designated agency may use to obtain scientific, technical, and engineering information from sources outside the State or States which it serves, for the purposes of this Act.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 12. The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the administration of this Act.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 13. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to affect the functions or responsibilities under law of any other department or agency of the United States.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 14. (a) Each designated agency shall make an annual report to the Secretary on or before the first day of September of each year on the work accomplished under the technical services program and the status of current services, together with a detailed statement of the amounts received under any of the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of their disbursement.

(b) The Secretary shall make a complete report with respect to the administration of this Act to the President and the Congress not later than January 31 following the end of each fiscal year for which amounts are appropriated pursuant to this Act.

EVALUATION

SEC. 15. Within three years from the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint a public committee, none of the members of which shall have been directly concerned with the preparation of plans, administration of programs or participation in programs under this Act. The Committee shall evaluate the significance and impact of the program under this Act and make recommendations concerning the program. A report shall be transmitted to the Secretary within sixty days after the end of such three-year period.

TERMINATION

SEC. 16. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any designated agency or participating institution receiving funds under this Act finds that—

(a) the agency or institution is not complying substantially with provisions of this Act, with the regulations promulgated by the Secretary, or with the approved annual technical services program; or

(b) any funds paid to the agency or institution under the provisions of this Act have been lost, misapplied, or otherwise diverted from the purposes for which they were paid or furnished—

the Secretary shall notify such agency or institution that no further payments will be made under the provisions of this Act until he is satisfied that there is substantial compliance or the diversion has been corrected or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until such agency or institution repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended.

REPAYMENT

SEC. 17. Upon notice by the Secretary to any designated agency or participating institution that no further payments will be made pending substantial compliance, correction, or repayment under section 16, any funds which may have been paid to such agency or institution under this Act and which are not expended by the agency or institution on the date of such notice, shall be repaid to the Secretary and be deposited to the account of the appropriations from which they originally were paid.

RECORDS

SEC. 18. (a) Each recipient of a grant under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition of such grant, the total cost of the related approved program, the amount and nature of the cost of the program supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to amounts received under this Act.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 19. This Act may be cited as the "State Technical Services Act of 1965".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and interstate programs to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise."

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact

that we have had full debate and explanation of the bill, since the Clerk has been reading the section dealing with the declaration of purpose, and the next section deals with definitions, and since I feel certain it is generally understood that the purpose of the bill is to provide for disseminating technical and scientific information to the business community, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time—and I shall not use 5 minutes, I hope—to ask a question or two concerning the bill of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

I have been reading the additional views of the minority members of the committee, which indicate that much information has been given by a substantial number of organizations, such as the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Council for Science and Technology, the Science Information Exchange, and so on and so forth, and that there is in the Department of Commerce a clearinghouse for scientific and technical information. On page 26 of the report I note that additional information has been provided by MIT Associates, Stanford Research, the Illinois Institute of Technology, Arthur T. Little, and the American Society for Metals and so on and so forth.

I wonder why it is necessary to spend $60 million to provide either a clearinghouse for information or to provide for gathering information when apparently there are contract organizations, probably being paid a good many millions of dollars, to provide information in addition to the agencies and departments of the Government. Can the gentleman tell me why $60 million is required under these circumstances?

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

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I will endeavor again very briefly to explain the purposes of this.

In the first place, and basically what is behind this program, is the idea of getting this information to all of the business of the country in order that we can have greater opportunities for the type of small business and others who do not have the benefit of and are not big enough to get the benefit of the information that the gentleman refers to.

What we are doing is we are seeing a situation develop in the country where big business is getting bigger because it is in a position to obtain this information with its own staff, but smaller business is being handicapped more and more and is on the wane. It is estimated by those who have gone into this that if we will put it into the gentleman's State of Iowa and my State and other States, where thousands and thousands of smaller business concerns may have the advantage of it—if we put it into those places, then the smaller business will be able to develop along with the development of the big business of the country.

Mr. GROSS. Are the States in such a condition that they cannot establish it themselves? Most States have some sort of development commission. Can they not communicate with the Department of Commerce as the established clearinghouse for this information?

Mr. HARRIS. That is the great difficulty about it. The Department of Commerce does have certain information available. We appropriate millions of dollars to the Department of Commerce for certain information.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, we certainly do.

Mr. HARRIS. But they do not bring together, or they have not as yet, this scientific information and the technical services that they are in a position to disseminate to the business community in general throughout the country. There again bigger business gets it but not the general average business.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Of course.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to make two points to the gentleman from Iowa. No. 1, your own State has it.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that.

Mr. MACDONALD. And the gentleman who runs that Center for Industrial Research and Service at the Iowa State University, Mr. Waldo Wagner, testified before the committee at length and said that he thought this program was not only a great one but was long overdue and he heartily subscribed to it. He thought that it would improve the economy of Iowa itself.

A second point I would like to make is that there cannot be any duplication by the Federal Government. If the gentleman will look at the bill on page 23, section (e)(2), it specifically prohibits any funds under this bill being used that would duplicate any activity of a Federal or State agency.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, if he can devise some way by which the agriculture of Iowa can obtain the $1 billion a year that it is not getting as part of its fair share of the national income, he will have accomplished something. But I do not think this bill or the spending of this $60 million is going to get to that problem at all. No other Federal program has. If it does, it will be working a miracle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Did the gentleman's committee go into the cost of these contract organizations, such as are mentioned on page 26 of the report?

Mr. HARRIS. I would say to the gentleman that the committee did give consideration to this subject matter. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] was quite active in that regard in developing it, and through his very effective work, as usual, the committee adopted a couple of amendments in order to satisfy what had been brought to his attention. He handled the program to make it more workable. We did not go into what these private services would charge under contracts, or anything of that nature.

Mr. GROSS. Have they not been contracted, have their services not been contracted for by some agency or department of the Government?

Mr. HARRIS. No doubt you will have some of these that are mentioned that perhaps have entered into contracts for specific purposes, but not for technical services as contemplated under this program at all.

Mr. GROSS. For instance, the specific organizations listed at the top of page 26 of the report have not been employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. HARRIS. As to the agencies mentioned on page 26 of the report—which is part of the additional views of some of the committee members—what they are suggesting here is that we should ask more than we are asking in this program. Some of the things mentioned in the additional views we think are a part of the program and are being accepted by these agencies mentioned here.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but what I am trying to get at is who paid these organizations for the information that they have apparently already made available?

Mr. HARRIS. The private industries of the United States who obtained their services.

Mr. GROSS. This has been financed then by private industry?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; and I would say mostly big industry.

Mr. GROSS. I will say that I know that MIT is heavily subsidized through the Federal Government by way of contracts as well as Stanford Research and Arthur T. Little.

Mr. HARRIS. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that this MIT Associates referred to here is not the MIT educational institution.

Mr. GROSS. I will accept that.

Mr. HARRIS. This is a private agency.

Mr. GROSS. I assumed this was a part of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. HARRIS. Not at all. It is no part of it at all.

Mr. GROSS. Then I withdraw reference to that institution, but I am sure all of these organizations hold Government contracts.

Mr. HARRIS. Neither is the Stanford Research referred to a part of Stanford University. It is not a part of the Stanford University. It just happens to have that name. It is a private organization.

Mr. GROSS. Was the suggestion by the Comptroller General given authority

to audit the books and records? Is that taken care of in the bill?

Mr. HARRIS. I can say to the gentleman from Iowa that that was given attention, and had the studied attention of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], a member of the committee, who never lets one of these pass without bringing that to the attention of the committee. That was well taken care of.

Mr. GROSS. I think it is an excellent enterprise on the part of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], that he gets that provision written into legislation, and I commend him for it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KEITH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEITH: On page 23, in line 10, strike out the colon and insert in lieu thereof a period, and strike out lines 11 through 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The Secretary may pay to the designated agency for each State (not including a designated agency under section 7) for each of the first three years after such agency is designated not to exceed one-half the cost of preparing the five-year plan for such State and its annual technical services programs, except that such payment may not exceed $25,000 for any such year."

And redesignate the following paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, all my amendment proposes to do is to require that in the planning phase of this legislation there shall be matching funds on the part of the States. I believe, in the absence of this amendment, some States might embark upon a planning phase, and they would be encouraged to do so even though they had no serious intent or perhaps, even, the capability for undertaking the operational phase of the program. So by requiring participation you would discourage some States and, accordingly, you would save some money.

Secondly, I think that in the absence of a matching fund arrangement there would be less interest on the part of the States than would be the case if they had to provide matching funds. In the absence of such interest, the program when it came to the legislature for support in its operational phase, would not be as well conceived nor as well understood by the local legislatures as would be the case if they had some participation in the planning phase.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as in the first year of the program there is only $10 million allocated, the money that would be saved by requiring State participation could be rather substantial. The balance would be available for the operation of programs of those States which have already completed their planning.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that the legislatures are not now in session and for that reason the program would not get off as readily as would otherwise be the case. This is an argument that could be brought up with reference to any of our programs where matching funds are required.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that on those grounds alone we should reject this amendment. I think the question is one of political philosophy. The States should participate—should pay their way from the start—and for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will support the amendment, and will require matching funds in the planning stage of this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if we comply with the gentleman's unanimous-consent request there would be no opportunity to rebut any remarks he might make, and I would like to have an opportunity to be able to counter those remarks, perhaps.

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

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, and I hope it will not be adopted.

It has been said, perhaps with some merit, that this Congress goes a long way toward doing something for every segment of our society. This is one time we are trying to do something for business, and as I said in debate earlier in the afternoon, the underlying basis of our whole society is free enterprise, business, and industry of this country. If we do not maintain a sound, strong, and healthy business community then we cannot expect the labor organizations and people in the fields of various segments of our society to be strong and healthy.

Here is something we know: It takes knowledge, technology, and science if we are going to be a success in the business line.

What we are trying to do here is, with a rather small token, to try to do something to help the business of the Nation, making it stronger, so that it can keep up with what is absolutely necessary if we are going to serve all of the people in an expanding economy.

The gentleman's amendment offered here would automatically, in certain of the States, delay the program for as much as 2 years because there are some States in which the legislatures will not be in session. The Governor and the institutions, as well as the designated agencies and the educational institutions of the State, can with this kind of planning funds help devise a program.

We made this a 3-year program. We think it will accomplish its purpose in 3 years, and will put business, industry, and the educational institutions in the various States in the position so that they can carry on themselves. Do not stymie the program by starting off with an amendment that would virtually say it cannot move or accomplish the purposes for which it was designed.

For these reasons I ask that the amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know how deeply the gentleman from Massachusetts feels about his amendment, both in the subcommittee and in the committee. I rather have the feeling his amendment is good, and I will tell you why I think it is good for whatever it may be worth.

In the later stages of the bill, after the first year, so to speak, the first allotment, the funds are matched by the States, but in the planning stages the Federal Government merely gives so much money to the States to set up a plan. It seems to me if a State is interested in setting up a plan involving $25,000, that they ought to furnish half of the money. I do not visualize States that cannot produce $12,500 in matching funds, to $12,500 by the Federal Government in order to get a program underway. If you would put this up to the States and ask them if the Federal Government were to put up $12,500 to plan it, and at a later stage produce as much as $500,000 a year in some States, as much as a million dollars in other States, and as much as $1.5 million in some States, and as much as $2 million in the large five States, that there would not be any State that would not say "We are willing to put up $12,500, or half of the $25,000 for planning."

This is not very much money but the gentleman from Massachusetts apparently has some of those New England precepts that States ought to do something for themselves in the beginning and not just later on—and match funds but they ought to match those funds from the beginning. Personally, that is the kind of integrity I rather admire. Maybe it will not make a great deal of difference whether or not this amendment carries, but the principle which the gentleman from Massachusetts has set out I do think stands for something and for that reason when the matter comes to a vote I personally shall support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RODINO, 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. 3420) to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise, pursuant to House Resolution 548, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and interstate programs to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD and include therewith extraneous matter on the bill just passed—H.R. 3420.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 949) to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

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

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. That Congress finds that wider diffusion and more effective application of science and technology in business, commerce, and industry are essential to the growth of the economy, to higher levels of employment, and to the competitive position of United States products in world markets. The Congress also finds that the benefits of federally financed research, as well as other research, must be placed more effectively in the hands of American business, enterprise, commerce, and industrial establishments. The Congress further finds that the several States through cooperation with universities, communities, and industries can contribute significantly to these purposes by providing technical services designed to encourage a more effective application of science and technology to both new and established business, commerce, and industrial establishments. The Congress, therefore, declares that the purpose of this Act is to provide a national program of incentives and support for the several States individually and in cooperation with each other in their establishing and maintaining State and regional technical service programs designed to achieve these ends.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) "Technical services" means activities or programs designed to enable business, commerce, and industrial establishments to acquire and use scientific and engineering information more effectively through such means as—

(1) analyzing problems of regions and industries to determine new opportunities for applying technology;

(2) preparing and disseminating technical reports, abstracts, computer tapes, microfilm, reviews, and similar scientific or engineering information, including the establishment of State or regional technical information centers for this purpose;

(3) providing a reference service to identify sources of engineering and other scientific expertise; and

(4) sponsoring industrial workshops, seminars, training programs, extension courses, demonstrations, and field visits designed to encourage the more effective application of scientific and engineering information.

(b) "Designated agency" means the institution or agency in each participating State, which has been designated as administrator of the program for such State under section 3 of this Act.

(c) "Qualified institution" means (1) an institution of higher learning with a program leading to degrees in engineering or business administration which is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association to be listed by the United States Commissioner of Education, or such an institution which is listed separately after evaluation by the United States Commissioner of Education pursuant to this subsection; or (2) a State agency or a private, nonprofit institution which meets criteria of competence established by the Secretary of Commerce and published in the Federal Register. For the purpose of this subsection the United States Commissioner of Education shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of engineering or business education or training offered. When the Commissioner determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such programs, he shall publish a list of institutions he finds qualified after prior evaluation by an advisory committee, composed of persons he determines to be specially qualified to evaluate the training provided under such programs.

(d) "Participating institution" means each qualified institution in a State, which participates in the administration or execution of the State technical services program as provided by this Act.

(e) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce or the official to whom the Secretary has delegated all or part of the authority in this Act.

(f) "State" means one of the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

PLANS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. The Governor or other competent authority of any State which wishes to receive Federal payments under this Act in support of its existing or planned technical services program shall designate, under appropriate State laws and regulations, an institution or agency to administer and coordinate that program and to prepare and submit plans and programs to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under this Act.

SEC. 4. The designated agency shall prepare and submit to the Secretary in accordance with such regulations as he may publish—

(a) At the beginning of each five-year period, a five-year plan which may be revised annually and which shall: (1) outline the technological and economic conditions of the State, taking into account its region, business, commerce, and its industrial potential and identify the major regional and industrial problems; (2) identify the general approaches and methods to be used in the solution of these problems and outline the means for measuring the impact of such assistance on the State or regional economy; and (3) explain the methods to be used in administering and coordinating the program.

(b) An annual technical services program which shall (1) identify specific methods, which may include contracts, for accomplishing particular goals and outline the likely impact of these methods in terms of the five-year plan; (2) contain a detailed budget, together with procedures for adequate control, fund accounting, and auditing, to assure proper disbursement for funds paid to the State under this Act; and (3) indicate the specific responsibilities assigned to each participating institution in the State.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall not accept a five-year plan for review and approval under this Act unless the Governor of the State or his designee determines and certifies that the plan is consistent with State policies and objectives; and the Secretary shall not accept an annual technical services program for review and approval under this Act unless the designated agency has, as certified thereto by the Governor or his designee—

(a) invited all qualified institutions in the State to submit proposals for providing technical services under the Act;

(b) coordinated its programs with other States and with other publicly supported activities within the State, as appropriate;

(c) established adequate rules to insure that no officer or employee of the State, the designated agency or any participating institution, shall receive compensation for technical services for which funds are provided under this Act from sources other than his employer and shall not otherwise maintain any private interest in conflict with his public responsibility;

(d) determined that matching funds will be available from State or other non-Federal sources;

(e) determined that such technical services program does not provide a service that is now available or could be made available as practically by private technical services, professional consultants, or private institutions;

(f) planned no services specially related to a particular firm or company, public work, or other capital project except insofar as the services are of general concern to the industry and commerce of the community, State, or region;

(g) provided for making public all reports prepared in the course of furnishing technical services supported under this Act or for making them available at cost to any person on rquest.

APPROVAL BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall review each 5-year plan and each annual program submitted by the designated agency under section 4, or by the regional or interstate institution under section 7, and shall approve only those which (1) bear the certification required by the Governor or his designee under section 5; (2) comply with regulations and meet criteria that the Secretary shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register; and (3) otherwise accomplish the purposes of this Act.

REGIONAL OR INTERSTATE PROGRAMS

SEC. 7. Two or more States may cooperate in administering and coordinating their plans and programs supported under this Act, in which event all or part of the sums authorized and payable under section 11 to all of the cooperating States may be paid to the institutions or persons authorized to receive them under the terms of the agreement between the cooperating States. When the cooperative agreement designates a regional or interstate institution to act on

behalf of all of the cooperating States, it shall submit to the Secretary for review and approval under section 6 a regional or interstate five-year plan and annual regional or interstate technical services program which, as nearly as practicable, shall meet the requirements of section 4 and section 5.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 11, the Secretary is authorized to increase by 10 per centum the amount which he approves for any regional or interstate technical services program submitted under section 7. Such additional amount may be paid without requiring matching funds from State or non-Federal sources.

SEC. 9. (a) The consent of the Congress is given to any two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance in establishing regional or interstate institutions under section 7 for accomplishing the purposes of this Act.

(b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section, or any consent granted pursuant to this section, is expressly reserved.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 10. Each designated agency and each regional or interstate institution shall appoint an advisory council for technical services, the members of which shall represent broad community interests and shall be qualified to evaluate programs submitted under section 4. The advisory council shall review each annual program, evaluate its relation to the purposes of this Act, and report its findings to the designated agency and the Governor or his designee. Each report of the advisory council shall be available to the Secretary on request.

ADMINISTRATION AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

(a) From these amounts, the Secretary is authorized to make an annual payment to each designated agency, regional or interstate institution, or person authorized to receive payments in support of each approved technical services program. Maximum amounts which may be paid to the States under this subsection shall be fixed in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register from time to time, considering (1) population according to the last decennial census; (2) business, commercial, industrial and economic development and productive efficiency; and (3) technical resources.

(b) The Secretary may reserve an amount equal to not more than 20 per centum of the total amount appropriated each year under this section and is authorized to make payments to any designated agency or participating institution for technical services programs which he determines have special merit or to any qualified institution for additional programs which he determines are necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, under criteria and regulations that he shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register.

(c) An amount equal to not more than 5 per centum of the total amount appropriated each year under this section shall be available to the Secretary for the direct expenses of administering this Act.

(d) No amount paid under subsection (a) shall exceed one-half of the cost of the approved annual technical services program of the State, and for each dollar paid under subsections (a) and (b) there shall be available for expenditure on each approved program at least $1 from State or other non-Federal sources: *Provided*, That the Secretary may pay an amount not to exceed $25,000 a year for each of the first three fiscal years to each designated agency to assist in the preparation of the first five-year plan and the initial annual technical services programs, without regard to any requirement of this section.

(e) At the end of each fiscal year, all remaining amounts which are appropriated for payments to the States under subsection (a) and which have not been obligated for payments to the States at that time, shall be available to the Secretary for payments under subsection (b), until expended.

SEC. 12. The Secretary is authorized and directed to aid the States and regions in carrying out their technical services programs by providing reference services which a State or region may use to obtain scientific, technical, and engineering information from sources outside the State or region, for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 13. The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the administration of this Act.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 14. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods of instructions, or administration of any educational institution.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to affect the functions or responsibilities under law of any other department or agency of the United States.

EVALUATION

SEC. 15. Within five years from the date of the approval of this Act, and prior to the end of each five-year period thereafter, the Secretary shall appoint a public committee, none of the members of which shall have been directly concerned with the preparation of plans, administration of programs or participation in programs under this Act. The Committee shall evaluate the significance and impact of the program under this Act and make recommendations concerning the program. A report shall be transmitted to the Secretary within sixty days after the end of each five-year period.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 16. (a) Each designated agency or regional or interstate institution shall make an annual report to the Secretary on or before the first day of September of each year on the work accomplished under the technical services program and the status of current services, together with a detailed statement of the amounts received under any of the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of their disbursement.

(b) The Secretary shall make a complete report with respect to the administration of this Act to the President and the Congress not later than January 31 following the end of each fiscal year for which amounts are appropriated pursuant to this Act.

TERMINATION

SEC. 17. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any agency or institution receiving funds under this Act finds that—

(a) the agency or institution is not complying substantially with the provisions of this Act, with the regulations promulgated by the Secretary or with the approved annual technical services program; or

(b) any funds paid to the agency or institution under the provisions of this Act have been lost, misapplied, or otherwise diverted from the purposes for which they were paid or furnished—

the Secretary shall notify such agency or institution that no further payments will be made under the provisions of this Act until he is satisfied that there is substantial compliance or the diversion has been corrected, or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until such agency or institution repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended.

SEC. 18. Upon notice by the Secretary to any agency or institution that no further payments will be made pending substantial compliance correction or repayment under section 17, any funds which may have been paid to such agency or institution under this Act and which are not expended by the agency or institution on the date of such notice, shall be repaid to the Secretary and be deposited to the account of the appropriations from which they originally were paid.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 19. This Act may be cited as the "State Technical Services Act of 1965".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARRIS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 949 and insert the provisions of H.R. 3420, as just passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title of the Senate bill (S. 949) to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise, may be amended to conform with the title of the House bill, H.R. 3420.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the purpose of this request to substitute the House bill for the Senate bill and send it back to the Senate for a vote?

Mr. HARRIS. The purpose is to insert the provisions of the House-passed bill in the Senate bill and return it to the Senate for its consideration and whatever action it cares to take.

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

There was no objection.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and interstate programs to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise."

A similar House bill, H.R. 3420, was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

NAZI GERMANY'S INVASION OF POLAND: A DAY OF INFAMY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, September 1, 1939, was a day of infamy. It was a day of infamy because it was on this day 26 years ago that the military forces of Nazi Germany invaded Poland and set off a series of events that led to World War II.

The world has not been the same since that fateful day when Hitler's military might was thrown against Poland. Vast changes in the world have taken place, changes that had been brought about by the mysterious workings of history.

Poland was the victim in September 1939; she was the sacrificial lamb; for it was the sacrifice of Poland that led all free nations of the world to make that final decision to stop Hitler's Germany from its march toward the conquest of all Europe.

Within a very short time, a matter of days, the Nazi war machine destroyed Poland. The heroic, courageous, patriotic Polish people fought desperately to turn back the mighty enemy, but the power of Hitler's war machine was too much for the Poles. All the courage of their fighting men could not compensate for the simple fact that here was a war machine of enormous power, armed with the most modern weapons, and driven on by the compulsions of real or imagined grievances of racist ideology. The German Army could not be stopped, and the consequences for Poland were predetermined.

As victory seemed certain for the Nazis, the Soviet Union decided to seize its share of the war booty and its military forces, on September 17, crossed the Polish frontier and joined the Germans in the final destruction of the Polish state.

What Hitler had done that morning of September 1, 1939, can never be undone. He had set into operation a series of events and forces that could not be halted. The consequences of this fateful decision to invade Poland have been enormous, and the responsibility for these consequences must be borne by Germany. For what this war did was to prepare the way for the expansion of Soviet power and world communism in the postwar era. On the European Continent the war created a massive power vacuum in Central and Eastern Europe, a vacuum which the Communists quickly filled. In other parts of the world it created other power vacuums as the massive imperial systems of France, Great Britain, and the Netherlands began to crumble, their power seriously weakened by the demands of the war.

No, the world will never be the same; and the price that Western civilization has paid, is paying, and will pay for this fateful miscalculation by Hitler will be enormous.

It is, of course, one of the tragedies of history that the victim too must pay the price of the enemy's miscalculation. For Poland and her people endured the worst of World War II, but only to find that a new enemy had taken control of the country's destiny once liberation became a reality. Communism quickly filled the void created by the destruction of Nazi power in Poland, and ever since the people of Poland have been subjected to a new and all-consuming tyranny.

Freedom never had a chance in Poland once the Nazis were driven out. As the Soviet armies moved across the Polish plain, they were followed by Soviet-trained Communist organizers who moved into the country and began to establish the nucleus of political organization intended for eventual Soviet control. Moreover, the Communists had the support of the Soviet military presence, a reality that insured their success. Thus, the Western Powers which had hoped for and worked for an acceptable form of democracy in postwar Poland were able to do no more than protest against the various Soviet violations of their pledged word.

A cruel fate had befallen the Polish people in the first few years after the end of the war. Once effective opposition was destroyed, the Communist regime leaders set out to create in Poland a Communist state modeled after that of the Soviet Union. Freedom of religion no longer existed. Political freedom was narrowly limited by the Communist Party. The economic sector, particularly industry, was organized along Communist lines. In the cultural realm Communist control was total. No longer could the Polish writer give full expression to his thoughts; no longer could the Polish artist, the playwright, the composer create his art freely as his inner soul had demanded.

During the first decade in the postwar era the Polish people had suffered much under the tyranny of communism. But the Polish people are an irrespressible people. Sooner or later their pent-up fury would manifest itself in some violent demonstration for freedom. The year was 1956 and the Polish people could stand no more. At Poznan, riots broke out during the early summer. This was the signal to the Communist leaders that a storm was gathering on the horizon. In October 1956 the storm broke. Revolution had erupted in Hungary and almost simultaneously a near similar revolution occurred in Poland. But the Polish Communists, seeing the inevitable consequences of their gross mismanagement of affairs in Poland, quickly put into power Gomulka, a Polish nationalist but a totally convinced Communist, and effectively checked any direct intervention in Polish affairs by the Soviet Army. The Soviet leaders who had flown to Warsaw at the most decisive moment in the crisis accepted the terms of compromise laid down by Gomulka. As a result, Poland did not become a scene of bloodshed in the Hungarian manner, and Communist rule, though somewhat modified, was retained.

What will be the ultimate destiny of communism in Poland no one can tell. In the near decade following the crisis of 1956 communism still maintains a firm and steady grip over the country. Hopes for better days never materialized. Certain manifestations of freedom do exist. The political police, for example, are no longer the instrument of fear and terror they were in the heyday of Stalinism. But the fact remains that Poland is still a Communist police state, and reports from Warsaw during the past year indicate that the regime has whittled down many of the small freedoms that had been granted the Polish people out of necessity during the critical years 1956–57.

On this anniversary of the beginning of World War II, our hearts go out to the Polish people. Their lives have been too full of tragedy, misery, and suffering. These fearless, lovable, hard-working, courageous people deserve a far better fate than what has befallen them since September 1, 1939. And it is our hope that one day they shall have better times, and that they will be a part of the whole European community of nations enjoying fully the fruits of democracy and freedom.

YOUTH'S OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. ROUSH. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, as we leave summer and welcome September with its promise of fall, I want to have a special conversation with young people. To most school-age youth, the decision to return to school and gain another year in their education is not a complicated one. But for an increasing number, there will be no return to school. This is the particular group of young people who have decided, or may soon decide, that their fortune lies elsewhere; or that school can not teach them anything new; or that the excitement they crave will come when they are no longer under the academic routine. This group is commonly called "school dropouts." The reason for leaving school, say at the age of 16, rather than finishing high school may come from any number of circumstances. It might be the conditions in the family, boredom, lack of training using the skills of a person, or the unfortunate illusion that one

does not really need an education in these times.

The school dropout problem has become one of national significance. On August 21, President Johnson announced a major campaign, headed by Vice President HUMPHREY, to encourage young Americans to return to school this fall term. This youth opportunity campaign will seek employment opportunities, both full and part-time, which will enable young people to continue their education rather than become dropouts. Why all this concern for helping young people secure an education? Well, for one thing, the rate of unemployment for those young people age 16 to 21 and classified as "school dropouts" is 16.6 percent or almost four times the national average of unemployment among all groups. And, during the coming school year, more than 750,000 young people will either fail to return to school or drop out during the school term. They will enter the labor force and, unfortunately, many will contribute to these "unemployment statistics."

Gaining an education which earns for you a productive place in American society has immeasurable effects. It influences you as an individual, the family you might have some day, the community in which you will live, and, ultimately, your country. But perhaps you, the individual, are the real reason to continue your education. It is true that you may not completely understand why you must take this subject in high school, or why study with that particular teacher, but these problems are only small parts of the general contribution an education will make for your future.

But, do not evaluate your need of an education only on statistics. Think about what it will mean to you personally 1 year—5 years—even 20 years from now. Say in 1980 when you will be only 30 or 35 years old. Will you be a national unemployment statistic? Or will you be using all the education and training you had available during the years you were growing and learning?

I hope that you young people will make the decision to return to school this term. In doing that, you will make some real plans for your future.

SS "HOPE" RETURNS FROM WEST AFRICA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, 1 hour ago the hospital ship SS *Hope* returned to the United States after successfully completing its fourth teaching and healing voyage. The great white ship docked in Philadelphia at 11 this morning, home from a 10-month mission to Conakry, Guinea.

During the 10 months this American floating medical center was in that West African port, the ship's medical staff trained hundreds of doctors, surgeons, nurses, and technicians in modern medical techniques.

At the same time, the *Hope* staff performed approximately 1,500 operations, immunized 125,000 Guineans, treated thousands more, and distributed 750,000 cartons of milk.

More important, though, the members of the *Hope* medical crew provided a practical demonstration of the spirit of Americanism in that developing African nation. In fact, Guinean Health Minister Alpha Amadou Diallo called the *Hope* "a living symbol of the will of the people of the United States to make an effective contribution to the efforts undertaken by the people of Guinea to improve their own conditions of existence."

Mr. Speaker, I have long believed in and supported Project Hope, since Dr. William Walsh first advanced this great humanitarian project, and I congratulate the men and women who staff the ship for their success in translating noble idea and objectives into far-reaching good will for America.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members will join me in welcoming home the good ship *Hope*.

MANNED ORBITAL LABORATORIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee I want to express my support of the program set forth in a recent announcement by the President that the United States plans to launch five manned orbital laboratories starting in 1968.

At his press conference on Sunday, President Johnson said:

> No national sovereignty rules in outer space. Those who venture there go as envoys of the entire human race.

As this editorial from the August 26 New York Journal American indicates, the President has demonstrated that he means what he says by his invitation to a Russian scientist to watch the Gemini VI launching later this year. The importance of this invitation is articulately put by this editorial which I insert in the RECORD by consent at this time.

LAB IN SPACE

Announcement by President Johnson and the Defense Department that the United States plans to launch five manned orbital laboratories beginning in 1968 is exciting and readily credible. Yesterday's fantasies are today's realities or tomorrow's likelihoods.

Two astronauts, crawling into a laboratory from an attached Gemini capsule, will remain for up to 30 days in researching the heavens for knowledge useful in future excursions. Their work done, they will return to the capsule, detach it from the laboratory and come back to earth.

The Gemini 6 launching scheduled for October will be a preliminary, involving a linking up with an orbiting satellite. To this launching, President Johnson has invited the Russian Academy of Science to send an observer.

The invitation is a brilliant stroke. It is notification to the world that we are not secretive about our space ventures. They are public. Possibly it holds a subtle retort to Russian criticism when Gemini 5 suffered early trouble. Moscow then scorned the flight as ill-prepared in our haste to outpace Russia.

The laboratory enterprise is dramatic assurance to the American people that we are not laggard. We may be a few yards ahead in one phase, a few behind in another. But the United States is on a daring course and there is solid reason that hope will become realization.

PRESS AND PUBLIC OPPOSE "DE-HATCHING"

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service Commission has largely ignored the pleas of some of us in Congress to act vigorously to protect the Federal work force being threatened increasingly by large-scale political wheeling and dealing. So it is fortunate that many current "de-Hatching" efforts are not going without public notice and growing condemnation.

I request inclusion in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a most interesting article by Mike Causey, staff writer on the Washington Post, which indicates many civil service employees are aware the retention of the Hatch Act is "the salvation of the civil service."

I also request inclusion of recent editorials which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune and the St. Paul Pioneer-Press.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 29, 1965]

THEIR DRUTHERS SAY "STAY HATCHED"—FEDERAL WORKERS LIKE LIFE OF PARTISAN CELIBACY

(By Mike Causey)

It has been 26 years since the "no politics" umbrella of the Hatch Act was raised over the heads of Federal workers. Despite this long period of partisan celibacy, it appears that most employees are uninterested in sticking their necks out to see if politics is still reigning in the Federal service.

Critics of the act argue that it makes second-class citizens of Federal workers by denying them the right to participate actively in partisan politics and local government.

But friends of the act love it this way.

The act was born out of the political scandals and rumors of scandals during the early years of the Roosevelt administration. The Government was trying to get the country out of the depression and thousands were added to the Federal payroll and millions of people came under federally financed projects.

Members of Congress from both parties expressed the fear that political bosses might use the Federal payroll to create a cadre of party workers and donors.

The act generally bars Federal workers (and State and county employees paid with Federal funds) from actively participating in

partisan politics. It also is supposed to protect them from on-the-job campaign solicitations. It does not interfere with the political activities of their families, or with the right to vote. It punishes violators with suspension or removal from their jobs.

PARTIAL EXEMPTIONS

Shortly after the act was passed, the Civil Service Commission began granting partial exemptions—"unhatching" areas with heavy Federal employee populations. Where that happened, employees may support nonpartisan candidates or run themselves against partisan candidates.

In other areas, Federal employees may only participate in elections that are strictly nonpartisan.

Those who want major liberalization of the act say that partial exemptions are no more refreshing than bathing fully clothed. They say this only creates a politically stagnant climate that nourishes nonpartisan splinter groups.

Counties and local communities in the Washington metropolitan area have been granted partial exemption from the act.

Nonpartisan organizations have sprung up in Alexandria and Falls Church and in Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties. The most successful is the Arlingtonians for a Better County, which has held power almost since it was organized in the mid-1950's. It has drawn much of its strength from Federal employees.

Local politicians and some employees claim that the nonpartisan splinter groups drain off the best talent in predominantly Federal employee communities and that regular parties suffer. Others say that the nonpartisan groups are, in fact, more partisan than regular Democratic or Republican organizations.

MOVES FOR CHANGE

So there are moves to change the law. Recently, several Federal workers in Montgomery joined with the county's Democratic State Central Committee and filed suit in Federal court to challenge CSC's partial exemption policy.

Representative HERVEY G. MACHEN, Democrat, of Maryland, and other lawmakers have introduced legislation to grant total exemption from the act for employees at the local level. Most of the steam generated for such exemptions has, naturally, come from area Congressmen.

The Senate has approved a bill by Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER, Democrat, of Maryland, to establish a bipartisan commission to study the Hatch Act. It is generally believed that such a commission would recommend liberalizing the act.

And if Congress approves home rule for Washington, residents may find themselves choosing between Democratic and Republican candidates for mayor who also are Federal employees. Both the Senate-approved bill and legislation by Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, now in the House District Committee, would lift the ban on partisan political activity for Federal employees who live here.

A CSC official said that no high-level study has been made by his agency but conceded that opening the political arena here to Federal employees "could make some interesting problems." Another high-level official said he thought it would "be terrible to exempt employees living here and keep restrictions" on more than 2 million Federal workers outside Washington.

But many Members of Congress and employee leaders doubt that Federal workers are straining at the leash to enter local partisan politics. Congressional critics have said for years that many employees don't even take advantage of the rights they have under the act. They suspect that some employees depend upon the act as a legal shield to avoid political involvement.

Those who favor liberalizing the act emphasize that none of the protections against on-the-job-partisanship would be altered. But skeptical Federal workers seem to believe a foot in the door could lead to many unwelcome changes.

NO BURNING ISSUE

Employees, however, haven't been consulted, and that isn't surprising. For one thing, there are too many of them. Another problem is that the act just isn't a typical item of daily conversation in Government lunchrooms as is Vietnam, vacation plans or the hard-hearted supervisor. In fact, an unscientific poll conducted by the Washington Post revealed that many employees don't even know what the Hatch Act is.

A dozen of those interviewed, mostly in grade 5 and below, said they were unaware of, or completely uninterested in, the act. But ignorance and apathy are not confined to the lower grades.

A grade 12 supervisor at Health, Education, and Welfare said she "never had any reason to think about it." But like other employees who "weren't interested," she added: "If it protects you from being forced to buy those $100 tickets, I'm for it. * * * Things are working well like they are."

She was referring to $100-a-plate Democratic congressional dinner here some time ago. Scores of employees contacted Congressmen and newspapers to say they were being pressured to buy tickets. But little hard evidence was ever turned over to CSC.

Another woman, a grade 4 employee of the District government, was well versed on the act. An active civil rights worker, she said it would "be risky to change it. I'm in all the outside activities I want and it doesn't bother me. * * * The act gives you a lot of freedom if you know how to use it."

A grade 12 Public Health Service employee said she had seen a great deal of politics and pressure in more than 20 years with Defense and an agency of the State Department. She called the act "the salvation of the civil service. Otherwise, each party in power would start nibbling away, some of them using a hatchet. * * * If you have a law to fall back on, you have some protection."

WHY ROCK THE BOAT?

During several lunch-hour sessions at a Government cafeteria, I talked with a few employees who said they had never heard of the act, but all but one knew there were certain political restrictions on employees and that it was illegal for their boss to bring political pressure on them.

A grade 7 college graduate at Treasury said he had never seen any political hanky-panky during his 3 years service. But he said the act "is a good thing. It saves us. Why rock the boat?"

A Veterans' Administration employee flatly stated: "Change it, are they nuts? It's what keeps the wolves away from the door."

A 43-year-old Commerce Department employee said fear of the act "keeps the commissars in my shop at bay."

A grade 16 official at Housing and Home Finance Agency said he had seen several administrations come and go and managed to weather them all with the help of the Hatch Act. Proposals to change it, he said, "are for the birds. It's the craziest damn thing they could do. It would be the start of the breakdown of civil service.

"I got nine letters at my home inviting me to that Democratic congressional dinner," he said. "Think of that—nine letters. I wonder where they got their mailing list? But they couldn't make me go."

Statistics on violations of the law kept by CSC since the law was approved in August 1939, show about 4,000 complaints of possible violations. CSC has ordered the removal of employees in 231 cases and has suspended 335 for violations. Thirty-five cases are pending. That means no action was taken in about 75 percent of the cases.

Violations included solicitation of funds by or from Federal employees for partisan political causes or candidates on Federal installations; threats regarding jobs and promotions for uncooperative political donors or workers, and actions or public statements by employees which violated their nonpartisan status.

Of course, CSC has no idea how many violations have not been reported. "People are afraid to talk about these things officially," a spokesman said, "and of course it is hard to prove that your boss implied you wouldn't get a promotion if you didn't kick in."

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Aug. 18, 1965]

POOR EXPLANATION OF POSTAL PATRONAGE

The announcement that future summer hiring of youths for postal jobs will be based on merit would be more convincing if it were not such a blatant attempt to excuse political favoritism.

There was a misunderstanding, admitted Postmaster General John Gronouski and John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, that gave nearly half of 8,500 youth opportunity jobs to nominees of mostly Democratic Congressmen. There apparently was a misunderstanding on their part, too, since the nominees included their own relatives and sons of the party faithful.

If this is the Civil Service Commission's idea of an investigation, the taxpayers are getting mighty poor protection for their money. The Commission, of course, has had experience at this sort of cover-up. For the past year, it and the Department of Justice have been sitting on demands by Representative ANCHER NELSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, that the law prohibiting Federal employees from soliciting political funds from other Federal employees be enforced.

That incident involved four officials in the Rural Electrification Administration, but the same type of arm-twisting was detected in the State and Commerce Departments for last June's $100-a-plate Democratic congressional dinner. The Commission, it seems, has a greater respect for politics than it does for the public.

The taxpayers deserve a better explanation of who is encouraging the patronage policy in youth work programs—a course that the Commission itself ordered to be avoided—and of what is being done to prevent its resumption. Continued pressure from Representatives ALBERT QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota, and H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, may help to get some real answers.

[From the St. Paul Dispatch, Aug. 20, 1965]

COVER-UP ON JOBS SCANDAL

Post Office officials at Washington are trying to cover up the full extent of the postal jobs scandal exposed by ALBERT QUIE, Minnesota's First district Republican Congressman.

QUIE caught the Post Office Department with its political pants down when he revealed that extra postal jobs supposed to be part of the President's poverty program were being handed out as patronage plums to relatives of high-up Democratic politicians.

In an effort to continue his probe, QUIE asked the Post Office Department for the names of all persons hired this summer under the youth opportunities program. He was denied the information, and is now trying to get the House to adopt a resolution formally demanding the list. No one expects the resolution to get far. After all, the House majority is Democratic, and not a few of these Members put friends or possibly relatives on the Post Office payroll before the White House clamped down on the patronage caper that was in progress.

Whether he ever gets the list of names or not, QUIE has performed an excellent public service by bringing the jobs situation into the open. He managed to dig out enough facts to show what was going on, and the refusal of the Assistant Postmaster General to provide more information probably means that other abuses would be disclosed if the full records were available. The public will draw its own conclusions from this tawdry episode.

KATHERINE NABOKOFF

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, 1965, the House of Representatives approved S. 618, which compensates Miss Nora Samuelli for the duration of her imprisonment by the Rumanian Government because of her alleged espionage in behalf of the United States. At that time, I stated my belief that others who suffered similar fates should be treated fairly by our Government.

In fulfillment of that statement, I am today introducing a private bill to compensate Katherine Nabokoff, and other persons employed by the American Legation in Bucharest, who were imprisoned under circumstances similar to Miss Samuelli. The Nabokoff case is extremely meritorious. She was imprisoned a longer period than Miss Samuelli. When she was released she made her way to Paris, and is currently employed in the American Embassy there.

I am confident the Congress will want to accord her, and others in similar situations, fair and equitable compensation. I hope the Claims Subcommittee will act expeditiously and favorably on my bill.

HELPING THE OLDER WORKER

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, of the multitude of ways in which man discriminates against his fellow man, one of the most difficult to oppose effectively—and to overcome personally—is discrimination in employment because of age.

Few social problems have become so serious and widespread in so short a time, chiefly because of the unfortunate trend in much of business and industry which denies to persons over 40 or 45 or 55, as the case may be, the opportunity even to be considered for employment, regardless of their qualifications or capabilities.

Men and women who, through no fault of their own, find themselves out of work and over 40 are the forgotten people of our time. They are victims of the myth that holds they are too settled, too hard to retrain, and have too little time left to make valuable contributions to new employers. The facts are otherwise, however—and demonstrably so—and it is up to Congress to help relieve the anxieties that beset millions of the middle-aged and eliminate the obstacles that stand in the way of full opportunity for all.

Toward this objective, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a series of five bills which I believe attacks the problem of age discrimination at its causes and which is designed not only to prohibit age discrimination in employment but also to encourage employers to give older workers a chance to prove their worth. In doing so, I am pleased to join with the growing number of our colleagues who have seen the tragedy of age discrimination and who are determined to do something to help.

When a man or woman of 55, for instance, loses his job, he faces the prospect of long months of frustration, fear, and insecurity as he searches for a new one. And the odds are heavily against his finding a new job similar in kind and pay to his former position—no matter how skilled and experienced and vigorous he may be. The cost of such an experience in terms of mental anguish, family suffering, lost income, and damaged self-respect is too high to measure. One must observe it at firsthand to appreciate how painful—and how unnecessary—it all is.

A number of recent studies, Mr. Speaker, including those undertaken by the Departments of Commerce and Labor, document the seriousness of age discrimination. Here are some of their findings:

First, nationally, one-half of all job openings that develop in the private economy each year are closed to applicants over 55, and one-quarter of them are unavailable to persons over 45.

Second, though 20 of the States, including New Jersey, do have laws banning age discrimination, many of the laws have not been implemented and most of the States lack the resources to assure compliance.

Third, 30 of the 50 States have no laws at all prohibiting age discrimination in employment, and in those States more than half of all employers set specific age limits—usually between 45 and 55—beyond which workers will not be considered for employment, regardless of ability.

Fourth, once a person over 45 loses a job, the chances against finding another job like it are 6 to 1 against him. And the older the person is and the less education and training he has, the more hopeless his problem becomes.

Fifth, last year, about 3.5 million workers age 45 or older were involuntarily unemployed—and this at a time of unprecedented prosperity. The number of workers in this age bracket continues to grow, and should the economy fail to continue growing as rapidly as the working-age population, conditions for the middle-aged worker can only become much worse.

There are reasons, of course, why age discrimination is so dishearteningly widespread. They are not malicious reasons, for business and industry do not seek to persecute middle-aged workers. Employers are concerned, however, that older workers may be less physically capable, less adaptable to new conditions, that they sometimes lack special skills and training and have a shorter period of work expectancy, that pension plans cost more for older workers, and that younger workers can be employed for less money, all of which may add to the cost of doing business in a highly competitive field.

On the other hand, when older applicants are, in fact, more capable and dependable, as these studies have demonstrated is often the case, or when retraining and the acquisition of new skills is feasible—and I refer to the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center study for the Bureau of Labor Statistics as evidence of the adaptability of older workers—then job discrimination hurts not only the deprived applicants but the employers and our economy and society as well. This, especially true when discrimination consists of the blunt, blind refusal, rigid and unbending, to employ workers once they have passed a specific age, however able or qualified they may be. Such a closed-door policy only adds to long-term unemployment, higher relief costs, and extensive human suffering and despair.

In such a complex situation, Mr. Speaker, a law which simply prohibits job discrimination will be unworkable. Legislation is needed, I am convinced, but it must attack the causes of discrimination, remove the obstacles to employment of older workers, and help make it possible for employers to hire such workers without suffering financial or competitive disadvantages.

The legislation I have introduced today will, I believe, meet these criteria. This five-bill package of proposals will, among other things, do the following:

First, amend both the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act to make it an unfair practice for an employer or labor organization to refuse to hire, to discharge, or to otherwise discriminate against an individual solely on account of age where age distinctions are not reasonably related to the demands of the job.

Second, establish in the Department of Labor a Bureau of Older Workers which would provide leadership and coordination in Federal activities to prevent age discrimination and to increase employment opportunities for older workers.

Third, authorize the appropriation of funds for the provision of grants by the Secretary of Labor to public and nonprofit private agencies for demonstration or experimental projects to show that older workers are useful and employable.

Fourth, authorize grants by the Secretary of Labor to voluntary, nonprofit groups which operate programs designed to assist older workers in obtaining employment.

Fifth, provide a credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons when it can be shown that such employment results in added costs of doing business.

I believe these are reasonable and workable proposals, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge employers and their organizations to study this and other pending legislation so as to cooperate with Congress and the executive branch in finding ways of ending age discrimination and enlarging opportunities for older workers—in the best interests of all concerned.

DEMOCRATS CREATE SPECIAL-INTEREST AUTO CARTEL

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND . Mr. Speaker, there is considerable irony in passage of H.R. 9042, which would wipe out automobile tariffs between the United States and Canada and establish instead a huge, international cartel. I remember well the time Mr. Charles Wilson, Secretary of Defense under President Eisenhower, said "What is good for General Motors is good for the country" and how the Democrats jumped on him and laughed him derisively from office. So here we have a Democratic administration urging a compliant Democratic Congress to enact, in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, a $50-million-a-year windfall for big automobile manufacturers.

This bill, by which Congress merely gives approval to an action already taken by the President and the Government of Canada, will give the big automobile companies the right to more operations across the border any time labor costs get too high for them in this country. American auto workers who are thrown out of work as a result, become eligible, under this special-interest legislation, for all kinds of special help and treatment which is not available to any other workers displaced by foreign imports. The cost of the special programs is to be borne not by the automobile companies who are being given this lush opportunity but by the Federal Treasury; that is, by the taxpayers of America.

SPECIAL INTEREST CARTEL

I voted against this bill because it is special-interest legislation, violating existing trade treaties, establishing a huge cartel to be operated by the barons of auto management. This bill eminently bears out my oft-repeated charge that, underneath its public-relations veneer of being for all the people, this Great Society administration is, in fact, only for the big interests.

