The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Joseph Butler, [redacted].
Brig. Gen. John George Cassidy, [redacted].
Brig. Gen. Ian MacLeod Davidson, [redacted].
Brig. Gen. Robert Paul Schultz, [redacted].
Brig. Gen. Robert Cleland Tyler, [redacted].

To be brigadier generals

Col. Arnold Tracy Barber, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. William Howard Booth, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. William Wirt Brock, Jr., [redacted], Infantry.
Col. Edward Joseph Czerniuk, [redacted], Armor.
Col. William Wiant Davis, [redacted], Medical Corps.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Kenneth Louis Dedekind, [redacted], Dental Corps.
Col. Joe Newton Frazar, Jr., [redacted], Armor.
Col. Herbert Robert Hackbarth, [redacted], Artillery.
Col. Martin Richard Krausz, [redacted], Medical Corps.
Col. John Thomas Pegg, [redacted], Corps of Engineers.
Col. Mackenzie Edgerton Porter, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. Andrew Wier Rogers, Jr., [redacted], Artillery.
Col. Edward Hill Thomas, [redacted], Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the U.S. officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Ivan Hardesty, [redacted].
Brig. Gen. Noble L. Schlatter, [redacted].

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Archibald Alexander Sproul, [redacted].
Brig. Gen. Paul Robert Teilh, [redacted].

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. William Charles Doyle, [redacted], Adjutant General's Corps.
Col. Daniel Kramer Edwards, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. Robert Lew Gamrath, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. Robert Francis Hassard, [redacted], Quartermaster Corps.
Col. John Vaughan Kean, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. Samuel Odell Robertson, [redacted], Signal Corps.
Col. Maurice Dana Tawes, [redacted], Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

Col. Marvin John Evans, [redacted], Infantry.
Col. Edward Blaize Thorpe, [redacted], Armor.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 20, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of American to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

William M. Rountree, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

William H. Weathersby, of California, a Foreign Service Reserve officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Sudan.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, of Colorado, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for the remainder of the term expiring May 11, 1966, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

Dr. Luther H. Foster, of Alabama, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for the term expiring May 11, 1966, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

Dr. Rufus C. Harris, of Georgia, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for the term expiring May 11, 1966, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

Arnold M. Picker, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for the term expiring May 11, 1966, and until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: John 3: 16: *For God so loved the world that he gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*

O Thou who art unchanging in Thy love and goodness, we beseech Thee for Thy companionship and counsel as we walk the ways of life which frequently seem so very dark.

May Thy spirit of peace and power descend upon our troubled souls and hearts, lifting us out of those fears which paralyze our energies into a faith which inspires us with confidence and joy.

Create within us and the Speaker and the Members of Congress those finer feelings and thoughts which are the progenitors of achievement in establishing a more stable and steadfast social order.

Give us the calm assurance that our whole universe is under the control of Thy omnipotent power and that our nobler instincts and capacities shall someday be victorious.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1317. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer which was imported during May 1963 for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 1386. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eduvigis Aran Hefferman;

H.R. 1781. An act to amend section 113(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide that Federal District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina shall be held at Clinton;

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Earnest J. Carlin;

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago;

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert;

H.R. 2762. An act for the relief of Manlio Massimiliani;

H.R. 2906. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lily Ning Sheehan;

H.R. 3079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleni Bacola Ciacco, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 3126. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Washington;

H.R. 3905. An act for the relief of Bibi Daljeet Kaur;

H.R. 4832. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Saint Louis University;

H.R. 5006. An act for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan;

H.R. 6312. An act for the relief of Mario Menna;

H.R. 6655. An act for the relief of Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar;

H.R. 6666. An act to provide for the free entry of a 90-centimeter split-pole magnetic spectrograph system with orange-peel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh;

H.R. 6720. An act for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong;

H.R. 6906. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one split pole spectrograph for the use of the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.;

H.R. 7282. An act for the relief of Richard D. Walsh;

H.R. 7357. An act for the relief Dr. Felipe V. Lavapies;

H.R. 7453. An act for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth and Frederick Henry Todd;

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.;

H.R. 8135. An act for the relief of Jennifer Rebecca Siegel;

H.R. 8232. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph for the use of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.;

H.R. 8272. An act to provide for the free entry of an isotope separator for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.;

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota;

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig counter-current distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.;

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H.R. 10256. An act for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife, Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter, Penelope Jean Blyth; and

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week.

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

H.R. 2571. An act for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.; and

H.R. 9903. An act to provide for the free entry of one multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of Yale University.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes", approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, to provide that such Commission shall not terminate prior to December 31, 1966, and to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of such joint resolution.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9047) entitled "An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. TOWER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to bill (H.R. 10305) entitled "An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. TOWER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that Mr. PROUTY be appointed a conferee on the bill (S. 2118) entitled "An act to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920" in place of Mr. DOMINICK, excused.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 66–7.

ADJUSTMENTS IN ANNUITIES UNDER THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4170) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 18, strike out all after "annuitant" down to and including "on" in line 19 and insert "prior to".

Page 3, line 21, strike out "during such period" and insert "prior to such date".

Page 3, lines 22 and 23, strike out "on October 16, 1960." and insert "at the time of such retirement."

Page 4, line 1, strike out all after "month." down to and including "date." in line 9.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give us a brief explanation of the meaning of these amendments? Does this have to do with the bill providing for select-out procedure in the State Department and related agencies?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is a bill which gave the Foreign Service officers who retired before October 16, 1960, when the law was changed, and who were married at that time, but made no provision for survivors' annuity, the opportunity to elect such annuity of $2,400 provided, first, they paid back for that annuity at the rate of $300 per year.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. ADAIR. 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. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] in urging the House to adopt H.R. 4170, a bill to provide for adjustments in the annuities of certain retired Foreign Service officers. Like the gentleman from Ohio, I, too, urge adoption with some reluctance. But given the attitude of the other body, it seems desirable that we salvage what we can of this bill.

One of the fundamental purposes of the bill as it passed the House last year and again this year was to provide a measure of equity for the older retired Foreign Service officers and their widows. Throughout the consideration of this measure the subcommittee was most anxious to relieve the Congress of private bills for the relief of distressed widows. Since I have served on the subcommittee during the past decade, we have had to consider many such bills. Our thought was to enact a comprehensive measure that would eliminate such bills. As a result of the Senate amendments, I anticipate that we may expect more private bills.