This bill is completely inconsistent with fair treatment for labor and with the administration's brave words about free trade. It represents a tremendous concession to four automobile companies. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] when he told us that we are on the road away from free trade and back to the stagnant days of the Smoot-Hawley tariffs.

AUTO WORKERS FAVORED OVER OTHERS

It is interesting to point out that, while auto workers who lose their jobs, as a result of Canadian imports enabled by this bill, can go directly to the President for relief, other workers similarly displaced are bound by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Under that act, workers seeking the authorized relief—tax breaks, job retraining, and so on—must apply to the Tariff Commission for a finding that imports were the cause of the unemployment. It is interesting to note that the Tariff Commission has turned down every such application since that law went into effect.

It is true that Canada is a great friend and a tremendously important ally. It is true that Canada will be helped by this legislation, particularly Canadian automobile companies which are 90-percent owned by American auto companies. It is true that the economic, political, and even cultural lives of our two countries are closely intertwined. But all these truths together do not justify our Government's abandoning trade commitments to other nations, or its unequal, unfair treatment of other American workers and industries.

LOGGING, SHOE, TEXTILE WORKERS LEFT OUT

What am I to tell my constituents in the shoemaking and textile industries about this bill? They are in trouble because of foreign imports and their livelihoods are in jeopardy? What can I tell my friends in the logging and papermaking industries? Are their problems with Canada going to be treated in a similar way? Can they go directly to our President for help if they lose their jobs? No, it would appear not. I must instead tell them that our Government has enacted a tremendously beneficial bill for the automobile industry, which is extremely rich and important, more important evidently than our treaty commitments to other nations, and certainly more important than the poor little fellow making shoes or textiles in New England, or cutting logs in the northern woods.

I shall also tell them I voted against the bill; that I was one of a relative handful who fought for their interests.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the spirit of Secretary Charlie Wilson is watching these proceedings. He might even agree with this bill because it is certainly wonderful for General Motors but I think he would be astonished that it comes from a Democratic administration.

YUGOSLAVIA 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate the people of the United States are consistently being misinformed by naive and misdirected Government functionaries and spokesmen on the true complications in foreign affairs. In my humble opinion, one of the most consistent misdirectors of public opinion is the distinguished Senator from Arkansas who is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Recently the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved the release of a report entitled "Yugoslavia 1964." The Croatian National Council—in exile—one of the stalwart anti-Communist organizations speaking on behalf of the peoples of Yugoslavia, presented a most effective reply to that report which I place in the RECORD at this point as a continuation of my remarks.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this commentary on the Foreign Relations Committee report clarifies the situation and corrects any misunderstandings which may have arisen if the Fulbright report is interpreted to be accurate.

The report follows:

FULBRIGHT'S FICTION: YUGOSLAVIA 1964

(A reply to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT'S report "Yugoslavia 1964" submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by the Croatian National Council)

J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, the honorable Senator from Arkansas and chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, made a 9-day visit to Yugoslavia last November, seemingly more to confirm his preconception about Tito's Communist government than to learn the facts. The Senator candidly admits in the opening sentence of his report submitted to the Senate committee and issued in summary to the press on July 20, 1965, that "it is not possible in a visit of 9 days to acquire expert knowledge or reach definitive conclusions about a country as complex as Yugoslavia." But having said this, Senator FULBRIGHT blithely proceeds to draw sweeping, and often erroneous conclusions about the nature of Tito's dictatorship, and then on this basis to postulate what U.S. policy should be toward Communist Yugoslavia.

Tito Equates the United States With Nazi Germany: After being wined and dined by Tito at one of his numerous retreats, Senator FULBRIGHT concluded that Tito and his associates are "extraordinary individuals" and that from the U.S. viewpoint Communist Yugoslavia is a "friendly country." Possibly Tito won Senator FULBRIGHT'S endorsement by comparing the United States with Hitler's Nazi Germany and Mussolini's Facist Italy (see David Binder, the New York Times, May 11, 1965). Senator FULBRIGHT does concede that Tito has vehemently condemned U.S. policy in Asia and Africa and that Yugoslavia trades with Castro's Cuba. But, says the Senator, Communist Yugoslavia is no more hostile toward the United States than many other countries. The conclusion he draws from this is that the United States should do what it can to strengthen Tito's dictatorship. Actually Tito conducts a cheap policy of blackmail, vehemently abusing the United States and then promising to suspend his attacks in return for economic assistance. Usually Tito assails the United States most vehemently when he needs U.S. aid the least, and turns cooperative when he is in dire economic straits. Thus, for months the Yugoslav press accused the United States of aggression in the Congo and Vietnam, but as economic chaos in Yugoslavia increased and the need for further U.S. aid became more pressing, Tito's criticism turned into a

whimper, and he even offered to act as an intermediary between the United States and North Vietnam. Tito will undoubtedly soon submit a bill for his services for a cool several hundred million dollars in aid.

After 20 years of Tito's rule, economic chaos: Senator FULBRIGHT claims that if Americans judge Tito's dictatorship by its performance "we are bound to concede that it has been a successful government." The Senator apparently got his "facts" about the Yugoslav economy directly from Tito and the other "men of unusual competence" who entertained him during his Yugoslav stay. It is regrettable that the Senator was not able to talk with Tito's unfortunate subjects, the workers in the factories and the farmers in the fields, for if he had he would have come back home with quite a different view of the "successes" of the Communist dictatorship. In fact Senator FULBRIGHT does not seem to have ever read George Bailey's article in the Reporter (July 1) describing the dismal chaos raging in the Yugoslav economy and the failure of Tito's foreign policy of so-called nonalinement. Even more surprising, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee does not seem to have read the New York Times dispatches in recent months, or perhaps he does not give them much credence. For instance on August 1, the New York Times reported that the Yugoslav cost of living went up 72 percent over the past few months, and that at present 200,000 "unskilled workers" (7 percent of the employed labor force) face dismissal. This is in addition to 500,000 workers already unemployed or underemployed, and the 140,000 Yugoslavs (mostly Croats) who have been compelled to seek employment in West Germany, the country which Tito constantly reviles. According to top Yugoslav Communists, Yugoslav industry operates at a dismal 54 percent of capacity. But all Senator FULBRIGHT needed to do was to find out what Komunist, the official organ of the Yugoslav Communist League, is saying about the economy. Last September, Komunist front-paged the speech of Vladimir Bakaric, Croatia's top Communist, in which he said that in Communist Yugoslavia the workers are worse off, and are more exploited, than were the slaves in Homer's Greece of 3,000 years ago, or the Central American Indians after the Spanish conquest. This then is the success achieved by the Communist regime, after 20 years in power. But even while Komunist concedes the dismal failures of the regime, Senator FULBRIGHT assures his colleagues of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "the Yugoslav economy has made impressive strides" and that "rapid growth continued in 1964."

Is Congress to blame for Yugoslavia's economic chaos? Arguing as he does against the facts, Senator FULBRIGHT is caught in a succession of contradictions. While lauding the impressive successes of Yugoslavia's Communist regime, he at the same time blames the U.S. Congress for the disastrous deficit in Yugoslavia's balance of payments. Says Senator FULBRIGHT: "The Yugoslav economy has been adversely influenced by inconsistent American policies." And a little later, he is even more explicit in blaming his congressional colleagues of problems of Tito's own making: "A new threat to the Yugoslav balance of payments has resulted from the unfortunate decision of Congress in October 1964 to deny Yugoslavia the right to purchase surplus American food products for local currency under the food-for-peace program." These so-called "sales" for local currency were in effect a form of subsidy to Tito's Communist regime, for the U.S. Government returned to Yugoslavia about 90 percent of the dinars to finance various projects in Yugoslavia. In reality Senator FULBRIGHT's attack on Congress' decision to terminate U.S. grain sales for worthless dinars (but to continue sales for dollars) may presage a renewed campaign to resurrect the now defunct program of subsidizing Tito's dictatorship. Let it be said that since 1945 Yugoslavia has received about $3.5 billion in U.S. assistance, more than Germany, France, or Italy received under the Marshall plan. Yet, today these countries enjoy unprecedented prosperity. The Yugoslav standard of living remains dismally low, and has in fact plummeted further over the past year, notwithstanding Senator FULBRIGHT's claim that "the standard of living of the Yugoslav people has risen steadily" under communism. The Yugoslav currency is almost worthless, to the point where farmers are refusing to sell their produce for dinars, and are instead demanding payment in German marks, dollars, and other foreign currencies (see the Belgrade publication Ekonomska Politika, June 5, 1965). At the same time the Government seeks to extract tax payments in foreign currencies from people with relatives working abroad. This is the state of the Yugoslav economy after 20 years of Tito's "extraordinary leadership" and after $3.5 billion in U.S. taxpayers' money has gone down the sewer which is Tito's economy. Clearly, Tito, and not the U.S. Congress, is to blame for Yugoslavia's economic chaos.

Why Yugoslav farms do not produce enough food: Senator FULBRIGHT praises Tito for abandoning collectivization in 1953. But if he had talked to the farmers or had read such books as Ernst Halpern's "The Triumphant Heretic," Senator FULBRIGHT would be aware that the regime has been driving the farmers off the land and into the cities by destroying them economically with confiscatory taxation. This is one of the reasons why Yugoslavia, which was formerly a food-exporting country, now must import every year large amounts of grain from abroad. To make the irony complete, the regime is currently dismissing from the factories the "unskilled workers" (i.e., the farmers previously driven off the land), and is forcing them to return to the villages, starve in the cities, or flee abroad.

More freedom, or less? One of the gravest mistakes Senator FULBRIGHT makes in his analysis of the Yugoslav situation is in asserting that "the long-term trend has been greater than less freedom." Admittedly, between 1948, following Tito's break with Moscow, and 1953, when Stalin died, Yugoslavia made notable steps in the direction of liberalization. But this trend was arrested after Stalin's death made it possible for Tito to mend his fences with Moscow. This, in fact, is what Milovan Djilas' dispute with Tito and the Yugoslav Communist Committee was all about. While Djilas demanded that the Communist dictatorship gradually evolve into socialist democrat, the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party held fast in its determination to maintain the dictatorship. Djilas was duly arrested, brought to trial and jailed in the Sremska Mitrovica prison. From then on, the Yugoslav leadership has carried on a determined struggle to prevent a further liberalization of the system. How much intellectual freedom there actually is in Communist Yugoslavia was amply shown by the arrest, imprisonment, and trial of Mihajlo Mihajlov, an assistant professor at the Croat University of Zagreb, at Zadar. The subsequent suspension of Mihajlov's jail sentence by the Croat Supreme Court is an indication of the power struggle going on within the Communist party between the "liberal" Croat and Slovene Communists and the "Stalinist" pro-Soviet Serbian wing of the party.

For a sane U.S. policy toward Communist Yugoslavia: The economic situation in Yugoslavia is so grave that the Communist regime may be forced to radically liberalize the system. Apparently, Senator FULBRIGHT is one of those representatives of the people who entertain doubts about the capacity of the people to find an alternative to dictatorship. He quotes to this effect from the book "Yugoslavia and the New Communism," by George W. Hoffman and Fred Warner Neal. According to this familiar line of thinking, there is no realistic alternative to dictators such as Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, Tito, and Trujillo; dissidents like Djilas, who advocate the establishment of a socialist democracy, are befogged utopians. The Croat people, as well as the other nations which live under Tito's terroristic regime, oppose the granting of further U.S. assistance to prop up the Tito regime. While such programs as the Fulbright-Hays Act, under which an exchange of students is carried on between the United States and Yugoslavia, may be of positive value; the granting of further economic assistance to Tito's regime can only hamper the struggle for freedom within Yugoslavia. The United States should, at the present time, pursue a policy of noninvolvement in internal Yugoslav affairs. First and foremost, this means that the U.S. Government should withhold further aid to Tito's crumbling dictatorship, either directly, through the food-for-peace program, or indirectly, through United States and World Bank loans.

THE 26TH ANNIVERSARY OF GERMAN INVASION OF POLAND

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 26 years ago today the Nazi forces invaded Poland, and the World War II officially erupted.

Of special significance to all of us is the continued determination of the people of Poland and the other captive nations of communism to resist the Red tyranny to which they were assigned by President Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference.

In commemoration of this historic day, I place in the RECORD as part of my remarks a message from the President of the Republic of Poland to the Polish nation:

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND TO THE POLISH NATION, SEPTEMBER 1, 1965

His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, has issued in London the following message to Poles all over the world to mark the 26th anniversary of the German invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939, and the 25th anniversary of her participation in the defense of Western Europe:

"On September 1, every Pole recalls with horror that terrible time when Hitler's Germany allied with Stalin's Russia began the war in order to carry out another partition of Poland. Both these inhumane autocrats, masking their imperialistic aims with the ideology of a pseudo-Socialism—one qualified as 'national' and the other as 'Soviet'—knew in advance that the Polish Armed Forces would be unable to withstand their combined more powerful armies despite the heroism of the Polish soldiers and the great effort made by the whole nation. Furthermore, they knew the attitude of our allies who did not even intend then to help us in the hope that they would manage to end hostilities by a compromise at Poland's cost.

"But it was unexpected for Poland's enemies that, despite defeat on the field of battle,

the Polish nation would continue to fight in the homeland and beyond its frontiers.

"The beginnings of the Polish Home Army date from immediately after the capitulation of Warsaw in 1939. Within a few months, there arose in France a fresh Polish army of nearly 100,000 men ready to fight for the indisputable right of the Polish nation to its own independent state. The greater part of this army consisted of Poles who had lived on hospitable French soil for long past. Wherever Poles happened to be, they also hastened to join the colors.

"As early as April 1940, the Polish Highland Brigade was fighting the Germans in Norway; off her coasts, fought Polish warships which had broken out from the Baltic whilst part of the Polish merchant fleet carried out auxiliary duties.

"Toward the end of August and in September of the same year, the Polish Air Force signally contributed to the victorious outcome of the Battle of Britain. Testimony to this was given by the then British Ambassador to the Polish Government, Sir William Howard Kennard, who wrote to the Polish Foreign Minister as follows on September 8, 1940:

" 'I should be grateful if you would convey to the President of the Republic and the Polish Government my congratulations on the brilliant feats of the Polish Air Force during the past few days. I feel sure that they must inspire all Poles with heartfelt pride and know that they are regarded with great admiration by all English people.'

"The current year, therefore, marks the passage of a quarter of a century since the fight for Poland began beyond her frontiers. I am convinced that although we cannot at the present juncture wage armed struggle for the freedom of our homeland, we will exert every effort to bring home the indubitable truth that there can be no word of freedom in the world until the Polish nation recovers its independence. And God Almighty will aid us in this, our struggle.

"AUGUST ZALESKI."

Mr. Speaker, as another indication of the determination of the Polish people to regain their freedom, I submit a resolution adopted at the Polish Soldiers Day on August 15, 1965, by the Polish Army Veterans Association of America, District 2, the New York Wing of the Polish Air Force Veterans Association in the U.S.A. and the Polish Underground Army Association of New York:

Whereas the stable and unswerving line of our activity and purposes has been and will continue to strive toward the restoration of full freedom and independence to Poland under a democratic system; and

Whereas the existing Communist system imposed on and forcibly maintained in Poland by Russia is not only far from being free and independent, but even does not show a tendency toward softening of the dictatorial regime, as was the case with other countries behind the Iron Curtain: Now, therefore:

1. We brand the hypocritical policy of the Communist regime as far as the recognition of Poland's western boundaries on the Oder and Neisse Rivers by the United States and other countries is concerned. Both the declaration of the regime as well as the policy pursued by the latter indicates that they are merely interested in a Soviet monopoly in this territory. This only incites us to double our efforts, so that the frontier be finally recognized by the United States and other countries of the free world.

2. We also endorse Poland's rights to the western frontiers with Lwow and Vilna, which were grabbed from Poland by force and lawlessness.

3. We reiterate our annual demand that the case of the Katyn Forest genocide be investigated by the United Nations Organization, and we brand the tactics of the regime to prevent an open and frank discussion on this subject both in Poland and on the international arena.

4. We solemnly protest against the increasing persecution of the Catholic Church in Poland. We demand that the Commission on Human Rights look into the continuous violation in Poland of the principle of religious tolerance, which was guaranteed by the United Nations Charter, as well as investigate the practice of depriving the Polish population of such citizen's rights as is freedom of speech and assembly, and primarily freedom of the press.

5. We also protest against the regime's persecution of the Polish writers, scientists and artists who strive for an ever-increasing freedom of their creative work. We shall alarm the Western World whenever the Communist regime will commit new violations which so far disgraced it in the opinion of the civilized world.

6. With regard to the so-called "Moczar Program" which under the pretenses of fraternal collaboration tends to perpetrate Communist infiltration into Polish veterans organizations in the United States and in the Western World by means of the "Association of Fighters for Freedom and Democracy" (ZBOWID)—we can only express contempt. If Moczar and ZBOWID really desire closer ties with our veterans organizations and Americans of Polish descent—let them abolish visas in the tourist exchange with Poland and let them allow free access into Poland of our publications and newspapers printed by both the veterans and Polonia, as well as Polish books printed in exile.

7. We promise to do everything in our power to assure splendor and success to the Millennium of Poland's Christianity observance in 1966 in the United States, which will remind the American Nation of the 1,000-year existence of Poland as a Christian, civilized, and independent state.

8. While rejecting the idea of an atomic war for the liberation of Poland and other countries under Communist occupation, we fully support an American policy which will help the Polish nation liberate itself and recover independence; in particular we favor the "bridge-building" policy of President Johnson, provided, however, that these bridges will connect the United States with the Polish nation and not the Communist regime.

9. We support the Government of the United States in its determined fight against the aggressive Communist front.

Long live the United States.

Long live the persevering people of Poland in their fight for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we must develop a foreign policy that will be based on the eventual restoration of freedom to the captives of communism. In this foreign policy we must use economic, diplomatic, and propaganda weapons to roll back communism and to place the Communists on the defensive, as they properly should be. Unless we avow this type of foreign policy, continued deterioration of the free-world position will unfortunately follow.

It is my hope that the stirring message of the President of the Republic of Poland to the oppressed Polish people and the resolution adopted at the convention of Polish-American veterans will carry with them significance to all of us in the free world who recognize that there cannot be true peace until legitimate freedom and self-determination are guaranteed all peoples of the world.

WHO IS FOOLING WHOM?

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, while traveling across country not too long ago, I stopped with my family in a restaurant for our evening meal. After reading over the menu, I noticed a printed card was attached and I was somewhat shocked. The card read:

Recent, rapid, ravaging food costs makes it necessary for an increase of 50 cents on all steaks. We hope this situation is only temporary.

The impression is left that the price of the steak is the cause of the increase. Coming from an area that produces the finest beef in America I thought I should press my inquiry further.

I then asked the waitress and later the assistant manager of the establishment if they had put a similar card on the menu when the price of beef was abnormally low about a year ago advising their customers that because their cost of beef was less than expected it was "necessary to reduce the price of steaks by 50 cents." The answer was, of course, no.

After returning to Washington, I began to make some inquiries about food prices and you do not have to be a housewife to realize there has been a substantial increase in cost.

I then went to a friend of mine here in Washington who is in the restaurant business and checked on his food prices to find out if there was a justification in placing the blame on the high cost of meat. The answer I received was no. The cost of fresh vegetables, lettuce, tomatoes, and so forth, and potatoes had risen substantially compared to the price of meat, in some cases over two and three times the cost of a year ago. This, then, is the area of blame and not the cattle producer, who a little over a year ago was on his way out as a result of the importation of cheap foreign beef.

My only point in bringing this to the House's attention, Mr. Speaker, is to set the record straight. The restaurant people have their problems and they seek redress in these legislative halls but if they want a fair audience and a fair hearing I suggest they play the ball game according to the rules.

There is an old maxim in equity cases that declares that persons seeking judgment must "come in with clean hands."

The person who blames increased costs of food on one group alone and actually profits by increased prices, should, I would think, be fair with the public and reduce prices when the costs they have to pay for food is reduced.

How long has it been since you looked at a menu in any restaurant and saw a reduction in the price of a meal?

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning's mail brought me a letter from Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover from our 30th Polaris nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *Benjamin Franklin* which has just successfully completed its sea trials.

The admiral told me something about the ship and also about our Founding Father for whom it was named. It is good for all of us to review the life of Benjamin Franklin. The plans he made and the program he followed to improve his own life and to serve his country are a challenge to all of us.

Under permission to extend my remarks I include the letter from Admiral Rickover.

U.S.S. "BENJAMIN FRANKLIN"
(SSBN 640).
At Sea in the North Atlantic,
August 30, 1965.

DEAR MRS. BOLTON: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Benjamin Franklin*, our 30th Polaris nuclear submarine. We also have in operation 22 attack-type nuclear submarines, making a total of 52. The *Benjamin Franklin* was built by the Electric Boat Division, General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn.

This ship is named for Benjamin Franklin (1706–90), one of the most illustrious of our Founding Fathers. A plain man of the people, his life was the American success story writ large. In his autobiography he speaks of his lowly beginnings and notes with quiet pride that he emerged from the poverty and obscurity of his birth to a state of affluence and some degree of reputation in the world. He did so purely on merit for he was, in every sense of the word, self-made man, owing little if anything to luck or the assistance of others, never pushing ahead at the expense of a fellow man.

Franklin was the youngest son of a poor tallow chandler who had migrated to Boston from England and married as his second wife the daughter of a former indentured serving maid. With 17 children to raise, he could give Benjamin only 2 to 3 years of schooling, but he encouraged him to study on his own, a habit which was to remain with Franklin all his life. At 10 the boy went to work in the family shop; at 12 he was apprenticed to his half brother to learn the printing trade, this being considered a suitable vocation for one whose love of books was already manifest.

In later life Franklin often remarked that he could not remember a time when he did not read. Books were his teachers. Through them he made himself a well-educated man. Taking the best authors as his models, he worked hard at perfecting his writing, eventually achieving a simple, lucid style. His thirst for knowledge never ceased. Since he wanted to read foreign books, he decided at 27—a busy young merchant—to teach himself to do so. "I soon made myself so much the master of the French," he remarked, "as to be able to read the books with ease. I then undertook the Italian." Later on, "with a little painstaking, acquired as much of the Spanish as to read their books also." He read not only for instruction but for enjoyment. His taste was catholic. All his life, men of learning and position, who would ordinarily not bother with an artisan, sought Franklin's company. He supposed it was because "reading had so improved my mind that my conversation was valued."

At 17 Franklin had learned all his brother could teach him and was ready to make his own way in the world. He went to New York but could find no work there, so continued on to Philadelphia. This is how he describes his arrival there after a long and uncomfortable trip—walking 50 miles, getting nearly shipwrecked, and helping to row a boat part of the way: "I was dirty from my journey; my pockets were stuffed out with shirts and stockings; I knew no soul, nor where to look for lodging. I was fatigued with traveling, rowing, and want of rest. I was very hungry and my whole stock of cash consisted of a Dutch dollar." He bought three large bread rolls. Wandering about town, munching, he met a fellow traveler. He gave her and her child two of his rolls. Thus did Franklin enter the town that was to become his permanent home, where he would rise to wealth and fame.

Seven years later he owned his own print shop, a stationery store, and a newspaper. He had in the meantime perfected his art by working for 18 months in England and could do the most intricate and difficult print jobs. At 26 he began the highly profitable annual publication of Poor Richard's Almanac. He managed his affairs so ably that at 42 he retired with an income equivalent to that of a royal governor. Though he was good at it, moneymaking never interested him, except as a means to obtain leisure for the things he really enjoyed: reading, study, scientific experimentation, social discourse, and correspondence with men of similar interests.

While still a journeyman printer, he had founded a club for sociability and self-improvement, called the Junto, of which he later said that it was "the best school of philosophy, morals, and politics" then existing in Pennsylvania. Its membership of about 12 consisted of alert, intelligent young artisans, tradesmen, and clerks who liked to read and debate. They met Friday evenings to discuss history, ethics, poetry, travels, mechanic arts and science (then called natural philosophy). It has been said of this group that it "brought the enlightenment in a leather apron to Philadelphia."

Franklin, who was full of ideas for improving life in Philadelphia and the Colonies in general, submitted all his proposals to the Junto where they were debated. Once accepted, members worked hard to get them put into effect. As a result, improvements were made in paving, lighting, and policing the town; a volunteer fire department and militia were formed; a municipal hospital was established; the foundations were laid for what became the University of Pennsylvania and the American Philosophical Society. Of most lasting importance, perhaps, was Franklin's plan for a subscription library, the first in the Colonies. Access to books, he felt, meant that "the doors to wisdom were never shut." The idea caught on. He noted with satisfaction that the numerous libraries springing up everywhere "have improved the general conversation of Americans, made the common tradesmen and farmers as intelligent as most gentlemen from other countries, and perhaps have contributed in some degree to the stand so generally made throughout the Colonies in defense of their privileges." The value of knowledge to man and society has never been put more succinctly.

When he was 40, Franklin discovered electricity. It was then a sort of magic, a parlor trick. Franklin—ably supported by his Junto—threw himself into experimentations and developed a workable theory which he proved in his famous kite experiment. In the 6 years between 1746 and 1752 his contributions to electricity changed it from a curiosity to a science, and in the process made him world famous. His writings on electricity were compared with Newton's Optics; he became the friend of most contemporary scientists, was made a member of virtually every scientific society and received honorary degrees from 20 universities. He was the first American scientist to win universal acclaim; the first American author to have his books translated and read as widely in Europe as in America. When he was sent to Paris, as America's first Ambassador to a major power, the admiration of France for Franklin's scientific achievement in catching lightning and putting it to man's use contributed not a little to the success of his mission: winning the help of France to the revolutionary cause.

As a man of leisure, Franklin found himself more and more drawn into public service, this being expected of anyone who had the time and ability to serve. He became a member of the Pennsylvania legislature, the Committee of Five charged with drafting the Declaration of Independence, the Second Continental Congress, and the Constitutional Convention. In one way or another, he represented America abroad a total of 25 years, becoming an exceedingly skillful diplomat. His statement, in hearings before Parliament, of the case of the Colonies against the hated Stamp Act was masterly and helped bring about the repeal of this act. He was among the first to recognize that not merely "taxation" but "legislation in general" without representation could not be borne by Englishmen, whether they lived at home or abroad. The bond uniting England and its Colonies, he argued, was the King, not Parliament. Had his "dominion status theory" been accepted, the war might have been prevented but, as he sadly remarked, "there was not enough wisdom."

At 65, Franklin began his autobiography, intending it for his son. When pressure of public duties interrupted work on the book, one of his friends pleaded with him to complete it. All that had happened to Franklin, he urged, was of great historic interest since it was "connected with the detail of the manners and situation of a rising people." Moreover, the way he had planned and conducted his life was "a sort of key and explained many things that all men ought to have once explained to them, to give them a chance of becoming wise by foresight."

His philosophy of life, the virtues he cultivated—competent workmanship, honesty, industry, and frugality—are within everyone's grasp; they are as important to a good and successful life today as in his time. No American child ought to grow to adulthood without having read the autobiography of this talented, wise, and good man, who personified all that is best in America. "Merely by being himself," wrote Mark van Doren, "he dignified and glorified his country."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW—VACATION OF PREVIOUS ORDER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the order previously entered to the effect that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

THE DOMESTIC SHEET GLASS INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope—and I know it is a hope which is shared by thousands of workmen and investors in the sheet glass industry across the country—that President Johnson will put to an early end the uncertainty and deep concern which prevail in the domestic sheet glass industry by declaring his intention to continue existing tariff rates.

The past few days have brought to my desk a large number of messages from business leaders, labor leaders, community officials—all expressing the very gravest concern about the possibility that the President might follow the implied advice of a portion of the Tariff Commission and reduce the tariff levels that were established by President Kennedy in 1962 following a report by the Tariff Commission that it was imperative, if we were going to have a domestic sheet glass industry, that tariff rates be increased.

I believe it would be highly dangerous to the stability of this important industry to reduce these tariff rates now.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a number of messages from some of the major officials of the producing industry stating that any cuts in the tariff rates would be disastrous to the country.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman that some time ago I received a telegram signed by all of the employees of the Pittsburgh Glass Co. in our district who share the same concern as those that the gentleman from Oklahoma just referred to.

I certainly want to commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a message which was received just a short time ago in my office from President Mr. Jimmie C. Wittman, of the United Glass & Ceramic Workers of America, Local 163, at Okmulgee, Okla., stating the position of that local on this question. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that letter might be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

UNITED GLASS & CERAMIC WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Okmulgee, Okla., August 3, 1695.

Representative ED EDMONDSON,

SIR: We the members of local 163 would like to go on record against the importation of foreign-made glass.

We do believe that this importing of foreign-made glass is detrimental to trade between American glass manufacturers, retailers, and consumers. We do believe this importation will injure, and possibly force out of business, many small glass manufacturers and jobbers. We also believe that this importation of foreign-made glass will result in the loss of many jobs.

As this administration has gone on record against unemployment, we feel that the importation of foreign-made glass would be a refutation of this policy.

We therefore wish to go on record against the increased importing of foreign-made glass.

A reply would be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

Jimmie C. Wittman, President; Farrell Lee Clements, O. C. Goodwin, L. E. Vaughn, Joseph Rice, J. C. Tyler, Robert Ketcher, C. E. Peckinpaugh, Charles J. Hicks, Troy Winkle, George S. Cosen, August Vercelli, Ernest Bussey, Bobby Lindsay, Odie Brown, Jimmy Sickeny, Eugene Van Meter.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I also have a message from the plant manager of the American-Saint Gobain Corp., Factory No. 3, at Okmulgee, Okla., Mr. James A. Arford, expressing the very grave concern of that great corporation about the possibility of a tariff rate reduction on sheet glass. I ask unanimous consent that that might be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN-SAINT GOBAIN CORP.,
Kingsport, Tenn., August 6, 1965.

Hon. ED EDMONDSON,
U.S. House of Representatives.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDMONDSON: As an employer of 380 people in your area and a manufacturer under increasing pressure to operate profitably, we are deeply concerned over the recent Tariff Commission recommendation to reduce the tariff on imports of foreign sheet glass. Our concern—and that of other sheet glass manufacturers and their employees—is expressed in the attached advertisement. It appeared in the Okmulgee Daily Times on Tuesday, August 3, 1965.

Foreign sheet glass took 25 percent of our domestic market last year. In an effort to increase that share, foreign producers reduced already depressed sheet glass prices in the last 30 days. Now we are faced with further price depression and market loss if President Johnson accepts the Commission's 3-to-2 recommendation.

I know you want these facts brought to your attention since any tariff reduction will deeply affect many people in your area.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. ARFORD,
Plant Manager, Plant 3.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have another message received from the manager of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. at Henryetta, Okla., Mr. E. J. Slack, the manager of the company there, and I ask unanimous consent that this be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

HENRYETTA, OKLA.,
August 31, 1965.

Hon. ED EDMONDSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Very much concerned over recommended reduction in sheet glass tariff. We are currently enjoying a good level of employment in an area where approximately 33⅓ percent of the residents are unemployed. Reduction in duties will undoubtedly add to the number of unemployed. Takeover or even more substantial share of the domestic market by foreign manufacturers would have detrimental effect on any future plant expansion and capital investment. Further expansion of European and Japanese glass industries at the expense of the higher wage American industry would be disastrous to communities such as ours. Can anticipate possibly 20-percent reduction in our employment as result of reduction in tariffs. Loss of payroll dollars would have staggering effect on community.

E. J. SLACK,
Manager,
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter also from the mayor of the city of Henryetta, Okla., Mayor W. E. Richeson, in which he brings to my attention the feeling of the city council of that city that all in our power should be done to oppose any reduction in tariff rates on sheet glass. I ask unanimous consent that that letter may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

HENRYETTA, OKLA.,
July 16, 1965.

Hon. ED EDMONDSON,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDMONDSON: The city council of Henryetta urges you to do all within your power to oppose the Tariff Commission report of June 11, 1965.

The split 3-to-2 decision advised the President that the termination of the escape clause duties would probably have only a slight effect on the domestic sheet glass industry. This conclusion, brought out by the report, we feel is unsupported by the facts.

Our local Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. officials have researched this subject quite thoroughly and we are in agreement with their contention that approval of the Tariff Commission's report would affect our local glass industry drastically. As you know, Pittsburgh Plate Glass is Henryetta's major industry. Without Pittsburgh Plate Glass, our local economy would most certainly be destroyed.

We strongly urge you to recommend to the President that present rates of duty on sheet glass be continued.

Respectfully submitted.

W. E. RICHESON,
Mayor.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the problem exists not only with reference to the major producers and to the workmen, but it has been pointed out that we could have a very grave effect on the small manufacturers and also on the jobbers who handle glass. As an illustration of a further impact we might bring about, we have word received from the raw materials suppliers for the sheet glass industry. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. William I. Weisman, president of the Ozark-Mahoning Co., at Tulsa, Okla., be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

OZARK-MAHONING CO.,
Tulsa, Okla., August 24, 1965.

Hon. ED EDMONDSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDMONDSON: It is our understanding that early in September, President Johnson will review the temporary tariff granted to the sheet glass industry on June 17, 1962, by the late President Kennedy. As a raw material supplier to the sheet glass industry, we earnestly solicit your help in maintaining or increasing the existing tariffs. It is our belief that through the continuation of these tariffs the domestic sheet glass industry will be able to compete on an equal basis with the lower priced foreign glass. Reduction or elimination of these tariffs could materially weaken a vital part of our national economy.

It is difficult to believe that the Tariff Commission might consider the thought of lower tariffs while the U.S. Government is beginning the multimillion-dollar Appalachian project. This area employs about half of the 7,300 sheet glass workers in the United States. Any help you can give in maintaining or increasing the tariffs would be very greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

WM. I. WEISMAN,
President.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, we have also heard from the press on this subject, from the editor of the Henryetta Daily Freelance at Henryetta, Okla., Mr. Leland Gourley, who has written me expressing the concern of that fine newspaper about the situation and predicting that there would be a loss of at least 1,500 direct jobs in depressed eastern Oklahoma alone with a possible 5,000 additional jobs being lost across the country with subsequent serious effects on our economy if a tariff reduction were to be put into effect by the President at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that might be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
July 16, 1965.

Congressman ED EDMONDSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Majority decision in 3–2 split opinion from U.S. Tariff Commission concerning glass imports is serious if recommendation is followed. It would cause loss of at least 1,500 direct jobs in depressed eastern Oklahoma alone. Loss of direct employment would result in 5,000 additional jobs being lost with subsequent serious effects on our economy.

LELAND GOURLEY,
Editor, Henryetta Daily Freelance.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think there is no question about the fact that the loss of many jobs and injury to many small glass manufacturers and jobbers would very likely be the result if the President were to disregard the warnings in the minority opinion of the Tariff Commission and if he were to conclude that the increases placed in effect in 1962 were no longer necessary. Increases in glass imports are almost certain to follow a tariff cut. The glass imports already consist of over a quarter of the American market in the sheet glass field. I earnestly hope that the President of the United States will heed the voice of the workmen and producers across the country and continue in effect the tariff rates that were established by the President in 1962.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Oklahoma in expressing my utter amazement at the recent sheet glass decision of the Tariff Commission and particularly with respect to the rationale which was used by the majority of that body in their opinion, which in substance would recommend the President to reestablish the tariff rates on sheet glass which were in effect prior to June 17, 1962.

If one were to spend much time in reading the opinion of the majority in this particular case, he can find the very basis for which the present tariff rate should be continued and no little, or any thought be given to reestablishing higher rates.

From time to time, I have pointed out on this floor several reasons why I believe that the President should not accept the suggestion of the Tariff Commission, but in fact, should give serious consideration to further increasing the tariffs. In order that I might share these thoughts with the House, I ask consent to include in my remarks the letter which I addressed to the President on this subject on August 13, 1965.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 13, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On June 11, 1965, the Tariff Commission made its report to you recommending by a 3-to-2 vote that the increased escape-clause rates of duty imposed on foreign sheet glass as of June 17, 1962, be removed, saying that this would have only a slight effect on the domestic sheet glass industry.

Commissioners Talbot and Sutton in their minority opinion stated, however, that a reduction in tariff would exert a downward pressure on sheet glass prices; lead to an increase in the share of consumption supplied by imports; contribute toward a decline in employment and profits; and idle productive facilities.

It would appear to me that the best evidence that the present tariff structure should be retained is the fact that even at the adjusted higher rates foreign imports of sheet glass continue to increase. Therefore, the higher rates have in no way prevented them from competing in the American marketplace. In addition, the adjusted higher rates have not been in effect for a sufficient period of time to actually determine whether or not higher rates of tariff on imported sheet glass should be considered rather than any suggestion that they be lowered.

Obviously, the recommendation of the majority was clearly based on a lack of information and erroneous assumptions, and its appraisement of the probable effects of its recommended action on the domestic sheet glass industry was not supported by its own findings of fact.

The Tariff Commission's action indicates a lack of knowledge or information concerning the problems and difficulties facing the sheet glass industry. Almost all of the sheet glass produced in the United States is produced by 7 companies in 14 plants. Six of these plants are in areas of persistent unemployment.

The destruction or the deterioration of the sheet glass industry would bring about further economic havoc to the State of West Virginia. The economy of the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., would in my opinion be totally destroyed and the jobs and well-being of thousands of people in the Clarksburg area would be placed in jeopardy. In my opinion, it is high time that the leadership in this Nation begin to concern themselves with the problems confronting American industries and its employees from the onslaught of unfair foreign imports. In my own district in West Virginia, the sheet glass industry is a large and important industry. In Clarksburg and Harrison County, this industry furnishes employment to over 2,000 employees at 3 local plants.

The American sheet glass industry generally, and especially the plants located in West Virginia, have been and are waging a desperate fight to compete with cheap-labor-produced foreign sheet glass from Japan and the mid-European countries. American sheet glass plants are already in many instances operating at less than full capacity and on a narrow margin of profit, if any, because about 25 percent of the sheet glass market in the United States has been captured by low-cost foreign labor competition. Naturally further inroads will be made by foreign sheet glass if the present increased escape-clause rates of duty are removed as recommended by the Tariff Commission.

The removal of the tariffs on sheet glass would impose great hardships and losses upon the owners and employees of sheet glass plants in West Virginia and elsewhere. Production would have to be further curtailed and some plants would probably have to go out of business, thereby imposing great losses and hardship on the owners and employees of other industries which furnish services and supplies to the sheet glass plants.

The six large sheet glass plants, including the three in or near Clarksburg, W. Va., are located in Appalachia. Congress and you, Mr. President, have authorized expenditures of almost $2 billion to help bring new industries to the area, to relieve unemployment, and to improve living standards. Maintenance of these protective tariffs which already have helped stabilize the American glass industry would definitely be more in line with the economic development objectives put forth by you and the Congress than would a reduction in duties.

Of course I am deeply concerned about the conditions of this industry in West Virginia. Job opportunities are scarce in West Virginia. Without the employment offered by the glass companies, our State would have an even more serious unemployment problem. It would be far better, considering the unemployment problem, if tariff rates on sheet glass were increased, rather than reduced or maintained at current rates.

The great damage that lies in store if these rates are reduced can be forestalled and instead the sheet glass industry can be given an incentive and a freer rein to make its own way back uphill, to the top where it belongs.

I therefore call for an increase in the protective tariffs on flat glass.

Sincerely yours,

ARCH A. MOORE, JR.,
Congressman, First District of West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that tariffs on imports of sheet glass into this country be lowered is utterly ridiculous. For this Congress on the one hand to pass time and again legislation which is supposed to be sympathetic to the economic conditions of certain areas of our country, and then to have an agency of the executive branch of the Government to continue rendering decisions which adversely affect the economy of the areas which the legislation endeavors to aid seems to me to be an inconsistency of the highest order.

IMPORT PROBLEMS IN THE GLASS INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to join my distinguished fellow Member, Congressman EDMONDSON from Oklahoma and others in this open discussion of our serious import problems. In this instance, the emphasis is on flat glass simply because it happens to be the item selected at the moment by the import-export cartel group as the next victim of their systematized and international plundering.

I say this bluntly because to do otherwise would be to dignify plain everyday international profiteering as something other than what it is.

There is little or no regard for the human elements in this modern business of free trade unless it is the interest of the few as against the welfare of the many—U.S. workers.

No one profits except the handlers in this kind of world trade. The public pays the freight coming and going in world trade between unequal economies, trading like products.

When one realizes that 1 out of every 13 cars sold this year in the United States will be a foreign made import, it is easy to understand why this Congress must pass all types of antipoverty, education, manpower training, and other economic aid legislation. Every factory worker who loses his job to imports cuts two and a half jobs out of the economy. Every American who produces for overseas creates fewer extra job opportunities since shipments abroad go direct from factory to shipside and shortcuts the entire U.S. industrial complex.

The glass industry has a vital stake in car manufacturing since all cars, domestic and import, use a great amount of glass in their production.

Glass has had a rocky road in this Nation. Just 20 years ago there were 42 flat glass manufacturers in the United States—today there are only 4 left and one of these, formerly the American Window Glass Corp. one of the world's largest at one time is now controlled by the St. Gobain Syndicate from Paris and the company is now known as American St. Gobain.

The history of the glass tariff fight is one that should be reviewed by every Member of Congress since a study of the industry will give a fairly accurate picture of what has or will happen eventually in all our basic industries.

To buy an all American made radio, television and dozens of other consumer products today is a chore and when one does buy what he thinks is an American made product he is rudely awakened, on close examination, to find it is foreign made although the trade name is a well established U.S. patented or trademarked label.

February 13, 1962, I made an address to a group in New York City on the then pending extension of the trade agreements. A few of the comments from this address are as appropriate today as they were then. Let me quote from this address headed "Survival in World Trade":

FOREIGN TRADE—THE PROPAGANDA BATTLE

In this trade and tariff fight before the Congress and the people, let's look at the record. On one side, lined up behind the State Department's spokesman, George Ball, we find an army of many generals, unlimited resources and tools for propaganda, for subsidies, for favors, for presssure and for reprisals. On the other side, we find an army made up of workers, small industry with very limited resources—hardly the resources that win a war that depends upon the creation of public opinion.

In a booklet entitled "The ABC's of Foreign Trade," put out by the State Department this past week, trade is described as "an exchange of goods for something else of value." This is a sound economic fact. However, after this opening statement, the pamphlet becomes an out and out propaganda piece and attempts to justify trade for trade's sake with or without economic reality. The argument is made that we sell $20 billion abroad and buy $15 billion worth of imports. This fails to take into account the 30 percent of our exports sold to American taxpayers and shipped abroad—gifts if you will. The State Department claims 2 million jobs from exports and fails to show how many more jobs are lost by imports.

THEORY VERSUS FACT

For over 4 years a Harvard liberal in the labor movement has given me the well-known bird every time I talked about foreign imports injuring U.S. industry and destroying U.S. job opportunities. Recently he came into my office after returning from Japan. He returned the same time as our State Department grand tour ended, with two notable achievements—Udall climbed Mount Fujiyama, and the State Department promised Japan more of our market.

However, my visitor stepped down in the valley of realities and came back with a new view of free trade between unequal economies. This is his story: "I've disagreed with you over the years. I was wrong. I'll support your position in this fight all the way. What I saw in the manufacturing plants in Japan convinced me that we cannot compete in a free world market, no matter how much we automate.

"In one instance I watched a production line in an electronics plant. They had the new machines we have in our own domestic plants where we have a contract. The only difference was that our machines were 9 years old while theirs were only 2 years old. The rate of production per unit was timed at the same productivity per machine as our machines.

"The difference, however, was that in the United States, one worker operated one machine at a pay scale of around $2.60 an hour, while in Japan, one female worker operated two machines at 15 cents an hour. An inspector earned about 20 cents an hour as against over $3 an hour in the United States."

FALLACIES IN THE ADMINISTRATION'S ARGUMENT

Does anyone believe that barriers in any country stop essential goods from being traded? If this is true, then why does Brazil sell coffee to Germany when Germany has a tariff of 75 cents a pound on coffee although it must import coffee, having none of its own?

We need trade, we need certain raw materials and products we have in short supply. This doesn't mean that in order to get minerals from Chile we must let Chile sell below our cost of production in fruits and vegetables and other items we have in oversupply. It doesn't mean that Chile shouldn't sell these same products in our market based upon merit and quality and not on price.

We say that unless we buy, we can't sell. Does that really hold water in international trade? If this is true, why is it that the Common Market is courting disaster by erecting more external protective tariff walls while eliminating internal restrictions? Those who clamor for tariff cuts have in mind the joining of our economy with the Common Market. What happens then? Do we apply a free trade policy with the Common Market to our most-favored-nation clause and if we do, how much trade will the Common Market do with the United States in competition with Japan, Hong Kong, the Alliance for Progress nations and the emerging nations of Africa and Asia? More important, how much can we retain of our own markets both here and abroad taking into consideration our tax bites and labor rates?

FAILURE FORESEEN

I won't predict doom and disaster if we enact the administration's foreign trade program. I do predict, however, that it will have to be revised before too many moons have passed. We may, of course, have to go the whole route before we admit failure. That's been our program since 1952. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act actually never got a real test, properly administered, using the safeguards supplied by Congress. In fact, world conditions with the depression of the 30's, World War II, the Korean conflict, the massive rebuilding program for our allies and our former enemies made it impossible to assess the real value of the act up until now. The real impact of consumer goods imports and the loss of the high labor content exports followed the 4-year extension.

After the passage of the 4-year extension, damage really did start snowballing. The amount of the damage isn't fully assessed. The loss of a production job is felt immediately by the displaced workers, next by the employer unless he automates, and slowly but surely, over a 4-year period, the whole economy feels the loss of spending money on the part of the one worker who lost his job.

A REALISTIC APPROACH

This much I will confess. Before I started studying wage scales, tariffs, embargoes, licensing, employment figures, job ratings, retail prices, personalities, and theories of economics by some of our leading present and past economists and philosophers, I was a dyed in the foreign wool free trader. I'll admit I've been disillusioned. I find that people are just pretty much the same the world over. Their wants, desires, ambitions, greed, charity, tolerance, intolerance and virtues all measure in greater or lesser degree to the level of all men and women.

There are no supermen in this field of economics. Trade is a commercial venture based upon profits and losses, supply and demand. It's as true today as it was yesterday and will be true tomorrow. Without restraints and protective covenants, the high-cost production area will suffer in

a free trade-international economy. The high-economy, high-price market will be flooded with cheap goods.

In this new world, with nations reduced to a matter of hours and minutes apart, instead of free trade being the answer, protective or survival trade must be the answer. When the world's nations were weeks and months apart, free trade was more workable because of the limitation of transportation and supply. These were built-in tariffs and protections.

Today, a new dress pattern in New Jersey is copied by foreign producers and put in the marketplace in New York within 72 hours after the original is shown to the public. The copies can come from Asia, Africa, Japan, Hong Kong, Portugal, Paris, Rome—in fact, anywhere in the world in about the same time as the New Jersey producer can fill his orders locally. This being the case, then how can a New Jersey operator compete in this new close-hitched world if he has a built-in cost of production beyond his control?

FIRST DUTY TO OUR PEOPLE

Proponents of the administration's program admit this much: "Some industries will be hurt more than others (by inference they admit all will be hurt), and the Government will have to give financial aid to those industries as well as institutive retraining programs for the displaced workers."

This means that, because of import injury, people will be denied their opportunities to earn a living in the field of endeavor they feel most suited for. It means that a family can be uprooted from its home site, its friends, its social and economic life. We seem to forget that although we have a collateral interest in the well-being of all nations and all peoples, our first interest and duty belong to the United States of America and all its peoples.

TOWARD SURVIVAL

Trade is described by Secretary Rusk of the State Department as "an exchange of goods for something else of value." We have no quarrel with this description. We refuse, however, to go on the premise that "trade for the sake of trade" is beneficial between two nations of different economic levels and costs of production.

Free trade is a desirable and worthwhile goal for all nations, but its attainment depends upon the economic equality between nations in the fields of wages, taxes, services, and raw materials costs. Until that time comes, if our Nation is to survive, it must maintain its economic stability by keeping all five pillars of our economy equal in proportion to protection. The five pillars of our economy are: Investment (creates production), Production (creates payrolls), Payrolls (creates consumption), Consumption (creates profits), Profits (create investment).

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, this is a fight against the importation of glass at a low tariff rate which causes unfair competition in our market for U.S. workers and U.S. industry.

Looking back to hearings before the committee, which I headed, studying the import impact the record shows the following statements from both management and labor on the glass situation:

Mr. SHERBONDY. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Donald J. Sherbondy. I am director of industrial relations for the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. (PPG).

Extensive evidence concerning the effects of sheet glass imports has already been presented by the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., both orally and by written documentation, before the U.S. Tariff Commission at hearings on August 17, 1960, and March 15, 1961. These hearings were for the purpose of determining whether sheet glass is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the customs treatment reflecting concessions in duties granted on such products under the Trade Agreements Act, as amended, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products. The U.S. Tariff Commission on May 17, 1961, unanimously found that the domestic industry has been and is continuing to be injured by foreign imports and recommended increases in existing tariff rates. On June 30, 1961, President Kennedy referred the sheet glass matter back to the Tariff Commission for additional investigation.

Much of the data, including most of the exhibits, which I shall present here today are already part of the record in the proceedings before the U.S. Tariff Commission. Mr. R. F. Barker, vice president and general manager of the Glass Division was the witness for the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. in the proceedings before the U.S. Tariff Commission.

The letter dated June 23, 1961, from Congressman JOHN H. DENT, chairman of this subcommittee, giving notice of the hearing, specifically requested that data be presented concerning the level of imports and exports of glass during the past 10 years and the changing levels of employment in the industry during this period.

It may be helpful to begin with a document which I designate as exhibit I, which I believe the committee has, and which is entitled "Import Duties—Paragraphs 219 and 224—1930 to Date." This exhibit shows the steady and marked decline in import duties on sheet glass over the years.

Exhibit II is entitled "Imports of Window Glass, Plain, Colored, and Processed, Covered by Paragraphs 219 and 224, Tariff Act of 1930, as Amended—1950 Through 1960."

The first general trade agreement concession on tariff duties applicable to sheet glass was made effective January 1, 1948, as indicated in exhibit I. Additional general reductions in duty were made effective in 1951, 1956, 1957, and 1958. During this period, as indicated in exhibit II, imports have increased sharply from 32,133,031 pounds in 1950 to 410,413,126 pounds in 1960, or an increase of more than 1,175 percent.

For a number of years following World War II the sheet glass industry abroad was principally concerned with rebuilding and reequipping its facilities and devoting its output to rehabilitating and rebuilding purposes in countries of production and neighboring countries. Through the decade of the 1950's there was, of course, a tremendous rise in the number of new sheet glass-producing foreign sources. As the home consumption needs of foreign industries were satisfied, as foreign expansion occurred and new foreign production sources were created, the attention of all foreign producers was turned to the world's largest market—the United States. It is respectfully submitted that this committee is not concerned with month-to-month or necessarily a year-to-year rise or fall but is interested in trends over a longer period covering a series of years.

Mr. DENT. May I interrupt you?

Mr. SHERBONDY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DENT. In your statement just previously, you said that these productive facilities being rehabilitated and built in foreign countries were built for the express purpose—you did not use that language—of invading the American market?

Mr. SHERBONDY. Whether they were built for that express purpose or not, the result is exactly that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DENT. Well, I think that at this time we ought to put right into the record a statement by Rene Lambert, permanent representative of the Belgium sheet glass industry for the United States and Canada, in its remonstrance against the protectionist order of the Tariff Commission.

The article also said:

"The Common Market countries are wondering whether this will be a first step toward a return to protectionism.

"The Belgians who claim they have created a modern sheet glass industry especially to suit the needs of the American market, hope Kennedy will reject them."

(The clippings referred to follow:)

"BELGIUM ASKS REJECTION OF GLASS TARIFF INCREASE

"NEW YORK.—The Belgian-American Chamber of Commerce has urged President Kennedy to reject the U.S. Tariff Commission's recommendation to almost double the tariff duty on sheet glass imported from Belgium and other West European countries.

"At at news conference, a spokesman for the chamber expressed 'deep concern' over the U.S. Tariff Commission's proposals, submitted to President Kennedy May 17, to increase duties on all types of imported sheet glass by almost 100 percent.

"Because the Communist bloc countries stand outside the mutual tariff concession area created by GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) these proposals would not affect sheet glass imported from Russia, Czechoslovakia, and other Iron Curtain countries.

"MAJOR MOVE

"Rene Lambert, permanent representative of the Belgian sheet glass industry for the United States and Canada, said, 'The question goes far beyond the limits of the glass industry because this is the first move of major importance and of major consequence by the new President in the matter of escape-clause proceedings and it is bound to have serious repercussions.

" 'The Common Market countries are wondering whether this will be a first step toward a return to protectionism,' Lambert said.

"The Belgians, who claim they have created a modern sheet glass industry especially to suit the needs of the American market, hope Kennedy will reject them because, they claim:

"Belgian sheet glass imports have not hurt the U.S. domestic glass industry;

"The new tariff hikes would be more than U.S. manufacturers themselves asked for;

"CLAIM DISADVANTAGE

"They would put Belgian and other West European sheet glass imports into a very disadvantageous position compared to Iron Curtain glass imports here, which have boomed over the past 18 months.

"Lambert told newsmen 'two can play this game. The tariff proposals if adopted will have a serious effect on the psychological relationships between the two allies.'

"He said Belgium already carries on a deficit trade with the United States (its imports from the United States are some $60 million larger than its exports to America).

" 'Imposition of protectionist barriers is bound to invite retaliation.' He did not elaborate but said Belgium already has recalled its delegate to GATT in Geneva and its Ambassador in Washington for consultation.

"The President has until July 17 to act on the recommendations.

"(Officials of American-St. Gobian Corp., which operates a plant in Jeannette, and representatives of other sheet glass firms testified at hearings in Washington recently that imports have forced closing or curtailment of plant operations in America.)"

"GLASS TARIFF NOT REVISED

"WASHINGTON.—The Tariff Commission has declined to revise the tariff agreement on imports of rolled glass after disagreeing on the impact of foreign products on the domestic industry.

"Most imports come from Belgium, Japan, West Germany, Great Britain, and France.

"Three Commissioners ruled on Thursday there was no threat to the domestic industry and made no recommendation for modification of the agreement.

"Two ruled there was injury and recommended duties be increased 1½ cents a pound and 5 percent ad valorem. One said there was a threat of serious injury and recommended a 2-cent tariff increase.

"'There is no recommendation of any group of Commissioners for "escape" action that may be considered by the President as a recommendation of the Commission,' the Commission said. 'Accordingly, no report is submitted to the President.'

"The President does not act without a report from the Commission, a spokesman said."

Mr. DENT. I wanted to put that in the record right at the point that you made the observation that the rehabilitation of the European economy went beyond that contained in the original reciprocal trade arguments, foreign aid argument, that we were to help them recover their economic status to what it was at the beginning of World War II.

In your opinion, have they gone beyond their own needs?

Mr. SHERBONDY. They certainly have, yes, sir.

Mr. DENT. Thank you. Proceed.

Mr. BAILEY. May I interrupt at that point? I participtaed, as the gentleman will no doubt recall, and appeared on behalf of the glass industry in the hearings before the Tariff Commission in March.

Mr. SHERBONDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAILEY. And as a development, we find the President referring the question of sheet glass, sheet, crown, and cylinder glass, back to the Tariff Commission for clarification of their report.

Mr. SHERBONDY. The significant fact is that during the period when duties on sheet glass were progressively reduced, imports increased at a staggering rate. During the period that these reductions in duty have been effected, the domestic industry has lost one-fourth of the U.S. market directly to import competition.

This is convincingly demonstrated by exhibit III which is entitled "Sheet and Window Glass, Plain, Colored, and Processed: U.S. Shipments, Exports, Imports, and Apparent Consumption 1950–60." This exhibit shows that although the total apparent consumption of sheet glass in the United States is increasing significantly the percentage of that consumption enjoyed by domestic producers has been steadily declining.

During this period from 1950 to 1960, imports of foreign sheet glass measured in pounds increased from 2.2 percent of total U.S. consumption in 1950 to 24.6 percent in 1960, a period of 10 years. Stated another way, in 1950 domestic manufacturers enjoyed 97.8 percent of our domestic market and in 1960 their share had declined to 75.4 percent. Unquestionably, imports have increased sharply and have taken over a steadily increasing share of the American market. There can be no doubt, therefore, that such imports have contributed substantially to the serious injury which the American industry and American labor have sustained.

It is also significant that during this same period, from 1950 to 1960, domestic exports of sheet glass from the United States to the other countries declined from 9,900,000 pounds to 4,200,000 pounds, a decline of more than 57 percent.

Mr. BAILEY. Would you say there that they have not only taken 24 or 25 percent of our domestic market but they are also taking our markets in other countries?

Mr. SHERBONDY. Correct. Correct.

Mr. BAILEY. And cutting down our exports?

Mr. SHERBONDY. Because our export business is declining.

Mr. DENT. Now one of the pet arguments of those seeking lower tariffs, and opposing any protective adjustment at all, is that you are in the position you are because you have failed to keep competitive and are not exporting as much as you can export.

Can you give us a reason for that, if it is so?

Mr. SHERBONDY. Well, as I will point out later in the statement, Mr. Congressman, the actual situation with respect to the comparative relationships between foreign glass producers and American glass producers is such that it is practically impossible for us to compete with them because of their much, much lower costs, and one of the things we should realize, I think a great many people in this country who are uninformed on the subject have a feeling that a lot of these foreign manufacturers, glass and other products, are small, struggling industries, and this is certainly a very, very erroneous conclusion.

With respect to the sheet glass manufacturing, for example, you should realize that the sheet glass manufacturing originated in Europe, and there are companies there that have been in the business for hundreds and hundreds of years, large and powerful companies. These are not little starving companies; these are very powerful units, and they are operating with cost situations that are so much better than the American industry that we are certainly in need of protection of the American workingman.

Mr. BAILEY. Would you add that they are not located in underdeveloped areas?

Mr. SHERBONDY. They certainly are not: Belgium, England, West Germany, they are not underdeveloped countries.

Mr. DENT. Do you know, is there any restrictive covenant in the countries that export to the United States against the importation of American glass, either by way of tariff, variable currency, or quotas, that you know of?

Mr. SHERBONDY. I believe there are tariff restrictions.

* * * * *

Mr. SHERBONDY. As I have pointed out, exports declined during this 10-year period more than 57 percent, but even more significant is the fact that exports in 1960 were only one-third of 1 percent of total sheet glass shipments by domestic producers in the United States. One-third of 1 percent, absolutely insignificant, against, you see, imports which were practically a quarter of the American consumption.

Exhibit V is entitled "Foreign Penetration of U.S. Market as a Percent of U.S. Sheet Glass Production 1959." Exhibit V shows that in 1950 foreign sheet glass imports—measured 50-foot S.S.E. boxes as distinct from pounds—were equivalent to 2½ percent of the total estimated domestic production. In 1959 imports measured in boxes increased to over 31 percent of domestic production.

The most significant reason for the lower costs of foreign sheet glass producers, which makes it possible for them to invade so successfully the U.S. market, is the drastically lower hourly wage costs in foreign countries. This is demonstrated by exhibit VI entitled "Glass Workers Average Hourly Wages" which was submitted in evidence by Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., at the hearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission on August 17, 1960.

You will observe that in 1959 the average hourly wages in Japan, excluding fringe benefits, were 33 cents and that such wages—including fringe benefits—were 69 cents and 75 cents, respectively, in West Germany and in Belgium.

On the other hand, our average—I mean by "our" the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.—average hourly wages in that year were $3.72. Thus, our wage rates were approximately five times those of Belgium and of West Germany, and eight times those of Japan.

While no data were available respecting Japanese fringe benefits it is unlikely that such benefits would increase the Japanese 33-cent figure above a maximum of 40 cents.

With respect to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. figure of $3.72, there have been additional wage and fringe benefits granted under existing labor agreements from 1959 to date which would increase the hourly wage costs by approximately 20 cents.

The significance of this almost insuperable labor cost advantage held by the foreign producers is best appreciated when it is realized that the labor content represents more than 50 percent of our total costs in making sheet glass.

The effect of all this upon employment in our sheet glass operations must be obvious and is illustrated by exhibits VII and VIII. Exhibit VII is entitled "Index of Imports to Total U.S. Sheet Glass Consumption 1950–60 (1950=100)."

Exhibit VIII is entitled "Comparison—Domestic Consumption of Sheet Glass and PPG Man-Hours 1950–60 (1950=100)."

These exhibits show that while the apparent consumption of sheet glass in the United States had increased by 1959 approximately 620 million pounds (by 1960, 208 million pounds) over 1950—an increase in 1959 of more than 42 percent—hours of employment in our sheet glass operations in those years not only had not increased but actually declined 5½ percent in 1959 and 7 percent in 1960 from 1950. At the same time, imports of sheet glass into the United States increased 1,478 percent in 1959 and 1,177 percent in 1960, over 1950 (see exhibits II and III).

Mr. RUST. Mr. Chairman, I am Enoch R. Rust, international vice president of the United Glass & Ceramic Workers of North America, AFL–CIO. I appear here today as the representative of the employees of the window, plate, and rolled-glass industries and workers engaged in the manufacturing of ceramic floor and wall tile. Today the imports of these items are staggering when compared to imports just 10 years ago.

The 1960 imports of sheet, plate, and rolled glass amounted to over $50 million. This excluded the millions of dollars worth of glass that was prefabricated prior to shipping, such as the approximately 15 million square feet that was imported in the 668,000 foreign-made automobiles imported during 1959 and almost an equal amount during 1960. Plus mirrors, furniture, and many other imported items containing glass.

The imports of window glass in 1949 were only 4 million square feet. In 1951, 26 million; 1953, 80 million; in 1956, 281 million; and in 1959, 425 million square feet, or 8.5 million 50-foot boxes; 1960 imports fell slightly to 7,077,000 50-foot boxes, but domestic shipments also dropped.

I might say at this point that this 425 million square feet of window glass, taken from the statistics offered in the record at the Tariff Commission hearings, the jobbers quoted a figure of 3½ boxes, which amounted to 175 square feet of glass; when divided into 425 million, you find that it goes around 4.5 million times, which means that this was enough glass to build or supply window glass for almost twice as many six-room homes as were built during that time.

I think by checking the Government record you will find that during the 2-year period, we built some 2,700,000 dwellings, and this glass was enough to supply 4,500,000.

During the fifties, exports took a reverse action from that of imports, and fell from 172,000 50-foot boxes to only 55,000. The picture is practically the same in the ceramic floor and wall tile. One can easily envision the devastating effects upon the American

economy when approximately $80 to $100 million in wages are being cut off yearly in these industries. (This is an estimated figure.) These workers that are being displaced by foreign imports are told to seek employment elsewhere in other industries, such as steel, textile, chemical, bicycle, plywood, or automobile, but when they arrive at the gates of these industries they find that they have laid off workers seeking employment in the glass and ceramic industries because they, too, have been adversely affected by excessive imports. In fact, they probably pass on the way to each other's gates.

Some companies are migrating to the South in search of cheaper labor. Some go out of business. Others leave the country.

Mr. BAILEY. Would you mind enlarging on that last statement, some "leave the country"?

Mr. RUST. Well, I understand, Mr. Congressman, that this is also encouraged, and in a meeting of the nationwide Committee on Export-Import Policy in 1960, a maker of electronic parts and radios said that if relief isn't granted his company, that his company has already decided to go overseas. And I asked him where he expected to get his market, and he said he expected to find a market in the United States for at least 5 more years. So they went into that pretty lengthily, to see how long they could stay in the United States and enjoy the market, until they plucked the chicken dry here, and I guess they are going to slant their eyes and move to Japan with their companies. I don't know. They didn't go that far.

Now, I am speaking of the last remarks, the adverse effect upon the overall economy, because all three of these moves have an adverse effect upon our overall economy because they tend to drain our purchasing market, which creates unemployment.

Let's take the Gemmer Co., makers of steering gears at Detroit, Mich. They decided to move to Lebanon, Tenn., so that they could enjoy paying a lesser wage to newly hired employees. A Federal court recently ruled that their promise to give job priority to local citizens was invalid because their Detroit workers with as much as 20 years' service had created a vested right of seniority which could not be canceled unilaterally. The Detroit workers therefore have prior rights to jobs after the plant moves September 2, 1961.

But let us consider the thousands of workers that are left high and dry when the companies they work for decide to move to some foreign country. There is no court on earth that can rule that they have vested rights, yet our Government encourages such migration. This does not sound much like government for the people nor by the people.

We are here today to discuss economic repercussions caused by foreign imports. I feel the facts are very clear. Those workers that are so affected by runaway companies are expected to be the purchasers of their products. But no one has as yet adequately explained where these people are supposed to get their spending money to buy with, when they have no job.

The freetrader likes to focus the attention of the unemployed worker on automation and makes a strong claim that this is his trouble. But let us use the wagonmaker for an example. When automobiles came into being he just put motors on his wagons and called them autos and continued to prosper. This in my opinion can be deemed the greatest step in automation in our history. But look what happened to the automaker when 668,000 units were imported in 1 year. He almost went out of business. Merger here and merger there, in order to keep their heads above water.

I think this proves that we can keep up with automation, but where products can be produced by labor with wages many times below that of ours, we find it impossible to compete. This places our free enterprise system in jeopardy, therefore endangering the entire American way of life.

Let me sum up the impact of foreign imports in this manner. Had the 2,000 glassworkers displaced by imports worked or, let's say, half of them, they would have created jobs in the automobile industry, and many other industries. The thousands of automobile workers displaced because of the loss of this business, and by imports, would have created jobs for the glassworker. The men and women employed in making the 80.5 million pairs of footwear imported in 1959 and the 133 million pairs in 1960 would have created many jobs in glass, automobile, and many appliance industries that had to cut off workers because of a lessening market, caused by excessive imports.

This situation exists in many other industries. All forms of ceramic pottery ware, flint glassware, toy and novelty, and many other American industries. This is the grassroots. This is where the market is created. And when we export these jobs to foreign lands, these people cease to buy radios, autos, televisions, refrigerators, furniture, and the many other necessities of life.

I have no way of knowing, but I think it would be vital information to this committee to know just what the retail price of the $14 billion worth of imports come to. I am sure it would open the eyes of many sleeping Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I will close by saying, God bless America. Today she really needs it.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and this is the end of my prepared remarks, but I do have here something I think should go in the record. It is called "The Truth About Imports" and it is printed by the United States-Japan Trade Council, and it will give anybody that is interested and that knows something about the import-export problems just how these people go around misconstruing fact, and to create a false impression as to just what is happening in the trade situation.

Now here in 1958—and I am quoting this from this magazine—"when four medium-size companies tried to get their duty raised on nails, galvanized fencing, and barbed wire, the Tariff Commission unanimously dismissed the cases. At the hearing, a witness for the United Steelworkers opposed any increase in duties, having advised the Commission that any problems the industry was having were the results of its own deliberate pricing policies."

Now, this man—there is no name in here of who this representative of the Steelworkers Union was, and I am pretty sure that there is a good reason for it, because if the people that he was supposed to be representing, the people that were out of jobs, the people that were working part time, and the people that were paying his wages to appear before the Tariff Commission knew that he was OK'ing to import their jobs to Japan or to some other country, I do not think he would have been there very long. So they very cleverly excluded his name from the report, and I think it was a protective measure for him.

Now, let me show you how they misuse information that is misleading to the public on another case. This is trying to support the escape clause legislation as outlined in section 76 of the act, and here they say concerning the case that is most dear to me and the gentlemen sitting here:

"The case of ceramic mosaic tile: The Commission unanimously found that imports caused serious injury to domestic producers, and recommended an increase in the tariff rate. Similiarly, in the case of cylinder crown sheet glass the Commission unanimously found serious import injury, and recommended a tariff increase. These three cases—baseball gloves, ceramic mosaic tiles, and sheet glass—indicate that in those relatively few cases where actual import injury has been established, the Tariff Commission can be relied upon to recommended additional tariff protection."

Now the same people that wrote this article are inferring to the American public that the mechanics of the legislation is workable, that it does work, and that relief was granted; and it has not been granted, and probably the odds are that it won't be granted unless a tremendous amount of pressure will be put on the person that has the authority to wield the pen to say yes or no.

So that's the kind of misleading information that is fed to the public, to make them think that they are secure, in a trade situation that in my opinion is very dangerous to the American way of life.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that the remarks that we have made here today have helped to further our case in this fight for some kind of protection.

Mr. DENT. Be seated, sir.

Mr. ROMITO. The city of Arnold is here today to impress upon the committee the economic aspects that have confronted the city, due to the layoff at the American Window or at the American-St. Gobain glass plant.

In the city of Arnold, one source of revenue is the collection of the wage tax. It has been one of our chief sources of revenue.

In the year of 1956, we received a total revenue that year from the wage tax of $102,736.89. The following year, that is, the year of 1957, when the American-St. Gobain plant closed, our revenue for that year was $88,409.13; and in 1958, the wage tax dropped to $78,329.35.

In 1959, the amount collected was $77,622.08. In 1960, the amount collected was $68,649.50, and in 1961, we have collected to date $35,546.16.

As a result of the loss in wage tax that has been collected, the city of Arnold has been compelled to double the assessment on the real estate tax. We had an assessment of 6 mills, and in December of last year, the millage was increased to 12 mills for the year of 1961.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Romito, does that mean that the plant that is idle over there also gets a double assessment?

Mr. ROMITO. Yes, they have been reassessed.

Mr. DENT. I think there are two fellows coming off the sidelines to attack you.

Mr. ROMITO. Now I don't say that all of this drop in the wage tax is due to the number of men being reduced at the glass plant. But at least in my opinion, anywhere from 50 to 60 percent of it is due to the fact that the men at the plant are not working. And it has created an extreme hardship on the city, and the inhabitants.

In the census of 1950, we had a population of about 11,000 and in the census of 1960, our report, we have a population of a little over 9,000 now. Part of that loss is due to the fact that the men are not working, and are leaving our city, and seeking work elsewhere. And we definitely feel that if some relief is granted to the glass industry, and the men are working, that our economic condition will be greatly improved, and that we might be able to grant some relief to the taxpayers and to the industry.

Mr. Speaker, while the debates were going on in 1961 and 1962 the tariff Commission belatedly found that the glass industry was heading for oblivion and suddenly agreed with the industry that tariffs were too low. The recommendations of the Commission asked that tariffs be placed at levels even higher than they were under the famous Smoot-Hawley high tariff law.

President Kennedy recognized the danger to the glass industry and ordered the tariff committee's recommendations be put into effect. However, the

import-export group never gave up and with the passing of President Kennedy started their moves to get back the lower tariff rates.

We now find ourselves faced with a simple majority recommendation that would wipe out the Kennedy rates and again put this industry in complete, serious jeopardy.

While the U.S. industry has been able to work out some modernization under the Kennedy tariff rate I am reliably informed that had the industry suspicioned a lower rate was in the offing there would not have been the vast sums of money spent to rehabilitate the industry. This I personally know to be true in my home town of Jeannette, Pa.

Even the majority members of the committee admit that the higher rate has not cut down on imports but it has given our domestic producers a narrower spread between our costs and foreign costs, thereby, giving the industry a fighting chance for survival.

It is no longer a fight to grow and expand, it is really a struggle to stay alive and survive in the glass industry.

The American glass industry has contributed immeasurably to the success of our space projects, to our defense stature and while its fight to stay alive has been hard and long drawn out it has spent millions to maintain its research and modernization of facilities.

What we seem to forget is that without our own industries the successful defense of our Nation is impossible.

We are already finding out that in the final analysis it is our own trained, skilled workers, our own facilities, that we must depend upon in both our peace and war economies.

For Congress to sit idly by while this is going on is to betray the trust the people placed in our hands.

The American workman is finding out that there is a third party at the bargaining table, the international trader who holds, in many instances, the trump cards and has more influence in the final negotiations than domestic labor and industry.

While working on the Fair Labor Standards Act we heard from witnesses after witnesses of the grave dangers—as told to the committee—in any increase in hourly wages, any overtime penalties and especially in any increases in production costs because of raising the minimum and lowering the maximum work week.

The ogre setting on the shoulders of the U.S. worker is foreign trade as represented by U.S. imports of competitive goods. Oftimes the witness wore two hats, they were American producers with overseas facilities and the implication and warnings in their testimony clearly spelled out a grave danger to the U.S. workman and his economy.

Can this Congress refuse to raise U.S. standards because worldwide traders can demoralize our market with foreign made products. This apparently is the aim of the international producers and traders.

While we enjoy a relatively sound economy one must realize that automation and specialization would be less damaging, in the face of population growth and increased consumption, if imports did not take so much of our market.

It has been stated that over 93 percent of all fine china sold in the United States is imported. The story of handmade glassware is too well known to repeat but it is worth noting that while the country has tripled in size only 10 percent of our hand plants are left.

There are some who say there is room for all the world's products to flow into our market and yet the same group use a completely different approach to the agricultural products such as wheat, flour, and so forth.

We cannot say in any kind of an honest appraisal that the farmer must be protected against imports of cotton, wheat, and other farm products while in the same breath demand a free market for manufactured products.

This world trade picture has many facets. We find ourselves exporting products we are in short supply of and importing products we have in surplus.

The case of molybdenum is one in point. We produce about 85 percent of world supply of molybdenum and yet our domestic industries operate in a straitjacket of shortage.

The case history is worth repeating. For the past 3 years I have had to fight with other Members of Congress helping to take molybdenum from the stockpile to keep the specialty steel industry from curtailing products and even shutting down facilities.

The following article from Iron Age, February 18, 1965, by T. M. Rohan, points out the seriousness of the situation:

MOLY SHORTAGE PINCHES STEELMAKERS

(NOTE.—The supply of molybdenum is becoming critical. It affects a large part of the steel and foundry industries. Moly producers are planning expansions to add new capacity.)

(By T. M. Rohan)

A critical near-term shortage of molybdenum for alloy steel, stainless and castings is now adding to the problems of harried steelmen, foundrymen, and their customers.

Supply has tightened since last summer. Neither producers nor users have any significant inventory. Some steelmakers' allocation of moly has been halved for the critical months of March and April.

Rationing; alloy steel producers don't like to discuss it. But some have had to put in a type of double-barreled allocation system where steel users are held to their pattern of moly content as well as regular steel tonnage pattern.

Others are discontinuing production of some high moly content steels. And they are urging users to attempt to convert to less critical chrome- or nickel-bearing types which cost more.

The pinch cuts across a fairly wide swath of the steel and foundry industry. For every ton of steel produced in the United States in 1963, for instance, .38 pound of moly was required, this ratio has been rising steadily from .24 pound per ton in 1947. The U.S. steel industry used 42 million pounds of molybdenum in 1963.

Tailgate survival: Much moly-bearing steel goes into forged auto ring and pinion gears, transmission gears, front auto spindles, machine tool and other machinery shafting, bolting stock and pressure vessels.

The big moly producers—Climax Molybdenum, Molybdenum Corp. of America, Kennecott Copper Corp., and Duval Corp.—are at capacity production, have no plant inventories and ship almost all production by premium truck. Steel mills and foundries are "living off the tailgate of the incoming moly trucks."

Molybdenum producers are in all-out production and have launched multi-million-dollar expansions which will increase capacity almost 50 percent but will not start becoming effective until late this year. A Government stockpile disposal of 3 million pounds this month will help temporarily.

Black market: Meanwhile, a small black market has sprung up. Resellers who got in on earlier Government stockpile sales have unloaded for as high as $6 per pound of contained moly compared to going market price of $1.75 for oxide and $2.04 as ferro molybdenite. Buyers were either desperate users or speculators or both.

Few steel firms will talk publicly for fear of getting cut off. "We have to plead and beg from molybdenum companies to get what we can," one steel mill purchasing agent says. "They keep assuring us they won't let us down. But we don't have enough on hand to get through the first 2 weeks of March now."

After scrap: Another steel executive says, "We are really riding our purchasing people to get all they can and also buy up all the moly-bearing scrap. Our customers are also being told we need their scrap back and they are cooperating."

One major steel firm admits privately it has only 50 percent of the moly it needs for April in sight. Some order commitments for the moly-bearing steel involve defense-rated tonnage. So the outlook for moly plate users who are building shovels, road graders and similar equipment is grim.

"All users of molybdenum-bearing steels ought to immediately work on using non-moly-bearing grades where possible or reduce the moly content," says R. S. Clingan, sales vice president of Copperweld Steel. "In many cases other hardening elements, like chrome and manganese can be used. The shortage does not appear to be temporary. There is some relief in sight the next few months, but the potential for the future is not encouraging."

Cynical view: A purchasing agent for an Ohio auto supplier, however, is somewhat cynical of the situation. He says:

"The steel companies are using this as a wedge to explain their delivery delays. Alloy producing facilities are marginal because they use the old hand mills for alloy production and this is why mills are falling behind in their production."

Mr. Speaker, let me sum up by quoting from my old friend and associate in our studies of the "Impact of Imports on U.S. Employment":

EXPORTS DO NOT INCREASE TOTAL MARKET

Many writers in business and technical articles have talked about the need to increase our exports so that we may have a healthy and growing economy. This idea seems to be a carryover from the well-exploded pessimism of the 1930's that our economy and domestic market had ceased to grow. The idea now, is that in order to expand production and sales, we will have to find markets outside the country. The deduction is that we will have to accept more imports to pay for the exports. It then follows that we will have to lower tariffs in order to increase imports. This sort of thinking fails to take into account the fundamental economic law that on a sound, long-term basis we cannot expand our production by more than the total economic demand in the country. If there is anything to be gained by increased foreign sales, it is a temporary lack of balance between production facilities and consumer demand.

A BILL TO HELP CURB MISMANAGEMENT AND WASTE IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, a favorite subject of criticism by Members of Congress is waste, inefficiency, and mismanagement of public funds. Yet, few of these attacks include proposals for workable solutions to reduce uneconomical and inefficient practices. Today I am introducing a bill which goes to the source of these problems and will provide improved procedures to ferret out the individuals or administrative practices underlying misuse of our tax dollars. Here are the principal objectives of this legislation:

First. To require publication in General Accounting Office reports of the names of Government employees personally responsible for failing to comply with the laws or administrative procedures in spending public funds after this has once been reported by the Comptroller General to the appropriate agency head.

Second. To require that before 1 cent of taxpayers' money can be spent by a newly established Federal agency, the head of that agency must consult with the Comptroller General to become well acquainted with requirements for the disbursement of funds and contracting procedures.

Third. To suspend funds from all agencies whose accounting systems have not been approved by the General Accounting Office within 2 years after passage of the bill, and requiring all new agencies to meet these approved standards within 2 years after they begin operation.

Fourth. To require that every agency which receives General Accounting Office recommendations because of findings of mismanagement of funds must submit to the Bureau of the Budget a report of corrective action to prevent recurring waste.

Now let us consider the provision to require the Comptroller General to publish the names of persons responsible for improper handling of public funds.

First, it is a basic concept of American Government that all activities of public employees should be open to inspection, excepting only those of a purely personal nature or involving the national security. Accordingly, persons charged with the authority to disburse public funds should be publicly held accountable for their actions. To hide by anonymity or pass the buck through the "chain of command" is a great disservice to the American people. It is with this in mind that I submit the Comptroller General should publish the names of persons whose fiscal or legal decisions have cost the taxpayers unnecessarily through inefficient operations.

I believe in rewarding those in Federal service whose suggestions and good judgment merit recognition. Through the Government Employees' Incentive Awards program, 67,731 awards, averaging $36, were given for superior job performance in 1964. More than 118,800 suggestions were adopted with awards averaging $40 presented to many thousands of officials. If such an expansive program can be conducted for promoting good work, surely it is only proper to seek to identify and obtain disciplinary action or dismissal, where justified, for those failing in judgment, training, or intent, to meet the standards of responsibility with which they are charged.

The Comptroller General presently has the basic authority for access to records of Government agencies but does not regularly publish the names of individuals involved in deficiencies in his periodic reports. However, former Comptroller General Campbell believes it desirable to identify these decisionmaking personnel and has stated this in a letter addressed to me on March 18, 1965:

> In order to achieve for the Congress and the agency involved the greatest benefits from our findings, it is our policy not only to clearly demonstrate the existence of deficiencies and their actual or potential adverse effects, but also to determine, insofar as practicable, the underlying causes. In this respect, we consider it desirable to closely relate the deficiencies we find, not only with the specific practices and procedures, but also with the organizational units and individuals who are responsible for the existence or occurrence of the deficiencies since we feel that there is no substitute for a strong sense of personal responsibility in conducting the Government's affairs.

The legislation I propose requires that when the Comptroller General finds that a particular Government employee is not complying with the prescribed procedures for dispensing funds, property, or assets for which he is responsible, this information must be called to the attention of the head of his department or agency. If, in a subsequent audit, the Comptroller General finds the same individual guilty of the same or similar deficiencies and corrective or disciplinary action has not been taken against him, then the name of this individual shall be published in the General Accounting Office reports on that agency. With the names of such persons and a documented report on the deficiencies involved, appropriate committees of Congress can conduct investigations, draft new legislation, or otherwise determine what action is needed to rectify these situations.

This bill goes to the heart of a great many of the wasteful practices which are often repeated. I believe it is essential that every accounting system must be adequate to properly and prudently dispense Federal moneys in accordance with statutory provisions and good business practices. My bill will require executive departments and agencies to bring their accounting procedures into conformity with the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act within 2 years. This 2-year limitation will also apply to all new agencies. If a department fails to comply, all expenditures of public funds must cease until the Comptroller General approves the agency's accounting system.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about Federal spending over a period of years we are referring to astronomical figures in the hundreds of billions of dollars. We should also not overlook these facts: In 1963, the Comptroller General presented evidence of potential savings of $218,380,000 and for 1964 the figure was $294,323,000. When we speak of accounting systems we are speaking of 128 such systems within the civil departments and agencies subject to General Accounting Office approval. These agencies have had more than 14 years to improve and modernize their accounting systems. Look at the results: Only 41 complete systems and parts of 15 others had been approved through May 1964. Last year the Comptroller General made the following statement regarding the delinquencies in improving their systems:

> In the nearly 14 years that have gone by * * * the number of executive agency accounting systems that have been modernized, improved, and brought into conformity with the requirements of law and the broad principles and standards prescribed by our office is disappointingly small.

This bill would require that all agencies receiving Government Accounting Office recommendations for improved procedures or policies submit a report to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on whether the agency has complied with the recommendations and, if not, why. The President has pledged his administration will fight waste, so, through this bill, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget must review the progress of executive departments and agencies to eliminate recurring waste. A compilation of the reports to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget will be submitted to Congress annually for review, particularly by the Government Operations Committee and Appropriations Committee.

While a basic problem in any government is the ability and judgment of personnel at every level of decisionmaking, the administrative officer should be quick to take remedial action when a Government Accounting Office recommendation is brought to his attention. Presently, except for the initiative taken by an Administrator and the encouragement in that direction contained in the Bureau of the Budget's Circular No. A–50 of April 1, 1959, little coordination or control is maintained over recurring waste.

The President, in his far-reaching legislative program, has proposed a number of completely new agencies, and at least one new Cabinet department. I believe the Congress has a responsibility beyond simply criticizing Government officials after waste has been discovered. We should build, develop, and reinforce administrative practices to keep newly hired officials in full and accurate compliance with the statutes under which new Government establishments must operate. The heads of all new agencies are required to consult with the Comptroller General on principles, standards, and related requirements for accounting and legal disbursement of public funds in my bill. This procedure is mandatory because only by a thorough review of the contracting and expenditure systems can an accounting system function with minimum difficulty and maximum efficiency.

Abundant examples to document the need for this bill are available to my

colleagues and the American people. I simply refer you to any annual report of the Comptroller General, the Comptroller General's periodic reports to Congress, and various hearings and reports of the House and Senate Government Operations Committees.

Consideration of this measure is timely today because as the first session of the 89th Congress prepares for adjournment, such a bill can be studied by Members this fall and appropriate committees and executive agencies. When we return in January with a full session ahead, necessary analysis and reports can be completed, and, I would hope, hearings held on this and other related measures.

SERIOUS CONDITION OF PRIVATE SHIPYARDS IN THE NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY AREA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the New York-New Jersey port has been hard hit in recent years. In the last few years we have seen the closing of not less than four private shipyards in addition to the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

It is fairly obvious what the economic loss to our part of the Nation has been. We have suffered greatly from these closings, and in my opinion, the security of the United States has not been well served by this paralysis which has hit the largest port in the United States.

After the announcement of the closing of the Todd Shipyard in Hoboken, on the New Jersey side of the Hudson, the New York-New Jersey congressional delegation met and formed a committee to aggressively seek repair work as a substitute for some of the shipbuilding work which we would no longer receive. The very able gentleman from New York, the beloved dean of the House, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER and I were elected cochairmen of the group.

Last spring, my colleague, Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY—representing Mr. CELLER—and I, along with a large number of representatives from labor and management, met with Secretary of the Navy, Paul H. Nitze, at his office at the Pentagon. We were given every assurance that we would be given every consideration.

Just how much consideration we have received can be gleaned by the following amount of repair work which our private yards have received since our meeting with Mr. Nitze on April 26, 1965.

From April 26 to June 23, 1965, our private yards received the magnificent total of $138,000 for repair work done on four destroyers, a minesweeper, an auxiliary ship, and subcontracted work relating to the overhaul of the aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *Intrepid*. Surely, this amount of work divided among five shipyards is not going to go very far toward alleviating our serious difficulties caused by the shutdown of the Brooklyn Navy Yard and the private yards in our port.

This week, insult was added to injury, when the Maritime Administration announced that our shipyards would be passed over for repair work being done on federally owned ships which are being taken out of the so-called mothball fleet for use by the Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service in connection with the current buildup in Vietnam.

Six ships are being reactivated from the mothball fleet which is located at Jones Point up the Hudson River.

Last week the Maritime Administration announced the reactivation of all of these ships would not be done in the New York-New Jersey facilities.

It was originally announced that only four of these ships would be refitted in our local shipyards. After a storm of protest was raised over the weekend from alarmed labor leaders, spokesmen for management and officials of the Port of New York, the Maritime Administration backed down, stating that only one ship would be taken from the Port of New York. This ship, the *Denison Victory*, is already at the Sun Shipyard in Chester, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, the cost for renovating each of these ships runs to about $300,000. In view of our severe unemployment situation, we cannot afford to lose even one of these ships.

Last week Capt. Thomas A. King, Director of the Atlantic coast district of the Maritime Administration, stated that repair work could not be done because we lack the facilities.

Mr. Speaker, if there were some substance to the statement of Captain King that we are not able to handle the repair work in question, then our cause would not be the legitimate one that it is. The fact of the matter is that we have all sorts of ship repair facilities available which are not presently being used. In my own district alone, the Bethlehem Steel Yard in Hoboken could handle all the work being done in connection with the ships being reactivated from the Jones Point reserve fleet. And, there are other yards in the port which are equally capable to perform the work in question.

Mr. Speaker, our workmen are highly skilled. They have learned the shipbuilding trades by means of years of experience. Their experience and skill is a vital national asset in times of international peril. During World War II and the Korean conflict our skilled workmen performed shipbuilding miracles.

The Bethlehem Yard in Hoboken could employ 12,000 men if it were running at full capacity. Today this great shipyard employs only about 1,000 men. The Todd Shipyard also in Hoboken now has only about a score of men still working. Its final demise is scheduled for December.

We have the yards, we have the skilled workers. In fact, we have everything except the work. Why has the Maritime Administration chosen to follow the Navy's lead in abandoning the New York-New Jersey port to its fate? This, Mr. Speaker, is the question which we in the New York-New Jersey delegation demand to know.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that if this decision is not countermanded, the conclusion is inescapable. The administration has broken faith with us. We in the New York-New Jersey delegation have gone down the line with the administration on matters which are geographically remote from our part of the Nation. We have loyally supported farm programs and aid to Appalachia because we felt that these programs were good for the Nation even though they do not benefit directly the people of our area. But if we are asked to support programs to aid every part of the United States and then see a major industry in our area, which has long been in decline because of the shortsighted Navy policies, treated with contempt, then I say, Mr. Speaker, it is time that those who are responsible for making administration policy learn that charity begins at home.

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

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

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to commend the gentleman for his interest in this very vital matter that is of great interest not only to the shipyards of New Jersey and New York but also to the entire country. The gentleman I know has had an abiding and continuing interest in the welfare of shipbuilding in New Jersey. I know that the gentleman has been most cooperative in the efforts I have tried to expend in bringing new work to the private shipbuilding yards in New Jersey.

I would like to say to the gentleman that I share his views. I believe that the time has come when the responsible Government agencies must recognize that if the private yards in the New York-New Jersey area are to continue in being they must receive their fair share of all Government contracts, whether it be in the form of new shipbuilding awards or, as the gentleman is pointing out, in major repair work.

I think the gentleman recognizes that one of the leading private yards in the country, the New York Shipbuilding Corp., is located in my district and employs a great many men who are residents of the district represented by the very distinguished and able gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCGRATH].

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCGRATH] has in the past and is now exerting a great deal of his personal effort in a cooperative effort with me in trying to aid this shipyard.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of our colleagues I would like to point out that the enrollment, the employment rolls, in that yard which have approximated 10,000 men for the past many years, have now been depleted to approximately 3,000. This has been occasioned by the inability of the yard to obtain any new contracts for the construction of ships or to be the recipients of any awards for major repair work. Therefore, I can recognize, as well as any Member of this House, the anxiety of the Member in the well for the yards in his area.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the men and management and labor who are dependent upon these yards for their sustenance, as well as the people of his district, should be very grateful to the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman I hope to bring

to the House within the next few days legislation which will create a study commission for the purpose of investigating as to what we can do to aid the private shipbuilding industry in this country.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman and congratulate him and assure him of my continuing cooperation in his endeavors to aid the yards in the State of New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] for the initiative which he has shown in this effort. Again, the gentleman demonstrates that he not only represents the people and the best interest of his constituency, but in doing so he serves the best interests of the Nation. He has called the attention of the House of Representatives to this matter, and I want to associate myself with him and offer him every cooperation and assistance that I possibly can put forth, along with, I know, the balance of the congressional delegation from New Jersey who join the gentleman in this effort.

Mr. DANIELS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New Jersey. The gentleman from Hudson County has made a very strong presentation. I am in full agreement with him that we in the New York-New Jersey area have not been getting proper consideration from the Navy Department and the Maritime Administration.

We are asked to go to bat for every other part of the United States. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I have no quarrel with these other sections of the United States. But once in a while, we would like a little consideration ourselves. It is nothing short of an outrage for the Maritime Administration to charge that our shipyards are not capable of doing the repair work on these ships that are being reactivated as a result of the Vietnamese crisis. There is no part of the United States where skilled labor is more readily available. As the gentleman from New Jersey just said so well, we proved what we could do in World War II and during the Korean crisis. We have serious unemployment situations in New Jersey and I cannot continue to support administration policies while the Navy Department and the Maritime Administration pursues policies which are designed to produce poverty in New Jersey.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also want to associate myself with the efforts of the gentleman from New Jersey now in the well.

Mr. Speaker, since coming to the Congress I have worked with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] in connection with similar problems with reference to the New York Shipbuilding Co. at Camden as many of the workers in that yard live in the Second Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] for his efforts on behalf of the private shipbuilding industry in New Jersey and on behalf of the Nation for his efforts in this regard and I pledge my continued assistance in behalf of his great efforts.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman's colleagues from the State of New Jersey in paying tribute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] for his leadership in pointing out what may be an oversight but which actually is turning into a prejudicial situation insofar as the entire New York port area is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey along with his colleagues and other colleagues of mine from the State of New York have met on several occasions over the past 3 years with the Secretary of the Department of the Navy. We have met with industry leaders. We have met with the labor union leaders in an effort to try and arrive at some concerted action to insure that the port of New York ship repair and shipbuilding industry is not discriminated against. Also, most recently I received communications from the presidents of the New York-New Jersey Drydock Associations.

His latest communication pinpointing the information so far as New York and New Jersey are concerned appears in this program addressed to Capt. Thomas A. King, Director, Atlantic Construction District, Maritime Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 45 Broadway, New York City, and reads as follows:

Your statement appearing in the New York Times on August 26, 1965, concerning the possibility that work assigned to the port of New York by MARAD might be sent to another port because of "restricted drydock and other shipyard repair facilities in this port" has caused deep concern and protest among the members of the New York & New Jersey Drydock Association.

In view of the already existing shortage of ship repair work in this port, partially attributable to Government policy, we would expect every opportunity be given to existing ship repair yards located here to repair ships currently or in the future being brought from the Hudson River reserve fleet or other reserve fleets.

Allocation of ship repair work to the port of New York has long been sought and will aid the already stricken industry here as well as help to preserve the skilled manpower pool.

Very truly yours,

K. DEFOREST,
President, New York & New Jersey Drydock Association.

The gentleman from New Jersey knows as well as I know we are losing the New York Naval Shipyard at Brooklyn. We know that facility employed at the beginning of this year almost 10,000 people. We know it is phased down to an employment level of about 6,000 at the present time. So we know there is ample skill in the port of New York to participate in this ship revitalization from the reserve fleet.

I think the Maritime Administration should compare their correspondence with the Department of the Navy. I would like to refer to some correspondence I had with the Navy as it affected the port of Philadelphia recently. I had written to the Bureau of Ships, Admiral Brockett, and knowing at one time there were about seven destroyers that were going to be put in the mothball fleet in the James River, Pa., I felt because of the shortage of work in the New York area they might be able to divert some of the work in the Philadelphia area to the New York yard. If they would let the New York yards bid on the mothball destroyers it might be that the New York yards could quote a figure, which would include the towing of the ship from Philadelphia to New York, and still win some work.

Admiral Brockett stated as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF SHIPS,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MURPHY: Your letter of August 14, 1964, mentioned that seven destroyers in the Philadelphia area are scheduled to be mothballed, and requested advice as to the possibility of New York private yards bidding for this work and absorbing the towing charges to and from New York in their bid prices.

Five destroyer-type ships (three destroyers (DD) and two escort vessels (DE)) currently are scheduled for inactivation in the Philadelphia area. The usual practice is to have the major portion of such inactivations performed by the reserve fleet group located at the appropriate berthing site, with the assistance of ships' forces. In this case the Philadelphia group, Atlantic reserve fleet, is the group assigned. Some industrial assistance will be required, on an intermittent basis, during the period of inactivation. This assistance will be obtained by contracting with a private yard or yards. Ships' forces will be supervised and assisted by personnel of the Philadelphia reserve fleet group. Much of their work will be performed concurrently with the work performed by contractor employees.

Performance of this work at a site far removed from the home station of personnel in the Philadelphia reserve fleet group would entail considerable expense and personal hardship. The foreseeable added costs of such an arrangement, including towing charges which you mentioned, would severely limit the ability of New York private yards to compete for this work. Also, award of this work to New York firms would, of course, constitute a significant drop in the very limited workload available for award to private yards in the Fourth Naval District.

In view of the foregoing, it does not appear to be practical to invite New York private yards to bid for this work.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BROCKETT.

I hope the Maritime Administration will take that same attitude that the

Navy took when we tried to activate some ships from the Hudson River reserve fleet.

Let us not send all of these ships down at once to the port of New York and say bid on them, lest we develop another situation which developed in the past, and that is when we had an emergency situation or some emergency developed where ships had to come out of the reserve fleet. There were some repair yards that were not repair yards. They were known as bicycle shops in the industry, or marginal yards that had not been doing work over a period of time. They actually took the work away from bona fide yards that were contributing to the economic and labor prosperity of the area throughout that period.

I would also like to include for the RECORD another letter I received from the Department of the Navy which is an answer to an inquiry I made to them as to the allocation of work in the New York area.

I asked them to break down the contract awards by shipyards and give me a total figure as to just how much work had come into the New York area, particularly in this period when the New York Naval Shipyard was being phased out.

As the letter reveals, the total awards amounted to $100,789. That total is broken down among the yards and I will name just a few of the yards here.

The award to the Tickle Yard was $2,245 to work on the *Parker*, the destroyer.

The Todd Shipyard had a $2,527 job for work on another destroyer, the *DeLong*.