The Senate amendments affect those Foreign Service officers who retired before October 16, 1960, and who were married at the time but who, upon retirement, made no provision for a survivor annuity. The House bill would have permitted such individuals to elect a survivor annuity of $2,400 for which they would pay $300 a year from October 16, 1960 to the effective date of the measure and would also pay $300 a year as the current cost of such an annuity.

The effect of the Senate amendment is to require these retired officers who now make such an election to start their repayments from the date of their retirement which in some cases goes back 20 years and to repay at the old rate of $1,200 a year. Thus some individuals would have to pay back about $24,000 in order to provide a survivor annuity of $2,400. This approach clearly defeats the purpose that our subcommittee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and this House has in mind.

I would expect that any retired Foreign Service officer who qualified for an election under the amended Senate language would proceed cautiously before making an election. He should be aware that his estate will be liable for any unpaid balances owed the Government. On the other hand, I would hope the Government would use restraint in seeking to impose a large liability on relatively small estates.

I am glad the gentleman from Ohio referred to the mechanics of repayment. The bill as it passed both Houses authorized the Secretary to make arrangements with annuitants who make an election to pay the cost of a survivor annuity in monthly installments. The House version made clear that this was to be in the form of a deduction from the annuitant's monthly check. The effect of the Senate amendment is to leave this matter unsettled. To require the Secretary to send out a monthly check and then have the annuitant send in a monthly check adds heavy administrative costs and burdens. I certainly should do nothing to increase paperwork in Government. I hope that nothing would be done to increase paperwork in Government.

There are many other commendable provisions in this bill that were not touched by the Senate amendments. On balance I think we have a measure that will help a number of the older retired Foreign Service officers and their widows. Therefore, I am urging my colleagues to support H.R. 4170 as amended by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, as H.R. 4170 passed the House, it gave to those Foreign Service officers who retired before October 16, 1960, and who were married

at that time but made no provision for a survivor annuity, the opportunity to elect such an annuity of $2,400 provided, first, they paid back for that annuity at the rate of $300 per year dating from October 1960, and second, paid the current cost of such annuity which is $300 per year. Further if the annuitant died before completing his repayments, the widow and the estate were relieved of further payments. The House bill also made clear that the Secretary of State could deduct monthly repayments made by the annuitant from the annuity paid him, thus simplifying the bookkeeping of the Department.

The Senate struck all this out. The effect of the Senate amendments is to permit a Foreign Service officer who retired before October 16, 1960, and who had made no provision for a survivor annuity to make such an election for $2,400 annuity provided he paid $1,200 per year for the period since his retirement plus $300 per year for the current survivor annuity. Many of these officers retired 15 or 20 years ago at low annuities which is one of the reasons they were unable at the time of retirement to provide for their widows. Now they are required under the Senate amendment to pay back sums of $18,000 to $24,000 or more in order to provide $2,400 a year for their widows. They may, of course, pay in small monthly installments. But should they die before completing the repayments, their estate is held liable for the unpaid balance. The widow would receive a $2,400 annuity until she died.

I cannot imagine the Government proceeding against a small estate of an elderly couple whose life savings may amount only to a few thousand dollars. Certainly in these days of solicitude for our elderly citizens there must be greater sources of untapped revenue lying around. If the annuitant is wise, he will arrange his affairs so that the Government will not be able to establish any claim upon his death. There are provisions of law for compromise of claims in favor of the United States upon the recommendation of those having charge of the claims—31 U.S.C. 194. It is the intention of those who have handled the bill in the House that on the death of an annuitant, the surviving widow shall receive her appropriate monthly survivorship annuity payments and the Secretary of State will not have authority to make deductions from such payments to collect any balance that may have been due on the death of the annuitant.

There may be some confusion about the mechanics of how any repayments will be handled on the monthly installment plan provided for in the House bill. As a result of Senate amendment No. 4, this matter is left in the air. It is the understanding of the members who handled this bill in the House that the Secretary of State will now not have the authority to deduct the monthly repayments of any annuitant from his monthly retirement check.

The House is confronted with one of two choices. Either it accepts the Senate amendments which will attempt to extract every penny from many low-income annuitants or it rejects the bill in its entirety which contains some advantages for other older retired Foreign Service officers and their widows. Informal conversations lead me to believe that a conference would be a waste of time in view of the adamant attitude of the other body. I, therefore, reluctantly recommend to the House that it adopt the bill with the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 612) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 612

Resolved, That PHILLIP BURTON, of California, be and he is hereby elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Education and Labor.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ACT OF 1937

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2092) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to provide for paid advertising, with Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, of the House engrossed amendments, after "limes," insert "olives, pecans,".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House engrossed amendments was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 373]

Andrews, George W.	Bell	Clausen, Don H.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Berry	Culver
Aspinall	Blatnik	Davis, Wis.
Baring	Bolling	Diggs
	Callaway	Dingell
	Casey	Dorn
	Edwards, Ala.	Flynt
	Ford, William D.	Frelinghuysen
	Fuqua	Hagan, Ga.
	Hardy	Hosmer
	Leggett	Lennon
	Lindsay	Love
	Mackay	Martin, Mass.
	Martin, Nebr.	Matthews
	May	Moeller
	Mosher	O'Konski
	O'Neal, Ga.	Poage
	Pool	Reifel
	Rivers, Alaska	Rivers, S.C.
	Robison	Roudebush
	Schisler	Senner
	Sisk	Sullivan
	Talcott	Tenzer
	Thomas	Thompson, N.J.
	Thompson, Tex.	Toll
	Tunney	Walker, N. Mex.
	Watkins	Willis
	Wilson, Bob	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9567) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities, and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1178)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9567) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Higher Education Act of 1965'.

"TITLE I—COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 101. For the purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use by enabling the Commissioner to make grants under this title to strengthen community service programs of colleges and universities, there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the succeeding fiscal year. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to enable the Commissioner to make such grants, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Definition of community service program

"SEC. 102. For purposes of this title, the term 'community service program' means an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program and a university

extension or continuing education offering, which is designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, where the institution offering such program, activity, or service determines—

"(1) that the proposed program, activity, or service is not otherwise available, and

"(2) that the conduct of the program or performance of the activity or service is consistent with the institution's over-all educational program and is of such a nature as is appropriate to the effective utilization of the institution's special resources and the competencies of its faculty.