The Brewer Dry Dock Co. received three shipyard awards for auxiliary ships—the *Allegheny*, the *Fulmer*, and the *Harris* which amounted to $4,780, $1,600, and $2,485 respectively.

Mr. Speaker, this is chickenfeed when we come to analyze the hundreds of millions of dollars that the Navy Department spends in the repair business as well as in the construction business.

We in the 3d Naval District think that is an inflated figure so far as the ship repair and new ship construction figures are concerned in comparison with other naval districts because we have virtually all of the nuclear submarine construction taking place in New London. That is a very expensive program. So that from the construction and repair dollar that is attributed to the 3d District we can actually take and eliminate that New London and nuclear business and see that there is not much left for the port of New York that has always been a preeminent and very busy and active Navy shipyard area.

The letter I have referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1965.

Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of July 27, 1965 requested a breakdown of the amount of repair work awarded to the five yards in the New York City area mentioned in the Navy's letter of June 23, 1965 to you.

The repair awards in question covered work on four destroyers, a minesweeper, and an auxiliary ship, and work related to the overhaul of the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Intrepid* (CVA–11).

In the overhaul of *Intrepid*, four New York area private repair yards received awards as follows: Coastal Dry Dock Co., $18,930; Hudson Engineering Co., $35,785; Tickle Engineering Co., $29,214; and Todd Shipyard Corp., Brooklyn, $16,860. The total value of these awards was $100,789.

Hudson, Tickle, and Todd also received one award each for repair work on destroyers. Hudson received the award for work on *Parker* (DD–369) in the amount of $2,245; Tickle, the award for *DeLong* (DD–684) amounting to $2,527; and Todd, the award for *Pierce* (DD–753) amounting to $23,800.

Finally, the Brewer Dry Dock Co. received three repair awards. These were for the auxiliary ship *Allegheny* (ATA–179) ($4,780), the minesweeper *Fulmer* (MSC(O)47), ($1,600), and the destroyer *Harris* (DD–447) ($2,485).

I trust this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,
GRAEME C. BANNERMAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

I would also like to call attention to another situation that we have that I brought to the attention of the Navy in 1963 and that was with the advent of the *Savannah* nuclear powered merchant ship which went on the high seas at that time as a demonstration project. When we analyzed the impact that that had and the fact that it is now going into commercial use and also the fact that we had so many nuclear submarines, I think we now have about 30 nuclear submarines in active service, I wrote to the Navy asking them to train people in the New York Naval Shipyard. This correspondence of mine is dated in 1963 before any decision was made to close any shipyards. I asked the Navy in my letter to train personnel at the New York Naval Shipyard so that the yard would be capable of doing nuclear powered and reconversion work and also to include private industry or invite private industry to send certain technicans to become qualified for nuclear repair work.

My communication from the Navy Department said that the Navy had adequate facilities to repair nuclear vessels and that they were not going to expand their facilities at all.

Mr. Speaker, that letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., November 6, 1965.

Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter of October 23, 1963, in which you referred to our earlier correspondence concerning your proposal that personnel in the New York area be trained for work on nuclear-powered ships. You indicated that you would like to discuss this matter with me personally.

I appreciate your interest in maintaining a satisfactory ship construction and repair capability in the New York area. As indicated in my letter of July 8, 1963, to you, we consider we now have adequate nuclear ship construction and repair capability in being. However, I shall be pleased to discuss this matter with you. It is suggested that your office communicate with Capt. Douglas C. Plate, U.S. Navy, of my office (telephone: code 11, extension 63452) to arrange a mutually agreeable time.

Sincerely,
KENNETH E. BELIEU,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I think we know and can see the long-range trend in cheap commercial power on the high seas is going to be in the nuclear reactor field. I think that is shortsighted on the part of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to refer to a telegram sent by the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce and signed by Mr. John C. Hilly, president, to Capt. Thomas A. King, director of the Atlantic Coast District, U.S. Maritime Administration.

He just begins to approach a point that was brought up recently by the Senate Appropriations Committee when they were going to amend the naval appropriations bill so that no vessels that would be combatant vessels or vessels belonging to the U.S. Navy could be built in any yard other than U.S. yards.

That telegram is as follows:

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 26, 1965.

Capt. THOMAS A. KING,
Director, Atlantic Coast District, U.S. Maritime Administration, New York, N.Y.:

The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce wishes to go on record as being unalterably opposed to any action by the Federal Government in diverting ship repair work from the port of New York on the spurious grounds that the port is lacking either the facilities or the skilled labor to handle such work.

There are few, if any, harbors in the United States with a more complete and diversified range of ship repair facilities than are available here. Further, we question the logic of any statement contending that there is a shortage of shipyard manpower when the current level of employment in the shipyards in this port is only a fraction of what it was at the time of the Suez crisis. It is true that many former shipyard workers have perforce found employment in other industries because of the uncertain nature of this business in recent years. But it is equally true that many of these skilled craftsmen would be willing to return to these yards if they had some assurance that their employment would not be subject to the vagaries of Federal policies seemingly bent upon favoring shipyards in other ports at the expense of the port of New York.

We join Brooklyn Borough President Abe Stark in decrying this diversion of work needed by our yards here, and make special note of the fact that the borough of Brooklyn, once a thriving shipbuilding and ship repairing center, has been reduced by this type of attrition to its present lowly state, and that even the few remaining yards here and their employees are threatened by continued diversion from the port of ship repair work essential not only to these yards but also to the national security.

JOHN C. HILLY,
President, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the Secretary of Defense made his reply to Senator HAYDEN and in essence he stated that about $9 billion of defense production for Great Britain was going to be purchased in American factories in the United States and would represent about $1 billion worth of profit to American industry and that to tie the hands of the executive department and not permit them to buy some things from Great

Britain would in effect cancel more than the like amount of business America was handling.

I should like to include at this point the statement of the Secretary of Defense to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The statement is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, August 17, 1965.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in connection with your consideration on Wednesday, August 18, of the proposed amendment to the defense appropriations bill which would impose an absolute prohibition on the purchase of ships abroad.

During the past 4 years, our Government has taken orders for the sale to foreign governments of over $9 billion of U.S.-manufactured defense products. These orders will provide over 1 million man-years of employment for U.S. labor and produce almost $1 billion in additional profits to U.S. industry. Of even greater importance to our Government, the sales will bring 9 billion in dollar payments as a partial offset to our adverse balance of payments. These are unsubsidized sales: They are the result of actions taken personally by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and Secretaries Dillon, Fowler, McNamara, and Vance. They are good for U.S. labor, good for U.S. business, and essential to our Nation.

Recently Mr. Vance and I participated in negotiations with the British Government which led to firm orders for the sale of almost a billion dollars of U.S.-manufactured equipment and options for the sale of several hundred million more. Because these orders required the approval of the Prime Minister and the British Cabinet and because they resulted in the cancellation of the British TSR–2 fighter aircraft program and the elimination in that one program of over 22,000 jobs in the United Kingdom, the British asked that we agree to buy a small amount of defense products from their industries. I stated we could give no such assurance. They then modified their request and asked that we agree as a matter of principle to consider the procurement of certain defense items from British suppliers when such suppliers were fully competitive in terms of quality and costs with U.S. manufacturers. This we agreed to do. To date, under this arrangement, we have procured nothing from British firms and I do not anticipate that in the future we would procure from the United Kingdom as much as even 10 percent of our sales to them. For us to achieve those sales, however, it is absolutely essential that we have the right to make such procurements when these can be justified on the basis of competitive standards of quality and cost. Such procurements are entirely consistent with the Buy American Act which requires the Government to procure from U.S. manufacturers except where the national interest will be better served by buying abroad. At present, I am insisting that the Defense Department procure its equipment and services from U.S. manufacturers whenever this can be done at a price not in excess of 50 percent above the price offered by foreign manufacturers—I plan to continue that policy except in those isolated cases where the national interest requires other action. The proposed amendment to the defense appropriations bill would prohibit such exceptions in the national interest and almost surely would result in the cancellation of British orders from U.S. manufacturers.

I strongly urge you to vote against the amendment.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, again I commend Representative DANIELS for his leadership in trying to bring to the attention of the Maritime Administration, of the Department of the Navy, and of the entire executive department, the critical juncture faced by the ship repair and shipbuilding industry in the New York port area. This includes, of course, some of the great ports of New Jersey, such as Perth Amboy, Jersey City, Hoboken, and Weehawken. These are areas whose labor skills and economic lives depend upon, and have depended in great part upon, the shipbuilding and ship repair industry.

I certainly hope that an equitable and fair decision will be made by the executive not to exclude the port of New York from this vital industry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. I compliment the gentleman from New York for his contribution. I am personally aware of the great interest which he has displayed in this problem over the past few years while he has been a Member of Congress. He has worked with me in an effort to try to find some solution to the problems which face our shipyards. I am sure he will agree that we not only have the necessary capacity, the drydocks, but also have the necessary skilled workmen to do the job which the Navy and the Maritime Administration require at the present time on these ships which are presently being released from the mothball fleet.

I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution in this matter today.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I should like to join with the gentleman in spotlighting this critical problem for the New York and New Jersey port.

I listened to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], and I certainly concur with him.

I should like to compliment my distinguished colleague from New Jersey for the great leadership which he has given in the Congress by spotlighting this very serious problem. I know from personal experience of the work the gentleman has done in behalf of the ship repair and shipbuilding industry in the New York and New Jersey port. Once again, the gentleman is doing a great service for the district and for our State by pointing up a very serious oversight on the part of the Maritime Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the New York-New Jersey port area has always been recognized as one of the main and vital commercial and military ports of call in the world. Ships flying every flag and trucks from every State in the Union load and unload daily. The New York Port Authority area, which includes Bayonne, Jersey City, and Hoboken, contributes in a tremendous way to the great commerce operations which help to make our Nation the most affluent power in the world today.

But while remaining a prosperous port, the New York-New Jersey area has been sustaining a great decline in another vital and necessary area; namely, ship repair and refitting. In the years since World War II New York-New Jersey concerns dealing in repair and drydock services have been steadily operating at a loss. In 1944 at the peak of wartime production area ship repair businesses employed 46,000 persons. In 1949, the peacetime peak, New York-New Jersey port area concerns employed 6,000 men. This in itself was quite a drop. However, the trend has continued and in 1964 the figure had dropped to 2,500 men employed. I think these figures accurately reflect the drastic decline in ship repair and refitting in the area.

Of course, the reasons for this decline are many and varied. One reason could be that the United States has fallen from prominence in the shipping industry and much of our seagoing trade has been taken over by foreign operators. However, one of the main reasons that ship repair and refitting facilities in the New York-New Jersey area are declining results from the Federal Government's failure to distribute contracts to area concerns. In 1964, of the $9 billion allocated for ship repair and refitting by the Department of Defense, only $272 million in contracts went to yards in New York and New Jersey. This figure represents a little over 3 percent of the total.

It seems strange that one of the largest ports in the world and a port area contributing a great deal to our defense effort should receive 3 percent of the repair and refitting work. An example of the importance of this area is the Bayonne Navy Yard which is in the port authority area. This yard has been designated Military Ocean Terminal for the Eastern Area, Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service. Bayonne will become the focal point of troop and cargo operations for the entire 23 Eastern States.

The case which has been receiving the greatest publicity in the past week concerns the one ship from Jones Point which has been sent to Chester, Pa., to be recommissioned and this case is only an example of the Maritime Administration's neglect of the New York-New Jersey repair operations. This example points up the reason why these area concerns are declining.

I have been assured by representatives of the interested parties that the yards in Hoboken could easily complete the work of refitting these six mothball fleet ships, not just five of them. I see no logical reason for going to the expense and trouble of towing these ships away from the area when facilities exist close at hand to complete the job.

The present war which we are engaged in in Vietnam is only one example of the need for the United States to keep in full and efficient working order the ship

repair and refitting facilities throughout the entire United States.

Besides helping to keep our defenses in good operational order, an increase in orders to the New York-New Jersey area would give many skilled workers in this area jobs and help to relieve the unemployment situation.

I feel it would be of great benefit to the Nation and to the area, if the decline of ship repair, refitting, and recommissioning facilities could be relieved and begun on the road to recovery.

Mr. DANIELS. I wish to thank my very able and distinguished colleague from the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished colleague, DOMINICK DANIELS, for taking this time to call the attention of the House to the deplorable situation involving ship repair allocations to the great port of New York. Unwise and unwarranted shutdown of defense installations, such as the Brooklyn Navy Yard and the Brooklyn Army Terminal, have created conditions severe enough in the employment of skilled workers. If anything, because of the effect of these projected shutdowns, there rests a real obligation on the appropriate agencies of our Government to channel and direct repair, overhaul, and construction work to the port area to offset these conditions. Instead, on the one hand we see the prospect that naval construction agreements may be made with Great Britain and on the other hand ships in the Reserve Fleet being made ready for active service are directed outside the port area without good reason. Recently I received the following telegram from the distinguished president of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, John C. Hilly, concerning this diversion of ship repair work and I commend Mr. Hilly's very sound and timely message to the attention of my colleagues.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 26, 1965.

Capt. THOMAS A. KING,
Director, Atlantic Coast District,
U.S. Maritime Administration,
New York, N.Y.:

The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce wishes to go on record as being unalterably opposed to any action by the Federal Government in diverting ship repair work from the port of New York on the spurious grounds that the port is lacking either the facilities or the skilled labor to handle such work.

There are few, if any, harbors in the United States with a more complete and diversified range of ship repair facilities than are available here. Further, we question the logic of any statement contending that there is a shortage of shipyard manpower when the current level of employment in the shipyards in this port is only a fraction of what it was at the time of the Suez crisis. It is true that many former shipyard workers have perforce found employment in other industries because of the uncertain nature of this business in recent years. But it is equally true that many of these skilled craftsmen would be willing to return to these yards if they had some assurance that their employment would not be subject to the vagaries of Federal policies seemingly bent upon favoring shipyards in other ports at the expense of the port of New York.

We join Brooklyn Borough President Abe Stark in decrying this diversion of work needed by our yards here, and make special note of the fact that the borough of Brooklyn, once a thriving shipbuilding and ship repairing center, has been reduced by this type of attrition to its present lowly state, and that even the few remaining yards here and their employees are threatened by continued diversion from the port of ship repair work essential not only to these yards but also to the national security.

JOHN C. HILLY,
President, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.

Unless remedial action for the port of New York shipbuilding trade is forthcoming it is my suggestion that the interested members of the delegation from New York and New Jersey meet to determine the course of action that will arrest and correct this inappropriate governmental action by calling before a joint meeting of the delegation, the Federal officials responsible.

New York is, and has every right to continue as, the greatest port in the world. Its facilities, personnel, and skills merit the appreciation and recognition of our Government. We were good enough for the fleet of Lord Howe and Henry Hudson 200 years ago and we are more than good enough—we are the best and most efficient bargain for the U.S. Government today.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in total opposition to a recent announcement by the Maritime Administration, that repair work being done in connection with the restoration of certain federally owned ships will be transferred from the port of New York.

Just why the Navy Department and the Maritime Administration should treat the port of New York as stepchildren is hard to fathom. What have we in the New York area done to deserve such callous treatment at the hands of the Federal Government.

I should like to read into the RECORD a telegram received last week from John C. Hilly, president of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, in reference to this shameful situation.

The telegram reads as follows:

AUGUST 26, 1965.

Capt. THOMAS A. KING,
Director, Atlantic Coast District, U.S. Maritime Administration, New York, N.Y.

The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce wishes to go on record as being unalterably opposed to any action by the Federal Government in diverting ship repair work from the port of New York on the spurious grounds that the port is lacking either the facilities or the skilled labor to handle such work.

There are few, if any, harbors in the United States with a more complete and diversified range of ship repair facilities than are available here. Further, we question the logic of any statement contending that there is a shortage of shipyard manpower when the current level of employment in the shipyards in this port is only a fraction of what it was at the time of the Suez crisis. It is true that many former shipyard workers have perforce found employment in other industries because of the uncertain nature of this business in recent years. But it is equally true that many of these skilled craftsmen would be willing to return to these yards if they had some assurance that their employment would not be subject to the vagaries of Federal policies seemingly bent upon favoring shipyards in other ports at the expense of the port of New York.

We join Brooklyn Borough, president, Abe Stark in decrying this diversion of work needed by our yards here, and make special note of the fact that the borough of Brooklyn, once a thriving shipbuilding and ship repairing center, has been reduced by this type of attrition to its present lowly state, and that even the few remaining yards here and their employees are threatened by continued diversion from the port of ship repair work essential not only to these yards but also to the national security.

JOHN C. HILLY,
President, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce.

AGAINST WARM WATERS POLICY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey in his protest against the decision of the Maritime Administration to have repair and construction work on ships by shipyards outside the port of New York.

In January, I sent a letter to the President protesting both the proposed closing of the Brooklyn Navy Yard and the corollary failure to increase the amount of Navy repair work awarded to the port of New York as some compensation for the Navy yard phasing-out. As I said at the time, I am completely opposed to the policy of cutting corners on repair costs by transferring an undue portion of these repairs to the warm waters of the right-to-work States. I do not like the idea of transferring repair work to States which have built their economic attractiveness on unfair labor policies. Even though the right-to-work laws are now near the end of their existence, their influence persists in the low wage levels they have permitted. The warm waters policy is still living on the fruits of unfair labor policies, and will be for some time.

To me, the administration's position here reeks of hypocrisy. As far as I am concerned, I do not think that the President is simply getting the Navy into warm waters—I think he is getting his administration into hot water. I do not like to see him pat unfair labor practitioners on the back. These actions are an insult to the labor council membership in the Brooklyn Navy Yard and other installations, which are not even being decently treated by the Government. These actions are also an insult to the private shipyards of the North, whose noncompetitiveness, I am coming to feel, is mainly a product of their fair and equitable labor policies.

Mr. Speaker, at present the port of New York receives only 6 percent of the total Navy repair program in private shipyards. We can expect this problem to increase as the warm waters policy is further implemented. I would like to register my strong disagreement with any repair program that does not shift repair work to New York to make up for the closing of the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The whole shoddy handling of

the Navy yard closing takes on an even darker coloration in the light of the seeming plans to also deemphasize repair work in New York, in order to profit from the wage scales of the South.

I urge the affected unions—and indeed the American labor movement in general—to take a long, searching look at the policies of this administration in penalizing northern unionists by shifting repair work to reward the cheap labor segregation bastions of Dixie. The maritime and ship repair workers are certainly getting the back of the hand from an administration that seeks out the cheap labor shipyards and also doublecrosses the American merchant marine and maritime workers so as to be able to peddle wheat to Russia more cheaply. This is to say nothing of the shoddy way the workers of the Brooklyn Navy Yard have been treated. I would suggest that the American labor movement look beyond the neat gift package of repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley and carefully analyze the multitude of mistakes that characterizes the administration's labor record.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey in his vigorous protest and in his demands that something be done to alleviate this condition which has aggravated the unemployment problem in the port of New York. I hope that the administration will take note of these comments made here today.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT HIRING PRACTICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on various occasions during the past months I have brought to the attention of my colleagues certain abuses practiced by the Post Office Department in the hiring of youths under President Johnson's so-called youth opportunity campaign.

I have pointed out how political patronage was used in filling many of these jobs. The Post Office Department now admits that 3,380 of 8,577 jobs were filled through patronage appointments.

I have pointed out how many of these jobs went to young people who are in no way educationally or economically disadvantaged, although when he announced the youth opportunity campaign on May 23 the President said the jobs should go "so far as practicable" to needy youths. Many disclosures in the public press have shown that the intent of the President's message was often disregarded in political patronage hiring by the Post Office.

There have been many facets to this case—too many to fully explore at this time, although I shall present my colleagues with a fuller explanation of the facts that have come to my attention at a later date.

However, there is an issue which has developed out of this case that I believe must be dealt with promptly and judiciously. That is the issue of departmental secrecy regarding nonsecurity governmental information.

Mr. Speaker, a clammy, gray cloud of secrecy has descended to envelop all who would inquire or anyone who might question, the procedures of the Post Office Department.

For instance, I have requested the names of the people hired by the Post Office Department under the so-called youth opportunity campaign. My requests have been denied. I have introduced a resolution, pending before a committee of the House, which would require the Post Office Department to provide this information to Members of Congress.

I have written the President of the United States, pointing out to him that if Members of Congress cannot obtain the most innocent information from executive branch agencies and departments, that representative government is dead. I have respectfully requested him to require the new Postmaster General, the very able Mr. Lawrence O'Brien, to voluntarily provide this information to Members of Congress. I anxiously await the President's reply.

Representatives of various news media have repeatedly requested the names of these people and related information from the Post Office Department, both at the regional and national levels. They have been shrouded in the cloud of postal secrecy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of this centers around a basic issue—the right of the people to know the operation of their Government. If elected Members of Congress can be denied this information—harmless to anyone who has nothing to hide—by appointive officials of the Post Office Department, I do not see how Congressmen can truly represent the people of their districts and their States.

If Congressmen are to work only with the information agencies or departments believe it expeditious for them to obtain, it means that Congressmen are being effectively propagandized by the executive branch.

If this occurs, the Congress of the United States will only be described in the term that every conscientious Member of Congress fears—as a rubberstamp.

To meekly bow to the withholding of nonsecurity information means that the Congress of the United States bows to a role as a secondary branch of the Federal Government which supposedly has three coequal branches.

By the same token, if the free press of this Nation is withheld nonsecurity information at the caprice of a department or agency, it is no longer a free press.

If the press is to work only with such information as the executive branch agencies or departments desire to release, it then is stripped of its role as the link between Government and people. The press then becomes a propagandizer of the people and the people are propagandized and no longer in a position to carry on their responsibilities of self-government.

Mr. Speaker, if the people see their elected Representatives turned into rubber stamps and their free press turned into propaganda by the secrecy of departments and agencies, the people's right to know is gone.

And if that is gone, democratic government is gone.

I ask my colleagues to picture in their minds the spectacle of a huge department of the executive branch, charged with grave responsibilities, using the distribution of 3,380 summer jobs for 16- to 21-year-olds as political patronage. And, picture in your minds the spectacle of this same supposedly responsible department, having distributed these jobs for partisan political purposes, adopting a fierce stance of defensiveness toward Members of Congress and representatives of the press, as they wrap this episode in a cloud of bureaucratic secrecy.

Mr. Speaker, if such unworthy actions are taken regarding a trivial matter, what of the important matters?

This is an issue of the gravest principle. If the Congress of the United States, and, ipso facto, the people of the United States, are to be denied a list of 8,577 names, what more serious matters are shrouded from our legitimate scrutiny?

And as though this were not serious enough, we come down to the sorry spectacle of a man removed from earning his means of livelihood for practicing his constitutional right of free speech. Now, I hear there is some question about the ability of this man to continue his job and I make no judgment on his competency. His name is John Cunavelis and he lives in Burlington, Vt. Until August 24, he was Director of the Youth Opportunity Center there.

Mr. Cunavelis spoke out about this political patronage hiring.

He called the way a part of the program had been run in Burlington, Vt., a "flagrant violation" of the intent of the program, as announced by the President on May 23.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of my colleagues to the following newspaper article, which appeared in the August 21, 1965, edition of the Burlington Free Press of Burlington, Vt.:

PAIR GET WORK NOT INTENDED FOR AFFLUENT: POSTAL HIRINGS IGNORED JOBS-FOR-YOUTH CONCEPT

The director of the Youth Opportunity Center here declared Friday that the hiring of two youths for the summer in the Burlington post office was a flagrant violation of the terms of the President's summer work program for high school graduates.

Four youths are working in the post office for $2.28 an hour as part of the youth opportunity campaign, under which Government agencies and private industry are to provide summer jobs for 450,000 high school and college students.

John Cunavelis, who runs the war on poverty clearinghouse for the State department of employment security here, said he has no

quarrel with the hiring of two of the four, but claimed that the other two are not economically disadvantaged.

Cunavelis also asserted that only the Post Office Department, through its regional office in Boston, insisted on selecting its own employees.

Many other youths are working in various Federal agencies in the Burlington Federal Building under the program, for $1.25 an hour, and the other agencies allowed the Youth Opportunity Center to select and refer youths for the jobs, Cunavelis said.

It became clear Friday that the Post Office Department had sought political recommendations—from both parties—for the summer post office jobs.

There were indications Friday that a storm may be brewing nationally on allegations that the post office jobs, which pay a high wage for youths, have been bestowed as political favors.

Donald Steele, Director of the Post Office Department's Boston region, sent a telegram to the department of employment security on June 10 in which he said the Post Office Department is participating in the program to make summer jobs available for deserving youngsters 16 through 21 who need employment.

After the youth opportunity campaign was announced, Cunavelis explained Friday, some 14 youths came to the St. Paul Street office with letters from Congressmen suggesting that the youths apply for the post office jobs.

Cunavelis said he does not refuse to allow anyone to apply through his office, regardless of whether they need work.

From files in the Youth Opportunity Center, names of 4 other youths were added, and the 18 applications were all sent in 1 envelope to Post Office regional headquarters in Boston, Cunavelis said.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cunavelis simply exercised his right of freedom of speech. I believe he also exercised a moral duty. He did not attack the program, which seems good in concept. He simply exercised his moral duty as a citizen in pointing out a very obvious abuse on the part of the Post Office Department.

Did he receive the thanks to which his responsibility as a citizen and a conscientious public servant entitle him?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cunavelis did not. He simply lost his job.

I commend the following article, from the August 25 edition of the Burlington Free Press, to your attention:

CUNAVELIS LOSES YOUTH OFFICE JOB

The director of the city's Youth Opportunity Center has been relieved of his duties.

Department of Employment Security Commissioner Mrs. Stella B. Hackel said Tuesday night that John Cunavelis has been offered a counseling job in the local Employment Security Office.

In an interview last Friday for Saturday's Free Press, Cunavelis spoke out against the hiring of two youths in the Burlington post office this summer, and called the hirings a "flagrant violation" of the terms of the President's youth opportunity campaign.

Cunavelis has been director of the YOC since it opened March 9.

"We feel that Mr. Cunavelis lacks the administrative experience it takes to run an office with 10 people in the best way."

She said she and Employment Security Director John White of Williamstown conferred before the decision was made.

"He is a very wonderful man and he'll make a very wonderful counselor, especially with young people," Mrs. Hackel said. She said her department feels the office should be run by someone with a "firm hand."

She said Cunavelis was hired in the first place because he was "on the list" in the DES office and they hoped he would gain the necessary administrative experience soon enough.

"We've been thinking about this for some time," Mrs. Hackel said, "we try to have our people in the best places in the department according to their abilities. We may even move him somewhere else."

She said Cunavelis had been offered the new job—three or four "steps down" in the department ratings—but she didn't know if he had accepted.

Cunavelis said Tuesday night, "I don't have any comment."

There was no hint of who Cunavelis' replacement would be, or when the change would be effective. "He's still at the office as far as I know," Mrs. Hackel said.

Mr. Speaker, there was, naturally, someone standing by to explain the situation.

I would not have you think that I believe there are not two sides to every story. But I do think it is worthy of note that the decision to sack Mr. Cunavelis just happened to be simultaneous with his expression of chagrin with the Youth Opportunity Campaign as conducted in Burlington.

It is also interesting to note that his immediate superior is quick to brand his remarks "less than perfect judgment" and a "mistake."

It is equally interesting to note that the Post Office Department's shroud of secrecy is amply extended by its Regional Director at Boston and by Mr. Cunavelis' immediate superior.

But perhaps the most telling point of all, is that his immediate superior calls Mr. Cunavelis "certainly a talented and able man" and adds that "we want to keep him."

Mr. Speaker, following is an article from the August 26 edition of the Burlington Free Press:

MRS. HACKEL, POSTAL OFFICIAL, EXPLAINS CUNAVELIS DEMOTION: NOT BECAUSE OF POLICY CRITICISM

Vermont's commissioner of employment security, Mrs. Stella B. Hackel, declared Wednesday that statements by John Cunavelis, published in Saturday's Free Press, had nothing to do with his removal as head of the Youth Opportunity Center in Burlington.

Mrs. Hackel said the matter had been under discussion for some time and the final decision was made last Friday, the day before the story appeared.

Cunavelis was critical of the hiring of two youths in the Burlington Post Office for the summer as part of the President's Youth Opportunity Campaign, a program for the Federal Government and private industry to provide summer jobs for high school and college students.

During an interview, Cunavelis said the President's directive initiating the program called for the hiring, so far as practicable, youths under economic and educational disadvantages.

Two of the four working in the post office are not under such disadvantages, Cunavelis said, and he called this a "flagrant violation" of the terms of the Youth Opportunity Campaign.

Mrs. Hackel said the statements in the article had been discussed with Cunavelis and she said it is not up to the Department of Employment Security to pass moral judgment.

The Youth Opportunity Center, a clearing house for Economic Opportunity Act programs, is operated here under the Department of Employment Security.

Mrs. Hackel said Cunavelis has accepted a position as counselor in the employment service office in Burlington, dropping from grade 18 to grade 15 in the Vermont civil service ratings.

(Grade 18 has a pay range of $110.50 to $140.50; grade 15 ranges from $94.50 to $121.50 a week.)

"Mr. Cunavelis is certainly a talented and able man and we want to keep him. We think he might do a fine job as a counselor," Mrs. Hackel said.

But she said he had virtually no administrative experience and his heading the Burlington office "hasn't worked out."

The commissioner said Cunavelis' term "flagrant violation" showed "less than perfect judgment."

"But, so what? We all make mistakes," she added.

The visit to her office last week of a Federal official who pointed out faulty administration in the Youth Opportunity Center here brought the matter to a head, she said.

As the Post Office Department was paying the four youths out of Post Office Department funds, rather than from poverty program funds, they were free to hire on a basis of competency, Mrs. Hackel said.

She said it would be illegal to divulge the names of the four youths working at the $2.29-an-hour jobs.

In Boston, the assistant regional commissioner for the Boston region, Daniel Day, also gave an "emphatic no" to a request for the names, saying postal workers' names are held in strict confidence, except for meritorious notices.

Day said youths working in post offices are being paid $2.29 an hour instead of the customary $1.25 an hour for most other youths working in the Federal agencies, because of the skilled nature of their work.

Recommendations from politicians in both parties were sought when the program was announced, solely to provide the Post Office Department with sufficient names, Day said.

He said regional headquarters did not actually hire the youths, but made recommendations to local postmasters.

Day said the Post Office Department usually gets names for summer job contacts through unemployment offices, but he said the President's announcement of the program came so suddenly that many youths did not know of it.

Therefore, he said, Members of Congress and party officials were asked for names as a matter of expediency.

Cunavelis said he sent 18 applications to the Post Office Department's regional headquarters in Boston, and he said he thought the four hired were from among the 14 who had recommendations.

Day also said he has had many commendations from postal patrons and parents of the youths for the program, and said his only inquiries have come from the news media.

In Vermont, 11 such youths are working in post offices under the Youth Opportunity Campaign, and Day said he expects all to leave shortly after Labor Day to go back to high school or college.

Mr. Speaker, having heard this explanation by Mr. Cunavelis' superior, I offer the following article, from the August 28 edition of the Burlington Free Press, with this comment: If the Post Office Department would be open and above board about this whole question of summer hiring, Mr. Cunavlis' removal from office could be considered only on his competency rather than the suspicion that he was removed because he spoke out:

TURNS DOWN DEMOTION—CUNAVELIS TELLS WHY HE'S SURE SPEAKING OUT COST HIS JOB

John Cunavelis, ousted Monday as director of the Youth Opportunity Center here, said Friday night he is quitting the Department of Employment Security job to which he was transferred "effective immediately."

He said he had worked Friday but would not be on the job Monday.

Asked if he thought his removal from the Youth Opportunity Center was connected with a statement published in last Saturday's Free Press, Cunavelis replied: "Definitely."

During an interview Cunavelis criticized the hiring of two youths from affluent families for summer jobs in the Burlington post office as part of the Youth Opportunity Campaign.

He called hiring the two, whom he said are not economically or educationally disadvantaged, a "flagrant violation" of the terms set by President Johnson when he initiated the summer work program.

Employment Security Director John White called Cunavelis that Saturday night and told him to be at the Department of Employment Security in Montpelier on Monday morning, Cunavelis said.

On Monday morning, Cunavelis was told that he was through as director of the Youth Opportunity Center.

Vermont's Commissioner of Employment Security, Mrs. Stella B. Hackel, said the story had no connection with Cunavelis' removal, and that he was transferred from the directorship because of his lack of administrative experience.

She said the matter had been under consideration for some time and the decision had been made Friday, the day before the story appeared.

Cunavelis, a former newspaperman and former employee of the U.S. Information Agency in Washington, D.C., said he doesn't have another job but will look for one and would like to remain in the Burlington area.

Cunavelis said on Monday morning White and Mrs. Hackel told him he was being transferred to the counselor job and wanted to know if he would go along with it.

He said he took the lower paying job (Mrs. Hackel estimated his pay cut at about $15 a week) because of the welfare of his family but he said his family has urged him to quit the employment service.

He said he is quitting directly because of the removal from the Youth Opportunity Center directorship.

Cunavelis said his contention that the post office jobs, which pay $2.29 an hour, should go to the youths who need work is based on the President's initial announcement.

When President Johnson announced the program early this summer, he directed Federal agencies to make every effort to find meaningful work for 1 youth for every 100 employees. He included this statement as part of the announcement:

"These jobs should go, so far as this is practicable, to boys and girls 16 through 21 who need them the most because of economic or educational disadvantages."

Cunavelis quoted this statement by the President earlier when he called hiring two of the four youths in the post office a "flagrant violation" of the youth opportunity campaign.

The Post Office Department has refused emphatically to divulge the names of youths in the summer program and a journalist for national publications in Washington said Friday that the names are not even available to Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is another Burlington, in Iowa. And there, in Burlington, Iowa, attempts to enforce secrecy were underway at the same time that events were transpiring in the Vermont city.

In Burlington, Iowa, postal inspectors were busy interrogating the staff of the local newspaper, in an attempt to find out how that scion of the free press had obtained its information.

The Des Moines Register of Des Moines, Iowa, reported on August 28 that postal inspectors from the St. Louis, Mo., regional office questioned an editor of the Burlington newspaper in an investigation to discover how the names became known.

Mr. Speaker, this is how the clammy, gray cloud of secrecy works, as administered by the Post Office Department, if we are to believe these reports. Fire a man for speaking. Interrogate members of the press for printing the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, object.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is obvious that there is bipartisan distaste for the manner in which the Post Office Department has conducted itself in this matter.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to avail themselves of any opportunity to aid in making public the names of youths hired by the Post Office Department under the so-called youth opportunity campaign. I believe that until the Post Office Department makes this information available to Members of Congress, we must doubt our ability to obtain any information necessary to our duties as the elected representatives of the people.

A SOUND BANKING SYSTEM: A TRIBUTE TO THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to reflect some observations I have made in my tenure as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. In this capacity, I have had the opportunity to view firsthand, and to study in depth, the banking industry and the manner in which it is regulated. Out of this experience has come a great confidence in our banking system, and a growing admiration for the man who has given new impetus and vitality to American banking, the Comptroller of the Currency, James Saxon.

In the brief time I have today, I would like to summarize my views on banking in America and bring to the attention of the American people, through this great forum, the historic contributions the Comptroller of the Currency is making in this complex and vital area of our economy.

Banking, along with certain other industries, is regulated by the Federal Government and by the authorities of the 50 States, not as some believe, because bankers need to be watched or protected, but to assure that banking is meeting the public's ever-changing needs for an ever-increasing variety of services. If less stringent regulation of banks will better fulfill the needs of the public and at the same time advance our Nation's economic goals, then it is in the interests of us all to see that artificial or outmoded restraints are relaxed. If we find evidence that bankers generally are derelict in their responsibilities to society, then we must reexamine our regulatory structure and the policies and procedures of the regulators. History has taught us, I hope, that we can never again tolerate the laxity and indolence which were responsible for our economic mistakes of the twenties. But history has made us aware, too, of the dangers of overregulation in an effort to compensate for some of the excesses of the past.

In recent years, it has become clear that banking has been hobbled unduly by crisis-oriented laws and rules and regulations. Codes under which enterprises operated and prospered three decades ago when the gross national product of our economy was at a level of $181 billion cannot be justified for businesses desiring to compete for their fair share of a $510 billion gross national product. Banking laws and rules and regulations have in recent years been reexamined in the light of changed and changing conditions. One of those most persistent and diligent in this reexamination has been our Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. James J. Saxon, who is responsible for the regulation of the national banking segment of our dual banking system. For 4 years, he and his colleagues in this oldest—and one of the smallest, in terms of personnel, of the Federal Government's regulatory agencies—have been engaged in an effort to broaden the opportunity for private initiative in the national banking system. They have kept their eye on a dual objective and a dual responsibility: Permit this private sector to make a viable contribution to our economy, while sustaining the public purpose. How can we test whether this objective has been achieved and how efficiently the agency has met its responsibility? There is ample statistical evidence to demonstrate that, under the stimulus of new powers granted to this industry, banking performance has reached a new high level—in deposits, loans, investments, and earnings. Banking and those who are served by banks have profited. There seems to be an eagerness on the part of bankers to explore fully the many new opportunities that lie ahead. And there certainly has been an appreciation and recognition by those served by banks—confirmed by the simple test of public acceptance of the services now open to all, where once—in the memory of many of us here—such services were available to only a relative few.

The Comptroller of the Currency has just sent up his annual report—the 102d since the establishment of this regulatory agency by Abraham Lincoln in 1863. He has prefaced his report to Congress with a document entitled "The Banking Structure in Evolution: A Response to Public Demand." It contains a statement of policy, an overview of the evolution of the banking structure in this century, and a look toward the future. I commend it to study by my colleagues, and I trust that those in both the public and the private sectors who ought to be concerned with the future of our private enterprise economy will read it. It is a

useful addition to the bibliography of economic education.

Change is not always easy, and the proponents of change must be stout-hearted men, invulnerable to attack from those who advocate the status quo. James Saxon is such a man. He has been resolute in his determination to bring needed reform to the national banking system. Almost 4 years ago James Saxon came to Washington equipped with the ability and the experience to do the job. He had been here before; in fact, it was here, before World War II, that he embarked upon a career that has combined public service, private business and the law. In his first Government job in the Insolvent Bank Division of the Comptroller's Office in the thirties, he witnessed at first hand the sad results of the near collapse of our private banking system. Later, as Treasury attaché to our High Commissioner in the Philippines, Francis B. Sayre, he encountered a different kind of problem. At the outbreak of war he was assigned as Treasury aid to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and at age 26, his became the task of taking over the assets of Japanese-owned banks. As the fall of the Philippines neared, he went with MacArthur to Corregidor and handled the destruction of currency in the face of the enemy's advance. The day before MacArthur was directed by President Roosevelt to leave Corregidor, Jim Saxon, carrying the general's personal papers, boarded a submarine carrying U.S. gold bullion as ballast and went to Australia. Upon his return to the United States and delivery of the general's papers, he was given another assignment: Treasury aid to Robert Murphy to handle currency and monetary affairs for the U.S. invasion force landing in North Africa.

During and after the war came other foreign assignments for the Treasury. Back in the United States, he pursued studies at Georgetown for his law degree. He left Government to serve with counsel to the American Bankers Association, and after a few years in the Washington office he accepted a position as an attorney with the First National Bank of Chicago. There he was exposed to the full impact of the regulatory agencies upon the regulated industry. When the late President Kennedy called him to Washington to take over the administration of the national banking system, Jim Saxon came armed with the experience and knowledge of having seen at first hand the harmful effects of over-restrictive and outmoded banking legislation. It became apparent early that Jim Saxon was not destined for the bureaucratic mold. One of his first steps was to ask each national bank to suggest necessary changes to the laws, policies, and regulations which affect its operations. At the same time he appointed an advisory committee of top bankers and lawyers to review the banker's responses and to make specific recommendations.

Out of this came "National Banks and the Future," one of the most searching studies ever made of American banking. By giving the regulated a chance to participate in their own regulation, Saxon not only underlined his belief that a free enterprise system must place primary reliance on individual initiative, but made quite clear that as he read the National Banking Act, it was not a fixed, immutable code, but rather a framework within which national banks "may employ their inventiveness and capacity for change" in order to respond to the needs of a growing industry.

Moreover, by putting into effect some 80 percent of the recommendations advanced in "National Banks and the Future," he showed himself to be a regulatory official who recognized that governmental limitations should be imposed only where there is a clear public purpose to be served, and that precedent is no excuse for maintaining a useless or outmoded regulation. Inevitably, this clear eyed boldness rubbed some people the wrong way. But timidity was never Jim Saxon's long suit. With a principle at stake, he seldom balked at taking on even the most powerful and firmly entrenched opponents. In his philosophy of bank regulation, the present Comptroller of the Currency believes that the presumption should be in favor of freedom of initiative and innovation by the individual banker. The same policy, he feels, is incumbent upon the bank regulatory agencies. The bank regulatory authorities, State and Federal, as any other regulatory authority, have an affirmative responsibility to assure that the regulated industry has the tools and the capacity to carry out its role with maximum effectiveness.

He has said:

> Excessive reliance on the negative crutch of all-knowing government—whether at the State or Federal level—can lead only to stagnation and regression. Not all the financial know-how of this great country is lodged in the genius of the financial and monetary regulatory agencies in Washington. Hence, the banking authorities should set, as their goal, the broadest reliance upon the initiative of the individual banker consistent with the specific proscriptions of the banking statutes.

The process of innovation and adaptation that Jim Saxon brought to the national banking system has not been confined to the national banks alone. Although many of his critics are from the other side of the dual banking system, the State-chartered banks and the State officials who regulate them, Jim Saxon has never wavered in his conviction that the dual banking system is the great strength of our economy. He looks on it as an effective instrument for perceptive adaptation of banking to the Nation's needs. As the Comptroller points out in his latest report, this dispersion of banking controls among the States and the Federal Government enables either segment of the dual banking system to supplement the other where deficiencies arise in service to the public.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Comptroller Saxon has been a courageous and able exponent of this philosophy, and in implementing it, he has rendered inestimable service to the banking community and to all Americans whose hope for a better future rests with a safe and sound banking system.

A GRAPHIC CONTRAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, while American soldiers are sacrificing their lives in support of this Nation's policy in Vietnam, some extreme elements protesting our Vietnam stand are straining the limits of the American people's patience. The New York Daily News of August 10 highlighted this contrast on page 6 with two provocative items. The first story was entitled: "A Gallant Captain Slain in Viet Gets Four Decorations," and told of the death of Capt. Christopher O'Sullivan in Vietnam on Memorial Day. The second headline read: "Scores Seized at District of Columbia Viet Protest," and can be best summarized by citing its opening sentence:

> Scores of biting, kicking, screaming pacifists, protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam, were arrested and tossed into paddy wagons on the Capitol grounds today.

The protesting demonstrators were associated with the so-called Assembly of Unrepresented People, which Congressman EDWIN WILLIS, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and myself, as ranking minority member of that committee, commented on extensively in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 4. Chairman WILLIS noted:

> The chief movers of the assembly include leaders, key activists, and members of the following organizations: The Communist Party; the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, the new national Communist youth group; the Progressive Labor Party, the ultra revolutionary Peiping-oriented Communist organization.

This is just a partial listing of participating organizations.

At the same time, I inserted in the RECORD three exhibits of the assembly's literature describing their plans for concerted action. One recommendation from exhibit 3 was most interesting:

> Students for a democratic society have tenative plans for mass burning of draft cards in Washington and elsewhere.

To show that Congress intends to make short shrift of extremist opposition to duly constituted authority, a bill calling for a 5-year prison term, a $10,000 fine or both for deliberately destroying selective service cards was made into law yesterday, less than a month after the destroying of draft cards was recommended.

A more vicious protest against our Vietnam policy has recently come to light in the form of abusive and threatening phone calls to survivors of American soldiers killed in Vietnam. The widow of the above-mentioned Captain O'Sullivan was one recipient of a cruel phone call mocking his death. One would be hard pressed to imagine a more revolting or extreme method of voicing opposition to our country's action in Vietnam.

In the hope that this harassment will be dealt with as expeditiously as the draft card business, I am introducing legisla-

tion calling for a penalty of 15 years imprisonment and/or a fine of $10,000 for this vicious practice. This is similar to legislation introduced in the Senate by Senator THOMAS DODD of Connecticut.

Following are the three news items from the New York Daily News along with a copy of the proposed legislation:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, Aug. 10, 1965]

A GALLANT CAPTAIN SLAIN IN VIETNAM GETS FOUR DECORATIONS

(By William Rice)

The Distinguished Service Cross, the Nation's second highest decoration, and three other medals, have been awarded posthumously to Captain Christopher J. O'Sullivan of Astoria, Queens, killed in Vietnam on Memorial Day.

They will be presented tomorrow to his widow and two sons, Michael, 4, and Stephen, 3, at a parade at 1st Army Headquarters, Governors Island.

In addition to the Distinguished Service Cross, for extraordinary heroism, the Silver Star, for gallantry in action, the Purple Heart, and the Army Commendation Medal will be given to Mrs. O'Sullivan.

SEARCH JUNGLE FOR YANK

O'Sullivan, 29, had led a 265-man Vietnamese ranger force into the jungle in a search for Lt. Donald Robinson of Tacoma, Wash., missing for 2 days. Robinson "has a young wife and a 3-year-old daughter" and O'Sullivan felt "responsible for him," he wrote his wife.

The Vietcong surrounded the search party and O'Sullivan, an Army sergeant and 100 of the rangers died before help arrived.

Robinson later walked out of the jungle, one of three survivors of another ambush.

What the captain died for was evident in a letter he wrote to his two sons just before he was killed:

"I cannot protect you from all the hurts of the world, but I can try to protect you from one of its major dangers.

"And that, my sons, is why, though we are thousands of miles apart, you are still before my eyes and I must try to protect you from this war."

O'Sullivan's parents, Mr. and Mrs. William J. O'Sullivan, and Mrs. O'Sullivan's parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Scott, will also attend tomorrow's ceremony.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, Aug. 10, 1965]

SCORES SEIZED AT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA VIET PROTEST

WASHINGTON, August 9.—Scores of biting, kicking, screaming pacifists, protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam, were arrested and tossed into paddy wagons on the Capitol Grounds today.

Many of the 800 demonstrators calling themselves the "assembly of unrepresented people," looked more like beatnik Indians after two members of George Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi Party tossed beer cans filled with red paint into their midst.

Newspaperman Andrew Glass was among those splattered with paint. He was later arrested with the demonstrators in the melee following an abortive charge through police lines, but was released this evening.

Yesterday 50 demonstrators were arrested while picketing the White House when they failed to keep moving past the entrance. Today they held a mass rally on the Mall before the Washington Monument, then marched on the Capitol, chanting: "L.B.J., L.B.J., how many children did you kill today?"

WARNED BY POLICE

An army of uniformed and plainclothes police bolstered by FBI agents, U.S. marshals and Capitol Police were ready when the marchers reached the Capitol. Before the statue of Ulysses S. Grant police used bullhorns to warn the disheveled sign-carrying group that they would face arrest if they marched on the Capitol's Grounds.

A sitdown and talkathon began at the base of the 88-foot Capitol Hill. While the leaders, under the command of paint-soaked Staugton Lynd, a Yale University professor, assailed the United States for intervening in Vietnam, others waved signs and taunted police.

LASTS 90 MINUTES

"Stop killing, end the dirty war," "Refuse to serve in Vietnam," and "War on Poverty, not people," read some of the signs.

The rally lasted 90 minutes under a broiling sun and tempers were frayed when the front rows suddenly charged the police line. The demonstrators were dumped to the sidewalk and arrest teams quickly began tossing them into the waiting paddy wagons.

There were about 300 demonstrators left when the arrests began, and almost all appeared willing to be arrested, despite biting and kicking.

One bearded youth stuck a booted leg out a paddy wagon window and tried to decapitate a nearby officer. A tattoo of night sticks finally forced prisoners to their seats.

As the bus pulled away to the chant of "We Shall Overcome," those still outside and not yet arrested cheered and waved.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, Aug. 19, 1965]

HERO'S DEATH IS MOCKED AS HE'S LAID TO REST

(By Gerald Kessler and John Cirri)

"I hope that the outcome in Vietnam will be a just one. I don't want the lives of my boy and others to have been sacrificed in vain."—Mrs. Josephine Devers, yesterday.