Where course offerings are involved, such courses must be university extension or continuing education courses and must be—

"(A) fully acceptable toward an academic degree, or

"(B) of college level as determined by the institution offering such courses.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 103. (a) Of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $25,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands and $100,000 to each of the other States, and he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of all States.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"(c) In accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of its allotment under this title be added to the allotment of another State under this title for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share of the cost of providing community service programs under this title. If it is found by the Commissioner that the programs with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of such State's allotment, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, such portion of such State's allotment shall be added to the allotment of the other State under this title to be used for the purpose referred to above.

"(d) The population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce.

"Uses of allotted funds

"SEC. 104. A State's allotment under section 103 may be used, in accordance with its State plan approved under section 105 (b), to provide new, expanded, or improved community service programs.

"State plans

"SEC. 105. (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment of Federal funds under this title shall designate or create a State agency or institution which has special qualifications with respect to solving community problems and which is broadly representative of institutions of higher education in the State which are competent to offer community service programs, and shall submit to the Commissioner through the agency or institution so designated a State plan. If a State desires to designate for the purposes of this section an existing State agency or institution which does not meet these requirements, if may do so if the agency or institution takes such action as may be necessary to acquire such qualifications and assure participation of such institutions, or if it designates or creates a State advisory council which meets the requirements not met by the designated agency or institution to consult with the designated agency or institution in the preparation of the State plan. A State plan submitted under this title shall be in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary and shall—

"(1) provide that the agency or institution so designed or created shall be the sole agency for administration of the plan or for supervision of the administration of the plan; and provide that such agency or institution shall consult with any State advisory council required to be created by this section with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of such plan;

"(2) set forth a comprehensive, coordinated, and statewide system of community service programs under which funds paid to the State (including funds paid to an institution pursuant to section 106(c)) under its allotments under section 103 will be expended solely for community service programs which have been approved by the agency or institution administering the plan;

"(3) set forth the policies and procedures to be followed in allocating Federal funds to institutions of higher education in the State, which policies and procedures shall insure that due consideration will be given—

"(A) to the relative capacity and willingness of particular institutions of higher education (whether public or private) to provide effective community service programs;

"(B) to the availability of and need for community service programs among the population within the State; and

"(C) to the results of periodic evaluations of the programs carried out under this title in the light of information regarding current and anticipated community problems in the State;

"(4) set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as not to supplant State or local funds, or funds of institutions of higher education, but to supplement and, to the extent practicable, to increase the amounts of such funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for community service programs;

"(5) set forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State or by the Commissioner to institutions of higher education) under this title; and

"(6) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

"Payments

"SEC. 106. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), payment under this title shall be made to those State agencies and institutions which administer plans approved under section 105(b). Payments under this title from a State's allotment with respect to the cost of developing and carrying out its State plan shall equal 75 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 75 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and 50 per centum of such costs for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, except that no payments for any fiscal year shall be made to any State with respect to expenditures for developing and administering the State plan which exceed 5 per centum of the costs for that year for which payment under this subsection may be made to that State, or $25,000, whichever is the greater. In determining the cost of developing and carrying out a State's plan, there shall be excluded any cost with respect to which payments were received under any other Federal program.

"(b) No payments shall be made to any State from its allotments for any fiscal year unless and until the Commissioner finds that the institutions of higher education which will participate in carrying out the State plan for that year will together have available during that year for expenditure from non-Federal sources for college and university extension and continuing education programs not less than the total amount actually expended by those institutions for college and university extension and continuing education programs from such sources during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, plus an amount equal to not less than the non-Federal share of the costs with respect to which payment pursuant to subsection (a) is sought.

"(c) Payments to a State under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, and they may be paid directly to the State or to one or more participating institutions of higher education designated for this purpose by the State, or to both.

"Administration of State plans

"SEC. 107. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency or institution submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency or institution administering a State plan approved under section 105(b), finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 105(a), or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify the State agency or institution that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"Judicial review

"SEC. 108. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 105(a) or with his final action under section 107(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of

the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education

"SEC. 109. (a) The President shall, within ninety days of enactment of this title, appoint a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education (hereafter referred to as the "Advisory Council"), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, Interior, State, and Housing and Urban Development, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and of such other Federal agencies having extension education responsibilities as the President may designate, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the President. Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons knowledgeable in the fields of extension and continuing education, State and local officials, and other persons having special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to community problems, and persons representative of the general public. The Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less often than twice a year.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 105(b), and policies to eliminate duplication and to effectuate the coordination of programs under this title and other programs offering extension or continuing education activities and services.

"(c) The Advisory Council shall review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community service programs, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports commencing on March 31, 1967, of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title and other Federal laws relating to extension and continuing education activities) to the Secretary and to the President. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

"(d) Members of the Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members 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.

"(e) The Secretary shall engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Advisory Council, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Advisory Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out its functions.

"(f) In carrying out its functions pursuant to this section, the Advisory Council may utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head of such agency.

"Relationship to other programs

"SEC. 110. Nothing in this title shall modify authorities under the Act of February 23, 1917 (Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act), as amended (20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28); the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, and 15aaa–15ggg); the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35–35n); title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–560); or the Act of May 8, 1914 (Smith-Lever Act), as amended (7 U.S.C. 341–348).

"Limitation

"SEC. 111. No grant may be made under this title for any educational program, activity, or service related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"TITLE II—COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE AND LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

"Part A—College library resources

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 201. There are authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants under this part to institutions of higher education to assist and encourage such institutions in the acquisition for library purposes of books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials (including necessary binding). For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to enable the Commissioner to make such grants, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Basic Grants

"SEC. 202. From 75 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year, the Commissioner is authorized to make basic grants for the purposes set forth in that section to institutions of higher education and combinations of such institutions. The amount of a basic grant shall not exceed $5,000 for each such institution of higher education and each branch of such institution which is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located, as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and a basic grant under this subsection may be made only if the application therefor is approved by the Commissioner upon his determination that the application (whether by an individual institution or a combination of institutions)—

"(a) provides satisfactory assurance that the applicant will expend during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested (from funds other than funds received under this part) for all library purposes (exclusive of construction) (1) an amount not less than the average annual amount it expended for such purposes during the two-year period ending June 30, 1965, and (2) an amount (from such other sources) equal to not less than the amount of such grant;

"(b) provides satisfactory assurance that the applicant will expend during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested (from funds other than funds received under this part) for books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related materials (including necessary binding) for library purposes an amount not less than the average annual amount if expended for such materials during the two-year period ending June 30, 1965;

"(c) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

"(d) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"Supplemental Grants

"SEC. 203. (a) From the remainder of such 75 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year, plus any part of such sums as the Commissioner determines will not be used for making grants under section 204, the Commissioner is authorized to make supplemental grants for the purposes set forth in section 201 to institutions of higher education and combinations of such institutions. The amount of a supplemental grant shall not exceed $10 for each full-time student (including the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students) enrolled in each such institution, as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner. A supplemental grant may be made only upon application therefor, in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may require, which application shall—

"(1) meet the application requirements set forth in section 202 except for the matching requirement set forth in paragraph (a) (2) of that section;

"(2) describe the size and quality of the library resources of the applicant in relation to its present enrollment and any expected increase in its enrollment;

"(3) set forth any special circumstances which are impeding or will impede the proper development of its library resources; and

"(4) provide a general description of how a supplemental grant would be used to improve the size or quality of its library resources.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve applications for supplemental grants on the basis of basic criteria prescribed in regulations and developed after consultation with the Council created under section 205. Such basic criteria shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part and they (1) may take into consideration factors such as the size and age of the library collection and student enrollment, and (2) shall give priority to institutions in need of financial assistance for library purposes.

"Special Purpose Grants

"SEC. 204. (a) (1) Twenty-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner in accordance with this subsection.

"(2) Of the sums available for use under paragraph (1) sixty per centum may be used

to make special grants (A) to institutions of higher education which demonstrate a special need for additional library resources and which demonstrate that such additional library resources will make a substantial contribution to the quality of their educational resources, (B) to institutions of higher education to meet special national or regional needs in the library and information sciences, and (C) to combinations of institutions of higher education which need special assistance in establishing and strengthening joint-use facilities. Grants under this section may be used only for books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials (including necessary binding).

"(3) Any sums available for use under paragraph (1) which are not used for the purposes of paragraph (2) shall be used in the manner prescribed by the first sentence of section 203(a).

"(b) Grants pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be made upon application providing satisfactory assurance that (1) the applicant (or applicants jointly in the case of a combination of institutions) will expend during the fiscal year for which the grant is requested (from funds other than funds received under this part) for the same purpose as such grant an amount from such other sources equal to not less than 33⅓ per centum of such grant, and (2) in addition each such applicant will expend during such fiscal year (from such other sources) for all library purposes (exclusive of construction) an amount not less than the average annual amount it expended for such purposes during the two-year period ending June 30, 1965.

"Advisory Council on College Library Resources

"SEC. 205. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on College Library Resources consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to establishing criteria for the making of supplemental grants under section 203 and the making of special purpose grants under section 204. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Council.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Council, while serving on business of the Advisory Council, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving 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.

"Accreditation Requirement for Purposes of This Part

"Sec. 206. For the purposes of this part, an educational institution shall be deemed to have been accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association if the Commissioner determines that there is satisfactory assurance that upon acquisition of the library resources with respect to which assistance under this part is sought, or upon acquisition of those resources and other library resources planned to be acquired within a reasonable time, the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such agency or association.

"Limitation

"SEC. 207. No grant may be made under this part for books, periodicals, documents, or other related materials to be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship, or primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Consultation With State Agency

"SEC. 208. Each institution of higher education which receives a grant under this part shall periodically inform the State agency (if any) concerned with the educational activities of all institutions of higher education in the State in which such institution is located, of its activities under this part.

"Part B—Library training and research

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 221. There are authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for the purpose of carrying out this part. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated for such purpose only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Definition of 'Librarianship'

"SEC. 222. For the purposes of this part the term 'librarianship' means the principles and practices of the library and information sciences, including the acquisition, organization, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of information, and reference and research use of library and other information resources.

"Grants for Training in Librarianship

"SEC. 223. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist them in training persons in librarianship. Such grants may be used by such institutions to assist in covering the cost of courses of training or study for such persons, and for establishing and maintaining fellowships or traineeships with stipends (including allowances for traveling, subsistence, and other expenses) for fellows and others undergoing training and their dependents not in excess of such maximum amounts as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

"(b) The Commissioner may make a grant to an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding that such program will substantially further the objective of increasing the opportunities throughout the Nation for training in librarianship.

"Research and Demonstrations Relating to Libraries and the Training of Library Personnel

"SEC. 224. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, for research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries or the improvement of training in librarianship, including the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment for processing, storing, and distributing information, and for the dissemination of information derived from such research and demonstrations, and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5), to provide by contracts with them for the conduct of such activities; except that no such grant may be made to a private agency, organization, or institution other than a nonprofit one.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to appoint a special advisory committee of not more than nine members to advise him on matters of general policy concerning research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries and the improvement of training in librarianship, or concerning special services necessary thereto or special problems involved therein.

"(c) Members of the committee appointed under this section who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Commissioner, but not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time; and they may, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, 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.

"Repealer

"SEC. 225. Effective July 1, 1967, section 1101 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by adding the word 'or' at the end of clause (2), by striking out clause (3), and by renumbering clause (4) as clause (3).

"Part C—Strengthening college and research library resources

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 231. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $6,315,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $7,770,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to enable the Commissioner to transfer funds to the Librarian of Congress for the purpose of—

"(1) acquiring, so far as possible, all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship; and

"(2) providing catalog information for these materials promptly after receipt, and distributing bibliographic information by printing catalog cards and by other means, and enabling the Library of Congress to use for exchange and other purposes such of these materials as are not needed for its own collections.

"For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to enable the Commissioner to transfer funds to the Librarian of Congress for such purpose, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"TITLE III—STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

"Statement of purpose and appropriations authorized

"SEC. 301. (a) The purpose of this title is to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life, and to do so by enabling the Commissioner to establish a national teaching fellow program and to encourage and assist in the establishment of cooperative arrangements under which these colleges may draw on the talent and experience of our finest colleges and universities, and on the educational resources of business and industry, in their effort to improve their academic quality.

"(b)(1) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(2) Of the sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year, 78 per centum shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during such year.