The Deverses and O'Sullivans of Queens are friends. That friendship was heightened yesterday by a common sorrow—both had lost men in Vietnam, both had received cruel phone calls mocking the deaths.

The O'Sullivan ordeal came after Army Capt. Christopher O'Sullivan, 29, was slain Memorial Day when an overwhelming force of Vietcong overran his patrol in a Vietnamese jungle.

On June 9, O'Sullivan was buried after a service in Long Island City attended by a 30-man police detail because of telephoned insults to his widow.

KILLED IN DEFENSE OF AIR BASE

Yesterday, a High Requiem Mass was offered for Marine Lance Cpl. Paul A. Devers, 21, of Jackson Heights, killed August 10 while on defense duty at Da Nang Air Base.

There was no uniformed police detail at the Devers rites in St. Joan of Arc Church, 83d Street and 35th Avenue, Jackson Heights. His death had not been widely publicized, as Captain O'Sullivan's had been, and his flag-draped casket had arrived here only Tuesday.

Even so, Dever's older brother, Peter, a Manhattan attorney and longtime friend of Captain O'Sullivan, got an anonymous call just before leaving for the funeral.

"I'm a card-carrying Communist," the caller phoned. "I've got a gun and I'm going to take care of all of you."

HANGS UP ON STREAM OF ABUSES

Devers, shocked, responded: "I'd like to meet you on the street and show you what Americanism is about."

When the caller burst into vicious abuse of his dead brother and the family, Devers hung up.

"I'd love to get my hands on him," the attorney later said. "But he did sound like a weakling or someone mentally sick."

Mrs. Eleanor O'Sullivan, widow of Captain O'Sullivan and mother of two young sons, visited the funeral home Tuesday night and offered her condolences to Mrs. Josephine Devers, mother of Corporal Devers.

Other sympathetic callers included Police Chief Inspector William McQuade and other brass. They had been friends of the corporal's father. A highly respected policeman, Detective Capt. Peter J. Devers was killed in a traffic accident while on duty on August 31, 1956.

MARINE HONOR GUARD AT SERVICE

An honor guard of nine marines from Fort Schuyler escorted the coffin to the church. About 200 mourners, including former schoolmates of Devers at St. Sebastian's parochial school, Jackson Heights, and Xavier High School, Manhattan, were present. Burial was at Pinelawn National Cemetery, Farmingdale, Long Island.

Paul Devers was a member of the 3d Marine Division and had served about 3 years.

"He enlisted to do his duty," his mother said. "And he did perform his duty. I hope all this will not be in vain."

H.R. 10818

A bill to protect the morale and efficiency of members of the Armed Forces by prohibiting the making of certain threatening and abusive communications to members of such forces or their families, and for other purposes

Whereas there have in recent months been repeated reports of telephone calls or other communications to wives and widows of members of the American Armed Forces serving in Vietnam, harassing and threatening them, and even threatening their children, specifically on account of their husbands' service in Vietnam; and

Whereas it is the natural expectation of all members of the American Armed Forces that the society they are serving will do its utmost to protect their families in their absence; and

Whereas the widespread publicity received by the threats and harassments directed against wives and widows of American servicemen in Vietnam has resulted in widespread indignation among our Armed Forces and an understandable anxiety over the safety and welfare of their families; and

Whereas this anxiety can only have an adverse effect on the morale of our servicemen in Vietnam and impair their ability to render efficient military service; and

Whereas the national security is threatened by such indirect assaults on the effectiveness of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas it is the power and duty of Congress to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, to raise and support armies, and to make all laws necessary and proper for these purposes: Therefore

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 115 of title 18, United States Code (relating to treason, sedition, and subversive activities), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2392. Subversive communications to members of the Armed Forces or their families

"(a) Whoever, at any time at which the United States is at war or any of the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in military operations abroad, knowingly makes, or knowingly conspires with any other person to cause to be made, an anonymous or pseudonymous communication by any means—

"(1) to any member of such forces whereby such member, or any member of his family, is threatened with physical harm or is subjected to abuse because of military service

rendered or to be rendered by such member of the Armed Forces; or

"(2) to any member of the family of any member of such forces, or of any individual who died while rendering military service in such forces, whereby such member of the Armed Forces, or any member of his family, is threatened with physical harm or is subjected to abuse because of military service rendered or to be rendered by such member of the Armed Forces—

shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than fifteen years, or both.

"(b) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'Armed Forces' means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; and

"(2) The term 'family,' when used in relation to any member or deceased member of the Armed Forces, means the wife, widow, child, brother, sister, or parent of such member."

(c) The section analysis of chapter 115, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2392. Subversive communications to members of the Armed Forces or their families."

IMMIGRATION STATUS OF CUBAN REFUGEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation which will permit refugees from the Communist domination in Cuba who have been living in the United States to adjust their immigration status to that of permanent residents.

The appropriation of money to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist Cuban refugees, while necessary, does not meet the real problem. Cuban refugees are forced to depend upon refugee relief programs because they are unable to secure permanent residence without which jobs, housing, educational, and other opportunities are closed. Adjustment of their immigration situation would permit many to obtain work and decent housing and to live independent lives. The refugees from Communist domination in Cuba are no more anxious to be on our welfare rolls than we are to have them there.

Adjustment of status for some refugees is possible through our consulates in Canada, but applicants must wait on long waiting lists, finally traveling to Canada to receive visas. This remedy is not available to thousands who under circumstances other than parole entered or became refugees after entry into the United States.

The immigration bill which the House passed on August 25 will not provide for the adjustment of status of Cuban refugees.

There are over 250,000 Cuban refugees in this country. It is estimated that 60,000 to 70,000 of them are living in New York City. In the interests of humanity we cannot ignore this problem any longer. It is one which money alone will not solve.

I have prepared this bill so that the adjustment of status will be voluntary; no one will be penalized if he does not wish to change his situation. But this bill says to each refugee, "You have come here as a refugee; whether you consider this stay temporary or permanent is a decision for you to make; as a country, the United States is prepared to help you in every way possible, whatever your decision."

This bill is addressed to an economic and social problem, not a political problem.

The bill contains special provisions for children in order that families may be kept together in case a child in a family applying for permanent residence might be found excludable under certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will receive prompt action by the Congress. The Cuban refugees deserve the opportunity to participate as permanent residents in the free society to which they with hope have fled.

WHY VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most comprehensive and thoughtful statements of this country's policy and this country's hopes for Vietnam is set forth in a recent publication of the administration entitled "Why Vietnam."

This document includes letters from President Eisenhower and President Kennedy which document the nature of our commitment. More important, it contains concise statements by President Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk, and Secretary of Defense McNamara which speak directly to the steps that have been taken to resist aggression, to our continuing efforts to achieve negotiations and a peaceful settlement, and to the "third face of the war"—the pressing requirement to deal with the deep and underlying problems confronting the people of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I include this document and also a transcript of a CBS special news program broadcast last week called "Vietnam Perspective: Winning the Peace." I include them for they speak pointedly to so many of the questions that are asked by thoughtful and concerned Americans.

WHY VIETNAM?

FOREWORD

MY FELLOW AMERICANS: Once again in man's age-old struggle for a better life and a world of peace, the wisdom, courage, and compassion of the American people are being put to the test. This is the meaning of the tragic conflict in Vietnam.

In meeting the present challenge, it is essential that our people seek understanding and that our leaders speak with candor.

I have therefore directed that this report to the American people be compiled and widely distributed. In its pages you will find statements on Vietnam by three leaders of your Government—by your President, your Secretary of State, and your Secretary of Defense.

These statements were prepared for different audiences, and they reflect the differing responsibilities of each speaker. The congressional testimony has been edited to avoid undue repetition and to incorporate the sense of the discussions that ensued.

Together, they construct a clear definition of America's role in the Vietnam conflict: the dangers and hopes that Vietnam holds for all free men, the fullness and limits of our national objectives in a war we did not seek, the constant effort on our part to bring this war we do not desire to a quick and honorable end.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AUGUST 20, 1965.

THE ROOTS OF COMMITMENT

In the historic documents that follow, two American Presidents define and affirm the commitment of the United States to the people of South Vietnam.

In letters to Prime Minister Churchill in 1954 and to President Diem in 1954 and 1960. President Eisenhower describes the issues at stake and pledges United States assistance to South Vietnam's resistance to subversion and aggression.

And in December 1961 President Kennedy reaffirms that pledge.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTER FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL, APRIL 4, 1954

(From Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Mandate for Change, 1953–56," New York, 1963)

DEAR WINSTON: I am sure * * * you are following with the deepest interest and anxiety the daily reports of the gallant fight being put up by the French at Dien Bien Phu. Today, the situation there does not seem hopeless.

But regardless of the outcome of this particular battle, I fear that the French cannot alone see the thing through, this despite the very substantial assistance in money and materiel that we are giving them. It is no solution simply to urge the French to intensify their efforts. And if they do not see it through and Indochina passes into the hands of the Communists the ultimate effect on our and your global strategic position with the consequent shift in the power ratios throughout Asia and the Pacific could be disastrous and, I know, unacceptable to you and me. * * * This has led us to the hard conclusion that the situation in southeast Asia requires us urgently to take serious and far-reaching decisions.

Geneva is less than 4 weeks away. There the possibility of the Communists driving a wedge between us will, given the state of mind in France, be infinitely greater than at Berlin. I can understand the very natural desire of the French to seek an end to this war which has been bleeding them for 8 years. But our painstaking search for a way out of the impasse has reluctantly forced us to the conclusion that there is no negotiated solution of the Indochina problem which in its essence would not be either a face-saving device to cover a French surrender or a face-saving device to cover a Communist retirement. The first alternative is too serious in its broad strategic implications for us and for you to be acceptable. * * *

Somehow we must contrive to bring about the second alternative. The preliminary lines of our thinking were sketched out by Foster [Dulles] in his speech last Monday night when he said that under the conditions to today the imposition on southeast Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Communists ally, by whatever means, would be a grave threat to the whole free community, and that in our view this possibility should now be met by united action and not passively accepted. * * *

I believe that the best way to put teeth in this concept and to bring greater moral and material resources to the support of the French effort is through the establishment of a new, ad hoc grouping or coalition com-

posed of nations which have a vital concern in the checking of Communist expansion in the area. I have in mind, in addition to our two countries, France, the Associated States, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, and the Philippines. The U.S. Government would expect to play its full part in such a coalition. * * *

The important thing is that the coalition must be strong and it must be willing to join the fight if necessary. I do not envisage the need of any appreciable ground forces on your or our part. * * *

If I may refer again to history; we failed to halt Hirohito, Mussolini, and Hitler by not acting in unity and in time. That marked the beginning of many years of stark tragedy and desperate peril. May it not be that our nations have learned something from that lesson? * * *

With warm regard,

IKE.

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO PRESIDENT DIEM, OCTOBER 1, 1954

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been following with great interest the course of developments in Vietnam, particularly since the conclusion of the conference at Geneva. The implications of the agreement concerning Vietnam have caused grave concern regarding the future of a country temporarily divided by an artificial military grouping, weakened by a long and exhausting war and faced with enemies without and by their subversive collaborators within.

Your recent requests for aid to assist in the formidable project of the movement of several hundred thousand loyal Vietnamese citizens away from areas which are passing under a de facto rule and political ideology which they abhor, are being fulfilled. I am glad that the United States is able to assist in this humanitarian effort.

We have been exploring ways and means to permit our aid to Vietnam to be more effective and to make a greater contribution to the welfare and stability of the Government of Vietnam. I am, accordingly, instructing the American Ambassador to Vietnam to examine with you in your capacity as Chief of Government, how an intelligent program of American aid given directly to your government can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial, provided that your government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied.

The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms. It hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government. Such a government would, I hope, be so responsive to the nationalist aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective in performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad and discourage any who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on your free people.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO PRESIDENT DIEM, OCTOBER 26, 1960

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My countrymen and I are proud to convey our good wishes to you and to the citizens of Vietnam on the fifth anniversary of the birth of the Republic of Vietnam.

We have watched the courage and daring with which you and the Vietnamese people attained independence in a situation so perilous that many thought it hopeless. We have admired the rapidity with which chaos yielded to order and progress replaced despair.

During the years of your independence it has been refreshing for us to observe how clearly the Government and the citizens of Vietnam have faced the fact that the greatest danger to their independence was communism. You and your countrymen have used your strength well in accepting the double challenge of building your country and resisting Communist imperialism. In 5 short years since the founding of the Republic, the Vietnamese people have developed their country in almost every sector. I was particularly impressed by one example. I am informed that last year over 1,200,000 Vietnamese children were able to go to elementary school; three times as many as were enrolled 5 years earlier. This is certainly a heartening development for Vietnam's future. At the same time Vietnam's ability to defend itself from the Communists has grown immeasurably since its successful struggle to become an independent republic.

Vietnam's very success as well as its potential wealth and its strategic location have led the Communists of Hanoi, goaded by the bitterness of their failure to enslave all Vietnam, to use increasing violence in their attempts to destroy your country's freedom.

This grave threat, added to the strains and fatigues of the long struggle to achieve and strengthen independence, must be a burden that would cause moments of tension and concern in almost any human heart. Yet from long observation I sense how deeply the Vietnamese value their country's independence and strength and I know how well you used your boldness when you led your countrymen in winning it. I also know that your determination has been a vital factor in guarding that independence while steadily advancing the economic development of your country. I am confident that these same qualities of determination and boldness will meet the renewed threat as well as the needs and desires of your countrymen for further progress on all fronts.

Although the main responsibility for guarding that independence will always, as it has in the past, belong to the Vietnamese people and their government, I want to assure you that for so long as our strength can be useful, the United States will continue to assist Vietnam in the difficult yet hopeful struggle ahead.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO PRESIDENT DIEM, DECEMBER 14, 1961

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have received your recent letter in which you described so cogently the dangerous condition caused by North Vietnam's efforts to take over your country. The situation in your embattled country is well known to me and to the American people. We have been deeply disturbed by the assault on your country. Our indignation has mounted as the deliberate savagery of the Communist program of assassination, kidnaping, and wanton violence became clear.

Your letter underlines what our own information has convincingly shown—that the campaign of force and terror now being waged against your people and your Government is supported and directed from the outside by the authorities at Hanoi. They have thus violated the provisions of the Geneva accords designed to insure peace in Vietnam and to which they bound themselves in 1954.

At that time, the United States, although not a party to the accords, declared that it "would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security." We continue to maintain that view.

In accordance with that declaration, and in response to your request, we are prepared to help the Republic of Vietnam to protect its people and to preserve its independence. We shall promptly increase our assistance to your defense effort as well as help relieve the destruction of the floods which you describe. I have already given the orders to get these programs underway.

The United States, like the Republic of Vietnam, remains devoted to the cause of peace and our primary purpose is to help your people maintain their independence. If the Communist authorities in North Vietnam will stop their campaign to destroy the Republic of Vietnam, the measures we are taking to assist your defense efforts will no longer be necessary. We shall seek to persuade the Communists to give up their attempts of force and subversion. In any case, we are confident that the Vietnamese people will preserve their independence and gain the peace and prosperity for which they have sought so hard and so long.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

TOWARD PEACE WITH HONOR

(Press conference statement by the President, the White House, July 28, 1965)

Not long ago I received a letter from a woman in the Midwest. She wrote:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In my humble way I am writing to you about the crisis in Vietnam. I have a son who is now in Vietnam. My husband served in World War II. Our country was at war, but now, this time, it is just something I don't understand. Why?"

I have tried to answer that question a dozen times and more in practically every State in this Union. I discussed it fully in Baltimore in April, in Washington in May, in San Francisco in June. Let me again, now, discuss it here in the East Room of the White House.

Why must young Americans, born into a land exultant with hope and golden with promise, toil and suffer and sometimes die in such a remote and distant place?

The answer, like the war itself, is not an easy one. But it echoes clearly from the painful lessons of half a century. Three times in my lifetime, in two world wars and in Korea, Americans have gone to far lands to fight for freedom. We have learned at a terrible and brutal cost that retreat does not bring safety, and weakness does not bring peace.

The nature of the war

It is this lesson that has brought us to Vietnam. This is a different kind of war. There are no marching armies or solemn declarations. Some citizens of South Vietnam, at times with understandable grievances, have joined in the attack on their own government. But we must not let this mask the central fact that this is really war. It is guided by North Vietnam and spurred by Communist China. Its goal is to conquer the South, to defeat American power, and to extend the Asiatic dominion of communism.

The stakes in Vietnam

And there are great stakes in the balance. Most of the non-Communist nations of Asia cannot, by themselves and alone, resist the growing might and grasping ambition of Asian communism. Our power, therefore, is a vital shield. If we are driven from the field in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in American promise, or in American protection. In each land the forces of independence would be considerably weakened. And an Asia so threatened by Communist domination would imperil the security of the United States itself.

We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else.

Nor would surrender in Vietnam bring peace. We learned from Hitler at Munich that success only feeds the appetite of aggression. The battle would be renewed in

one country and then another, bringing with it perhaps even larger and crueler conflict.

Moreover, we are in Vietnam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American Nation. Three Presidents—President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and your present President—over 11 years, have committed themselves and have promised to help defend the small and valiant nation.

Strengthened by that promise, the people of South Vietnam have fought for many long years. Thousands of them have died. Thousands more have been crippled and scarred by war. We cannot now dishonor our word or abandon our commitment or leave those who believed us and who trusted us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow.

This, then, my fellow Americans, is why we are in Vietnam.

Increased effort to halt aggression

What are our goals in that war-stained land?

First: We intend to convince the Communists that we cannot be defeated by force of arms or by superior power. They are not easily convinced. In recent months they have greatly increased their fighting forces, their attacks, and the number of incidents. I have asked the commanding general, General Westmoreland, what more he needs to meet this mounting aggression. He has told me. We will meet his needs.

I have today ordered to Vietnam the Air Mobile Division and certain other forces which will raise our fighting strength from 75,000 to 125,000 men almost immediately. Additional forces will be needed later, and they will be sent as requested. This will make it necessary to increase our active fighting forces by raising the monthly draft call from 17,000 over a period of time, to 35,000 per month, and stepping up our campaign for voluntary enlistments.

After this past week of deliberations, I have concluded that it is not essential to order Reserve units into service now. If that necessity should later be indicated, I will give the matter most careful consideration. And I will give the country adequate notice before taking such action, but only after full preparations.

We have also discussed with the Government of South Vietnam lately the steps that they will take to substantially increase their own effort—both on the battlefield and toward reform and progress in the villages. Ambassador Lodge is now formulating a new program to be tested upon his return to that area.

I have directed Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara to be available immediately to the Congress to review with the appropriate congressional committees our plan in these areas. I have asked them to be available to answer the questions of any Member of Congress.

Secretary McNamara, in addition, will ask the Senate Appropriations Committee to add a limited amount to present legislation to help meet part of his new cost until a supplemental measure is ready and hearings can be held when the Congress assembles in January.

In the meantime, we will use the authority contained in the present Defense appropriations bill now to transfer funds, in addition to the additional money that we will request.

These steps, like our actions in the past, are carefully measured to do what must be done to bring an end to aggression and a peaceful settlement. We do not want an expanding struggle with consequences that no one can foresee. Nor will we bluster or bully or flaunt our power.

But we will not surrender. And we will not retreat.

For behind our American pledge lies the determination and resources of all of the American Nation.

Toward a peaceful solution

Second, once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution is inevitable. We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table. I have stated publicly, and many times, America's willingness to begin unconditional discussions with any government at any place at any time. Fifteen efforts have been made to start these discussions, with the help of 40 nations throughout the world. But there has been no answer.

But we are going to continue to persist, if persist we must, until death and desolation have led to the same conference table where others could now join us at a much smaller cost.

I have spoken many times of our objectives in Vietnam. So has the Government of South Vietnam. Hanoi has set forth its own proposal. We are ready to discuss their proposals and our proposals and any proposals of any government whose people may be affected. For we fear the meeting room no more than we fear the battlefield.

The United Nations

In this pursuit we welcome, and we ask for, the concern and the assistance of any nation and all nations. If the United Nations and its officials—or any one of its 114 members—can, by deed or word, private initiative or public action, bring us nearer an honorable peace, then they will have the support and the gratitude of the United States of America.

I have directed Ambassador Goldberg to go to New York today and to present immediately to Secretary General U Thant a letter from me requesting that all of the resources, energy, and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam. I made a similar request at San Francisco a few weeks ago.

Free choice for Vietnam

We do not seek the destruction of any government, nor do we covet a foot of any territory. But we insist, and we will always insist, that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the south, or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision. And they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

This was the purpose of the 1954 agreements which the Communists have now cruelly shattered. If the machinery of those agreements was tragically weak, its purposes still guide our action.

As battle rages, we will continue as best we can to help the good people of South Vietnam enrich the condition of their life—to feed the hungry, to tend the sick, teach the young, shelter the homeless, and help the farmer to increase his crops, and the worker to find a job.

Progress in human welfare

It is an ancient, but still terrible, irony that while many leaders of men create division in pursuit of grand ambitions, the children of man are united in the simple elusive desire for a life of fruitful and rewarding toil.

As I said at Johns Hopkins in Baltimore, I hope that one day we can help all the people of Asia toward that desire. Eugene Black has made great progress since my appearance in Baltimore in that direction, not as the price of peace—for we are ready always to bear a more painful cost—but rather as a part of our obligations of justice toward our fellow man.

The difficulty of decision

Let me also add a personal note. I do not find it easy to send the flower of our youth, our finest young men, into battle. I have spoken to you today of the divisions and the forces and the battalions and the units. But I know them all, every one. I have seen them in a thousand streets, in a hundred towns, in every State in this Union—working and laughing, building, and filled with hope and life. I think that I know, too, how their mothers weep and how their families sorrow. This is the most agonizing and the most painful duty of your President.

A nation which builds

There is something else, too. When I was young, poverty was so common that we didn't know it had a name. Education was something you had to fight for. And water was life itself. I have now been in public life 35 years, more than three decades, and in each of those 35 years I have seen good men, and wise leaders, struggle to bring the blessings of this land to all of our people. Now I am the President. It is now my opportunity to help every child get an education, to help every Negro and every American citizen have an equal opportunity, to help every family get a decent home and to help bring healing to the sick and dignity to the old.

As I have said before, that is what I have lived for. That is what I have wanted all my life. And I do not want to see all those hopes and all those dreams of so many people for so many years now drowned in the wasteful ravages of war. I am going to do all I can to see that that never happens.

But I also know, as a realistic public servant, that as long as there are men who hate and destroy we must have the courage to resist, or we will see it all, all that we have built, all that we hope to build, all of our dreams for freedom—all swept away on the flood of conquest.

So this too shall not happen; we will stand in Vietnam.

THE TASKS OF DIPLOMACY

(Statement by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, August 3, 1965)

As the President has said, "there are great stakes in the balance" in Vietnam today.

Let us be clear about those stakes. With its archipelagos, southeast Asia contains rich natural resources and some 200 million people. Geographically, it has great strategic importance—it dominates the gateway between the Pacific and Indian Oceans and flanks the Indian subcontinent on one side, and Australia and New Zealand on the other.

The loss of southeast Asia to the Communists would constitute a serious shift in the balance of power against the interests of the free world. And the loss of South Vietnam would make the defense of the rest of southeast Asia much more costly and difficult. That is why the SEATO Council has said that the defeat of the aggression against South Vietnam is "essential" to the security of southeast Asia.

But much more is at stake than preserving the independence of the peoples of southeast Asia and preventing the vast resources of that area from being swallowed by those hostile to freedom.

The test

The war in Vietnam is a test of a technique of aggression; what the Communists, in their upside-down language, call wars of national liberation. They use the term to describe any effort by Communists short of large-scale war, to destroy by force any non-Communist government. Thus the leaders of the Communist terrorists in such an independent democracy as Venezuela are described as leaders of a fight for "national liberation." And a recent editorial in Pravda said that "the upsurge of the national liberation movement in Latin American countries has been to a great extent a result of the activities of Communist Parties."

Communist leaders know, as the rest of the world knows, that thermonuclear war would be ruinous. They know that large-scale invasions, such as that launched in Korea 15 years ago, would bring great risks and heavy penalties. So, they have resorted to semi-concealed aggression through the infiltration of arms and trained military personnel across national frontiers. And the Asian Communists themselves regard the war in Vietnam as a critical test of that technique. Recently General Giap, leader of North Vietnam's Army, said:

"If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated everywhere in the world."

In southeast Asia, the Communists already have publicly designated Thailand as the next target. And if the aggression against South Vietnam were permitted to succeed, the forces of militant communism everywhere would be vastly heartened and we could expect to see a series of so-called wars of liberation in Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

International law does not restrict internal revolution. But it does restrict what third powers may lawfully do in sending arms and men to bring about insurrection. What North Vietnam is doing in South Vietnam flouts not only the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 but general international law.

The assault on the Republic of Vietnam is beyond question, an aggression. It was organized and has been directed by North Vietnam, with the backing of Communist China. The cadres of guerrilla fighters, saboteurs, and assassins who form the backbone of the Vietcong were specially trained in the north. Initially, many of them were men of South Vietnamese birth who had fought with the Viet Minh against the French and gone north in their military units after Vietnam was divided in 1954. But that reservoir was gradually exhausted. During 1964 and since, most of the military men infiltrated from the north have been natives of North Vietnam. And near the end of last year they began to include complete units of the regular North Vietnamese Army. In addition to trained men and political and military direction, the North has supplied arms and ammunition in increasing quantities—in considerable part of Chinese manufacture.

Between 1959 and the end of 1964, 40,000 trained military personnel came down from the north into South Vietnam, by conservative estimate. More have come this year. Had all these crossed the line at once—as the North Koreans did in invading South Korea 15 years ago—no body in the free world could have doubted that the assault on Vietnam was an aggression. That the dividing line between North and South Vietnam was intended to be temporary does not make the attack any less of an aggression. The dividing line in Korea also was intended to be temporary.

If there is ever to be peace in this world, aggression must cease. We as a nation are committed to peace and the rule of law. We recognize also the harsh reality that our security is involved.

We are committed to oppose aggression not only through the United Nations Charter but through many defensive alliances. We have 42 allies, not counting the Republic of Vietnam. And many other nations know that their security depends upon us. Our power and our readiness to use it to assist others to resist aggression, the integrity of our commitment, these are the bulwarks of peace in the world.

If we were to fail in Vietnam, serious consequences would ensue. Our adversaries would be encouraged to take greater risks elsewhere. At the same time, the confidence which our allies and other free nations now have in our commitments would be seriously impaired.

The commitment

Let us be clear about our commitment in Vietnam.

It began with the Southeast Asia Treaty, which was negotiated and signed after the Geneva agreements and the cease-fire in Indochina in 1954 and was approved by the U.S. Senate by a vote of 82 to 1 in February 1955. That treaty protects against Communist aggression not only its members but any of the three non-Communist states growing out of former French Indochina which asks for protection.

Late in 1954 President Eisenhower, with bipartisan support, decided to extend aid to South Vietnam, both economic aid and aid in training its armed forces. His purpose, as 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."

Vietnam became a republic in 1955, was recognized as an independent nation by 36 nations initially, and is so recognized by more than 50 today.

Beginning in 1955, the Congress has each year approved overall economic and military assistance programs in which the continuation of major aid to South Vietnam has been specifically considered.

During the next 5 years, South Vietnam made remarkable economic and social progress—what some observers described as a "miracle."

Nearly a million refugees from the north were settled. These were the stouthearted people of whom the late Dr. Tom Dooley wrote so eloquently in his first book, "Deliver Us From Evil," and who led him to devote the rest of his all-too-brief life to helping the people of Vietnam and Laos.

A land-reform program was launched. A comprehensive system of agricultural credit was set up. Thousands of new schools and more than 3,500 village health stations were built. Rail transportation was restored and roads were repaired and improved. South Vietnam not only fed itself but resumed rice exports. Production of rubber and sugar rose sharply. New industries were started. Per capita income rose by 20 percent.

By contrast, North Vietnam suffered a drop of 10 percent in food production and disappointments in industrial production.

In 1954, Hanoi almost certainly had expected to take over South Vietnam within a few years. But by 1959 its hopes had withered and the south was far outstripping the heralded "Communist paradise." These almost certainly were the factors which led Hanoi to organize and launch the assault on the south.

I beg leave to quote from a statement I made at a press conference on May 4, 1961:

"Since late in 1959 organized Communist activity in the form of guerrilla raids against army and security units of the Government of Vietnam, terrorist acts against local officials and civilians, and other subversive activities in the Republic of Vietnam have increased to levels unprecedented since the Geneva agreements of 1954. During this period the organized armed strength of the Vietcong, the Communist apparatus operating in the Republic of Vietnam, has grown from about 3,000 to over 12,000 personnel. This armed strength has been supplemented by an increase in the numbers of political and propaganda agents in the area.

"During 1960 alone, Communist armed units and terrorists assassinated or kidnaped over 3,000 local officials, military personnel, and civilians. Their activities took the form of armed attacks against isolated garrisons, attacks on newly established townships, ambushes on roads and canals, destruction of bridges, and well-planned sabotage against public works and communication lines. Because of Communist guerrilla activity 200 elementary schools had to be closed at various times, affecting over 25,000 students and 800 teachers.

"This upsurge of Communist guerrilla activity apparently stemmed from a decision made in May 1959 by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of North Vietnam which called for the reunification of Vietnam by all 'appropriate means.' In July of the same year the Central Committee was reorganized and charged with intelligence duties and the liberation of South Vietnam. In retrospect this decision to step up guerrilla activity was made to reverse the remarkable success which the Government of the Republic of Vietnam under President Ngo Dinh Diem had achieved in consolidating its political position and in attaining significant economic recovery in the 5 years between 1954 and 1959.

"Remarkably coincidental with the renewed Communist activity in Laos, the Communist Party of North Vietnam at its third congress on September 10, 1960, adopted a resolution which declared that the Vietnamese resolution has as a major strategic task the liberation of the south from the 'rule of U.S. imperialists and their henchmen.' This resolution called for the direct overthrow of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam."

Next door to South Vietnam, Laos was threatened by a similar Communist assault. The active agent of attack on both was Communist North Vietnam, with the backing of Peiping and Moscow. In the case of Laos, we were able to negotiate an agreement in 1962 that it should be neutral and that all foreign military personnel should be withdrawn. We complied with that agreement. But North Vietnam never did. In gross violation of its pledge, it left armed units in Laos and continued to use Laos as a corridor to infiltrate arms and trained men into South Vietnam.

There was no new agreement, even on paper, on Vietnam. Late in 1961, President Kennedy therefore increased our assistance to the Republic of Vietnam. During that year, the infiltration of arms and military personnel from the north continued to increase. To cope with that escalation, President Kennedy decided to send more American military personnel—to assist with logistics and transportation and communications as well as with training and as advisers to South Vietnamese forces in the field. Likewise, we expanded our economic assistance and technical advice, particularly with a view to improving living conditions in the villages.

During 1962 and 1963, Hanoi continued to increase its assistance to the Vietcong. In response, President Kennedy and later President Johnson increased our aid.

Hanoi kept on escalating the war throughout 1964. And the Vietcong intensified its drafting and training of men in the areas it controls.

Last August, you will recall, North Vietnamese forces attacked American destroyers in international waters. That attack was met by appropriate air response against North Vietnamese naval installations. And Congress, by a combined vote of 504 to 2, passed a resolution expressing its support for actions by the Executive "including the use of armed force" to meet aggression in southeast Asia, including specifically aggression against South Vietnam. The resolution and the congressional debate specifically envisaged that, subject to continuing congressional consultation, the Armed Forces of the United States might be committed in the defense of South Vietnam in any way that seemed necessary, including employment in combat.

In summary, our commitment in Vietnam has been set forth in the Southeast Asia Treaty, which was almost unanimously approved by the U.S. Senate; the pledges made with bipartisan support by three successive Presidents of the United States; the assistance programs approved annually, beginning

in 1955, by bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress; the declarations which we joined our SEATO and ANZUS allies in making at their Ministerial Council meetings in 1964 and 1965; the joint congressional resolution of August 1964, which was approved by a combined vote of 504 to 2.

Our commitment is to assist the Government and people of South Vietnam to repel this aggression, thus preserving their freedom. This commitment is to the South Vietnamese as a nation and people. It has continued through various changes of government, just as our commitments to our NATO allies remain unaltered by changes in government.

Continued escalation of the aggression by the other side has required continued strengthening of the military defenses of South Vietnam. Whether still more American military personnel will be needed will depend on events, especially on whether the other side continues to escalate the aggression. As the President has made plain, we will provide the South Vietnamese with whatever assistance may be necessary to ensure that the aggression against them is effectively repelled—that is, to make good on our commitment.

The pursuit of a peaceful settlement

As President Johnson and his predecessors have repeatedly emphasized, our objective in southeast Asia is peace—a peace in which the various peoples of the area can manage their own affairs in their own ways and address themselves to economic and social progress.

We seek no bases or special position for the United States. We do not seek to destroy or overturn the Communist regimes in Hanoi and Peiping. We ask only that they cease their aggressions, that they leave their neighbors alone.

Repeatedly, we and others have sought to achieve a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam.

We have had many talks with the Soviet authorities over a period of more than 4 years. But their influence in Hanoi appears to be limited. Recently, when approached, their response has been, in substance: You have come to the wrong address—nobody has authorized us to negotiate. Talk to Hanoi.

We have had a long series of talks with the Chinese Communsts in Warsaw. Although Peiping is more cautious in action than in word, it is unbending in its hostility to us and plainly opposed to any negotiated settlement in Vietnam.

There have been repeated contacts with Hanoi. Many channels are open. And many have volunteered to use them. But so far there has been no indication that Hanoi is seriously interested in peace on any terms except those which would assure a Communist takeover of South Vietnam.

We and others have sought to open the way for conferences on the neighboring states of Laos and Cambodia, where progress toward peace might be reflected in Vietnam. These approaches have been blocked by Hanoi and Peiping.

The United Kingdom, as cochairman of the Geneva conferences, has repeatedly sought a path to a settlement—first by working toward a new Geneva conference, then by a visit by a senior British statesman. Both efforts were blocked by the Communists—and neither Hanoi nor Peiping would even receive the senior British statesman.

In April, President Johnson offered unconditional discussions with the governments concerned. Hanoi and Peiping called this offer a "hoax."

Seventeen nonalined nations appealed for a peaceful solution, by negotiations without preconditions. We accepted the proposal. Hanoi and Red China rejected it with scorn calling some of its authors "monsters and freaks."

The President of India made a constructive proposal for an end to hostilities and an Afro-Asian patrol force. We welcomed this proposal with interest and hope. Hanoi and Peiping rejected it as a betrayal.

In May, the United States and South Vietnam suspended air attacks on North Vietnam. This action was made known to the other side to see if there would be a response in kind. But Hanoi denounced the pause as "a wornout trick" and Peiping denounced it as a "swindle." Some say the pause was not long enough. But we knew the negative reaction from the other side before we resumed. And we had paused previously for more than 4 years while thousands of armed men invaded the south and killed thousands of South Vietnamese, including women and children, and deliberately destroyed schoolhouses and playgrounds and hospitals and health centers and other facilities that the South Vietnamese had built to improve their lives and give their children a chance for a better education and better health.

In late June, the Commonwealth Prime Ministers established a mission of four of their members to explore with all parties concerned the possibilities for a conference leading to a just and lasting peace. Hanoi and Peiping made it plain that they would not receive the mission.

Mr. Harold Davies, a Member of the British Parliament, went to Hanoi with the approval of Prime Minister Wilson. But the high officials there would not even talk with him. And the lower-ranking officials who did talk with him made it clear that Hanoi was not yet interested in negotiations, that it was intent on a total victory in South Vietnam. As Prime Minister Wilson reported to the House of Commons, Mr. Davies met with a conviction among the North Vietnamese that their prospects of victory were too imminent for them to forsake the battlefield for the conference table.

We and others have made repeated efforts at discussions through the United Nations. In the Security Council, after the August attacks in the Gulf of Tonkin, we supported a Soviet proposal that the Government of North Vietnam be invited to come to the Security Council. But Hanoi refused.

In April, Secretary General U Thant considered visits to Hanoi and Peiping to explore the possibilities of peace. But both those Communist regimes made it plain that they did not regard the United Nations as competent to deal with that matter.

The President's San Francisco speech in June requested help from the United Nations membership at large in getting peace talks started.

In late July the President sent our new Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur J. Goldberg, to New York with a letter to Secretary General U Thant requesting that all the resources, energy and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam. The Secretary General has already accepted this assignment.

We sent a letter to the Security Council calling attention to the special responsibility in this regard of the Security Council and of the nations which happen to be members of the Council. We have considered from time to time placing the matter formally before the Security Council. But we have been advised by many nations—and by many individuals—who are trying to help to achieve a peaceful settlement that to force debate and a vote in the Security Council might tend to harden positions and make useful explorations and discussions even more difficult.

President Johnson has publicly invited any and all members of the United Nations to do all they can to bring about a peaceful settlement.

By these moves the United States has intended to engage the serious attention and efforts of the United Nations as an institution, and its members as signatories of its charter, in getting the Communists to talk rather than fight—while continuing with determination an increasing effort to demonstrate that Hanoi and the Vietcong cannot settle the issue on the battlefield.

We have not only placed the Vietnam issue before the United Nations, but believe that we have done so in the most constructive ways.

The conditions for peace

What are the essential conditions for peace in South Vietnam?

In late June, the Foreign Minister of South Vietnam set forth the fundamental principles of a "just and enduring peace." In summary, those principles are:

An end to aggression and subversion.

Freedom for South Vietnam to choose and shape for itself its own destiny "in conformity with democratic principles and without any foreign interference from whatever sources."

As soon as aggression has ceased, the ending of the military measures now necessary by the Government of South Vietnam and the nations that have come to its aid to defend South Vietnam; and the removal of foreign military forces from South Vietnam.

And effective guarantees for the freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

We endorse those principles. In essence, they would constitute a return to the basic purpose of the Geneva accords of 1954. Whether they require reaffirmation of those accords or new agreements embodying these essential points, but with provision in either case for more effective international machinery and guarantees, could be determined in discussions and negotiations.

Once the basic points set forth by South Vietnam's Foreign Minister were achieved, future relations between North Vietnam and South Vietnam could be worked out by peaceful means. And this would include the question of a free decision by the people of North and South Vietnam on the matter of reunification.

When the aggression has ceased and the freedom of South Vietnam is assured by other means, we will withdraw our forces. Three Presidents of the United States have said many times that we want no permanent bases and no special position there. Our military forces are there because of the North Vietnamese aggression against South Vietnam and for no other reason. When the men and arms infiltrated by the North are withdrawn and Hanoi ceases its support and guidance of the war in the South, whatever remains in the form of indigenous dissent is a matter for the South Vietnamese themselves. As for South Vietnamese fighting in the Vietcong or under its control or influence, they must in time be integrated into their national society. But that is a process which must be brought about by the people of South Vietnam, not by foreign diplomats.

Apart from the search for a solution in Vietnam itself, the U.S. Government has hoped that discussions could be held on the problems concerning Cambodia and Laos. We supported the proposal of Prince Sihanouk for a conference on Cambodia, to be attended by the governments that participated in the 1954 conference, and noted the joint statement of the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, in April, to the effect that both favored the convening of conferences on Cambodia and Laos. Subsequently, however, Hanoi appeared to draw back and to impose conditions at variance with the Cambodian proposal.

We look beyond a just and enduring peace for Vietnam and Laos and Cambodia, to the day when Peiping will be ready to join in a general settlement in the Far East—a general settlement that would remove the threat of aggression and make it possible for all the

peoples of the area to devote themselves to economic and social progress.

Several of the nations of Asia are densely populated. And high rates of population growth make it difficult for them to increase per capita incomes. The solution to these problems cannot be found through external aggression. They must be achieved internally within each nation.

As President Johnson has said, the United States stands ready to assist and support cooperative programs for economic development in Asia. Already we are making available additional funds for the development of the Mekong Valley. And we are taking the lead in organizing an Asian Development Bank, which we hope will be supported by all the major industrialized nations, including the Soviet Union. We would welcome membership by North Vietnam, when it has ceased its aggression.

Those are our objectives—peace and a better life for all who are willing to live at peace with their neighbors.

The present path

I turn now to the specific actions we are taking to convince Hanoi that it will not succeed and that it must move toward a peaceful solution.

Secretary McNamara is appearing before the appropriate committees of the Congress to discuss the military situation within South Vietnam in detail. In essence, our present view is that it is crucial to turn the tide in the south, and that for this purpose it is necessary to send substantial numbers of additional American forces.

The primary responsibility for defeating the Vietcong will remain, however, with the South Vietnamese. They have some 545,000 men in military and paramilitary forces. Despite losses, every branch of the armed forces of South Vietnam has more men under arms than it had 6 months ago. And they are making systematic efforts to increase their forces still further. The primary missions of American ground forces are to secure the airbases used by the South Vietnamese and ourselves and to provide a strategic reserve, thus releasing South Vietnamese troops for offensive actions against the Vietcong. In securing the airbases and related military installations, American forces are pushing out into the countryside to prevent buildups for surprise attacks. And they may be used in emergencies to help the South Vietnamese in combat. But the main task of rooting out the Vietcong will continue to be the responsibility of the South Vietnamese. And we have seen no sign that they are about to try to shift that responsibility to us. On the contrary, the presence of increasing numbers of American combat troops seems to have stimulated greater efforts on the part of the fighting men of South Vietnam.

At the same time, on the military side, we shall maintain, with the South Vietnamese, our program of limited air attacks on military targets in North Vietnam. This program is a part of the total strategy. We had never expected that air attacks on North Vietnam alone would bring Hanoi to a quick decision to cease its aggression. Hanoi has been committed to its aggression too long and too deeply to turn around overnight. It must be convinced that it faces not only continuing, and perhaps increased, pressure on the north itself, but also that it simply cannot win in the south.

The air attacks on the North have also had specific military effects in reducing the scale of increased infiltration from the North. Finally, they are important as a warning to all concerned that there are no longer sanctuaries for aggression.

It has been suggested in some quarters that Hanoi would be more disposed to move to negotiations and to cease its aggression if we stopped bombing the North. We do not rule out the possibility of another and longer pause in bombing, but the question remains—and we have repeatedly asked it: What would happen from the North in response? Would Hanoi withdraw the 325th Division of the Regular Army, which is now deployed in South Vietnam and across the line in Laos? Would it take home the other men it has infiltrated into the South? Would it stop sending arms and ammunition into South Vietnam? Would the campaign of assassination and sabotage in the South cease? We have been trying to find out what would happen if we were to suspend our bombing of the North. We have not been able to get an answer or even a hint.

Those who complain about air attacks on military targets in North Vietnam would carry more weight if they had manifested, or would manifest now, appropriate concern about the infiltrations from the North, the high rate of military activity in the South, and the ruthless campaign of terror and assassination which is being conducted in the South under the direction of Hanoi and with its active support.

The situation in South Vietnam

Let me now underline just a few points about the political and economic situation in South Vietnam. For we know well that, while security is fundamental to turning the tide, it remains vital to do all we can on the political and economic fronts.

All of us have been concerned, of course, by the difficulties of the South Vietnamese in developing an effective and stable government. But this failure should not astonish us. South Vietnam is a highly plural society striving to find its political feet under very adverse conditions. Other nations—new and old—with fewer difficulties and unmolested by determined aggressors have done no better. South Vietnam emerged from the French Indochina war with many political factions, most of which were firmly anti-Communist. Despite several significant initial successes in establishing a degree of political harmony, the government of President Diem could not maintain a lasting unity among the many factions. The recent shifting and reshuffling of Vietnamese Governments is largely the continuing search for political unity and a viable regime which can overcome these long-evident political divisions.

And we should not forget that the destruction of the fabric of government at all levels has been a primary objective of the Vietcong. The Vietcong has assassinated thousands of local officals—and health workers and schoolteachers and others who were helping to improve the life of the people of the countryside. In the last year and a half, it has killed, wounded, or kidnaped 2,291 village officials and 22,146 other civilians—these on top of its thousands of earlier victims.

Despite the risks to themselves and their families, Vietnamese have continued to come forward to fill these posts. And in the last 6 years, no political dissenter of any consequence has gone over to the Vietcong. The Buddhists, the Catholics, the sects, the Cambodians (of which there are about a million in South Vietnam), the Montagnards—all the principal elements in South Vietnamese political life except the Vietcong itself, which is a very small minority—remain overwhelmingly anti-Communist.

The suggestion that Ho Chi Minh probably could win a free election in South Vietnam is directly contrary to all the evidence we have. And we have a great deal of evidence, for we have Americans—in twos and threes and fours and sixes—in the countryside in all parts of Vietnam. In years past Ho Chi Minh was a hero throughout Vietnam. For he had led the fight against the Japanese and then against the French. But his glamour began to fade when he set up a Communist police state in the North—and the South, by contrast, made great progress under a non-Communist nationalist government. Today the North Vietnamese regime is badly discredited. We find the South Vietnamese in the countryside ready to cooperate with their own government when they can do so with reasonable hope of not being assassinated by the Vietcong the next night.

At the present time, somewhat more than 50 percent of the people of Vietnam live in areas under control of their government. Another 25 percent live in areas under shifting control. And about 25 percent live in areas under varying degrees of Vietcong control. But even where it succeeds in imposing taxes, drafting recruits, and commandeering labor, the Vietcong has not usually been able to organize the area. We have a good deal of evidence that Vietcong tax exactions and terrorism have increasingly alienated the villagers. And one of the problems with which the South Vietnamese Government and we have to deal is the large scale exodus from the central highlands to the coastal areas of refugees from the Vietcong.

It is of the greatest significance that, despite many years of harsh war, despite the political instability of the central government, and despite division of their country since 1954, the people of South Vietnam fight on with uncommon determination. There is no evidence among politicians, the bureaucracy, the military, the major religious groups, the youth, or even the peasantry of a desire for peace at any price. They all oppose surrender or accommodation on a basis which would lead to a Communist takeover. The will to resist the aggression from the North has survived through periods of great stress and remains strong.

The central objective of our foreign policy is a peaceful community of nations, each free to choose its own institutions but cooperating with one another to promote their mutual welfare. It is the kind of world order envisaged in the opening sections of the United Nations Charter. But there have been and still are important forces in the world which seek a different goal—which deny the right of free choice, which seek to expand their influence and empires by every means including force.

The bulwark of peace

In defense of peace and freedom and the right of free choice:

We and others insisted that the Soviets withdraw their forces from Iran.

We went to the aid of Turkey and Greece.

We joined in organizing the European recovery program and in forming the North Atlantic Alliance.

We and our allies have defended the freedom of West Berlin.

We and 15 other nations joined in repelling the aggression in Korea.

We have joined defensive alliances with many other nations and have helped them to strengthen their defensive military forces.

We supported the United Nations in its efforts to preserve the independence of the Congo.

We insisted that the Soviet Union withdraw strategic weapons from Cuba.

Had we not done these things—and others—the enemies of freedom would now control much of the world and be in a position to destroy us or at least to sap our strength by economic strangulation.

For the same basic reasons that we took all those other measures to deter or to repel aggression, we are determined to assist the people of South Vietnam to defeat this aggression.

In his last public utterance, recorded only half an hour before his death, a great and beloved American, Adlai Stevenson, said:

"There has been a great deal of pressure on me in the United States from many

sources to take a position—a public position—inconsistent with that of my Government. Actually, I don't agree with those protestants. My hope in Vietnam is that resistance there may establish the fact that changes in Asia are not to be precipitated by outside forces."

I believe, with the President, that "once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution is inevitable."

The great bulwark of peace for all freemen—and therefore of peace for the millions ruled by the adversaries of freedom—has been, and is today, the power of the United States and our readiness to use that power, in cooperation with other free nations to deter or to defeat aggression, and to help other free nations to go forward economically, socially, and politically.

We have had to cope with a long series of dangerous crises caused by the aggressive appetites of others. But we are a great nation and people. I am confident that we will meet this test, as we have met others.

THE TASKS OF DEFENSE

(Statement by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, before the Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, August 4, 1965)

The issue in Vietnam is essentially the same as it was in 1954 when President Eisenhower said:

"I think it is no longer necessary to enter into a long argument or exposition to show the importance to the United States of Indochina and of the struggle going on there. No matter how the struggle may have started, it has long since become one of the testing places between a free form of government and dictatorship. Its outcome is going to have the greatest significance for us, and possibly for a long time into the future.

"We have here a sort of cork in the bottle, the bottle being the great area that includes Indonesia, Burma, Thailand, all of the surrounding areas of Asia with its hundreds of millions of people. * * *"

The nature of the conflict

What is at stake in Vietnam today is the ability of the free world to block Communist armed aggression and prevent the loss of all of southeast Asia, a loss which in its ultimate consequences could drastically alter the strategic situation in Asia and the Pacific to the grave detriment of our own security and that of our allies. While 15 years ago, in Korea, Communist aggression took the form of an overt armed attack, today in South Vietnam, it has taken the form of a large-scale intensive guerrilla operation.

The covert nature of this aggression, which characterized the earlier years of the struggle in South Vietnam, has now all but been stripped away. The control of the Vietcong effort by the regime in Hanoi, supported and incited by Communist China, has become increasingly apparent.

The struggle there has enormous implications for the security of the United States and the free world, and for that matter, the Soviet Union as well. The North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists have chosen to make South Vietnam the test case for their particular version of the so-called wars of national liberation. The extent to which violence should be used in overthrowing non-Communist governments has been one of the most bitterly contested issues between the Chinese and the Soviet Communists.

Although the former Chairman, Mr. Khrushchev, fully endorsed wars of national liberation as the preferred means of extending the sway of communism, he cautioned that "this does not not necessarily mean that the transition to socialism will everywhere and in all cases be linked with armed uprising and civil war. * * * Revolution by peaceful means accords with the interests of the working class and the masses."

The Chinese Communists, however, insist that:

"Peaceful coexistence cannot replace the revolutionary struggles of the people. The transition from capitalism to socialism in any country can only be brought about through proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat in that country. * * * The vanguard of the proletariat will remain unconquerable in all circumstances only if it masters all forms of struggle—peaceful and armed, open and secret, legal and illegal, parliamentary struggle and mass struggle, and so forth." (Letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, June 14, 1963.)

Their preference for violence was even more emphatically expressed in an article in the Peiping People's Daily of March 31, 1964:

"It is advantageous from the point of view of tactics to refer to the desire for peaceful transition, but it would be inappropriate to emphasize the possibility of peaceful transition. * * * the proletarian party must never substitute parliamentary struggle for proletarian revolution or entertain the illusion that the transition to socialism can be achieved through the parliamentary road. Violent revolution is a universal law of proletarian revolution. To realize the transition to socialism, the proletariat must wage armed struggle, smash the old state machine and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. * * *"

"Political power," the article quotes Mao Tse-tung as saying, "grows out of the barrel of a gun."

Throughout the world we see the fruits of these policies and in Vietnam, particularly, we see the effects of the Chinese Communists' more militant stance and their hatred of the free world. They make no secret of the fact that Vietnam is the test case, and neither does the regime in Hanoi. General Giap, head of the North Vietnamese Army, recently said that "South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time. * * * If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated everywhere in the world." And, Pham Van Dong, Premier of North Vietnam, pointed out that "The experience of our compatriots in South Vietnam attracts the attention of the world, especially the peoples of South America."

It is clear that a Communist success in South Vietnam would be taken as proof that the Chinese Communists' position is correct and they will have made a giant step forward in their efforts to seize control of the world Communist movement.

Furthermore, such a success would greatly increase the prestige of Communist China among the nonalined nations and strengthen the position of their followers everywhere. In that event we would then have to be prepared to cope with the same kind of aggression in other parts of the world wherever the existing governments are weak and the social structures fragmented. If Communist armed aggression is not stopped in Vietnam, as it was in Korea, the confidence of small nations in America's pledges of support will be weakened and many of them, in widely separated areas of the world, will feel unsafe.

Thus, the stakes in South Vietnam are far greater than the loss of one small country to communism. Its loss would be a most serious setback to the cause of freedom and would greatly complicate the task of preventing the further spread of militant Asian communism. And, if that spread is not halted, our strategic position in the world will be weakened and our national security directly endangered.

Conditions leading to the present situation in South Vietnam

Essential to a proper understanding of the present situation in South Vietnam is a recognition of the fact that the so-called insurgency there is planned, directed, controlled, and supported from Hanoi.

True, there is a small dissident minority in South Vietnam, but the government could cope with it if it were not directed and supplied from the outside. As early as 1960, at the Third Congress of the North Vietnamese Communist Party, both Ho Chi Minh and General Giap spoke of the need to "step up" the "revolution in the South." In March 1963 the party organ Hoc Tap stated that the authorities in South Vietnam "are well aware that North Vietnam is the firm base for the southern revolution and the point on which it leans, and that our party is the steady and experienced vanguard unit of the working class and people and is the brain and factor that decides all victories of the revolution."

Through most of the past decade the North Vietnamese Government denied and went to great efforts to conceal the scale of its personnel and materiel support, in addition to direction and encouragement, to the Vietcong.

It had strong reasons to do so. The North Vietnamese regime had no wish to force upon the attention of the world its massive and persistent violations of its Geneva pledges of 1954 and 1962 regarding noninterference in South Vietnam and Laos.

However, in building up the Vietcong forces for a decisive challenge, the authorities in North Vietnam have increasingly dropped the disguises that gave their earlier support a clandestine character.

Through 1963, the bulk of the arms infiltrated from the North were old French and American models acquired prior to 1954 in Indochina and Korea.

Now, the flow of weapons from North Vietnam consist almost entirely of the latest arms acquired from Communist China; and the flow is large enough to have entirely reequipped the main force units, despite the capture this year by government forces of thousands of these weapons and millions of rounds of the new ammunition.

Likewise, through 1963, nearly all the personnel infiltrating through Laos, trained and equipped in the North and ordered South, were former southerners.

But in the last 18 months, the great majority of the infiltrators—more than 10,000 of them—have been ethnic northerners, mostly draftees ordered into the People's Army of Vietnam for duty in the South. And it now appears that, starting their journey through Laos last December, from one to three regiments of a North Vietnamese regular division, the 325th Division of the North Vietnamese Army, have deployed into the Central Highlands of South Vietnam for combat alongside the Vietcong.

Thus, despite all its reasons for secrecy, Hanoi's desire for decisive results this summer has forced it to reveal its hand even more openly.

The United States during the last 4 years has steadily increased its help to the people of South Vietnam in an effort to counter this ever-increasing scale of Communist aggression. These efforts achieved some measure of success during 1962. The South Vietnamese forces in that year made good progress in suppressing the Vietcong insurrection.

Although combat deaths suffered by these forces in 1962 rose by 11 percent over the 1961 level (from about 4,000 to 4,450), Vietcong combat deaths increased by 72 percent (from about 12,000 to 21,000). Weapons lost by the South Vietnamese fell from 5,900 in 1961 to 5,200 in 1962, while the number lost by the Vietcong rose from 2,750 to 4,050. The Government's new strategic hamlet program was just getting underway and was showing

promise. The economy was growing and the Government seemed firmly in control. Therefore, in early 1963, I was able to say: "* * * victory over the Vietcong will most likely take many years. But now, as a result of the operations of the last year, there is a new feeling of confidence, not only on the part of the Government of South Vietnam but also among the populace, that victory is possible."

But at the same time I also cautioned:

"We are not unmindful of the fact that the pressure on South Vietnam may well continue through infiltration via the Laos corridor. Nor are we unmindful of the possibility that the Communists, sensing defeat in their covert efforts, might resort to overt aggression from North Vietnam. Obviously, this latter contingency could require a greater direct participation by the United States. The survival of an independent government in South Vietnam is so important to the security of all southeast Asia and to the free world that we must be prepared to take all necessary measures within our capability to prevent a Communist victory."

Unfortunately, the caution voiced in early 1963 proved to be well founded. Late in 1963, the Communists stepped up their efforts, and the military situation began to deteriorate. The Diem government came under increasing internal pressures, and in November it was overthrown. As I reported in February 1964:

"The Vietcong was quick to take advantage of the growing opposition to the Diem government and the period of uncertainty following its overthrow. Vietcong activities were already increasing in September and continued to increase at an accelerated rate in October and November, particularly in the delta area. And I must report that they have made considerable progress since the coup."

Following the coup, the lack of stability in the central government and the rapid turnover of key personnel, particularly senior military commanders, began to be reflected in combat operations and throughout the entire fabric of the political and economic structure. And, in 1964, the Communists greatly increased the scope and tempo of their subversive efforts. Larger scale attacks became more frequent and the flow of men and supplies from the north expanded. The incidence of terrorism and sabotage rose rapidly and the pressure on the civilan population was intensified.

The deteriorating military situation was clearly reflected in the statistics. South Vietnamese combat deaths rose from 5,650 in 1963 to 7,450 in 1964 and the number of weapons lost from 8,250, to 14,100. In contrast, Vietcong combat deaths dropped from 20,600 to 16,800 and, considering the stepped-up tempo of activity, they experienced only a very modest rise in the rate of weapons lost (from 5,400 to 5,900).

At various times in recent months, I have called attention to the continued buildup of Communist forces in South Vietnam. I pointed out that although these forces had not been committed to combat in any significant degree, they probably would be after the start of the monsoon season. It is now clear that these forces are being committed in increasing numbers and that the Communists have decided to make an all-out attempt to bring down the Government of South Vietnam.

The entire economic and social structure is under attack. Bridges, railroads, and highways are being destroyed and interdicted. Agricultural products are being barred from the cities. Electric powerplants and communication lines are being sabotaged. Whole villages are being burned and their population driven away, increasing the refugees burden on the South Vietnamese Government.

In addition to the continued infiltration of increasing numbers of individuals and the acceleration of the flow of modern equipment and supplies organized units of the North Vietnamese Army have been identified in South Vietnam. We now estimate the hard core Vietcong strength at some 70,000 men, including a recently reported increase in the number of combat battalions. In addition, they have some 90,000 to 100,000 irregulars and some 30,000 in their political cadres; i.e., tax collectors, propagandists, etc. We have also identified at least three battalions of the regular North Vietnamese Army, and there are probably considerably more.

At the same time the Government of South Vietnam has found it increasingly difficult to make a commensurate increase in the size of its own forces, which now stand at about 545,000 men, including the regional and local defense forces but excluding the national police.

Combat deaths on both sides have been mounting—for the South Vietnamese from an average of 143 men a week in 1964, to about 270 a week for the 4-week period ending July 24 this year. Vietcong losses have gone from 322 a week last year to about 680 a week for the 4-week period ending July 24

Most important, the ratio of South Vietnamese to Vietcong strength has seriously declined in the last 6 or 7 months from about 5 to 1 to about 3 or 3½ to 1; the ratio of combat battalions is substantially less. This is far too low a ratio for a guerrilla war even though the greater mobility and firepower provided to the South Vietnamese forces by the United States help to offset that disadvantage.

The South Vietnamese forces have to defend hundreds of cities, towns, and hamlets while the Vietcong are free to choose the time and place of their attack. As a result, the South Vietnamese are stretched thin in defensive positions, leaving only a small central reserve for offensive action against the Vietcong, while the latter are left free to concentrate their forces and throw them against selected targets. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Vietcong retains most of the initiative.

Even so, we may not as yet have seen the full weight of the Communist attack. Presently, the situation is particularly acute in the northern part of the country where the Communists have mobilized large military forces which pose a threat to the entire region and its major cities and towns. Our air attack may have helped to keep these forces off balance but the threat remains and it is very real.

Clearly, the time has come when the people of South Vietnam need more help from us and other nations if they are to retain their freedom and independence.

We have already responded to that need with some 75,000 U.S. military personnel, including some combat units. This number will be raised to 125,000 almost immediately with the deployment of the Air Mobile Division and certain other forces. But, more help will be needed in the months ahead and additional U.S. combat forces will be required to back up the hard-pressed Army of South Vietnam. Two other nations have provided combat forces—Australia and New Zealand. We hope that by the end of this year others will join them. In this regard, the Koreans have just recently approved a combat division for deployment to Vietnam, which is scheduled to arrive this fall.

Role of U.S. combat forces in South Vietnam

As I noted earlier, the central reserve of the South Vietnamese Army has been seriously depleted in recent months. The principal role of U.S. ground combat forces will be to supplement this reserve in support of the frontline forces of the South Vietnamese Army. The indigenous paramilitary forces will deal with the pacification of areas cleared of organized Vietcong and North Vietnamese units, a role more appropriate for them than for our forces.

The Government of South Vietnam's strategy, with which we concur, is to achieve the initiative, to expand gradually its area of control by breaking up major concentrations of enemy forces, using to the maximum our preponderance of airpower, both land and sea based. The number of fixed-wing attack sorties by U.S. aircraft in South Vietnam will increase manifold by the end of year.

Armed helicopter sorties will also increase dramatically over the same period, and extension use will be made of heavy artillery, both land based and sea based. At the same time our air and naval forces will continue to interdict the Vietcong supplies line from North Vietnam, both land and sea.

Although our tactics have changed, our objective remains the same.

We have no desire to widen the war. We have no desire to overthrow the North Vietnamese regime, seize its territory or achieve the unification of North and South Vietnam by force of arms. We have no need for permanent military bases in South Vietnam or for special privileges of any kind.

What we are seeking through the planned military buildup is to block the Vietcong offensive, to give the people of South Vietnam and their armed forces some relief from the unrelenting Communist pressures—to give them time to strengthen their government, to reestablish law and order, and to revive their economic life which has been seriously disrupted by Vietcong harassment and attack in recent months. We have no illusions that success will be achieved quickly, but we are confident that it will be achieved much more surely by the plan I have outlined.

Increases in U.S. military forces

Fortunately, we have greatly increased the strength and readiness of our Military Establishment since 1961, particularly in the kinds of forces which we now require in southeast Asia. The Active Army has been expanded from 11 to 16 combat ready divisions. Twenty thousand men have been added to the Marine Corps to allow them to fill out their combat structure and at the same time facilitate the mobilization of the Marine Corps Reserve. The tactical fighter squadrons of the Air Force have been increased by 51 percent. Our airlift capability has more than doubled. Special forces trained to deal with insurgency threats have been multiplied elevenfold. General ship construction and conversion has been doubled.

During this same period, procurement for the expanded force has been increased greatly: Air Force tactical aircraft—from $360 million in 1961 to about $1.1 billion in the original fiscal year 1966 budget; Navy aircraft—from $1.8 billion to $2.2 billion; Army helicopters—from 286 aircraft to over 1,000. Procurement of ordnance, vehicles and related equipment was increased about 150 percent in the fiscal years 1962–64 period, compared with the preceding 3 years. The tonnage of modern nonnuclear air-to-ground ordnance in stock tripled between fiscal year 1961 and fiscal year 1965. In brief, the Military Establishment of the United States, today, is in far better shape than it ever has been in peacetime to face whatever tasks may lie ahead.

Nevertheless, some further increases in forces, military personnel, production, and construction will be required if we are to deploy additional forces to southeast Asia and provide for combat consumption while at the same time, maintaining our capabilities to deal with crises elsewhere in the world.

To offset the deployments now planned to southeast Asia, and provide some additional forces for possible new deployments, we propose to increase the presently authorized

force levels. These increases will be of three types: (1) Additional units for the Active Forces, over and above those reflected in the January budget; (2) military personnel augmentations for presently authorized units in the Active Forces to man new bases, to handle the larger logistics workload, etc.; and (3) additional personnel and extra training for selected Reserve component units to increase their readiness for quick deployment. We believe we can achieve this buildup without calling up the Reserves or ordering the involuntary extension of tours, except as already authorized by law for the Department of the Navy. Even here the extension of officer tours will be on a selective basis and extensions for enlisted men will be limited, in general, to not more than 4 months.

The program I have outlined here today and the $1.7 billion amendment to the fiscal year 1966 Defense appropriation bill now before the committee will, in the collective judgment of my principal military and civilian advisers and myself, provide the men, materiel, and facilities required to fulfill the President's pledge to meet the mounting aggression in South Vietnam, while at the same time maintaining the forces required to meet commitments elsewhere in the world.

THE CHALLENGE OF HUMAN NEED

(Address by the President to the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists, the White House, May 13, 1965)

The third face of the war

The war in Vietnam has many faces.

There is the face of armed conflict—of terror and gunfire—of bomb-heavy planes and campaign-weary soldiers. * * *

The second face of war in Vietnam is the quest for a political solution—the face of diplomacy and politics—of the ambitions and the interest of other nations. * * *

The third face of war in Vietnam is, at once, the most tragic and most hopeful. It is the face of human need. It is the untended sick, the hungry family, and the illiterate child. It is men and women, many without shelter, with rags for clothing, struggling for survival in a very rich and a very fertile land.

It is the most important battle of all in which we are engaged.

For a nation cannot be built by armed power or by political agreement. It will rest on the expectation by individual men and women that their future will be better than their past.

It is not enough to just fight against something. People must fight for something, and the people of South Vietnam must know that after the long, brutal journey through the dark tunnel of conflict there breaks the light of a happier day. And only if this is so can they be expected to sustain the enduring will for continued strife. Only in this way can longrun stability and peace come to their land.

And there is another, more profound reason. In Vietnam communism seeks to really impose its will by force of arms. But we would be deeply mistaken to think that this was the only weapon. Here, as other places in the world, they speak to restless people—people rising to shatter the old ways which have imprisoned hope—people fiercely and justly reaching for the material fruits from the tree of modern knowledge.

It is this desire, and not simply lust for conquest, which moves many of the individual fighting men that we must now, sadly, call the enemy.

It is, therefore, our task to show that freedom from the control of other nations offers the surest road to progress, that history and experience testify to this truth. But it is not enough to call upon reason or point to examples. We must show it through action and we must show it through accomplishment, and even were there no war—either hot or cold—we would always be active in humanity's search for progress.

This task is commanded to us by the moral values of our civilization, and it rests on the inescapable nature of the world that we have now entered. For in that world, as long as we can foresee, every threat to man's welfare will be a threat to the welfare of our own people. Those who live in the emerging community of nations will ignore the perils of their neighbors at the risk of their own prospects.

Cooperative development in southeast Asia

This is true not only for Vietnam but for every part of the developing world. This is why, on your behalf, I recently proposed a massive, cooperative development effort for all of southeast Asia. I named the respected leader, Eugene Black, as my personal representative to inaugurate our participation in these programs.

Since that time rapid progress has been made, I am glad to report. Mr. Black has met with the top officials of the United Nations on several occasions. He has talked to other interested parties. He has found increasing enthusiasm. The United Nations is already setting up new mechanisms to help carry forward the work of development.

In addition, the United States is now prepared to participate in, and to support, an Asian Development Bank, to carry out and help finance the economic progress in that area of the world and the development that we desire to see in that area of the world.

So this morning I call on every other industrialized nation, including the Soviet Union, to help create a better life for all of the people of southeast Asia.

Surely, surely, the works of peace can bring men together in a common effort to abandon forever the works of war.

But, as South Vietnam is the central place of conflict, it is also a principal focus for our work to increase the well-being of people.

It is that effort in South Vietnam, of which I think we are too little informed, which I want to relate to you this morning.

Strengthening Vietnam's economy

We began in 1954, when Vietnam became independent, before the war between the north and the south. Since that time we have spent more than $2 billion in economic help for the 16 million people of South Vietnam. And despite the ravages of war, we have made steady, continuing gains. We have concentrated on food and health and education and housing and industry.

Like most developing countries, South Vietnam's economy rests on agriculture. Unlike many, it has large uncrowded areas of very rich and very fertile land. Because of this, it is one of the great rice bowls of the entire world. With our help, since 1954, South Vietnam has already doubled its rice production, providing food for the people as well as providing a vital export for that nation.

We have put our American farm know-how to work on other crops. This year, for instance, several hundred million cuttings of a new variety of sweet potato, that promises a sixfold increase in yield will be distributed to these Vietnamese farmers. Corn output should rise from 25,000 tons in 1962 to 100,000 tons by 1966. Pig production has more than doubled since 1955. Many animal diseases have been eliminated entirely.

Disease and epidemic brood over every Vietnamese village. In a country of more than 16 million people with a life expectancy of only 35 years, there are only 200 civilian doctors. If the Vietnamese had doctors in the same ratio as the United States has doctors, they would have not the 200 that they do have but they would have more than 5,000 doctors.

We have helped vaccinate, already, over 7 million people against cholera, and millions more against other diseases. Hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese can now receive treatment in the more than 12,000 hamlet health stations that America has built and has stocked. New clinics and surgical suites are scattered throughout the entire country, and the medical school that we are now helping to build will graduate as many doctors in a single year as now serve the entire civilian population of South Vietnam.

Education is the keystone of future development in Vietnam. It takes trained people to man the factories, to conduct the administration, and to form the human foundation for an advancing nation. More than a quarter million young Vietnamese can now learn in more than 4,000 classrooms that America has helped to build in the last 2 years; and 2,000 more schools are going to be built by us in the next 12 months. The number of students in vocational schools has gone up four times. Enrollment was 300,000 in 1955, when we first entered there and started helping with our program. Today it is more than 1,500,000. The 8 million textbooks that we have supplied to Vietnamese children will rise to more than 15 million by 1967.

Agriculture is the foundation. Health, education, and housing are the urgent human needs. But industrial development is the great pathway to their future.

When Vietnam was divided, most of the industry was in the North. The South was barren of manufacturing and the foundations for industry. Today more than 700 new or rehabilitated factories—textile mills and cement plants, electronics and plastics—are changing the entire face of that nation. New roads and communications, railroad equipment, and electric generators are a spreading base on which the new industry can, and is, growing.

Progress in the midst of war

All this progress goes on, and it is going to continue to go on, under circumstances of staggering adversity.

Communist terrorists have made aid programs that we administer a very special target of their attack. They fear them because agricultural stations are being destroyed and medical centers are being burned. More than 100 Vietnamese malaria fighters are dead. Our own AID officials have been wounded and kidnaped. These are not just the accidents of war. They are a part of a deliberate campaign, in the words of the Communists, "to cut the fingers off the hands of the Government."

We intend to continue, and we intend to increase our help to Vietnam.

Nor can anyone doubt the determination of the South Vietnamese themselves. They have lost more than 12,000 of their men since I became your President a little over a year ago.

But progress does not come from investment alone, or plans on a desk, or even the directives and the orders that we approve here in Washington. It takes men. Men must take the seed to the farmer. Men must teach the use of fertilizer. Men must help in harvest. Men must build the schools, and men must instruct the students. Men must carry medicine into the jungle, and treat the sick, and shelter the homeless. And men—brave, tireless, filled with love for their fellows—are doing this today. They are doing it through the long, hot, danger-filled Vietnamese days and the sultry nights.

The fullest glory must go, also, to those South Vietnamese that are laboring and dying for their own people and their own nation. In hospitals and schools, along the rice fields and the roads, they continue to labor, never knowing when death or terror may strike.

How incredible it is that there are a few who still say that the South Vietnamese do

not want to continue the struggle. They are sacrificing and they are dying by the thousands. Their patient valor in the heavy presence of personal physical danger should be a helpful lesson to those of us who, here in America, only have to read about it, or hear about it on the television or radio.

We have our own heroes who labor at the works of peace in the midst of war. They toil unarmed and out of uniform. They know the humanity of their concern does not exempt them from the horrors of conflict, yet they go on from day to day. They bring food to the hungry over there. They supply the sick with necessary medicine. They help the farmer with his crops, families to find clean water, villages to receive the healing miracles of electricity. These are Americans who have joined our AID program, and we welcome others to their ranks.

A call for aid

For most Americans this an easy war. Men fight and men suffer and men die, as they always do in war. But the lives of most of us, at least those of us in this room and those listening to me this morning, are untroubled. Prosperity rises, abundance increases, the Nation flourishes.

I will report to the Cabinet when I leave this room that we are in the 51st month of continued prosperity, the longest peacetime prosperity for America since our country was founded. Yet our entire future is at stake.

What a difference it would make if we could only call upon a small fraction of our unmatched private resources—businesses and unions, agricultural groups and builders—if we could call them to the task of peaceful progress in Vietnam. With such a spirit of patriotic sacrifice we might well strike an irresistible blow for freedom there and for freedom throughout the world.

I therefore hope that every person within the sound of my voice in this country this morning will look for ways—and those citizens of other nations who believe in humanity as we do, I hope that they will find ways to help progress in South Vietnam.

This, then, is the third face of our struggle in Vietnam. It was there—the illiterate, the hungry, the sick—before this war began. It will be there when peace comes to us—and so will we—not with soldiers and planes, not with bombs and bullets, but with all the wondrous weapons of peace in the 20th century.

And then, perhaps, together all of the people of the world can share that gracious task with all the people of Vietnam, North and South alike.

VIETNAM PERSPECTIVE: "WINNING THE PEACE"

(CBS News Special Report as broadcast over the CBS television network, August 23, 1965)

Participants: Secretary of State Dean Rusk, U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, Presidential Assistant McGeorge Bundy.

Reporters: CBS News United Nations Correspondent Richard C. Hottelet, CBS News Diplomatic Correspondent Marvin Kalb, CBS News White House Correspondent Harry Reasoner.

ANNOUNCER. This is the third of four special 1-hour broadcasts by CBS News, Vietnam Perspective. In the past 2 weeks, the new decisions and the American military effort in Vietnam were examined. Tonight, "Winning the Peace."

The paths to a peaceful settlement in Vietnam will be discussed by three Government officials. Now here is CBS News White House Correspondent Harry Reasoner.

Mr. REASONER. Good evening. We're in the John Quincy Adams Room of the State Department in Washington for the third in our series of programs with the U.S. policymakers on Vietnam. Across from me are three distinguished officials whose task it is to pursue perhaps the most difficult and illusive of our objectives in Vietnam, the pursuit of peace.

We're happy to have back with us the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, who with the President formulates our foreign policy and who heads our diplomatic offensive in southeast Asia.

This is our newly designated Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg, who is exploring the avenues of a peaceful settlement in Vietnam through U.N. channels.

And this is McGeorge Bundy, Special Assistant to the President, who has played a key role in the formulation of our policies in Vietnam and who, a few weeks ago on this network, defended the administration's position with some professors who disagree with it.

Seated with me are two CBS news colleagues, Diplomatic Correspondent Marvin Kalb, who regularly covers the State Department and who is just back from one of many trips to Russia. And U.N. Correspondent Richard C. Hottelet.

Gentlemen, I'd like to begin with a fairly basic question. It's been quite a weekend in Vietnam. We bombed close to China again. We bombed for the first time some targets that could be described as less directly military than before, and there is a kind of new optimism about how the ground fighting is going. Is this the moment? Is this the time for negotiations? I'd like each of you to reply to that briefly. Secretary Rusk?

Mr. RUSK. Well, that depends on the other side in their assessment of the situation. We have been ready for a long time to make peace in southeast Asia. Our problem is to get the other side to the conference table. We just don't know. The other side must make that decision.

Mr. REASONER. Ambassador Goldberg?

Mr. GOLDBERG. I think any time is a good time for negotiations. The only way to resolve conflict is to go to the bargaining table, to use a term that I am very well familiar with, and it seems to me that this is not determined by the calendar, or even by the course of military events. This is determined by the genuine desire of the parties to the conflict to remove the problem from the battlefield to the bargaining table. So for me, any time is a good time to negotiate.

Mr. REASONER. Mr. Bundy?

Mr. BUNDY. Well, it's certainly true that it is our position that now is a good time to negotiate. We have had that view for many months, have tried to make it clear in every way, public and private, at every level of discourse, from the President on down. It is also true that the response from Hanoi, still more from Peiping, has been consistently and powerfully negative. No later than a week ago, in an interview with the correspondent of the French newspaper Le Monde, Ho of Hanoi made it very plain that they were not prepared to negotiate except on terms of all power to the Communists. I believe it to be true that military success of the kind which we have seen in recent days does help us bring nearer the day when there will be effective negotiation.

Mr. HOTTELET. It also reinforces the question that some people have asked of whether you ought to negotiate at all, or whether, if you find the tables turning your way, if you are gaining any kind of military ascendancy, whether you shouldn't use that advantage, press it to checkmate Communist aggression, which is the U.S. professed aim, not only in Vietnam, but all through southeast Asia and Laos and in northeast Thailand and Malaysia as well. In other words, why should we negotiate, is the question.

Mr. BUNDY. I think all of us would agree, and I know this to be the position of President Johnson, that we are ready to negotiate and that we are not disposed to take the view that because the battle is going well we are unwilling to talk about it. In our view, the effort to end the aggression must continue, while the aggression continues, but we are prepared for discussion and for negotiation at any time.

Mr. KALB. There is in the air right now in Washington something which has not been here before, at least in the past couple of months, and that is a wispy kind of feeling that maybe there is some optimism here and some grounds for optimism. I'd like to ask you, Mr. Secretary, what are the grounds for optimism? What is the evidence that gives rise to this sense?

Mr. RUSK. Well, I think the fact that President Johnson has made it very clear that we are not going to be pushed out of South Vietnam and that we shall meet our commitments to South Vietnam has made a big difference to this situation. I think also the fact that international opinion is not supporting the effort of Hanoi to take over South Vietnam makes a difference, because I think they were hoping at one time that there would be a buildup of international opinion that might cause the United States to change its attitude toward our commitment.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Gentlemen, may I make an observation on the Secretary's statement? New to diplomacy, I have been reading in diplomacy. Talleyrand made a statement about the Vienna Congress in which he said that the great powers there assembled were too frightened to fight and too stupid to agree. And I think in a very simple measure, we can say of American foreign policy in this situation, that it is clear from what the President has said, from what the Secretary of State has said, Mr. Bundy said in his teach-ins, that the United States very definitely is not too frightened to fight. That has been demonstrated.

Mr. RUSK. Let me come back, Mr. Kalb, if I may, to Mr. Bundy's reference to the interview—in Le Monde—Ho Chi Minh on August 14. He seemed to be saying there that a precondition for peace is the withdrawal of American forces. Well, under the circumstances, this is quite an unrealistic point of view, because those forces are there solely because of the intervention of outside forces from Hanoi in South Vietnam. Now one would suppose that peace requires that there be a withdrawal of those North Vietnamese forces that have penetrated into South Vietnam. If you don't like the word "withdrawal," you can use the word "redeployment," but it is that infiltration which is solely responsible for the presence of American combat forces in South Vietnam.

Now, obviously, we and others have been giving a good deal of thought to the basis on which peace can be achieved. I think the entire record of the United States since 1945 shows that we want peace and not war and that all of our effort in this postwar period has been directed to that end. Well, now, in South Vietnam, the cessation of outside aggression, the cessation of this infiltration from the north is certainly fundamental because that would make it possible for American forces to come home. We should like to see full performance on all sides of the military clauses of the 1954 agreements. We have said repeatedly, time after time, that as far as the United States is concerned, we have no interest in military bases or a permanent military presence in southeast Asia. Well, now, that is in accord with the 1954 agreements and that should be one of the essential elements of a peaceful settlement.

Now as far as South Vietnam internally is concerned, we have a deep commitment to the simple notion of self-determination. In the 1954 agreements, it was anticipated that there would be elections, through secret elections—through secret ballot, and that the peoples of Vietnam, north and south, would have a chance to express their—their opinions, and we are prepared for elections in South Vietnam to determine what the people

of that country want in terms of their own institutions.

And then the question of reunification which has been troublesome over the years. Again, it is instinctive with the United States to say, What do the people want? What do the people want? And there again, to find out in North Vietnam and South Vietnam what the people themselves really want on this matter is important. Now, this isn't very simple. And it doesn't mean that both are going to want reunification. The people in the north would want reunification only if there were a Communist regime throughout the country. The people in the south don't want reunification on that basis, but it is for the people of Vietnam to decide that at such time as they have a chance to express their views freely on that point. So what we are talking about here are the simple elements of a settlement which were reached basically in 1954, and again in 1962 in the Laotian agreements.

Mr. HOTTELET. Mr. Goldberg, you sit at probably the most sensitive listening post in the world. Do you get any indication from the—your colleagues at the United Nations that the other side has gotten this message of—that we are not too frightened to fight, not too stupid to talk?

Mr. GOLDBERG. Not yet. Not yet in all candor. We have to persevere with patience, and experience, and hope. Our message is loud and clear. The signal that the Secretary has referred to on occasion, saying that negotiations will take place when you hear a signal, has been made by the United States. Our President has stated publicly to the world that we are prepared to sit down in unconditional negotiations, discussing the points that Hanoi has made, discussing the points we have made and to arrive at a durable settlement, a durable settlement. I am hopeful—I am hopeful—and I continue in this hope that we will get a similar signal from the other side. It's very simple to make that signal. The President did it at Baltimore. He did it on other occasions. He has done it since. He armed me with a letter to the Secretary General when we said very plainly that we are ready to negotiate unconditionally all problems and to negotiate on the basis of their position and our position, and I think we are looking for a signal from the other side.

Mr. REASONER. Mr. Secretary, I think that there's some confusion in this country about these 1954 agreements which are mentioned so often. For instance, I don't know how many Americans realize it's an agreement that we didn't sign. Does—could you outline why we did not sign that and if we would sign a similar agreement now?

Mr. RUSK. Well, we did not formally sign those agreements, but Gen. Bedell Smith, who was then Under Secretary of State, made a statement at the time which in effect embraced those agreements on behalf of the United States, and said that any attempt to violate those agreements by force would be looked upon by the United States as a threat to the peace. So that we do believe that the 1954 agreements, in their essential principles, do provide a basis for peace in southeast Asia. What we do not believe is that the settlement of 1954 can be upset by force by any party.

Mr. REASONER. Mr. Bundy, for reasons which you've explained, and the President has explained, the war in Vietnam has gotten bigger. Our participation in it has increased. How do we know that it won't continue to escalate until eventually we have World War III? Is there some kind of a tacit understanding on how far both sides go?

Mr. BUNDY. I know of no tacit understanding, Mr. Reasoner, but I think it is fair to say that all parties—and all those concerned—are aware of the danger of enlargement of the conflict. We certainly are on our side. We have lived with crises large and small over a 20-year period now—in Berlin, in Greece, in Korea, in Cuba, and elsewhere—and I think Americans can be proud of the care and the prudence and the restraint which their Government has shown in this generation of effort. Under the leadership of President Johnson—a man of peace if there ever was one—we are conducting our affairs in that tradition and with that purpose of restraint. We believe that there is a similar recognition—although not always a similar recognition of the rights of others—there is a similar recognition of the hazards of any great enlargement of the conflict on the part of the parties interested on the other side. We cannot be sure of what they will do. We can be sure, and we must be accountable for what we do, and that is why our entire effort has been directed at things related specifically to what is being done to and in South Vietnam. That's what we are concerned with; not the fate of any other regime elsewhere; not the safety or security of any larger power nearby which we do not threaten. We are concerned with the fulfillment of our obligations in South Vietnam, a limited objective, and the nature of those limitations we've made just as clear as we know how.

Mr. KALB. Mr. Bundy, could you convince us, and thereby provide us with the evidence that leads you to feel that the American bombing of North Vietnam is specifically related to acts of terrorism in South Vietnam, and that this will convince the Vietcong operations in South Vietnam that they must stop what they're doing?

Mr. BUNDY. No, the bombing in North Vietnam is not—I would not relate it specifically and directly to any one action in South Vietnam, but to the campaign in South Vietnam and to the program pursued by Hanoi against South Vietnam it is related and related most directly. The targets are military targets: military lines of communication, military barracks, military depots. There has been no miscellaneous bombing of any old target in North Vietnam or anywhere so far as we can avoid it. The targets have been directly related to a campaign of infiltration, a campaign of military control, and a campaign of organized terror where the heartbeat of that campaign is in Hanoi.

Mr. HOTTELET. Getting back to China, I've heard the assumption expressed that China will not intervene directly in Vietnam as long as the regime—the Communist regime of North Vietnam—is not in danger of being overthrown, and as long as there is no massive incursion of American power on the ground. Is this, in fact, an assumption that guides your policy?

Mr. RUSK. Well, I think we are at some hazard in trying to think like the members of the Politburo in Peiping. It is my impression that the Communist world does not want a general war over southeast Asia. Unfortunately, some of them want southeast Asia. Therefore, we cannot be completely sure at the end of the trail which desire on their part will predominate. But, the authorities in Peiping must know that they have undertaken to support an effort in South Vietnam right up against an American commitment of which they were fully informed. Therefore, they must recognize that there are very large hazards if they themselves elect to pursue this by direct intervention. Now we, therefore, have been acting with a combination of firmness and prudence in an effort to keep wide open the doors of peaceful settlement. This has characterized American policy in all of these postwar crises to which Mr. McGeorge Bundy referred, and we would hope very much that the time will come when it will be recognized on the other side that pushing this matter militarily is not worth the risk at the end of the trail, and therefore, that they will bring this to the conference table for settlement.

Mr. KALB. Mr. Secretary, there are a number of people in Washington who study the China problem who believe that, on the contrary, it is precisely a war in southeast Asia that the Chinese want. It is precisely the bogging down of an enormous number of American troops in southeast Asia that the Chinese want, both for internal political reasons as well as a justification of their position in terms of their quarrel with the Russians. What evidence can you provide that, indeed, the Chinese—I'm not talking about the Russians now—do not really want this kind of—of a larger and deeper American involvement, even running the risk of war with America?

Mr. RUSK. Well, one can only judge by their actions thus far and by impressions one gets from those who have been in touch with Peiping. There is a comment going around in the Communist world these days that Peiping is prepared to fight to the last Vietnamese. There is a certain caution and prudence in their action, more so than in their words, but when you analyze these matters from the point of view of basic national interest, objectively in terms of what can be at the root of their thinking, I myself cannot believe that it is a rational idea that the principal powers involved in this business could look with favor upon the outbreak of a general war. It doesn't make sense from anyone's point of view.

Now, that means that it is important to do what we can, not to let events take control; to try to keep some sort of control over the situation so that contacts among the capitals might have a chance to find a way to a peaceful settlement. And that is one of the reasons why, one of the principal reasons why President Johnson has tried to act with the combination of the firmness and prudence that he believes the situation requires.

Mr. BUNDY. Could I pick up from what the Secretary said for one moment and say that, in the first place, that nothing is more important than the maintenance of prudence and of effective control of our own operations by our own Government. That's the meaning of the insistent, direct surveillance which the President maintains over major military decisions, and specifically, over decisions which affect military action against North Vietnam. This is a matter which he keeps under his own control by the consent and with the support of the senior military commanders concerned.

And just one more point. Obviously, the Chinese would be delighted to have us mismanage our affairs in South Vietnam and in southeast Asia so that we got more and more engaged in something less and less successful. It is our object and our purpose and our responsibility to do a better job than that, and to do that job within the limits of prudence, restraint, and decency which we are trying to follow.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Could I summarize American policy in this area by quoting an ancient Greek wise man, Polybius, who said that "the purpose of war"—and I would describe it in terms of our attitude toward Hanoi—"is not to annihilate the enemy, but to get him to mend his ways." And this, in fact, is what we have been attempting to do, prevent aggression, and this has been made clear time and time again. We—the President said, my distinguished predecessor at the United Nations said, we don't covet any territory, we don't seek to establish any military bases; we are acting the way we do to stop aggression. And when you move only to stop aggression, not to promote aggression, I think the dangers of a general war are minimized.

Mr. KALB. Mr. Ambassador, the—everything that you said is certainly true, and this is precisely what the administration is saying. At the same time, people said in the Chinese capital, who have to view it from the point

of view of their national interest—you can say that we're not building bases around China, but when the Chinese leaders look out at the map, they can see the presence of American military forces from one end of the Chinese border to the other. When you bomb, as we did today, to within 31 miles of the Chinese border, people responsible for Chinese national security probably would look with some great concern about that. I am trying to understand what makes you feel that they're not that deeply concerned, or that they don't feel that bombing 31 miles on this side of the border might not lead to 31 miles on the other side of the border.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Mr. Kalb, for a very simple reason: because we have stated as a matter of direct public policy to the world, a commitment which America has made to everybody, that if aggression ceases from the north, our activities in South Vietnam will likewise cease. This is a pretty broad statement, quite different from statements that were made by other powers at other points in the history of South and North Vietnam.

Mr. HOTTELET. There was a time in the Korean war after the cessation of fire, and before the armistice was signed, when—as President Eisenhower revealed not long ago—he got tired of waiting for the Chinese to sign the armistice and threatened or promised to use all American power, including nuclear power, against the Chinese. He said they got the message and they came to the conference table. Can you envisage any similar circumstances in Vietnam?

Mr. RUSK. Well, I think we'll have to let that question ride for the future. There already was a negotiation going on at that time, and the problem was to bring it to a final conclusion. In a major sense, the fighting had already been brought to a conclusion by the earlier discussions of the cease-fire. We may get to a point where a cease-fire gets to be the crucial element there in Vietnam.

Mr. Kalb, if I could return to your point just for a second. I don't believe that ideological differences are as profound as to cause Peiping to be concerned about what they see around their borders when they know that we would come home if Hanoi would leave South Vietnam alone, and that we would not have bases or troops in southeast Asia if these countries could live in peace. Now they can pretend, given their ideological commitments, that they somehow are afraid that we have in mind a major attack on China. There's nothing in the record to show that. Nothing in the conduct of the last 15 or 20 years to give any support to that idea.

Mr. KALB. Mr. Secretary, you are suggesting then that the American confrontation—if I can use that large word—in southeast Asia is really the United States and North Vietnam and not the broader confrontation of the United States and Communist China?

Mr. RUSK. Well, I think, in the first instance, it is clear that what Hanoi is doing is our principal problem and explains why we're in South Vietnam with military forces, so that we're not involved in a confrontation, the purpose of which, on our side, is to destroy the regime in Peiping. We have two divisions in Korea because among other things, several hundred thousand Chinese came into the Korean war in 1950–51 and this posed a problem of the security of South Korea. But throughout this postwar period, force has been initiated by the other side. The free world has had to meet that force with determination, but the free world has also met it with the kind of prudence and restraint that keeps open the doors of peaceful settlement. And all I would say on that to our colleagues in Peiping, if they want to test whether or not the United States is aggressive, then let them live at peace with their neighbors and they would find out that the United States is not aggressive with respect to mainland China.

Mr. KALB. We're talking in a kind of a shorthand, though, sir. Isn't it more direct in some way at this stage, given the dimension of the danger, to have a more direct link of communication with the Chinese Communists? I'm aware of the Warsaw conversations, but we've had enormous political differences with the Russians; we've been able to establish a hot line to Moscow. What about some kind of line directly to Peiping?

Mr. RUSK. Well, I think we've had more discussions with Peiping over the last 10 years on more important subjects than has any government that recognizes Peiping, with the possible exception of Moscow. Our problem with Peiping is not communication. Our problem is that when we have talks with them, they begin by saying that there can be no improvement in the situation until we are prepared to surrender Formosa to the mainland, and that means turning over 11 million people against their will to Peiping, and we make it clear that this is not possible, and I must confess, the conversation gets to be implacable and harsh and takes well-known lines as represented in the public statements of the two sides.

Mr. BUNDY. Going by their own conversations, Mr. Kalb, and their own—what they say to journalists, the few and rare ones whom they receive, the Peiping government itself has said over and over again, framing the matter in its own terms, that what is at issue in Vietnam is fundamentally a matter for the Vietnamese people to decide. This is exactly what we think. We believe that the center of this question is in what is being done to and in South Vietnam. It is not in Peiping, except as they may be engaged in support and assistance to those who are attempting to destroy a given society and replace it with one fashioned in their own image. And I believe the people in Peiping know that, and I believe they understand clearly that it is only by their action and by their decision that there can be the kind of enlargement which would involve direct danger to them.

Mr. REASONER. This question has come up several times about letting the people of Vietnam decide what they want to do. Is this, indeed, the case, or is it a case, as in other U.S. policy, where there are limitations, where there are certain options denied them? Suppose South Vietnam decided that it wished to make a separate peace. Would we accept it?

Mr. BUNDY. Well, I think when you asked that question earlier to Ambassador Taylor he said that he just didn't think that was a realistic possibility. My own judgment is, on the basis of one short visit and innumerable reports and a great many discussions with others who have been there much longer, that there is no problem, from our side, of confidence in the ability of the people of South Vietnam, given a free choice and conditions of reasonable peace, to frame their own future in ways with which we would be happy to live; that it is an unreal question to suppose that they would freely choose to cast their lot with the Communists.

Mr. REASONER. Nevertheless——

Mr. BUNDY. There is a great deal of——

Mr. REASONER. It is not an unreal question, to this extent: that some intelligence estimates this spring indicated this would be a possibility. Now, if—even if it is unlikely——

Mr. BUNDY. I am not aware of those——

Mr. REASONER. It must be something we consider.

Mr. BUNDY. Intelligence estimates, Mr. Reasoner. Really not——

Mr. REASONER. Well, then put it on a purely hypothetical basis. To think through the unthinkable, what would be our attitude? Would we accept it?

Mr. BUNDY. Well, let me put it the other way around, and say that the United States is obviously not in a position to make the kind of effort and to make the kind of sacrifices which we are making if there were not effort and sacrifice by the people and Government of the country to which we are giving assistance. There is that kind of effort. There is that kind of sacrifice. Our attention focuses most naturally upon the battles in which Americans are heavily engaged, and we feel, most naturally, American casualties. But the rate of casualties and the rate of effort is running many times to one on the Vietnamese side as between us.

Mr. HOTTELET. Are there any points on which the peace aims of the United States and the Government of South Vietnam do not coincide?

Mr. BUNDY. Well, there's a constant problem of discussion over the exact ways in which we would state our peace aims, but the current situation is that—and the Secretary can speak to this better than I can—that the Foreign Minister of the Government of South Vietnam, and the Secretary himself, have made closely parallel statements about our peace aims.

Mr. REASONER. I don't mean to be offensive, and I certainly recognize your right to decline to answer this question, but in Santo Domingo we retained a possibility of a veto over a government. This was clear. This denied certain options to people in the way of self-determination. Do we retain similar veto over possible decisions out of Vietnam?

Mr. BUNDY. Mr. Reasoner, you're talking about an island I love. I was down there. And the point that I think needs to be made is rather that these two situations are closely parallel. Our action there, first to save lives, then to prevent a particular kind of Communist hazard, has developed into an action designed precisely to give a reasonable opportunity for the people of the Dominican Republic to make their own choice about the kind of government and the kind of society they want to have. Now, a small island in the Caribbean, and a newly independent country operating within international agreements which somewhat affect its international position on the other side of the world—these are two very different situations, but my own belief is that the fundamental purposes of the United States in both areas can be defined in the same broad terms.

Mr. RUSK. Mr. Reasoner, there's a very deep commitment of the American people to the simple notion that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and we have not seen a government, a Communist government, brought to power by the free election of its own people. Now, we have overwhelming evidence from all sections, sectors, areas, groups, in South Vietnam that they do not want what Hanoi is offering to them in South Vietnam. Therefore, I do not believe that we need fear, from the point of view of freedom, that we need to fear what the effect would be of genuinely free elections among the people of South Vietnam. I've heard some people who were not, I think, in a very good position to know the details, speculate that 80 percent of the people in South Vietnam would elect Ho Chi Minh or accept Hanoi if they had a free election. That just doesn't fit any of the evidence that we have about the attitude of these people.

Mr. REASONER. I was thinking not so much of elections as of a coup which would put into power, without reference to the people—as essentially the present government is, without reference to a majority of the people; it's not established that way yet; they don't know how, Ambassador Lodge says—but if they had a government which wanted to make peace, do we retain veto power over that peace?

Mr. BUNDY. Mr. Reasoner, the coupmaking power, to put it in those terms, does rest, as Ambassador Taylor was suggesting last week, primarily with the military. There's no hint of this in the military. The people

underestimate the degree of the commitment of all factions, not the Communists, to a non-Communist solution in South Vietnam. One of the principal Buddhist leaders said to one of our people the other day on a point that comes up occasionally with respect to negotiation, that he hoped very much that we would not give any international diplomatic recognition to the Vietcong. The Vietcong did not represent the South Vietnamese people, but only an agency of the Communists in the north. This is a—there are divisions and difficulties, many, varied and fascinating, among the non-Communist forces in South Vietnam, but not on this issue.