"(3) The remainder of the sums so appropriated shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which do not plan to award such a degree during such year.

"Definition of 'developing institution'

"SEC. 302. As used in this title the term 'developing institution' means a public or nonprofit educational institution in any State which—

"(a) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a secondary school, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate;

"(b) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within the State an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles of knowledge;

"(c) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Commissioner to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation;

"(d) has met the requirements of clauses (a) and (b) during the five academic years preceding the academic year for which it seeks assistance under this title;

"(e) is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative staffs and of its student services;

"(f) is, for financial or other reasons, struggling for survival and is isolated from the main currents of academic life;

"(g) meets such other requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation; and

"(h) is not an institution, or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Advisory Council on Developing Institutions

"SEC. 303. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Developing Institutions (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Council'), consisting of the Commissioner who shall be Chairman, one representative each of such Federal agencies having responsibilities with respect to developing institutions as the Commissioner may designate, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(b) The Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title and in particular shall assist the Commissioner in identifying those developing institutions through which the purposes of this title can best be achieved and in establishing priorities for use in approving applications under this title. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Council.

"(c) Members of the Council who are not otherwise full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members 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.

"Grants for cooperative agreements to strengthen developing institutions

"SEC. 304. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to developing institutions and other colleges and universities to pay part of the cost of planning, developing, and carrying out cooperative arrangements which show promise as effective measures for strengthening the academic programs and the administration of developing institutions. Such cooperative arrangements may be between developing institutions, between developing institutions and other colleges and universities, and between developing institutions and organizations, agencies, and business entities. Grants under this section may be used for projects and activities such as—

"(1) exchange of faculty or students, including arrangements for bringing visiting scholars to developing institutions;

"(2) faculty and administration improvement programs utilizing training, education (including fellowships leading to advanced degrees), internships, research participation, and other means;

"(3) introduction of new curriculums and curricular materials;

"(4) development and operation of cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of academic study and business or public employment;

"(5) joint use of facilities such as libraries or laboratories, including necessary books, materials, and equipment; and

"(6) other arrangements which offer promise of strengthening the academic programs and the administration of developing institutions.

"(b) A grant may be made under this section only upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Commissioner shall not approve an application unless it—

"(1) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more projects or activities which meet the requirements of subsection (a) and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

"(2) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes which meet the requirements of subsection (a), and in no case supplant such funds;

"(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

"(4) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, after consultation with the Council, establish criteria as to eligible expenditures for which grants made under this section may be used, which criteria shall be so designed as to prevent the use of such grants for expenditures not necessary to the achievement of the purposes of this title.

"National teaching fellowships

"SEC. 305. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships under this section to highly qualified graduate students and junior members of the faculty of colleges and universities, to encourage such individuals to teach at developing institutions. The Commissioner shall award fellowships to individuals for teaching at developing institutions only upon application by an institution approved for this purpose by the Commissioner and only upon a finding by the Commissioner that the program of teaching set forth in the application is reasonable in the light of the qualifications of the teaching fellow and of the educational needs of the applicant.

"(b) Fellowships may be awarded under this section for such period of teaching as the Commissioner may determine, but such period shall not exceed two academic years. Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this section shall receive a stipend for each academic year of teaching of not more than $6,500 as determined by the Commissioner upon the advice of the Council, plus an additional amount of $400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents.

"TITLE IV—STUDENT ASSISTANCE

"Part A—Educational opportunity grants

"Statement of Purpose and Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 401. (a) It is the purpose of this part to provide, through institutions of higher education, educational opportunity grants to assist in making available the benefits of higher education to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need, who for lack of financial means of their own or of their families would be unable to obtain such benefits without such aid.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make payments to institutions of higher education that have agreements with him entered into under section 407, for use by such institutions for payments to undergraduate students for the initial academic year of educational opportunity grants awarded to them under this part. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969 and for the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to carry out the first sentence of this subsection, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. There are further authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for payment to such institutions for use by them for making educational opportunity grants under this part to undergraduate students for academic years other than the initial year of their educational opportunity grants; but no appropriation may be made pursuant to this sentence for any fiscal year beginning more than three years after the last fiscal year for which an appropriation is authorized under the first sentence. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall be available for payment to institutions until the close of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. For the purposes of this subsection, payment for the first year of an educational opportunity grant shall not be considered as an initial-year payment if the educational opportunity grant was awarded for the continuing education of a student who had been previously awarded an educational opportunity grant under this part (whether by another institution or otherwise) and had received payment for any year of that educational opportunity grant.

"Amount of Educational Opportunity Grant—Annual Determination

"SEC. 402. From the funds received by it for such purpose under this part, an insti-

tution of higher education which awards an educational opportunity grant to a student under this part shall, for the duration of the grant, pay to that student for each academic year during which he is in need of grant aid to pursue a course of study at the institution, an amount determined by the institution for such student with respect to that year, which amount shall not exceed—

"(1) the lesser of $800 or one-half of the sum of the amount of student financial aid (including assistance under this title, but excluding assistance from work-study programs) provided such student by such institution and any assistance provided such student under any scholarship program established by a State or a private institution or organization, as determined in accordance with regulation of the Commissioner, or

"(2) in the case of a student who during the preceding academic year at an institution of higher education received grades placing him in the upper half of his class, the amount determined under paragraph (1), plus $200.

If the amount of the payment determined under the preceding sentence for an academic year is less than $200 for a student, no payment shall be made under this title to that student for that year. The Commissioner shall, subject to the foregoing limitations, prescribe for the guidance of participating institutions basic critera or schedules (or both) for the determination of the amount of any such educational opportunity grant, taking into account the objective of limiting grant aid under this part to students of exceptional financial need and such other factors, including the number of dependents in the family, as the Commissioner may deem relevant.

"Duration of Educational Opportunity Grant

"SEC. 403. The duration of an educational opportunity grant awarded under this part shall be the period required for completion by the recipient of his undergraduate course of study at the institution of higher education from which he received the educational opportunity grant, except that such period shall not exceed four academic years less any such period with respect to which the recipient has previously received payments under this part pursuant to a prior educational opportunity grant (whether made by the same or another institution). An educational opportunity grant awarded under this part shall entitle the recipient to payments only if he (1) is maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study which he is pursuing, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution from which he received the grant, and (2) is devoting essentially full time to that course of study, during the academic year, in attendance at that institution. Failure to be in attendance at the institution during vacation periods or periods of military service, or during other periods during which the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for his nonattendance (during which periods he shall receive no payments) shall not be deemed contrary to clause (2).