Mr. HOTTELET. The Vietcong has been treated as a monolithic force, which is really not human, because human beings are different and even if they are bound by a discipline or bemused by an ideology, they do have their own antecedents and they do have their own tastes. How much is being done now and what will be done more in the future to—to insert a wedge into the differences that must exist inside this theoretically monolithic Vietcong—the nationalists, the patriots, the people who are just peasants wanting to live a life of their own?

Mr. RUSK. Well, there are various elements in the National Liberation Front. I think it is true that not all of them are Communists, although the Communists have, in even recent weeks, declared that they are the dominant factor and they must themselves be the ones to give the orders. I think there may also be some tensions between some of the southerners and some of the northerners within the Liberation Front. But basically, they are united on the notion that the program of Liberation Front must be accepted as a solution for South Vietnam and that the Liberation Front itself must have a dominant role in the government there, regardless of the fact that this is not the wishes of the overwhelming majority of 14 million South Vietnamese.

Mr. GOLDBERG. May I add a word in this connection? I was looking at the Geneva agreement last night. The Geneva agreement, despite what is said in Hanoi, did not contemplate, nor does it say anything about a coalition government in which the Liberation Front would occupy the dominant role that Hanoi would like to accord it. The Geneva agreement says that "the Vietnamese people, north and south, should enjoy fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions"—I am reading—"established as a result of free, general elections by secret ballot." Now, it's very interesting to see the contrast in positions. When we talk about returning to the essentials of the Geneva agreement, which Hanoi says it wants and which we say we subscribe to, we rely upon the fact that there shall be self-determination. Hanoi relies upon the fact that they should take over the government in their image before there are free elections. Well, we all have had a bit of history in this since the war. I don't recall after that has been done elsewhere that there have been any free elections. Now, surely the acid test is whether you are willing to subscribe to the principle of free elections. That, we have said, we are ready to subscribe to. If we are ready to subscribe to it, it must reflect a considerable degree of confidence—confidence which is lacking on the other side.

Mr. BUNDY. To put it another way, the Geneva Conference included as a participant the State of Vietnam. The current position from Hanoi is that there is no question of Saigon authorities. This is the very language of Ho Chi Minh, so what they wish to do is to foreclose the question of choice by the establishment as the only authentic representative, again his own language, their agent, controlled from within by a clearly Communist party, the Vietcong.

Mr. RUSK. And without elections.

Mr. KALB. Mr. Secretary, you mentioned before that—or Mr. Bundy did actually—that you and the Foreign Minister of South Vietnam have come out with statements that are rather similar as to what both countries want in South Vietnam. We have yet to hear what the Prime Minister of South Vietnam actually wants and there have been stories that there are possible differences already even in this early period of Ambassador Lodge's return, of differences between the two; the Prime Minister was not there when the Ambassador arrived. Do you feel, sir, that negotiations as we have been discussing them is in any way realistic, or possible, given the possibility of continued political instability in South Vietnam or the continued absence of statements from the new South Vietnamese governments that aline themselves with us?

Mr. RUSK. Oh, I think the political instability in South Vietnam is itself directly related to violence in the countryside and the conditions of the war. During the Greek guerrilla operations, for example, there were some eight Greek governments in the period of some 15 months of guerrilla operations. It isn't easy to sustain an orderly government based upon elections throughout the countryside when thousands of local officials are being assassinated or kidnaped and when the normal processes of the economy are interrupted by sabotage of routes of communication, so that there is a connection between the political possibilities of what we would call a democratic and constitutional government and peace throughout the country. I have no doubt that—that the South Vietnamese themselves would move toward a government rooted in popular support and that this could be easily demonstrated if the conditions of peace made it possible for them to proceed on that basis. A few weeks ago, as you will recall, they did have provincial elections, for a large number of those who were eligible to vote did in fact register, over two thirds, and that some 73 percent of those who were registered did in fact vote, even though the Vietcong were opposing those provincial elections. There are multiple candidates. From our point of view, they were free elections and we can be—I think, take some confidence in the fact that if given a chance, if given some possibility of peace, these people in South Vietnam would know how to establish a government and base it upon popular support and get on with the main job which would be their first choice.

Mr. KALB. And yet, sir, the Prime Minister of the country, the air commodore, has expressed his impatience publicly with the politicians in South Vietnam. He's even expressed a certain admiration for dictators of the past. Do we really have a sense that this is the kind of government that we can go to the conference table with?

Mr. RUSK. Oh, I think that we can go to the conference table with the Government of South Vietnam. I think that their war aims and our war aims are basically the same and that if the country can get some peace, then there can be a rapid development of their political, economic, and social institutions in the direction which would cause all of us to applaud them and give them full support.

Mr. HOTTELET. You don't say, sir, that the war aims are identical. What are the points of difference?

Mr. RUSK. Well, perhaps I could say "identical" as far as my present knowledge is concerned. I'm not aware of any significant difference in the war aims of our two countries. The central thing, gentlemen, the central thing is that the aggression from the north, the infiltration of men and arms from the north, must be stopped and the South Vietnamese be allowed to work out their own problems themselves without the use of force from the outside. Now, this is the major, central, overriding point. The details are incidental to that central point and on that there's no difference between us and Saigon.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Can I phrase—rephrase the Secretary's remark in a simple way? I was writing it down as he said it. If we look at the public record, and the public record is not unimportant in this area, the goal of Hanoi policy as recently expressed is to wage a 20-year war to impose a Communist regime on South Vietnam. The goal of American and South Vietnamese policy is to determine their own destiny, by democratic means under conditions of peace.

Mr. RUSK. I think an examination of Hanoi's, Peiping's, broadcasts in the last several months will indicate that they were leaning rather heavily on three points: one, that they could score a military success in South Vietnam—we know that will be denied to them; second, that international opinion somehow will build up in such a way as to put sufficient pressure on the United States to cause us to change our commitment to South Vietnam—we know that that will not occur. And, third, that divisions inside the United States will cause us to change our view of this matter—we don't believe that will occur. Therefore, Hanoi, I think, must face the fact that three essential pillars in their policy are weak pillars and, therefore, we would hope very much that they would realize that this matter must be brought to some conclusion.

Now, I don't want to exaggerate the role of public discussion and public debate. You'll recall, for example, that the Greek guerrilla problem was not settled in debate. At a certain stage the guerrillas simply began to wither away. You'll recall that the Berlin blockade was not lifted through a debate in the Security Council. It was done through private contacts ahead of time by—between the Soviet Union and the United States. Similarly, the Korean war was not settled in a debate in the United Nations. It was settled by contacts among the parties. And, therefore, we believe that we're in a period where the real views of the various parties need to be explored by channels that are available, in order to see whether the basis for a peace exists. I've indicated myself earlier in this program what seemed to us to be the main lines of a peaceful settlement as far as we're concerned. There are many details which can't be elaborated, because we're not at a negotiating table. But I do believe that it is important for us to pursue the quiet diplomacy, whether in the United Nations or in other respects, because it is in that way that we shall, I think, get the key signals at some stage that might bring this to the conference table.

Mr. HOTTELET. But can one not hasten this process somewhat? Can one not ripen the quiet diplomacy by creating circumstances in which the other side will find it necessary to come to the conference table, by, for instance, dramatizing a desire to return to Geneva, or perhaps some dramatic, substantive but dramatic, approach by President Johnson—a summit conference on this problem, which I think everyone recognizes is a most serious problem?

Mr. GOLDBERG. Mr. Hottelet, how more dramatic can the President of the United States be? He made a public declaration about this in Baltimore, "unconditional discussions," and then some critics said that the President did not mean "negotiations." So then in the letter that he sent down with me to the Secretary General of the United Nations, he used the word "negotiations" to put at rest this thing that people were talking about. Following which, we sent a letter to the Security Council, in which we said, "We call upon anyone, any member, not only of the Security Council, but of the

United Nations, to participate with us in this effort."

The 17 nonalined nations made a proposal. We said that they would form the basis for a negotiation. And then—I can't go through all of the 15 efforts that were made. Mr. Davies went to Hanoi. We said that we welcomed that initiative. The Commonwealth ministers made a declaration. We said we welcomed that initiative. Mr. Nkrumah has indicated some interest; we did not discourage it.

I personally feel that you never denigrate any party nor a great nation by indicating a desire for peaceful resolution of a conflict. The President has done this. He's gone all out for this purpose.

Mr. HOTTELET. The purpose of my question, Mr. Goldberg, was to ask whether one could not do more than just indicate a willingness to accept, indicate acquiescence——

Mr. BUNDY. Well, we have done that, Mr. Hottelet, in the specific case that you mentioned. It seems to me that the fact is, and it's very clear, really, and increasingly recognized around the world, we are unconditionally ready for negotiations; we are unconditionally ready to return to Geneva if others are; we are unconditionally ready for the good offices of the United Nations in any way that they can be made effective; we are unconditionally ready to meet with all interested governments and go to work on this problem, and we have said so in every sharp and flat, and the President is fond of saying, in every State of the Union. And I believe the message has been heard.

Mr. KALB. Mr. Bundy, at one time there was an unadvertised pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. I wonder, sir, if the administration might not—in following up Dick's line of questioning—might not consider that an advertised or unadvertised effort along these same lines might not be contemplated, because the leaders in Hanoi—and you keep making reference to the other side—have certain things that they must go on, too——

Mr. BUNDY. Well——

Mr. KALB. In addition to public statements, they have the fact that they are being bombed.

Mr. BUNDY. You talked about this matter in this series a couple of weeks ago, and I think the Secretary then made the point that at the time of the unannounced pause there was information about its existence, was, in fact, conveyed to the governments most concerned, and in the first instance, to the government in Hanoi. They were in no doubt that this was happening. They were in no doubt that we would be watching to see whether there was any response or any secondary action.

Anytime that we thought that there was a promise of action and response in terms of the reduction of the activities which had made this trouble, there would be no hesitation in the United States about making appropriate adjustments in our own military activity.

Mr. RUSK. Yes, I'd like to assure you that we have not been negligent in our business, and that hardly a week goes by that the other side doesn't have a chance to indicate what else would happen if the bombing ceased.

Now, I said in our earlier program that we would be willing to consider cessation of the bombing if it were a step toward peace. Now that remains open, that possibility. But what else would happen? Would the 325th North Vietnamese Division go home? Would there be a cessation of the bombing in South Vietnam, where it's occurring all the time among the South Vietnamese and against our own forces?

In other words, the target here is peace, and all of these incidental aspects of it ought to be fitted into a movement toward a genuine, permanent, peaceful settlement of this situation.

Mr. REASONER. There's a question here I'd like to address to Mr. Bundy. If, as we seem to feel, that we have some years ahead of us, or some weeks or months or possibly years, making South Vietnam strong, waiting for a signal, what happens to the war in the meantime? It seems to get a little bigger all the time. Our participation seems to get stronger. Is there a limit to that?

Mr. BUNDY. Well, our actions there—and this is a point which I think Secretary McNamara spelled out with some care a couple of weeks ago on this program—our actions there have been essentially actions in response and in reply, and what has enlarged the war has been the increasing commitment directed from, supplied by and coming from, very often and increasingly, coming from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. Our own forces are there because of actions which have been necessary in response. That is why we feel so strongly that the question here as to whether it's going to get worse or better, the question as to when it will come to the peace table, is one in which one has to think about more than just the U.S. position.

Our determination is to assist and support a people who are defending themselves against an effort to make them a Communist power—part of a Communist power. That effort has been the effort which seemed necessary and appropriate at each stage, and only that much. We are not in a position to say to our countrymen in this country when that will end. We think that the American people understand why they are there, why these sacrifices are necessary. We hope that it will not grow larger, the conflict in South Vietnam. We will do what we can to limit it. But we cannot be unwilling and unready to do our part.

Mr. HOTTELET. Looking ahead to the permanent peace settlement, you have stressed your adherence to the essentials of the Geneva Agreement and you have stressed the need for self-determination. When the United States refrained from signing the Geneva Agreement, Bedell Smith also suggested that free elections should be supervised by the United Nations. Do you see a role for the United Nations in making certain that any future Geneva Agreement on Vietnam is actually honored by those recitals?

Mr. RUSK. Yes, I would hope that the United Nations could play an important part in connection with any settlement. But that would depend upon the attitude of all the parties, including Hanoi and Peiping, and thus far, both of those capitals have rather pushed aside and rejected participation by the United Nations. But if there could be organized an international inspection force, a police force, to supervise a peaceful settlement, if there could be a strong effort to build upon the capability of the United Nations to bring about economic and social development in the area, then I think there's a very important role for the United Nations in connection with the making and keeping of the peace, and I would hope very much that the other parties would make it possible for the United Nations to play that kind of role.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Before we leave this subject, may I make an observation on what Mr. Bundy just said. We are not the ones that are talking about a war that lasts 10 or 20 years. Ho Chi Minh has been talking about that. We are talking about a peace that should be negotiated here and now. Here and now.

Mr. BUNDY. That's a very important point. I'd like to just make one comment in finishing up on that. We don't know when, but the sooner the better, and we are absolutely sure that it is the order to all of us from our President, from our Nation's President, that we shall never be second, never be slow, never be without energy and imagination in trying to find ways of bringing a peaceful and decent settlement to this contest.

Mr. RUSK. Mr. Reasoner, it seems to me that each citizen in the United States has a special obligation in thinking about such a problem as South Vietnam. I think it really isn't enough just to worry about it and be concerned about it and be anxious about the future. Of course, all of us are concerned about it and anxious about the future. But each citizen might consider what he would do if he were the President of the United States, facing the choices faced by the President of the United States, to enter into the full agony of the question, what does the United States do in this situation? And I have no doubt that if each one of us should look very hard at the nature of the aggression, at the nature of the American commitment, the importance of the integrity of the American commitment, at the many efforts made to find a peaceful settlement, that the citizen would, thinking of himself as President for the moment, would conclude that we have to make good on our commitment, but at the same time we have to explore every possibility for a peaceful settlement. And that is what President Johnson is doing.

Mr. REASONER. Gentlemen, I'd like to thank you very much for coming, as we leave some millions of citizens considering what they would do if they were the President of the United States. You may have spoiled a lot of people's sleep, Mr. Secretary.

Thus far in our four-part series on Vietnam, we have examined the critical decisions that our country faces, the questions of how we can win the war there; and tonight, how we can win the peace. Two weeks from tonight, on September 6, in the conclusion of Vietnam Perspective, we shall take a close look at what kind of a war it is we're fighting there. Teams of CBS news correspondents and camera crews will film a single day of combat at different locations to bring you, in color, Vietnam Perspective: "A Day of War." This is Harry Reasoner. Good night.

SIX SEPARATE BILLS INTRODUCED TO RELIEVE SIX MERGED BANKS FROM LIABILITY UNDER OUR ANTITRUST LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR PREVIOUS MERGERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced six separate bills to relieve six merged banks from liability under our antitrust laws in connection with their previous mergers. The bill would dismiss the suits which the Attorney General has filed against four of these banks, and would void the decision which the Attorney General has already won against two of them.

My introduction of these bills does not mean that I am necessarily in favor of their passage. The equity of each bank's case must stand or fall on its own merits, through due consideration by the Congress. I am introducing these bills so that each case can be considered on its own merits.

But there is a wider purpose as well. I am introducing these six bills so that two important but clearly distinct issues may be fully examined on an individual basis. The matter of relief for the six

merged banks has been brought up in connection with hearings on S. 1698, the Robertson bill with the Proxmire amendment, now being held in the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

As it now stands, S. 1698 addresses itself to two issues. The first concerns the general status of banks under our antitrust laws, and in particular, the effect of bank mergers and competitive influence in a given geographic area. The second concerns relief for six merged banks: The First National Bank & Trust Co. and Security Trust Co., Lexington, Ky.; the Continental-Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. and City National Bank & Trust Co., Chicago, Ill.; the Manufacturer's Trust Co. and the Hanover Bank, New York, N.Y.; the Crocker Anglo National Bank and Citizens National Bank, California; the Third National Bank and Nashville Bank & Trust Co., Nashville, Tenn.; and the Mercantile Trust Co. National Association and Security Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo.

The hearings currently being held on S. 1698 have clearly shown that relief for these six banks should not be confused and combined with a general bill clarifying the manner in which the Justice Department should act when it believes that the merger of two banks would result in a violation of the Sherman or Clayton Acts.

The question of relief for six merged banks is one thing. The question of general antitrust legislation for the banking industry is clearly another.

To leave legislation affecting these six banks in a general bill defining overall antitrust policy would allow—with justification—the charge of "special interest legislation" to be made against it. Special interest legislation, although it may be legitimate and needed in many cases. should be clearly recognized and dealt with as such. It definitely should not be camouflaged.

Let me try to explore the issues involved a little bit further.

The question of the status of the banking industry under our antitrust laws has been much vexed in recent years. The status of the industry, coming as it does under significant Federal supervision, is said to be unclear. Certain sections of legislation attempting to clarify this status have been the subject of a good deal of debate in the Congress, in the courts, and in the banking industry itself. It was this alleged confusion which called forth S. 1698.

This issue has been the concern of many learned and expert witnesses who have appeared before our Subcommittee on Domestic Finance. I expect it will be discussed by a good many other witnesses before our hearings are concluded. It would be premature of me to comment on the substance of this issue before the subcommittee has heard all the pertinent testimony on the matter. But, and let me make this clear once again, this issue is one of the overall U.S. antitrust policy with respect to the banking industry.

The problem of relief for six merged banks is not one of overall U.S. antitrust policy. Considering these specific problems with S. 1698 may, in fact, obstruct our ability to study the main issue with the care and consideration it deserves. For it brings up a number of problems which, although of considerable interest in themselves, are not the same thing as overall antitrust policy.

First, the theme and intent of the last sentence of S. 1698, without question, is to exempt from judicial review the cases of these six merged banks which the Attorney General has brought to the courts. Special exemption from judicial review is an important question, but it is not the same as overall antitrust policy.

Second, the suits instituted by the Attorney General are six separate suits, before six different courts, in six different States. The mergers in question took place over a 4-year period, all in differing circumstances. To try to arrive at a blanket decision in all six cases—which is what S. 1698 as presently written would do—would be to do violence to the equity considerations of each case. Each merger and the circumstances surrounding it should be studied separately.

The six banks merged in accordance with the requirements of the 1960 Bank Merger Act. In other words, their mergers were approved by the bank regulatory agencies which had jurisdiction over them. It should be noted that the regulatory agencies generally could not deny the mergers simply on grounds that they reduced competition or might result in a tendency toward monopoly. The mergers could be broken on antitrust grounds only on the basis of a suit by the Department of Justice in the courts. Such a suit was instituted in the cases of all six banks immediately before or upon consummation of the mergers.

Indeed, the Department of Justice attempted to restrain the banks from merging on the grounds that the banks, once merged, would have difficulty in demerging, and therefore, it was better for the banks to wait until after the mergers had been found free of antitrust violations until they were consummated.

Almost without exception, the banks argued that they were aware of the risks of future divestiture, that they accepted the extreme difficulty of such a move, and that they were willing to assume the future risks of a present merger.

This argument did have an impact on the issue at the time of the mergers. For example, in the case of the United States of America against the Third National Bank in Nashville and Nashville Bank & Trust Co., Judge William E. Miller, on August 17, 1964, in denying the request of the Justice Department to issue an injunction to prevent the two banks from merging, stated:

> The defendants are aware of the risks involved. They know that the final result in this case cannot be predicted with absolute certainty. They have indicated their willingness to assume the risks, aware that they may in the end have to undo what they have done. Such a willingness strengthens the belief that substantial restoration of the status quo could be fairly brought about by divestiture if the merger should finally receive judicial condemnation.

The argument has been given that the banks merged in good faith, believing that the Bank Merger Act of 1960 removed them from jurisdiction under the Sherman and Clayton Acts. But nothing in the 1960 act affected the jurisdiction of either the Sherman or Clayton Acts. The debate and reports on this bill in both the House and the Senate certainly have made it clear that the application of the Sherman and Clayton Acts remained unchanged.

Following the passage of the 1960 act, the Philadelphia National Bank and Girard Trust Co. were given permission to merge by the Comptroller of the Currency. The merger was challenged in the courts, and the banks did not press the merger pending outcome of the suit. On June 17, 1963, the Supreme Court held the proposed merger to be in violation of the Clayton Act, and the banks are, as a result, still separate.

Three banks which merged prior to the Philadelphia decision have argued that they thought the law was unclear and that the provisions of the Sherman and Clayton Acts did not apply to them. It should be noted that this was prior to the Philadelphia decision, which stated clearly that the Sherman and Clayton Acts did apply to bank mergers.

The three banks which merged after the Philadelphia case decision cannot make such an argument. They are: The Crocker-Anglo National Bank and the Citizens National Bank, California; the Third National Bank and the Nashville Bank & Trust Co., Nashville, Tenn.; and the Mercantile Trust Co. National Association and Security Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo. Their cases are still pending in the courts. Supporters of their exemptions from prosecution argue that these banks acted in good faith, not believing that the Clayton Act applied in their cases. However, I believe that it is plain, following the clear ruling on the Philadelphia case by the Supreme Court, that these banks cannot claim that their lawyers were uninformed of the law and that it might not apply to them. Further, since the Justice Department had attempted to restrain them from merging pending outcome of the antitrust suits, the banks knew that their mergers were being seriously questioned.

Therefore, I feel these banks have little equity in their case, and I cannot recommend that the bills providing them relief be seriously considered.

Two of the merged banks, the Manufacturer's Trust Co. with the Hanover Bank, New York, and the First National Bank & Trust Co. with the Security Trust Co., Lexington, Ky., have a better case. These mergers occurred before the Philadelphia decision, and the banks involved could not have known about the Supreme Court's ruling. However, in the Lexington case, the judge, in denying the restraining injunction sought by the Justice Department, requested the banks to keep their assets separate in the event that they should lose the antitrust suit brought against them which is now the case. Thus, the Lexington banks merged fully realizing that they might have to divest at a later date. The U.S. Supreme Court has upheld an order of divestiture in this case by a lower court.

Manufacturer's Hanover has scrambled its assets, but it has pled that it

would assume the risks of divestiture when its attorneys argued against the restraining injunction. It, too, has been held in violation of the antitrust laws, and has worked out a settlement with the Justice Department.

The Continental-Illinois Bank merged prior to June 17, 1963, and, therefore, did not know the law as defined by the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia case. They did recognize the risk of merger, but, because of the branching laws of the State of Illinois, they, of all the merged banks, may have the best case in equity.

But better than the case of any of these six is the case of Philadelphia National and Girard Trust. They did not merge, but awaited the outcome of the antitrust suit. If they had merged, they, too, could plead that they were in good faith and should be relieved of the law. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that they are entitled to special consideration, even though—or especially because—they have not asked for it. Whereas the other banks said they would assume their risk if they could merge, and now plead that they should not have to suffer the consequences of that assumption of risk, Philadelphia and Girard never placed themselves in such an ambiguous position.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, to be logical and consistent, the introduction of a bill to permit Philadelphia National and Girard Trust to merge should be considered, even though the courts have held the proposed merger a violation of antitrust laws. Then the cases of all the banks affected can be reviewed by Congress on the basis of their individual merits.

By removing the issue of the six banks from S. 1698, I believe the relevant issues can be more clearly defined. I trust that this division of the issues—which are truly separate and unrelated—will be of assistance to the Congress in its study of the legislation.

A PROUD RECORD

Mr. CLEVENGER. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this Congress and the President of this country can be proud of the record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress; we are not through yet, but what we have accomplished in the first 8 months of 1965 will long be remembered.

President Johnson well deserves the plaudits extended in the following birthday editorial which appeared in the August 27, 1965, edition of the New York Journal-American:

HAPPY DAY FOR L.B.J.

Doubtless there will be a cake and candles today as President Johnson observes his 57th birthday. It occurs to us that quite a large cake would be needed if each candle represented an achievement by L.B.J. in the not-quite 2 years he has been in office.

The President's domestic legislative accomplishments have astounded experts and fascinated the public, especially since many of them in the recent past were issues of fierce and seemingly insoluable controversy.

To name some of the big ones in this session of Congress alone:

Education, which extends benefits indirectly to pupils in Catholic and other nonprofit private schools.

Medicare.

Voting Rights Act.

Creating a new Cabinet-rank Department of Housing and Urban Development.

War on poverty bill and aid to Appalachia, related but legislatively separate.

Water pollution control.

Presidential continuity.

Omnibus housing bill.

Excise tax reductions.

On the international scene, the President's policy in Vietnam has the support of a great majority of the people and most leaders of both parties.

Mr. Johnson has every reason, when he blows out those candles, to blow with gusto and satisfaction. Many happy returns, Mr. President.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1128, TO PROVIDE BENEFITS FOR VETERANS OF SERVICE AFTER JANUARY 31, 1955

Mr. CLEVENGER. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, 1965, I submitted the following statement to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in support of my bill H.R. 1128, which would provide educational and other benefits to those of our citizens who served in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1128, TO PROVIDE EDUCATION AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR VETERANS OF SERVICE AFTER JANUARY 31, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to make this statement to your committee in support of my bill, H.R. 1128, which would provide vocational rehabilitation, education and training, and loan guaranty benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955. The benefits provided by this bill are extended to veterans of what is frequently called the cold war and are made available without distinction to all who serve, whether or not they have volunteered or have been inducted.

There are those who oppose this legislation on the ground of its cost to the Government. This is a narrow view of the problem. Let them look at what happened to the income of World War II and Korean veterans as a result of the education benefits made available to them by law. It is estimated that their income levels have increased to the point where they pay $1 billion in additional income taxes annually to the Treasury of our Nation. At this rate the entire cost of GI benefits to them will be repaid by those veteran recipients within a reasonable time.

Others oppose this legislation on the ground that only a small number of veterans are actually drafted. They fail to realize that this threat induces many to enlist voluntarily. The hope of a choice assignment is another reason that comes to mind as a reason for voluntary enlistment. Our obligation is to every veteran regardless of the manner in which he entered military service or the reasons which prompted it.

The argument is made that this legislation would induce trained military personnel to leave the service to avail themselves of its benefits. Although this may be true, it is no valid reason to deny veterans these benefits. They make up an available pool of trained manpower for the security of our country. While they may not be in active service they can easily be converted to active service.

The history of democracy is the story of the citizen army and its defeat of the tyrant's army at crucial moments in history. The difference that spelled victory was the ability to think and the desire for freedom by the citizen soldier. It is shortsighted to believe that it is better for our country to retain its citizen soldier in service for longer periods than to encourage him to continue his education and his duties as a citizen while he remains available in a reserve status. Good citizens make better soldiers and certainly more dedicated ones. In my book the educated, responsible, self-motivated and trained citizen always makes a better fighting man than the tyrant's robot.

Objection is made that the bill's benefits that are made available to peacetime soldiers who faced no war hazards is a departure from past custom. The argument goes that the peacetime inductee can anticipate the draft and plan accordingly, while this is not possible for the wartime inductee, and that the peacetime inductee can postpone his induction by attending school or by enrolling in the 6-month training program.

This argument fails to consider those who for patriotic reasons or otherwise volunteer or are inducted without delay when called. Those veterans would be penalized. I think it is specious to draw the line on the basis of those who are, and those who are not able to arrange their affairs. At best, in most instances, the arrangements are makeshift and impose hardship on the citizen. His induction is a serious incursion into his life and affairs.

I know it is the duty of every citizen to serve his country, and rightly so. But it is not too much to expect that his country would want to assist him to regain what he may have lost as a result. The GI bill of World War II and the Korean conflict did not distinguish between those who were exposed to combat and those who "also" served. Benefits were made available indiscriminately to both. Our peacetime veterans should also be given the benefits of this legislation.

Then there are those who object to this legislation because its benefits are not related to need. I will support any measure that would raise our country's educational level. There is not yet any legislation on the books to provide educational opportunities for all our younger people. I believe my bill would encourage more volunteers to serve their country in return for their education. I think the quid is well worth the quo. My bill will tell our youth that service to our country is a two-way street and that they are not its forgotten citizens.

This bill affirms our faith in our youth.

I urge the committee to favorably report H.R. 1128.

TESTIMONY OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER SUPPORTING HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CLEVENGER. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, 1965, it was my privilege to appear before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the District of Columbia to testify in support of my bill H.R. 4644.

H.R. 4644 would provide home rule for the District of Columbia; on August 24 I placed on the Speaker's table a petition to discharge the home rule bill. I strongly urge our colleagues to sign that petition so that the House can work its will.

The following is a transcript of my testimony before Subcommittee No. 5 of the District Committee:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE 13TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. WHITENER. The next witness is the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Member of Congress from the State of New York. He is another valued member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. But from what I read in the paper, he does not like to serve here and wants to get rid of us.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I think that is a slightly inaccurate appraisal of my feelings. I have enjoyed working on this committee. What I want to do is lighten the burden of the committee. What I would like to do is put where it belongs the government of the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHITENER. May I interrupt you there, Mr. MULTER, and ask if your bill which you are testifying on today is similar to the one that you testified on before the committee in 1963?

Mr. MULTER. In large part; yes.

I had intended, Mr. Chairman, to simply talk about my bill, H.R. 4644, and S. 1118, which has already passed the Senate, which are the administration bills. S. 1118 was introduced as the administration bill in identical form to my H.R. 4644, and was amended in some minor details and then passed and is now before this committee.

In view of the shortness of time, if it is agreeable to the committee, I shall ask that that statement be made a part of the record in full.

Mr. WHITENER. Without objection, we will make it a part of the record

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

"STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER ON H.R. 4644

"Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to come before this committee today. I do so to urge support of my bill, H.R. 4644, which would provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia.

"This is the same bill which was introduced in the Senate as S. 1118 and which has already been passed by the Senate with several amendments. Except for the amendments the bills are identical.

"I believe home rule can no longer be denied to the District of Columbia. The reasons therefor have been expounded by me and many others too frequently to require repetition today. I did elaborate on them before this committee during the 87th Congress.

"Because I am convinced that the 89th Congress will consider a home rule bill, I urge reporting to the House either H.R. 4644, the administration bill, or S. 1118 as passed by the other body.

"At this time I intend to address myself solely to differences betwen my bill and the Senate-passed version of the bill.

"The Senate bill provides for a 19-member council elected for 4 years, 1 from each of 14 wards and 5 elected at large. Of the five councilmen-at-large no more than three may be of the same political party. My bill provides for a 15-member council, 1 for each of the 15 wards, elected at large for a 2-year term.

"I prefer the House version. Majority rule means just that. When the majority of the electors indicate their choice the minority should abide by it until they can win over to their viewpoint enough of the majority.

"Proportional representation has never worked and I know of no place that has not abandoned it after having tried it. If the purpose of the Senate version is to assure Negro representation, this can and should be accomplished only by an apportionment of the city into districts of equal population. A majority within each district should then elect its representative. I prefer the 4-year-term for councilmen for the same reasons that I have advocated a 4-year term for Members of Congress.

"The Senate bill provides for a school board of 14 members elected for 4-year terms on a nonpartisan basis. My bill abolishes the Board of Education and transfers its functions to the council.

"I approve of the Senate provision calling for an elective Board of Education on a nonpolitical basis. I believe that this will bring about an improvement of the education system and facilities in the District. If it doesn't work out that way then either the local government or the Congress can change it after a fair period of experimentation.

"The Senate bill permits recall of 'any elected officer.' My bill permits recall of the mayor only.

"I believe the House version is better. The right of recall of legislators keeps a government in constant turmoil requiring a legislator to keep his ear attuned to the emotional reactions of the electorate rather than to their best interests.

"The Senate bill permits District voters to propose and enact legislation. Any act resulting from the exercise of such initiative is subject to Presidential disapproval in the same manner as any act passed by the council. My bill does not provide for initiative.

"The Senate provision for proposal of legislation by petition is a good one. It should serve to keep the people interested in what their city council does or fails to do.

"The Senate bill directs the Administrator of General Services to certify that the account computed under the formula and required for payment is 'based upon a reasonable and fair amendment of real and personal property factors,' which enter into the computation. My bill is intended to accomplish the same thing.

"The difference between my bill and the Senate bill calling for certification by the General Services Administrator, in my opinion, is a difference in language only.

"I can and am prepared to and will support either bill with or without any minor amendments.

"The important thing in my opinion is that we enact one of these bills and then learning from actual experience with home rule in full operation we can improve the basic statute from time to time. If the experiment should fail we can repeal the statute and go back to the present or a substitute method for governing the District.

"It is my firm conviction that the experiment will not fail. On the contrary, home rule government in the Nation's Capital can become a model for other municipalities."

Mr. MULTER. I would like now, then, to comment upon some of the things that have been said here this morning which I think are possibly more important than the differences between the Senate version of the administration bill and my bill introduced.

To begin with, I would like to direct the attention of the committee to the fact that, since I have been on this committee, I have been introducing home rule bills and there has not been a session at which I have introduced such a bill that I have not asked for hearings on the bill and that I have not written to the chairman, the honorable, distinguished gentleman, Mr. MCMILLAN, asking for hearings. I did that again in this session. Before the commencement of this session, when I was asked would I introduce a home rule bill again, I said, "Yes," I would, and I was then asked, "Will you file a discharge petition?" and I said not until the committee has had an opportunity to have hearings. And despite the pressures to introduce a discharge petition, I have withheld that, waiting for the committee to act on these bills.

Mr. MCMILLAN. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to say he has written me concerning home rule bills. I think I have always advised him that it was my opinion, and I think you would agree with me, that we have had bills such as the crime bills, transit bill, minimum wage increases, that should have priority. I think you will agree with me.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I have always deferred to your judgment as to when bills should be scheduled and as to which was the more important and the order in which they should be called up. At the same time, I would also like to direct attention, only because our distinguished colleague, Mr. BROYHILL, has referred to the matter, that in more than one executive session, I have suggested action on home rule bills.

Why did we not make the motion formally before the committee? Very frankly, we do not have the votes. I think if there was a vote taken in the full committee, of the 25 members, I think the result would be 13 to 12 against reporting the bill. But that nevertheless does not relieve this committee of its duty to report a bill either favorably or unfavorably to the House, and then let the House work its will.

Now, I have heard comment to the effect that other bills than home rule bills were sham and that they are diversionary stratagems and dilatory tactics to delay action on the home rule bill. Without impugning the motives of any of the Members who have introduced those bills or their testimony, and giving them credit for only the highest sense of duty as Members of this Congress, I say the result has been to divert the attention of this committee from the issue before it and to delay action on it.

Now, in all good faith, I say, Mr. Chairman, and again I want to make it very clear that I have the utmost respect for you, Mr. Chairman, and every member of this committee. I have enjoyed serving with you. We have disagreed, but I think we have never been disagreeable, and I hope we never will be. But, we are now going to be put to the test as to whether or not 13 members, a majority of this committee of 25, are going to be able to withhold action from the Congress if the majority of the Congress desires action on the home rule bills. That is the issue before this committee, Mr. Chairman, and no amount of talk for or against the bills is going to delay that action. If I am right that a majority of the Members of the Congress want action on a home rule bill, we are going to get it. If I am wrong, we shall not get it. But I think it is the duty of this committee to report a bill or bills—maybe you should report them all to the House and let the House work its will on them—but short of that, nothing is going to delay our following the democratic process as provided in the rules of the House to bring before the

House any bill that a majority of the Congress wants to consider.

Now, no member has a right to take offense at the procedure that we are following, and it is being led by members of this committee—true, a minority of the members of this committee, but members of this committee who believe it is the right of the Congress to pass upon this issue as to whether or not the District shall have home rule. I have no pride of authorship in any of the bills. I think the record will show, and I think the chairman knows and members of the committee know, I have introduced every version of home rule for the District. I have done it knowingly, knowing that there were differences, but always taking the position that the Congress should ultimately decide what form this home rule should take, that the Congress should make that decision.

I think the time has now come, and I think it is fast running out, when this committee will have the opportunity to present to the House a bill. When the 7 legislative days have expired after the filing of my rule or resolution which is now before the Rules Committee, I will file a discharge petition, which will be on Tuesday, the 24th of August. At that time, we shall determine whether or not a majority of the House wants the Rules Committee discharged from the consideration of the resolution, and then we shall get a vote, if 218 members sign that petition, the House will vote whether or not they want to consider the home rule bill. If the majority so votes we shall then go to work on what kind of home rules we should get for the District.

Now, I say again that nobody has a right to deprecate the work that this committee has thus far done legislatively, whether in this session or prior sessions. It has done a good job; I am happy that I have been able to participate in bringing before the House good legislation, most of which passed unanimously, some of which passed by bare majorities. But we did our duty in that respect. I think we are failing in our duty to report a bill to the House for home rule.

Now, I have no doubt that much argument can be made on the constitutionality of the home rule approach. But just as much and just as vigorous and just as good argument can be made the other way, and this is a question that only the U.S. Supreme Court will properly finally determine if it is questioned. If there is any question in the minds of anybody as to whether or not the home rule bill can be tested for its constitutionality, I say let us write into it an amendment to that effect so there is no question that it can be reviewed as to its constitutionality.

I know that every Member has the right, and it is his conscientious duty to say, "I will not vote for this bill because I believe it to be unconstitutional," and nobody has the right to criticize him for doing that. My position as to constitutionality has been whenever there is a question as to constitutionality of a bill which gives somebody a right, pass the bill and let the Court determine whether or not it is constitutional.

On the other hand, I have always felt and so voted that when we pass a piece of legislation that seeks to deprive somebody of a right, then my oath requires me to vote against that if I conscientiously believe that it is unconstitutional. There we do not take the risk on what the Supreme Court will do eventually. But where we are granting a right, there is no real risk entailed, when we give the right and let the Court review and say this act is unconstitutional.

Now, I do hope that before the petition is ready for action by the House, this committee will report a bill or all of the bills, either favorably or unfavorably, and let the House work its will.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to be here this morning. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. McMILLAN?

Mr. McMILLAN. I have no questions. I have always had full confidence in the gentleman from New York. He has been a good member of this committee and he has been regular in attendance, more than a lot of other members I could mention. I am happy to have his explanation of his proposals. Thank you.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. HORTON?

Mr. HORTON. I have no questions. I just want to commend the gentleman on his statement and state that I subscribe to it 100 percent. I am very proud to be associated with him in the efforts to get a discharge petition on this matter of home rule.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. GRIDER?

Mr. GRIDER. I have no questions.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. NELSEN?

Mr. NELSEN. Only to thank Mr. MULTER for his appearance and for his usual courteous, thorough presentation of his point of view, and I thank him for appearing before this committee.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. BROYHILL?

Mr. BROYHILL. No questions.

Mr. WHITENER. I join in expressing appreciation to the gentleman. He and I have disagreed in the past on some things, which I felt were good for the District of Columbia. I suppose that if they had home rule and they had a local governing board, there would be conscientious differences as to what is the best course. I do thank the gentleman.

But I would point out to him as one of the advocates of the discharge procedure, to which I have never subscribed in connection with this or any other legislation, even though, as the gentleman knows, in my Committee on the Judiciary there are many bills that from time to time many of us would want to get out but have not been able to do so because those in control of the committee did not think that they were good legislative proposals. So I can understand the gentleman's sense of frustration. I am sure he will agree, though, that even if the accusation that is being made is correct; namely, that this committee has not been willing to face up to this particular issue, it is not the only instance of that kind of unsupported charge, that he has seen it in his long service here.

Mr. MULTER. I am in complete agreement with the gentleman. The same thing has happened on other committees on which I am privileged to serve. This is part of the procedure of the House, where some persons who are opposed to a piece of legislation feel there is no need to consider it or it should not be considered, whereas others feel that good, bad, or indifferent, it should be considered.

Mr. WHITENER. I am sure the gentleman will remember that some of us who may differ on some of the thoughts which he has were among those in the Congress and in the Judiciary Committee who pressed for the amendment to the Constitution which gave the people in the District of Columbia the right to vote in the presidential elections. So we have not been totally harsh in our attitude toward giving them that right.

Mr. MULTER. I would repeat again, I have the utmost respect for every member of this committee, and I do not for 1 minute question their motives or their desires. They are legislating as their conscience dictates to them they should. I think this committee should be commended instead of being condemned as frequently as it is in the mass media. I think this committee has done a good job, and you and the chairman are among the leaders in bringing to the floor legislation that is needed for the District.

Mr. WHITENER. Well, I appreciate that statement.

Since you have mentioned mass media, I am not sensitive to what the papers say if they just get my name right and if some way they could get circulation down in my district.

Mr. MULTER. I think you should do as I do and ask only that they spell your name correctly, and that will increase the vote by which we are returned.

Mr. HORTON. They spell my name "Morton" all the time.

Mr. WHITENER. I noticed with interest this morning that in the mail we had an editorial which appeared on one of the television stations. It said that this committee started out by deliberately hearing the opponents of home rule, and that we were not fooling the other Members of the Congress and the public about what we were doing. I just made a mental tabulation that out of four witnesses we have had, we have had three proponents of home rule who took 3 hours, and the fourth, an opponent, had 5 minutes only. So the only thing I can deduct from the editorial is that the gentleman who wrote it either was not present or has not been present, or if he were present, he was doing what some of us might do at times and that is not pay the right amount of attention to what was going on around him.

Mr. MULTER. If I were the editor of that newspaper, the editorial I would have written on the subject would have probably been along the line that being convinced that the majority of the Congress is for home rule, the committee is now hearing the opponents.

Mr. WHITENER. I take it the gentleman does not consider himself an opponent except he opposes perhaps the Broyhill proposal or some other proposal.

Maybe since you have mentioned that, technically he is correct, that they were folks who were not supporting his particular view, and, therefore, they were opponents of home rule.

Mr. HORTON. I might point out to the chairman that my reading of it was that they would hear opponents and Members of Congress, and we have not gotten to opponents yet; we are still on Members of Congress.

Mr. MULTER. I am all for any procedure that you adopt which will avoid repetition of the testimony which has already been given to this committee on prior occasions and get on with the work and report out the bills.

Mr. WHITENER. I would say to Mr. HORTON, that I got here a little bit before he did, and one of the first things that I found when I got here was an unwritten rule that in all committees, Members of the House or Senate are heard from first. I did not make that rule. Sometimes I try to hear from somebody else.

They say we are all alike in two respects. One is that a Member of Congress loves nothing better than the sound of his own voice, and hates nothing more than the sound of a colleague's voice.

Mr. MULTER. I hope the day will never come, though, that the procedure of the House and of the committees will prevent us from hearing anyone and everyone who wants to be heard.

Mr. WHITENER. You are not objecting to the fact that we gave you priority because you are a Member of Congress?

Mr. MULTER. I appreciate and thank you therefor.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to state on this procedure of hearing opponents, at the present time, I think some people have forgotten that in the last Congress we had 4 days of hearings and 500 pages of testimony of the proponents on practically the same bills. We thought in all fairness it was best to give the opponents an opportunity to give their testimony here.

Mr. MULTER. Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I wish to give you and Mr. WHITENER credit for

trying to expedite the hearings rather than delay them.

Mr. MCMILLAN. That is what we are trying to do. If we hear the same group of people over again on the new proposals we would be here until Christmas.

Mr. WHITENER. I certainly thank the gentleman again for his good humor and his learned comments. Our time is now up. The bell has rung calling us to the House.

I wish to announce that our next witness will be Congressman SICKLES, if existing custom and usage is applied to hear Members of Congress. We shall have 3 days of hearings next week, the first day being Tuesday at 10:30, and we shall resume on Wednesday and Thursday at the same hour.

We shall now adjourn until next Tuesday.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the hearing recessed until the following Tuesday, August 24, 1965, at 10:30 a.m.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE PROPERLY IMPLEMENTED BY AGENCIES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we have in this Congress and in the session just passed contributed in the most dramatic way to the advancement of education in this country. We have made a record unparalleled in the entire history of this land and the Congress. However, I think we should be the first to be aware that all of the actions we take are not ideally implemented in the agencies of Government to whom the executing of legislative ideas are vested. So it is with the great Federal programs for education. It has been brought to my attention that these massive programs at the present time lack coordination, and this is understandable since new machinery has been placed into operation to carry out these programs. It is anticipated that many newly employed governmental officials perhaps lack understanding either of the work that they are specifically to do or are unappreciative of the interdependence of their responsibilities with those of other agencies, or even other offices within their own department. These things must be watched carefully by Members of Congress and certainly should have the overriding attention of the executive heads of the agencies responsible.

But what is most disappointing is that we are seeing an ambulant enthusiasm driving agency representatives directly to areas where they feel problems exist which the legislation has drafted to serve and bypassing the State agencies and local agencies which, on their own level, are themselves involved in these specific programs. This failure to communicate and clear with important persons and organizations is creating harsh reactions.

Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, I think we must direct our attention to this problem immediately. We must bring to bear our influence upon the agency heads and the Cabinet officers who may be involved to avoid the conflicts that can occur, the animosities and enmities which are already developing and the lack of results which, therefore, have been occurring. To have a good idea on how to solve a particular problem is not enough. We must be aware of the relevancy of the action that is being taken, the utilization of existing machinery and institutions through which the flow of effort must be directed and, above all, insure that intelligent consideration for cooperative effort for the appropriate balanced involvement of all levels of government be brought to bear on a problem which all are trying to serve in common.

I urge this Congress, through its appropriate committees, to make a prompt report in the year that lies ahead of us so that this Congress might follow up and gain for itself the assurance that the great works that they have accomplished in legislative programs are in fact becoming great works in the grassroots of America where the ultimate tests of the effectiveness of what we have wrought here in these halls will be measured.

U.S.S. "BENJAMIN FRANKLIN"—30TH POLARIS NUCLEAR SUBMARINE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOLL] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to receive this morning a letter from the distinguished Assistant Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion, Adm. H. G. Rickover, dated "At Sea—North Atlantic" on August 30, in which he notes the successful completion of the first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Benjamin Franklin,* our 30th Polaris nuclear submarine.

To Philadelphians the felicitous naming of this nuclear submarine for its most famous citizen is particularly gratifying. With the rest of the Nation, we never cease to marvel at the wisdom and the amazing achievements of this versatile and selfless man of humble origin, who accomplished so much for Philadelphia, for Pennsylvania, and for his country.

Franklin's inspiring philosophy as set forth in his autobiography and exemplified in his constructive life is as valuable a guide today as it was 200 years ago. Admiral Rickover's letter describing this great Founding Father and some of the basic, timeless lessons he has taught us is so fascinating that I take the liberty of quoting it in full below.

Congratulations to the Navy and best wishes to the captain and the crew of the 30th nuclear submarine. May the honored name it bears presage a successful future for the U.S.S. *Benjamin Franklin.*

The letter follows:

U.S.S. "BENJAMIN FRANKLIN"
(SSBN 640),
At sea, North Atlantic, August 30, 1965.

The Honorable HERMAN TOLL,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TOLL: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Benjamin Franklin,* our 30th Polaris nuclear submarine. We also have in operation 22 attack-type nuclear submarines, making a total of 52. The *Benjamin Franklin* was built by the Electric Boat Division, General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn.

This ship is named for Benjamin Franklin (1706–90), one of the most illustrious of our Founding Fathers. A plain man of the people, his life was the American success story writ large. In his autobiography he speaks of his "lowly beginnings" and notes with quiet pride that he "emerged from the poverty and obscurity" of his birth to "a state of affluence and some degree of reputation in the world." He did so purely on merit for he was, in every sense of the world, a self-made man, owing little if anything to luck or the assistance of others, never pushing ahead at the expense of a fellow man.

Franklin was the youngest son of a poor tallow chandler who had migrated to Boston from England and married as his second wife the daughter of a former indentured serving maid. With 17 children to raise, he could give Benjamin only 2 to 3 years of schooling, but he encouraged him to study on his own, a habit which was to remain with Franklin all his life. At 10 the boy went to work in the family shop; at 12 he was apprenticed to his half brother to learn the printing trade, this being considered a suitable vocation for one whose love of books was already manifest.