"Selection of Recipients of Educational Opportunity Grants

"SEC. 404. (a) An individual shall be eligible for the award of an educational opportunity grant under this part at any institution of higher education which has made an agreement with the Commissioner pursuant to section 407 (which institution is hereinafter in this part referred to as an 'eligible institution'), if the individual makes application at the time and in the manner prescribed by that institution.

"(b) From among those eligible for educational opportunity grants from an institution of higher education for each fiscal year, the institution shall, in accordance with the provisions of its agreement with the Commissioner under section 407 and within the amount allocated to the institution for that purpose for that year under section 406, select individuals who are to be awarded such grants and determine, pursuant to section 402, the amounts to be paid to them. An institution shall not award an educational opportunity grant to an individual unless it determines that—

"(1) he has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there as an undergraduate student;

"(2) he shows evidence of academic or creative promise and capability of maintaining good standing in his course of study;

"(3) he is of exceptional financial need; and

"(4) he would not, but for an educational opportunity grant, be financially able to pursue a course of study at such institution of higher education.

"Allotment of Educational Opportunity Grant Funds Among States

"SEC. 405. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence section 401(b) for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all the States. The number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education for purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

"(2) If the total of the sums determined by the Commissioner to be required under section 406 for any fiscal year for eligible institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment to that State under paragraph (1) for that year, the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as he may fix, to other States in such manner as he determines will best assist in achieving the purposes of this part.

"(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to the third sentence of section 401(b) for any fiscal year shall be allotted or reallotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes for which such sums are appropriated.

"Allocation of Allotted Funds to Institutions

"SEC. 406. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which eligible institutions in any State must file applications for allocation, to such institutions, of educational opportunity grant funds from the allotment to that State (including any reallotment thereto) for any fiscal year pursuant to section 405(a), to be used for the purposes specified in the first sentence of section 401(b). Such allocations shall be made in accordance with equitable criteria which the Commissioner shall establish and which shall be designed to achieve such distribution of such funds among eligible institutions within a State as will most effectively carry out the purposes of this part.

"(b) The Commissioner shall further, in accordance with regulations, allocate to eligible institutions, in any State, from funds apportioned or reapportioned pursuant to section 405(b), funds to be used for the educational opportunity grants specified in the third sentence of section 401(b).

"(c) Payment shall be made from allocations under this section to institutions as needed.

"Agreements With Institutions—Conditions

"SEC. 407. (a) An institution of higher education which desires to obtain funds for educational opportunity grants under this part, shall enter into an agreement with the Commissioner. Such agreement shall—

"(1) provide that funds received by the institution under this part will be used by it only for the purposes specified in, and in accordance with, the provisions of this part;

"(2) provide that in determining whether an individual meets the requirements of section 404(b)(3) the institution will (A) consider the source of such individual's income and that of any indivdual or individuals upon whom the student relies primarily for support, and (B) make an appropriate review of the assets of the student and of such individuals;

"(3) provide that the institution, in cooperation with other institutions of higher education where appropriate, will make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths of exceptional financial need and to encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school through programs and activities such as—

"(A) establishing or strengthening close working relationships with secondary-school principals and guidance and counseling personnel with a view toward motivating students to complete secondary school and pursue post-secondary-school educational opportunities, and

"(B) making, to the extent feasible, conditional commitments for educational opportunity grants to qualified secondary school students with special emphasis on students enrolled in grade 11 or lower grades who show evidences of academic or creative promise;

"(4) provide assurance that the institution will continue to spend in its own scholarship and student-aid program, from sources other than funds received under this part, not less than the average expenditure per year made for that purpose during the most recent period of three fiscal years preceding the effective date of the agreement;

"(5) include provisions designed to make educational opportunity grants under this part reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all eligible students in the institution in need thereof; and

"(6) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part.

"(b)(1) An institution, which has in effect an agreement for Federal capital contributions for a student loan fund pursuant to title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, may use, as an additional Federal capital contribution for the purposes of such loan fund, not to exceed 25 per centum of the funds paid to it for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1970, for the purpose set forth in section 401(b). The requirement in section 204(2)(B) of such Act shall not apply to such a Federal capital contribution.

"(2) For the purpose of making payments from amounts appropriated pursuant to the third sentence of section 401(b), any institution electing for any fiscal year to use an amount of its payment as a Federal capital contribution pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be paid an equal amount for each of the succeeding three fiscal years from such amounts appropriated pursuant to such third sentence, if the amount so paid to the institution for each such year is used by such institution as such a Federal capital contribution.

"Contracts to Encourage Full Utilization of Educational Talent

"SEC. 408. (a) To assist in achieving the purposes of this part the Commissioner is authorized (without regard to section 3709

of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)), to enter into contracts, not to exceed $100,000 per year, with State and local educational agencies and other public or nonprofit organizations and institutions for the purpose of—

"(1) identifying qualified youths of exceptional financial need and encouraging them to complete secondary school and undertake postsecondary educational training,

"(2) publicizing existing forms of student financial aid, including aid furnished under this part, or

"(3) encouraging secondary-school or college dropouts of demonstrated aptitude to reenter educational programs, including postsecondary-school programs.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

"Definition of 'Academic Year'

"SEC. 409. As used in this part, the term 'academic year' means an academic year or its equivalent as defined in regulations of the Commissioner.

"Part B—Federal, State, and private programs of low-interest insured loans to students in institutions of higher education

"Statement of Purpose and Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 421. (a) The purpose of this part is to enable the Commissioner (1) to encourage States and nonprofit private institutions and organizations to establish adequate loan insurance programs for students in eligible institutions (as defined in section 435), (2) to provide a Federal program of student loan insurance for students who do not have reasonable access to a State or private nonprofit program of student loan insurance covered by an agreement under section 428(b), and (3) to pay a portion of the interest on loans to qualified students which are made by a State under a direct loan program meeting the requirements of section 428(a)(1)(B), or which are insured under this part or under a program of a State or of a nonprofit private institution or organization which meets the requirements of section 428(a)(1)(C).

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this part—

"(1) there are authorized to be appropriated to the student loan insurance fund (established by section 431) (A) the sum of $1,000,000, and (B) such further sums, if any, as may become necessary for the adequacy of the student loan insurance fund,

"(2) there are authorized to be appropriated, for payments under section 428 with respect to interest on student loans, such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and succeeding fiscal years, as may be required therefor, and

"(3) there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $17,500,000 for making advances pursuant to section 422 for the reserve funds of State and nonprofit private student loan insurance programs.

Sums appropriated under clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection shall remain available until expended, and sums appropriated under clause (3) of this subsection shall remain available for advances under section 422 until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"Advances for Reserve Funds of State and Nonprofit Private Loan Insurance Programs

"SEC. 422. (a)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to clause (3) of section 421(b), the Commissioner is authorized to make advances to any State with which he has made an agreement pursuant to section 428(b) for the purpose of helping to establish or strengthen the reserve fund of the student loan insurance program covered by that agreement. If for any of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, June 30, 1967, or June 30, 1968, a State does not have a student loan insurance program covered by an agreement made pursuant to section 428(b), and the Commissioner determines after consultation with the chief executive officer of that State that there is no reasonable likelihood that the State will have such a student loan insurance program for such year, the Commissioner may make advances for such year for the same purpose to one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations with which he has made an agreement pursuant to section 428(b) in order to enable students in that State to participate in a program of student loan insurance covered by such an agreement. The Commissioner may make advances under this subsection both to a State program (with which he has such an agreement) and to one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations (with which he has such an agreement) in that State if he determines that such advances are necessary in order that students in each eligible institution have access through such institution to a student loan insurance program which meets the requirements of section 428(b)(1).

"(2) Advances pursuant to this subsection shall be upon such terms and conditions (including conditions relating to the time or times of payment) consistent with the requirements of section 428(b) as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this section. Advances made by the Commissioner under this subsection shall be repaid within such period as the Commissioner may deem to be appropriate in each case in the light of the maturity and solvency of the reserve fund for which the advance was made.

"(b) The total of the advances to any State pursuant to subsection (a) may not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to 2½ per centum of $700,000,000 as the population of that State aged eighteen to twenty-two inclusive, bears to the total population of all the States aged eighteen to twenty-two, inclusive. If the amount so determined for any State, however, is less than $25,000, it shall be increased to $25,000 and the total of the increases thereby required shall be derived by proportionately reducing (but not below $25,000) the amount so determined for each of the remaining States. Advances to nonprofit private institutions and organizations pursuant to subsection (a) may be in such amounts as the Commissioner determines will best achieve the purposes for which they are made, except that the sum of (1) advances to such institutions and organizations for the benefit of students in any State plus (2) the amounts advanced to such State, may not exceed the maximum amount which may be advanced to that State pursuant to the first two sentences of this subsection. For the purposes of this subsection, the population aged eighteen to twenty-two, inclusive, of each State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

"Effect of Adequate Non-Federal Programs

"SEC. 423. The Commissioner shall not issue certificates of insurance under section 429 to lenders in a State if he determines that every eligible institution has reasonable access in that State to a State or private nonprofit student loan insurance program which is covered by an agreement under section 428(b).

"Scope and Duration of Federal Loan Insurance Program

"SEC. 424. (a) The total principal amount of new loans made and installments paid pursuant to lines of credit (as defined in section 435) to students covered by Federal loan insurance under this part shall not exceed $700,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $1,000,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $1,400,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Thereafter, Federal loan insurance pursuant to this part may be granted only for loans made (or for loan installments paid pursuant to lines of credit) to enable students, who have obtained prior loans insured under this part, to continue or complete their educational program; but no insurance may be granted for any loan made or installment paid after June 30, 1972.

"(b) The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this part, assign, within the maximum amounts specified in subsection (a), Federal loan insurance quotas applicable to eligible lenders, or to States or areas, and may from time to time reassign unused portions of these quotas.

"Limitations on Individual Federally Insured Loans and on Federal Loan Insurance

"SEC. 425. (a) (1) The total of the loans made to a student in any academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner) which may be covered by Federal loan insurance under this part may not exceed $1,500 in the case of a graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner), or $1,000 in the case of any other student. The aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of all such insured loans made to any student shall not at any time exceed $7,500 in the case of any graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner, and including any such insured loans made to such person before he became a graduate or professional student), or $5,000 in the case of any other student. The annual insurable limit per student shall not be deemed to be exceeded by a line of credit under which actual payments by the lender to the borrower will not be made in any year in excess of the annual limit.

"(2) If in any academic year or its equivalent a student receives a loan which is insured by the Commissioner under this part, no loan to that student in that year may be made or insured by the Commissioner under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965; and if in any academic year or its equivalent a student receives a loan which is made or insured by the Commissioner under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, no loan to that student in that year may be insured by the Commissioner under this part.

"(b) The insurance liability on any loan insured by the Commissioner under this part shall be 100 per centum of the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the loan. Such insurance liability shall not include liability for interest whether or not that interest has been added to the principal amount of the loan.

"Sources of Funds

"SEC. 426. Loans made by eligible lenders in accordance with this part shall be insurable by the Commissioner whether made from funds fully owned by the lender or from funds held by the lender in a trust or similar capacity and available for such loans.

"Eligibility of Student Borrowers and Terms of Student Loans

"SEC. 427. (a) A loan by an eligible lender shall be insurable by the Commissioner under the provisions of this part only if—

"(1) made to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing there as determined by the institution, and (B) is carrying at least one-half of the normal full-time workload as determined by the institution, and (C) has provided the lender with a statement of the institution which sets forth a schedule of the tuition and fees applicable to that student and its

estimate of the cost of board and room for such a student; and

"(2) evidenced by a note or other written agreement which—

"(A) is made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and such note or other written agreement executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, endorsement may be required.