In later life, Franklin often remarked that he could not remember a time when he did not read. Books were his teachers. Through them he made himself a well educated man. Taking the best authors as his models, he worked hard at perfecting his writing, eventually achieving a simple, lucid style. His thirst for knowledge never ceased. Since he wanted to read foreign books, he decided at 27—a busy young merchant—to teach himself to do so. "I soon made myself so much the master of the French," he remarked, "as to be able to read the books with ease. I then undertook the Italian." Later on, "with a little painstaking, acquired as much of the Spanish as to read their books also." He read not only for instruction but for enjoyment. His taste was catholic. All his life, men of learning and position, who would ordinarily not bother with an artisan, sought Franklin's company. He supposed it was because "reading had so improved my mind that my conversation was valued."

At 17 Franklin had learned all his brother could teach him and was ready to make his own way in the world. He went to New York but could find no work there, so continued on to Philadelphia. This is how he describes his arrival there after a long and uncomfortable trip—walking 50 miles, getting nearly shipwrecked, and helping to row a boat part of the way: "I was dirty from my journey; my pockets were stuffed out with shirts and stockings; I knew no soul, nor where to look for lodging. I was fatigued with traveling, rowing and want of rest. I was very hungry and my whole stock of cash consisted of a Dutch dollar. * * *" He bought three large bread rolls. Wandering about town, munching, he met a fellow traveler. He gave her and her child two of his rolls. Thus did Franklin enter the town that was to become his permanent home, where he would rise to wealth and fame.

Seven years later he owned his own printshop, a stationery store, and a newspaper. He had in the meantime perfected his art

by working for 18 months in England and could do the most intricate and difficult print jobs. At 26 he began the highly profitable annual publication of Poor Richard's Almanac. He managed his affairs so ably that at 42 he retired with an income equivalent to that of a royal governor. Though he was good at it, moneymaking never interested him, except as a means to obtain leisure for the things he really enjoyed: reading, study, scientific experimentation, social discourse, and correspondence with men of similar interests.

While still a journeyman printer, he had founded a club for sociability and self-improvement, called the Junto, of which he later said that it was "the best school of philosophy, morals, and politics" then existing in Pennsylvania. Its membership of about 12 consisted of alert, intelligent young artisans, tradesmen, and clerks who liked to read and debate. They met Friday evenings to discuss history, ethics, poetry, travels, mechanic arts, and science (then called natural philosophy). It has been said of this group that it "brought the enlightenment in a leather apron to Philadelphia."

Franklin, who was full of ideas for improving life in Philadelphia and the Colonies in general, submitted all his proposals to the Junto where they were debated. Once accepted, members worked hard to get them put into effect. As a result, improvements were made in paving, lighting and policing the town; a volunteer fire department and militia were formed; a municipal hospital was established; the foundations were laid for what became the University of Pennsylvania and the American Philosophical Society. Of most lasting importance, perhaps, was Franklin's plan for a subscription library, the first in the Colonies. Access to books, he felt, meant that "the doors to wisdom were never shut." The idea caught on. He noted with satisfaction that the numerous libraries springing up everywhere "have improved the general conversation of Americans, made the common tradesmen and farmers as intelligent as most gentlemen from other countries, and perhaps have contributed in some degree to the stand so generally made throughout the Colonies in defense of their privileges." The value of knowledge to man and society has never been put more succinctly.

When he was 40, Franklin discovered electricity. It was then a sort of magic, a parlor trick. Franklin—ably supported by his Junto—threw himself into experimentations and developed a workable theory which he proved in his famous kite experiment. In the 6 years between 1746 and 1752 his contributions to electricity changed it from a curiosity to a science, and in the process made him world famous. His writings on electricity were compared with Newton's optics; he became the friend of most contemporary scientists, was made a member of virtually every scientific society and received honorary degrees from 20 universities. He was the first American scientist to win universal acclaim; the first American author to have his books translated and read as widely in Europe as in America. When he was sent to Paris, as America's first Ambassador to a major power, the admiration of France for Franklin's scientific achievement in catching lightning and putting it to man's use contributed not a little to the success of his mission: winning the help of France to the Revolutionary cause.

As a man of leisure, Franklin found himself more and more drawn into public service, this being expected of anyone who had the time and ability to serve. He became a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature, the Committee of Five charged with drafting the Declaration of Independence, the Second Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention. In one way or another, he represented America abroad a total of 25 years, becoming an exceedingly skillful diplomat. His statement, in hearings before Parliament, of the case of the Colonies against the hated Stamp Act was masterly and helped bring about the repeal of this act. He was among the first to recognize that not merely "taxation" but "legislation in general" without representation could not be borne by Englishmen, whether they lived at home or abroad. The bond uniting England and its colonies, he argued, was the King, not Parliament. Had his "dominion status theory" been accepted, the war might have been prevented but, as he sadly remarked, "there was not enough wisdom."

At 65, Franklin began his autobiography, intending it for his son. When pressure of public duties interrupted work on the book, one of his friends pleaded with him to complete it. All that had happened to Franklin, he urged, was of great historic interest since it was "connected with the detail of the manners and situation of a rising people." Moreover, the way he had planned and conducted his life was "a sort of key and explained many things that all men ought to have once explained to them, to give them a chance of becoming wise by foresight."

His philosophy of life, the virtues he cultivated—competent workmanship, honesty, industry and frugality—are within everyone's grasp; they are as important to a good and successful life today as in his time. No American child ought to grow to adulthood without having read the autobiography of this talented, wise and good man, who personified all that is best in America. "Merely by being himself," wrote Mark van Doren, "he dignified and glorified his country."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

POEM WRITTEN BY MISS LUCI BAINES JOHNSON AND PRESENTED TO HER FATHER, PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 57TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the poem written by Miss Luci Baines Johnson and presented to her father, President Lyndon Baines Johnson, on the occasion of his 57th birthday. Apart from the illustration of Miss Johnson's talents, the poem is also evidence of the devoted family life which the Johnsons have been able to enjoy despite the great official demands all of them have met over many years. The family is the foundation of our society. It is embedded in love. The millions of Americans who find happiness and strength in family life rejoice that our first family, like the average American family, is bound together by genuine ties of love and devotion.

The poem follows:

LUCI TURNS POET, LAUDS L.B.J.'s 57TH

AUSTIN, TEX.—Luci Baines Johnson, younger of the two daughters of the President, revealed herself as a poet in observing the 57th birthday of her father on Friday.

She presented him with a white leather-bound volume of poems which had been written by her since she was 9. She is now 18.

Assistant White House Press Secretary Joseph Laitin read one of the poems to reporters here on Saturday. Entitled "On Becoming 57," it reads:

"There are problems I can't understand
That you must face each day
All the black and white in life is gone,
And the remainder purely gray,
Oh, I wish there'd be a problem
That a mortal man could solve
Once again to know the satisfaction
Black and white—hope and love,
Though all the world is shaking at your door
You stand erect and calm
Knowing panic is man's enemy, and control is balm.
Though the Presidency possess you,
Your private life you retain
Unending love for Mom, Sis and me
Always has—and will remain.
Him's love affairs are your concern
As the cattle and the land
They fill your heart, enrich your mind
Yes—you love—and understand.
You understand so much of life
Much more than I once believed
You've come from intelligent to wise
I know this and believe
That you are more to me than a
Father, President, or friend
You are hope and strength and diligence
Concern and wisdom.
Admiration flows abundantly from
This pen of mine
For the man who's giving
All he's got
To try to save mankind."

INCREASE IN ANNUITIES AND PENSIONS UNDER THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. CLEVENGER. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement concerning a bill I have introduced today to provide a 7-percent increase in annuities and pensions under the Railroad Retirement Act.

Railroad retirement benefits have not been increased since May of 1959. Yet the cost of living has increased by 9 percent since that time. Railroad retirement annuitants have not been treated as generously in their battle with the day-to-day cost of living as have the beneficiaries of other federally administered retirement systems.

During the post-World War II period, for example, social security benefits have been increased five times by percentage increases that total on the average, to over 140 percent, including the 7-percent increase enacted this year along with the medicare program. Civil service annuitants have received four increases totaling, in some cases, to over 70 percent, and the House has recently passed a bill granting these beneficiaries another increase ranging from 5 to 10 percent depending upon the date of retirement.

The railroad retirement annuitant has received only four increases during the last 20 years totaling but 55 percent. The retired railroad worker appears to be the forgotten man among those fighting the increased living costs on the limited income of a retired worker. Surely our obligation toward these retirees is as great as it is toward those on social security or civil service retirement.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most compelling reasons why the retired railroad workers need this additional money is to help them to take advantage of the supplemental medical insurance program under the medicare bill. As you know, the medicare bill provides two health insurance programs for those age 65 and over. The basic, or part A, program of hospital and other institutional care is financed out of social security and railroad retirement contributions for those covered under those two systems. The so-called supplemental, or part B, program to provide physicians benefits, however, is to be supported by $3 a month contributions by subscribers, matched by a like amount out of Federal general revenues. This latter program is to be voluntary, covering only those who wish to join. Part of the rationale for the 7-percent cash benefit increase for social security beneficiaries that was enacted as part of the same law that established the medicare programs, was to afford these beneficiaries additional funds in order that they might take advantage of the supplemental medical insurance program. But what about the railroad retiree? Where is he going to get the additional funds necessary to subscribe for these benefits? Unless we grant him an increase, he is going to have to cut into his limited funds for living expenses in order to take advantage of this program.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has always recognized its continuing responsibility to those on the rolls of federally administered retirement systems. It is not enough that these persons be paid only a stated amount per month as stipulated in advance. The purpose of a retirement plan is to afford an individual the means to retire with some assurance that his retirement income will provide the protection he expected it would when he was making contributions to it. The Government must maintain the annuities of retirees at a level that will afford them living standards they have every right to expect.

WE, THE MERCHANTS OF DREAMS

Mr. CLEVENGER. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues an address of Mr. Philip J. Goldberg before the Associations of Life Insurance Underwriters & Salesmen, at the convention of Hamilton Life Insurance Co. of New York this past June.

Mr. Goldberg is one of this country's dynamic and influential leaders in the American life insurance industry. He is now chairman of the board of Hamilton Life Insurance Co. of New York. He has built a complex of some half-dozen life insurance companies in various sections of the country.

Before his entry into the life insurance management field he was perhaps the country's most successful life insurance salesman. He now travels the country speaking before associations of life insurance underwriters and salesmen, carrying to them the message of the role of life insurance in building security. He refers to the members of his audience as "merchants of dreams" whose function it is to sell "security on the installment plan."

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this address typifies the fact that democratic capitalism remains a dynamic social and economic philosophy for our times.

I call this to the attention of my colleagues for their reading:

WE, THE MERCHANTS OF DREAMS

Esteemed colleagues and friends, ladies, and gentlemen, all members of the Hamilton Life family, welcome. There is work ahead these next few days.

I wish to point out just how important you are and to fully assess your posture and your importance not only to yourselves and your families, not only to Hamilton, but to our entire society. So indeed, if I have any text this evening, it is to persuade and prove to you your own importance.

I have learned early in my career that it is you that the insured buys and not a company. Be it the richest or the oldest. He buys the personal services of an agent. He buys you and he buys me.

It is pure coincidence, of course, but we meet in the shadow of history. I credit this past Sunday's New York Times Magazine for pointing this up to me. One hundred and fifty years ago tomorrow, Napoleon met his Waterloo—and with his defeat was ushered in what historians refer to as the hundred years of so-called peace—four generations of mankind's progress on earth, essentially dominated by Great Britain and brought to a harsh and crashing end with the onset of World War I. More pointed and cogent for all of us, this week also marks the 25th anniversary of the fall of France before the invasion of Hitler's hordes. And in the generation that has passed since those black days, the historians tell us, the world has undergone more physical, technological, and social change than in all prior recorded history.

I will not argue with history—or with the historians. Certainly, the world of 1965, as we know it today, was beyond our contemplation or comprehension 25 years ago. Perhaps the best gage is the fact that miracles attributed to Buck Rogers in the 25th century have come to pass in a short 25 years. And, yet, as great and unpredictable as have been the changes, I say to you that the fundamentals of man's passage on this earth remains the same today as they were 25 years ago, and as they were 150 years ago, and as they were 1,000 and 10,000 years ago.

From caveman to today's urbane and civilized middle class, the yearnings, the longings, the hopes, the aspirations are the same. First, to satisfy the basic physical needs—bread and shelter. Second, to achieve some measure of security, so that our children may have it a little bit better than we did—a better education, a bolder start in life. Third, to forge some personal identity so that when we depart this earth, someone will remember. It is true that it is the great leaders who make history. It is the scientists who have wrought the technological miracles. It is the thinkers and the geniuses who have forged new frontiers of law and social order. But it is the rank and file—the unnamed, unknown world's billions—who inch ahead generation by generation, repeating the cycle of hope, aspiration, despair, anxiety—and in the end, some measure of progress. In this sense, the world remains unchanged.

Each man continues as his own lonely island, tentatively groping for a kindred spirit, slow to advance, and quick to retreat. This has great significance for each of us in our chosen calling. For who, more than we, has the God-given opportunity to help our fellow man? Who, more than we, is able to build a bridge to that lonely island that is everyman? I feel that God tapped us on the shoulder when he directed our steps toward life insurance as a career. To me, we are all His financial ministers, doing for man's worldly needs what the priest, the rabbi and the minister do for his spiritual needs. Both contribute to man's security, his peace of mind, his dignity.

Yes, ours is a divine calling—a service—a duty—a way of life—an awesome responsibility. We are not doctors. Yet, I daresay that we have kept more souls and bodies together than many a doctor. We are not statesmen. But we have made, and continue to make, our contribution to the economic security that is at the root of American democracy. We are not soldiers. Yet, we guard the economic outposts of the democratic American way of life. We are not writers. But how many happy endings have we written to the very human story of struggle and conquest over a too-stern destiny. To all those to whom we have brought the salvation of life insurance, we are all these things—and more. For, unlike the great in so many walks of life, we are not aloof from the people. Rather, we are an intimate part of the lives of those whom we serve, always on call, always accessible.

In a day and age when anxiety reflects man's defenselessness against fate, it is we who give him the confidence to cope with at least some of life's fundamental problems. Consider, for a moment, what our society would be like if there was no life insurance.

Every man would at once be beaten by the fact that death may come to him before he has an opportunity to discharge his greatest social obligation, the support of his family.

He is at once beaten by the treachery of time. For the passing years which give him the opportunity of caring for his family today, are whittling away at his power to take care of them tomorrow.

He is at once beaten by the fact that it is impossible for him to reconcile his need for an estate today with his inability to pay for it today.

He is at once beaten by the fact that you have taken away from him the only plan of accumulation which enables him to be an indulgent father at the same time that he is a provident father.

He is at once beaten by the fact that you have taken away from him the only plan of property accumulation, which scientifically amortizes the debt youth owes to old age.

He is at once beaten by the fact that you have taken away from him the only method whereby the value of human life which is destroyed at his death, is automatically converted into indestructible dollars; gentlemen—were it not for life insurance, ours would be a society in which most people would be beaten before they were started, laboring, as in bygone days only to earn the peace and promise of the hereafter. Life insurance helps translate that promise to the

heavenly kingdom on earth. Are we not indeed the financial ministers of God? There is nothing more powerful than the force of an idea whose time has come. This is that idea "There is only one real reason for buying life insurance—love." There is only one real method for selling life insurance—faith. A passionate—yes, religious—conviction that what we are doing is the most important and vital and necessary service that can be rendered to our fellow men. Only with this faith, can we be successful. It is this faith, and this creed that has always guided me to sell: first, as a life insurance agent, then, as a general agent, and even now, as chairman of the board of a life insurance company. I would make my prospect come to grips with fundamentals I was neither afraid nor embarrassed to be emotional; I know that typically the average prospect can't afford to die—and can't afford to live.

I come to him with answers to unspoken problems—protection against dying too soon—or living too long—or facing the living death of disability. In my days in active selling I would always ask my prospect this question—"If you were to lose your wife and your job on the same day which would be the more tragic loss for you?" The prospect does not answer—because there is no answer. I would quickly point out that this is precisely the situation that his wife will face on the day he dies. She will have lost a husband and a provider. Yes, I have never been fearful or uncomfortable about being emotional with my prospect. This is what he understands. I do not hesitate to bring to him the feel, the sight, the touch, yes, the very smell of premature death. Gentlemen, you and I know that what makes our business possible is that people die at all ages.

The Biblical "3 score and 10" is a hope, rather than an expectation. And a mortality table does nothing more than record statistical experience over thousands of people. Individually, the man of 40 has no more right to expect to live a day longer than the man of 70. The mortality rate for people in the United States is still one per person. So let us see what does really happen? "You died last Monday, they buried you yesterday; you were a good provider while you lived, but how will you stack up in death?" A man may be judged by his peers on the basis of his accomplishments in life but his family is forced to judge him by what he has done for them in death. This is a truth which every prospect must be made to face, for when the funeral is over and the guests have departed, and the flowers have withered and all that remains to the widow is the black of night and a bottomless well of loneliness, who and what will there be to bring her a glint of hope for the future? Only you will be there with the dollars to help her bear this tragic loss. It is only we who remain. It is only we who can come to her in the cold light of morning bearing the assurances of security for her and the children. It is only we who stand between a renewed and purposeful life and a scrap heap of dreams.

Yes, the mortality rate for people is still one per person.

Set in this context our calling emerges as the most humane, perhaps, even divine, in which a man can be engaged, we are indeed merchants of dreams. Because we make it possible for people to realize their life's dreams. For we bring dreams to a reality on the installment plan. How do I tell these things to a prospect? Easily, by not talking to him about premiums and cash values and dividends. These are the incidence of life insurance, but they are not the language of life insurance. To live and to die. To have and to have not. The brow of a wife, wrinkled with fear. The lined anxious faces of elderly parents. This is the language of life insurance; this is the language that any man can understand. Yet, how often do we reject this fundamental approach in favor of being too professional? We sell tax shelters and rate comparisons and 20-year net cost comparisons and dividends. Gentleman, may I ask this distinguished assemblage to tell me on what mortality table is the 50 megaton bomb? I ask you. What would it do to our projection of cash values and dividends and net costs?

Yes, the mortality rate is still one per person. We must speak the language of life insurance or else we must pass ourselves off as estate planners and financial planners and insurance consultants and, we, unconsciously compete with the lawyer and the accountant in selling a product for which there is no competition.

We tend to forget that we are selling the most basic product on earth—bringing security and dignity to human beings—in life and in death—enabling them to realize their most unattainable goals. How colorless, indeed, become the tricks of the trade when we size up our mission in life in these bold and dramatic terms. This is selling by faith—faith in the fact that ours is the only product ever created that can only help our prospect or his family; that ours is the only product ever created that is guaranteed to deliver what it promises; and promises a multiple of what is paid for it.

Widows ask, "How much insurance did my husband have?" Never in my career have I heard asked, "What kind did he have?" How fortunate we are to know that, whatever we sell a man, be it only overnight insurance, we can only do him good. But there is a second premise to my equation. There is only one reason for buying life insurance—love. Only a deep and constant love of his family moves a man to purchase financial security for them. It is a noble and selfless act.

You are needed to translate sentiment into action. And, the odd part of this business we're in is that whether the insurance is purchased or not purchased someone pays for it. Either with money—or with suffering.

Is not the insurance paid for by the man of 65 your prospect will be someday? Will it not be paid for with a loss of personal dignity? Is he still useful, and needed, even for an opinion, when he could not save enough money to exist on? Will it not be paid for with physical and mental denial—a pack of cigarettes less a week, a shabbier Christmas present, a poorer neighborhood to live in, a dingier cafeteria to have a lonely supper, yes, there are no raises in pay at retirement. Yes, one father can support eight children but how many times have you heard of eight children supporting one father? Is it not paid for by the prospect's wife who expects her husband to live to be an old man? Is not she paying for the premiums when in the autumn years of her life she has to work as a maid and helper in other people's homes? As a babysitter at a time when her mind cries out for protection from the playful shrieks of little children? Is not she paying for it when she shamefully accepts the worn handouts of clothing, the leftover gifts of food, the invitation to "join us all at Christmas dinner * * * and please, do not buy anything for the children * * * they have everything." Yes, everyone wants to go to Heaven, but no one wants to die.

Is not life insurance paid for by the young mother whose husband was taken away during the summer of life? Remember the question I asked in my opening remarks? "If you lost your wife and your job both on the same day how would you feel?" Well, she knows the answer. She lost her love and her economic existence at the same moment, yes she will pay. By working at a job she cannot risk losing, by worrying if Johnny ate his lunch or worse—is he playing in the playground or at the poolroom? She will pay, by smiling at the boss even though she is irritated at his attention. By worrying over unpaid bills and being a father-mother and breadwinner. Yes, the magazines show the picture of the brave young widow smiling confidently as she gazes toward the horizon, surrounded by her three children and white home with its white picket fence. That is a true picture if her husband bought insurance. If he did not, the horizon she is looking at is really whether the girls from the car pool are too early to take her to the plant, breakfast is not ready for the children, and the house is grey and mortgaged, and the picket fence is falling down.

If your prospect still doesn't want to buy insurance, ask him to write a letter to his wife and children to be left with his will. Ask him to explain to them why he didn't protect his family—for we wouldn't be able to. Yes, the man who doesn't buy enough life insurance for his wife and children doesn't die, he absconds.

Would you like to know who else pays for life insurance? Little Mary and Johnny do. In a future world, when the battle will be for mind power and not manpower, Johnny can't go to college, and he has to deliver papers * * * and that's cute, but sometimes it's raining. And sometimes the snow is wet and sometimes his fingers are numb from the cold. And sometimes he gets home late for supper—too late to study or help his mother. Yes, he, too, pays for insurance. And little Mary can be loved by her father. But only her father can buy her a blouse with a "W" on it, and only her father can determine whether the "W" is for Woolworth or Wellesley. Yes, everyone can cry, but how many people can cry for joy? Wouldn't you agree with me that the most beautiful, the most tender, the most endearing love letter a man can write to his beloved wife and children is a life insurance policy?

Wouldn't you agree with me that there is only one real reason for buying life insurance? Love. Yes, you have to love someone to buy life insurance. You have to have faith to sell life insurance. There is nothing more powerful than the force of an idea whose time has come. Love—faith—life insurance.

A fundamental equation to meet the fundamental needs of life. The Bible says we walk by faith and not by light. I have that faith. I believe, every time I see a business that has not closed down because a partner has died. I believe, every time I see a child go to college even though his father has passed away. I believe, every time I see a home where the mortgage has been paid, though the father is departed. I believe every time I see a widow cash a monthly life insurance check. I believe, when I see an old man who does not have to beg for a handout. Yes, then I know why I believe.

And how about believing and having faith in yourself? There are not triumphs without sacrifices, and the road to success is a torturous one. You have to put a fire in your heart. And work hard for success. We have to clean the cobwebs out of our brains—the fears, the frustrations, the anxieties, the insecurities. These are the chains which bind us to failure. We cannot look inside ourselves for success and outside ourselves for failure. We cannot let others set the standards for our behavior. Let us set impossible goals, and move ahead to achieve them. A man's reach should exceed his grasp, else what is heaven for?

I call upon you all to follow me to unlimited horizons. Join me in the arena. Ask no quarter and give none. There is no real competition for our product. Let us then get down to fundamentals in selling. Men buy when they are motivated. When we recognize that the heart knows reasons of

which the mind knows nothing; we can speak and sell accordingly. We must bring to this business of ours clarity of judgment, and a genuine sense of urgency; personal magnetism, simple professional skill, strong devotion of duty, and unsquelchable honesty. Let us go out and truly work—and tell our story and spread the Gospel.

As evangelists, as revivalists, as fundamentalists. For we are the financial ministers of God. It is we whom He has sent to deliver the money for bread and milk and mortgage payments and dignity and security and college educations. Because of us, the postman rings twice. Once, for the bills, and the second time, with the check from the insurance company that will pay the bills—even though the breadwinner is no longer there. The life insurance company sends a love letter every month. We helped compose this letter. We, who sold him life insurance. It is we who talked long and hard into the small hours of the morning, so that his family could receive the check that spells life and hope. Isn't it truly a glorious calling that answers today's problems with the promise of tomorrow? Are we not indeed merchants of dreams?

SAVINGS AND LOAN PROGRESS IN VENEZUELA

Mr. CLEVENGER. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the savings and loan industry which has been created within the last few years in Latin America is one of the bright spots in the Alliance for Progress. Only last week, it was reported that savings and loan associations organized in 11 Latin American and African countries have already attracted more than 318,000 savers and more than $85 million in savings. These funds have provided homes for more than 35,000 people.

One of the nations experiencing tremendous success with private thrift and home financing under the savings and loan concept is Venezuela. On July 11, the Daily Journal of Caracas, Venezuela's English-language newspaper, published an article in its Sunday magazine section on the savings and loan program in that nation. I am very proud to report that a fellow Floridian has played a major role in the development of the Venezuelan savings and loan system. He is Harry P. Greep, president of the Atlantic Federal Savings & Loan Association, of Fort Lauderdale, and the vice president of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, of Washington, D.C. Mr. Greep has spent much time in Venezuela working with the Agency for International Development on the savings and loan program.

According to the Caracas Daily Journal, the present homebuilding boom in Venezuela is due to the private home financing made available by the new savings and loan associations recently established in Latin America. In just a few short years, the introduction of savings and loan associations has had a major impact on Latin America. It is my hope that the Congress soon will take additional steps to accelerate this highly worthwhile program by enacting legislation to establish an International Home Loan Bank which would channel limited funds from savings associations in the United States in the form of "seed capital" investments in these newly organized, locally owned and managed savings institutions in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The above-mentioned article follows:

SAVINGS AND LOANS

(By Alvaro Arraiz)

Venezuela's construction industry is riding in the crest of a homebuilding boom.

Industry leaders say it surpasses even the gold dust days of the mid-1950's, when Venezuela leapt from its colonial structure to the futuristic skyline it has today. In the first 10 months of last year, investments in private construction totaled 530 million bolivars—the highest amount in any year except 1959—and experts were predicting an alltime record would be reached by December.

This year, the boom has, if anything, gained greater momentum, spilling from Caracas' narrow valleys to fill whole new areas with houses, buildings, and schools. A leading firm in the horizontal property field recently estimated 4,000 new apartments would go up by 1966.

THE ROLE OF SAVINGS AND LOAN

Builders say a major factor in producing this boom is the rapid growth of the savings and loans system. Thousands of Venezuelans who see in it an opportunity to build their own homes, have made the system the fastest growing financing plan in the country. According to builders, this is because it places a private home within the reach of many who could not afford it otherwise. And this, say the builders, is the reason homebuilding prospects are so encouraging.

While new in Venezuela, the savings and loans system's ancestry goes back to the industrial revolution days of England's 18th century. English immigrants brought the system to the United States in 1831, where it grew rapidly. By the turn of the century, the system's total assets in the United States reached $579 million. Thirty-one years later, this figure had grown to $6,400 million.

Today the savings and loan system in the United States consists of 6,000 private associations with capital assets above $100,000 million. Eloquent testimony of its importance to the American construction industry is the fact one of two homes built in the United States are financed through a savings and loans association.

ADOPTION IN 1961

Venezuela adopted the system in 1961 through two Presidential decrees. These decrees created the central savings and loans office and the savings and loans commission—the agencies which regulate the functioning of the system in Venezuela.

The savings and loans commission is in charge of establishing the norms of operation for savings and loans companies in Venezuela, as well as of approving creation of these companies. It is the highest authority on savings and loans in the country, and through its decisions the system is developed and expanded. It is made up of seven principal and seven alternate members, chosen by the President from leading figures in the construction industry and government.

The central savings and loans office is the technical and administrative body of the system. Its job is to carry out the decisions taken by the commission, to create new savings and loans companies, and to intervene in them whenever necessary. The central office also handles the legal work for the system.

AID LOAN

Savings and loans began in Venezuela with a Bs. 45 million fund provided by the Agency for International Development (AID) and Bs. 33 millions loaned by the Venezuelan Government. This capital was later expanded by another government loan of Bs. 35 millions to a total of Bs. 113 millions. In October 1962, the system consisted of only a few companies with total savings of Bs. 1.64 million, and that year loans approved by the system amounted to only Bs. 134,000.

Today, 21 savings and loans companies with nearly Bs. 80 millions operate in the country. As of March this year loans approved by these companies totaled Bs. 167 millions, and experts say real growth is just beginning.

GOVERNMENT BILL

In view of this extraordinary growth, the Government has started work on a law to "institutionalize" the savings and loans system. The bill—now being studied in Congress—aims to replace the central office and commission and the norms of operations with a solid legal structure.

The bill was introduced by Miraflores' planning and coordinating office (Cordiplan) with the plan of making a national autonomous institute of the savings and loans system. Its principle objective is to create national savings and loan banks to handle the work presently being done by the two government agencies.

But the bill has met with criticism from business circles, which claims nationalizing the system would greatly hinder its development. Constructions industry leaders argue that national institutes are inefficient and inoperative. They point to the success savings and loans have had under private control and say it would never have been possible if the system were in government hands.

The construction chamber and the Venezuelan Federation of Savings & Loans Associations have both announced their stand publicly on several occasions.

FEDECAMARAS STAND

Recently the Chambers Federation (Fedecamaras), Venezuela's most important business organization added its weight to this stand.

Fedecamaras President Concepcion Quijada said making the savings and loans system a national institute would deter savings since "people have built up confidence in private savings and loans bank, but only if this bank was a private corporation."

Quijada said capital for the bank should be mixed private-government, and not 100 percent government as planned in the bill. He also said the bank's board of directors should have at least two representatives of private savings and loans associations, and one representative of the construction industry.

According to the Government bill, all seven members of the board of directors will be appointed by the President of the Republic and of these, none may be a director of a savings and loans association.

COPEI PROPOSAL

While debate of these differences was still going on, a second savings and loans bill was introduced by the Social Christian Party (Copei).

The Copei bill follows closely the stand adopted by business leaders, inasmuch as it plans the savings and loans bank as a private corporation, but allows some representation of private savings and loans associations, and accord that capital for the bank will be 25 percent private.

Until now, neither Fedecamaras nor the construction chamber has announced that they will support Copei's bill. While the

bill meets nearly all the requirements these bodies have asked for, Copei's congressional strength gives little hope that the bill might be passed over the three Amplia base parties, who support the Cordiplan bill.

Some observers have said private enterprise would rather seek a compromise with the Amplia base parties than support a bill introduced by the opposition.

What Fedecamaras and private business will decide is not easy to predict. But it is clear that this decision will vitally affect the future development of the savings and loans system and the construction industry, and through them, the nation's economy.

For this reason, the business world's attention is focused on the deliberations and negotiations Fedecamaras is holding on this matter, and also on the possible willingness of the Government to compromise with private enterprise in a joint effort to economically develop Venezuela.

A BILL TO PROVIDE INSURANCE PROTECTION FOR ACTIVE DUTY SERVICEMEN

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the Insurance Subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been working for several weeks on legislation which would provide insurance coverage for members of the Armed Forces who are on active duty.

Survivors of members of the Armed Forces who lose their lives on active duty are protected by the dependency and indemnity compensation program for service-connected death. This program became effective in 1957 and is designed to give continuing protection to the wife, children, and dependent parents of servicemen who lose their lives from service-connected causes.

The dependency and indemnity compensation program does not extend to single men whose parents are nondependent. It is the purpose of the bill which I am introducing to make available insurance coverage to single men with nondependent parents. This coverage would also be available to servicemen with wives, children, and dependent parents in addition to the protection which they now receive under the dependency and indemnity compensation program.

The bill which I am introducing is the result of conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and Defense Department, Veterans' Administration insurance experts and insurance experts from the private companies. This bill is patterned closely after the group insurance program now available to Federal employees. It would provide for a program of group life insurance which would be administered by the Veterans' Administration and underwritten by private insurance companies. The plan would be voluntary; however, members of the Armed Forces would be required to sign a statement in writing removing themselves from the program if they do not desire to participate. Members of the Armed Forces being separated would be given a period of 31 days after separation during which insurance could be converted and continued with one of the participating companies. The premiums would be established by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs based on actuarial estimates. However, tentative estimates supplied the Insurance Subcommitte indicate that this insurance would be available at a rate of about 25 to 35 cents per thousand per month.

The U.S. Government would bear the extrahazardous cost of war deaths under this program just as it did in the U.S. Government life insurance and national service life insurance programs.

The Insurance Subcommittee has scheduled hearings on this legislation for September 8, 1965, with the hope that a satisfactory program can be developed and passed before the end of this session.

CONGRESSMAN STRATTON ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF 1965 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE IN 35TH DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues the results of my 1965 congressional questionnaire. I should point out that this upstate New York district has a party enrollment which favors the Republican Party by a margin of nearly 2½ to 1 although President Johnson carried the district last year by more than 50,000 votes. It will be apparent from the figures below, the people I have the honor to represent, on the basis of their replies to this questionnaire, still strongly support the President, his handling of our foreign policy and in general his domestic legislative program. I believe these results will be of great interest to Members of the House. I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that basically this is the same congressional district which was represented prior to 1962 for a period of 40 years by our distinguished former colleague from Auburn, Hon. John Taber.

The question and answer results follow:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Do you favor:

1. Our actions and policies in Vietnam and Dominican Republic? Yes, 61 percent; no, 25 percent; undecided, 14 percent.

2. The two-price or class I base for dairy farmers, to allow them to cooperate voluntarily to bring milk supply into line with demand? Yes, 44 percent; no, 11 percent; undecided, 45 percent.

3. Extension of the Area Redevelopment Administration, to help communities with high unemployment to attract new business? Yes, 65 percent; no, 20 percent; undecided, 15 percent.

4. Continuation of the present wheat certificate plan for wheat farmers? Yes, 14 percent; no, 39 percent; undecided, 47 percent.

5. Federal help to local communities in constructing needed sewer lines or water systems? Yes, 67 percent; no, 24 percent; undecided, 9 percent.

6. President Johnson's proposal to combat crime by putting limitations on the importation and mail order shipment of firearms? Yes, 65 percent; no, 30 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

7. Adoption of a constitutional amendment allowing States with a two-house legislature to apportion one house on the basis of factors other than population, as is done with the U.S. Senate? Yes, 56 percent; no, 19 percent; undecided, 25 percent.

8. Spending some $30 million to construct two flood control dams at Davenport Center in Delaware County and on the Genegantslet Creek in Chenango County without waiting for the results of a comprehensive survey of up-to-date flood needs in the Susquehanna River basin? Yes, 11 percent; no, 75 percent; undecided, 14 percent.

9. The administration's voting rights bill, to enforce the 15th amendment in places like Selma, Ala., and elsewhere? Yes, 64 percent; no, 19 percent; undecided, 17 percent.

10. Federal funds for college scholarships for needy and deserving students? Yes, 72 percent; no, 21 percent; undecided, 7 percent.

11. Federal help in developing and distributing scarce water supplies to combat New York State's continuing drought? Yes, 67 percent; no, 22 percent; undecided 11 percent.

12. Amending our present immigration laws to base immigration quotas on education, skill, and family relationship rather than national origins? Yes, 67 percent; no, 17 percent; undecided, 16 percent.

13. Generally speaking, do you approve of President Johnson's handling of his job since taking office? Yes, 64 percent; no, 18 percent; undecided, 18 percent.

FOREIGN SHIPPERS REFUSE SAIGON-BOUND U.S. GOODS

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Greek crew of the freighter *Stamatios S. Embiricos* has refused a $10,000 bonus in addition to wages to sail 10,000 tons of U.S. Army supplies from Long Beach, Calif. to South Vietnam.

The Army cargo was previously offered to a Mexican-flag ship, which also refused to transport the urgently needed war materiel.

The cargo is now scheduled to be shipped sometime around September 8 aboard the American-flag freighter *Bay State*.

Why should the Greek crew balk at doing this job for the United States? Greek-flag ships have received a total of $360,000 from the United States for hauling U.S. cargoes to South Vietnam since the beginning of January of this year.

Furthermore, in case there is any doubt as to the willingness of Greek ships to call in the Vietnam area, 15

Greek vessels have hauled goods into North Vietnam since the beginning of this year.

Mr. Speaker, this incident illustrates the vital need for a strong American merchant shipping industry. The U.S. Government must not depend on the whims and temperament of foreign shipping interests. We need our own ships to handle defense needs in time of national emergency.

If the American shipping industry declines any more, and it now handles less than 10 percent of the total traffic of goods flowing through U.S. ports, this Nation may one day find itself landlocked when it needs to sealift goods to a war zone.

I urge that the U.S. Government be first to "ship American."

OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH CANADA

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the traditional tranquillity of our relationships with Canada has been seriously disturbed by Canadian concern over her heavy deficit with the United States in automotive trade. Some methods employed by Canada to reduce her automotive trade imbalance have threatened to trigger a retaliatory sequence that could have grown into a mutually disastrous trade war between the world's greatest commercial partners.

Thanks to imaginative leadership on both sides of the border, such folly has not been permitted to occur. Instead, calm and reasonable negotiations have resulted in the Automotive Products Trade Agreement we are considering here.

I support, without reservation, the bill before us which would implement the agreement and provide for effective assistance to those firms and workers who may find it necessary to make adjustments.

While some of the initial adjustments may be difficult, the longer range consequences of this trade agreement are stronger automotive industries, greater automotive employment, and more value for car customers in both countries.

Considering the tremendous impact the automotive industry has on the economy of our Nation—about one-sixth of the U.S. gross national product is derived from spending on automotive transportation—the direct benefits of expanding the total North American automotive market are in themselves of very major importance.

But what may prove to be the most important results of all are the further implications of this automotive trade agreement with Canada. The duty removals it provides for, and the improved spirit of cooperation it reflects, can be the pattern for an expanding trade between the two countries reaching far beyond the automotive products field.

While the agreement falls short of full free trade in automotive products, it is a significant start. The remaining restrictions imposed by Canada will become less important as the Canadian automotive industry makes the efficiency gains which the agreement would permit. In time, as the Canadian production costs approached U.S. levels, these remaining restrictions would serve no further purpose, and the North American automotive market could realize its full potential growth in employment, efficiency, and productivity.

Mr. Speaker, the reduction of artificial trade barriers between Canada and the United States is an essential step in promoting the economic development of both countries and in strengthening the bonds of friendship and understanding between them. The Automotive Products Trade Agreement represents a landmark on the road toward the freer trade that economic logic demands between the two nations whose peoples and cultures have so much in common.

Canada has already demonstrated her good faith in this imaginative and historic agreement. It would be unthinkable for us, in our turn, to pass up the great opportunity that has been opened. I urge that we implement the agreement by passage of H.R. 9042.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RONCALIO (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of Colorado), for September 2 through September 13, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, for September 2, 1965, through September 13, 1965, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. MORTON), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. MORTON), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. MORTON), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, September 2, 1965; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS, for 20 minutes, on September 7.

Mr. RYAN (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TODD (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WELTNER (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER), for 60 minutes, on September 2; 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. KING of Utah to include extraneous matter in connection with his remarks in Committee of the Whole on H.R. 3141.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona to extend his remarks during general debate on H.R. 3141 and to include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ELLSWORTH.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. ERLENBORN.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama in three instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM to include extraneous matter in his remarks in Committee today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLEVENGER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. IRWIN.

Mr. MCGRATH.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. ROYBAL in two instances.

Mr. MCVICKER.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

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. 950. An act to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2232. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf," approved September 2, 1958, as amended, in order to further provide for a loan service of educational media for the deaf, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4905. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the Fed-

eral Government to the Board of Public Instruction, Oklaloosa County, Fla.;

H.R. 6927. An act to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 632. Joint resolution to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into an agreement with the University of Texas for the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Archival Depository, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4905. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the Federal Government to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla.; and

H.R. 6927. An act to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 2, 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:

1534. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of quartz crystals from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1535. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of lump steatite talc from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1536. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of graphite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1537. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United State in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1538. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for acceptance by the United States of America of two instruments for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1539. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements of the Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1964; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1540. A letter from the Acting Comproller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of procedures and practices for terminating procurement of excess missile spare parts, U.S. Army Missile Command, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1541. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of management of automatic data processing facilities in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1542. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to control the use of the design of the great seal of the United States and of the seal of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 561 for the consideration of S. 2294, an act to amend section 2 of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 945). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 562. Resolution for consideration of S. 1903, an act to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–736); without amendment (Rept. No. 946). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 563. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6277, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 947). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10238. A bill to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 948). 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. 1084. An act for the relief of Shu Hsien Chang; without amendment (Rept. No. 919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1919. An act for the relief of Laura MacArthur Goditiabois-Deacon; without amendment (Rept. No. 920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1931. A bill for the relief of Alexander Porzse; without amendment (Rept. No. 921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2926. A bill for the relief of Efstahia Giannos; with amendment (Rept. No. 922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3062. A bill for the relief of Son Chung Ja; without amendment (Rept. No. 923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3079. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleni Bacola Ciacco, doctor of medicine; without amendment (Rept. No. 924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3765. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosa Basile DeSantis; without amendment (Rept. No. 925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4211. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Finocchiaro; without amendment (Rept. No. 926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4464. A bill for the relief of Michael Hadjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas and Paniote Hadjichristofas; without amendment (Rept. No. 927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4926. A bill for the relief of Enzo (Enzio) Perotti; without amendment (Rept. No. 928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4928. A bill for the relief of Chizuyo Hoshizaki; without amendment (Rept. No. 929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5006. A bill for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan; without amendment (Rept. No. 930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5457. A bill for the relief of Maria del Rosario de Fatima Lopez Hayes; with amendment (Rept. No. 931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5554. A bill for the relief of Mary Francis Crabbs (Koh, Mi Sook); with amendment (Rept. No. 932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5904. A bill for the relief of Nam Ie Kim; without amendment (Rept. No. 933). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6819. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orhan Metin Ozmat; with amendment (Rept. No. 934). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10256. A bill for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife, Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter, Penelope Jean Blyth; without amendment (Rept. No. 935). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 137. An act for the relief of Rosauro L. Lindogan; with amendment (Rept. No. 936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1311. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. McDevitt; with amendment (Rept. No. 937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4203. A bill for the relief of Alton G. Edwards; with amendment (Rept. No. 938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5204. A bill for the relief of Joseph K. Bellek; without amendment (Rept. No. 939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8085. A bill for the relief of Harvey E. Ward; with amendment (Rept. No. 940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McCLORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8829. A bill for the relief of S. Sgt. Robert E. Martin, U.S. Air Force (retired); without amendment (Rept. No. 941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10403. A bill for the relief of Edward F. Murzyn and Edward J. O'Brien; without amendment (Rept. No. 942). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10404. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. James E. Bailey, Jr., U.S. Air Force (retired); without amendment (Rept. No. 943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10405. A bill for the relief of Col. Donald J. M. Blakeslee and Lt. Col. Robert E. Wayne, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 944). 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. CRAMER:

H.R. 10799. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide that at least 75 percent of cargoes procured, furnished, or financed by the United States shall be transported in U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 10800. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, Boys Town, Nebr.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 10801. A bill to establish the national water resources trust fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 10802. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide equality of treatment with respect to widows and widowers of certain employees who die in service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 10803. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Great South Bay; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 10804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include the expenses incurred by employers in providing training and retraining programs for their employees and prospective employees as expenses which qualify for the investment credit under section 38; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 10805. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 10806. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 10807. A bill to provide that any alien otherwise qualified who has resided in the United States for a continuous period of 5 years (regardless of the nature of such residence) shall be eligible for health insurance benefits for the aged under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10808. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the status of certain Cuban refugees to that of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10809. 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. CAHILL:

H.R. 10810. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit contracting for the construction of vessels for the U.S. Navy at places outside of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 10811. A bill creating the Dubuque Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Dubuque, Iowa, Grant County, Wis., and Jo Daviess County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 10812. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in employment against individuals on account of their age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10813. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer or a labor organization to discriminate unjustifiably on account of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10814. A bill to facilitate the obtaining of employment by older workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10815. A bill to establish a Bureau of Older Workers in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 10817. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the expeditious delivery in the mails by the Post Office Department of monthly benefit payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 10818. A bill to protect the morale and efficiency of members of the Armed Forces by prohibiting the making of certain threatening and abusive communications to members of such forces or their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10819. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 10820. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 10821. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish a program of group life insurance which shall be provided by private insurance companies for members of the uniformed services who are on active duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 10822. A bill to improve and clarify certain laws of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 10823. A bill relating to credit life insurance and credit health and accident insurance with respect to student loans; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 10824. A bill to establish a National Commission on Older Workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 10825. 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. WHALLEY:

H.R. 10826. A bill to provide that the battleship *Missouri* shall be maintained as a naval museum at Annapolis, Md., or near Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 10827. A bill to provide for identification by the Comptroller General of individuals who fail to comply with certain prescribed procedures, to require approval of certain accounting systems by the Comptroller General, to require reporting by the Bureau of the Budget of action on recommendations made by the Comptroller General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 10828. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments out of tax revenues; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10829. A bill to authorize liens of value of secured equipment used solely for navigation or fishing on a vessel of the United States and to permit the recording of such liens; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 10830. A bill to provide for planning, coordination, and construction of facilities to assure an adequate supply of pure fresh water for the Northeastern United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10831. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide that hearings on applications for construction permits for certain facilities must be held at or near the places where such facilities are to be located; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.J. Res. 649. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 650. Joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.J. Res. 651. Joint resolution to designate April 3 of each year as Pony Express Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 468. Concurrent resolution to recognize the World Law Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H. Con. Res. 469. Concurrent resolution to recognize the World Law Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 470. Concurrent resolution to recognize the World Law Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. Res. 559. Resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Junior Chamber International; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. Res. 560. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives declaring the policy of the United States relative to the intervention of the international communistic movement in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

365. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Memorial of the Nebraska State Legislature urging the opposition to the proposed diversion of Federal-aid secondary road funds for use on scenic highways while great needs continue to exist on the Federal-aid secondary road system; to the Committee on Public Works.

366. Also, memorial of the Nebraska State Legislature urging opposition to the adoption of the proposed policy of denying Federal-aid funds to those States which do not provide effective regulation of signs and displays along the Interstate Highway System and the primary highway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 10832. A bill for the relief of Gloria Alesna Relampagos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 10833. A bill for the relief of Anica Nastasic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 10834. A bill to provide for the free entry of a pipe organ and parts imported for the use of the Episcopal Church of the Advent of Christ the King, San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 10835. A bill for the relief of Francesco Corigliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 10836. A bill for the relief of Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10837. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 10838. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Post Office Department at Eau Gallie, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 10839. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Norman Dean Schanche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 10840. A bill for the relief of Nicolae and Ana Spuza and their children, Diana, Maria and Decebal Spuza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 10841. A bill for the relief of Ferrum Trading Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10842. A bill for the relief of Sotirios Catarachias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10843. A bill for the relief of Estepan Evladian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10844. A bill for the relief of Elma Eiola Tobitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 10845. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Norene Buckley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 10846. A bill for the relief of Katherine Nabokoff, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 10847. A bill for the relief of First National Bank & Trust Co. of Lexington and Security Trust Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10848. A bill for the relief of Continental-Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago and City National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10849. A bill for the relief of the Merchantile Trust Co. National Association and the Security Trust Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10850. A bill for the relief of the Third National Bank in Nashville and the Nashville Bank & Trust Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10851. A bill for the relief of Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Hanover Bank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10852. A bill for the relief of Crocker-Anglo National Bank, Citizens National Bank, and Transamerica Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in changing and troubled days we pray for conceptions big enough, and spirits strong enough, to match the awesome time in which we live and serve.

We face the tasks here with minds startled by the swift march of world-shaking events. Hidden fires are flaming forth, consuming the old habitations of men. We hear angry voices that challenge all that men have counted fixed and final and sure. Men so long in chains are chanting a new song of expected freedom.

For social systems that have sentenced the masses to grinding poverty, for arrogant overlords of government and industry who have held human life more cheap than merchandise, the ax is at the root of the rotted tree, the judge is at the barred gate, as the shining sword of universal freedom is lifted against all that denies and enslaves.

As Thy emancipating truth goes marching on, may our souls be swift to answer Thee, and jubilant our feet.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 31, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 4905. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the Federal Government to the Board of Public Instruction, Okaloosa County, Fla; and

H.R. 6927. An act to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9042) to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, excluding treaties and the nominations placed on the Secretary's desk, and continuing through the nominations in the Department of State, including the nomination of Phillips Talbot, of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Lawrence Francis O'Brien, of Massachusetts, to be Postmaster General.