"(B) provides for repayment (except as provided in subsection (c)) of the principal amount of the loan in installments over a period of not less than five years (unless sooner repaid) nor more than ten years beginning not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the date on which the student ceases to carry at an eligible institution at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution, except (i) as provided in clause (C) below, (ii) that the period of the loan may not exceed fifteen years from the execution of the note or written agreement evidencing it and (iii) that the note or other written instrument may contain such provisions relating to repayment in the event of default in the payment of interest or in the payment of the cost of insurance premiums, or other default by the borrower, as may be authorized by regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time the loan is made,

"(C) provides that periodic installments of principal need not be paid, but interest shall accrue and be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner, (ii) not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, or (iii) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act, and any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period or the fifteen-year period provided in clause (B) above,

"(D) provides for interest on the unpaid principal balance of the loan at a yearly rate, not exceeding the applicable maximum rate prescribed and defined by the Secretary (within the limits set forth in subsection (b)) on a national, regional, or other appropriate basis, which interest shall be payable in installments over the period of the loan except that, if provided in the note or other written agreement, any interest payable by the student may be deferred until not later than the date upon which repayment of the first installment of principal falls due, in which case interest that has so accrued during that period may be added on that date to the principal (but without thereby increasing the insurance liability under this part),

"(E) provides that the lender will not collect or attempt to collect from the borrower any portion of the interest on the note which is payable by the Commissioner under this part,

"(F) entitles the student borrower to accelerate without penalty repayment of the whole or any part of the loan, and

"(G) contains such other terms and conditions, consistent with the provisions of this part and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this part, as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan, including, if agreed upon, a provision requiring the borrower to pay to the lender, in addition to principal and interest, amounts equal to the insurance premiums payable by the lender to the Commissioner with respect to such loan.

"(b) No maximum rate of interest prescribed and defined by the Secretary for the purposes of clause (2)(D) of subsection (a) may exceed 6 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan, except that under circumstances which threaten to impede the carrying out of the purposes of this part, one or more of such maximum rates of interest may be as high as 7 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan.

"(c) The total of the payments by a borrower during any year of any repayment period with respect to the aggregate amount of all loans to that borrower which are insured by the Commissioner under this part shall not be less than $360 or the balance of all of such loans (together with interest thereon), whichever amount is less.

"Federal Payments To Reduce Student Interest Costs

"SEC. 428. (a)(1) Each student who has received a loan for study at an eligible institution—

"(A) which is insured by the Commissioner under this part;

"(B) which was made under a State student loan program (meeting criteria prescribed by the Commissioner), and which was contracted for, and paid to the student, within the period specified by paragraph (4); or

"(C) which is insured under a program of a State or of a nonprofit private institution or organization, which was contracted for, and paid to the student, within the period specified in paragraph (4), and which—

"(i) in the case of a loan insured prior to July 1, 1967, was made by an eligible lender and is insured under a program which meets the requirements of subparagraph (E) of subsection (b)(1) and provides that repayment of such loan shall be in installments beginning not earlier than sixty days after the student ceases to pursue a course of study (as described in subparagraph (D) of subsection (b)(1)) at an eligible institution, or

"(ii) in the case of a loan insured after June 30, 1967, is insured under a program covered by an agreement made pursuant to subsection (b),

and whose adjusted family income is less than $15,000 at the time of execution of the note or written agreement evidencing such loan, shall be entitled to have paid on his behalf and for his account to the holder of the loan, over the period of the loan, a portion of the interest on the loan. For the purposes of this paragraph, the adjusted family income of a student shall be determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time of the execution of the note or written agreement evidencing the loan. Such regulations shall provide for taking into account such factors, including family size, as the Commissioner deems appropriate. In the absence of fraud by the lender, such determination of the adjusted family income of a student shall be final insofar as it concerns the obligation of the Commissioner to pay the holder of a loan a portion of the interest on the loan.

"(2) The portion of the interest on a loan which a student is entitled to have paid on his behalf and for his account to the holder of the loan pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be equal to the total amount of the interest on the unpaid principal amount of the loan which accrues prior to the beginning of the repayment period of the loan, and 3 per centum per annum of the unpaid principal amount of the loan (excluding interest which has been added to principal) thereafter; but such portion of the interest on a loan shall not exceed, for any period, the amount of the interest on that loan which is payable by the student after taking into consideration the amount of any interest on that loan which the student is entitled to have paid on his behalf for that period under any State or private loan insurance program. The holder of a loan with respect to which payments are required to be made under this section shall be deemed to have a contractual right, as against the United States, to receive from the Commissioner the portion of interest which has been so determined. The Commissioner shall pay this portion of the interest to the holder of the loan on behalf of and for the account of the borrower at such times as may be specified in regulations in force when the applicable agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (b) was made, or if the loan was made by a State or is insured under a program which is not covered by such an agreement, at such times as may be specified in regulations in force at the time the loan was paid to the student.

"(3) Each holder of a loan with respect to which payments of interest are required to be made by the Commissioner shall submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make with respect to that loan.

"(4) The period referred to in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act and end at the close of June 30, 1968, except that, in the case of a loan made or insured under a student loan or loan insurance program to enable a student who has obtained a prior loan made or insured under such program to continue his educational program, such period shall end at the close of June 30, 1972.

"(5) No payment may be made under this section with respect to the interest on a loan made from a student loan fund established under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"(6) In no event shall interest payments with respect to the same student loan be made under both this section and under section 9 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

"(b)(1) Any State or any nonprofit private institution or organization may enter into an agreement with the Commissioner for the purpose of entitling students who receive loans which are insured under a student loan insurance program of that State, institution, or organization to have made on their behalf the payments provided for in subsection (a) if the Commissioner determines that the student loan insurance program—

"(A) authorizes the insurance of not less than $1,000 nor more than $1,500 in loans to any individual student in any academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner);

"(B) authorizes the insurance of loans to any individual student for at least six academic years of study or their equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner);

"(C) provides that (i) the student borrower shall be entitled to accelerate without penalty the whole or any part of an insured loan, (ii) the period of any insured loan may not exceed fifteen years from the date of execution of the note or other written evidence of the loan, and (iii) the note or other written evidence of any loan may contain such provisions relating to repayment in the event of default by the borrower as may be authorized by regulations of the Commissioner in effect at the time such note or written evidence was executed;

"(D) subject to subparagraph (C), provides that, where the total of the insured loans to any student which are held by any one person exceeds $2,000, repayment of such loans shall be in installments over a period of not less than five years nor more than ten years beginning not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at an eligible institution, except that if the program provides for the insurance of loans for part-time study at eligible institutions the program shall provide that such repayment period shall begin not earlier than nine months nor later than one year after the

student ceases to carry at an eligible institution at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution;

"(E) authorizes interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at a yearly rate not in excess of 6 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance of the loan (exclusive of any premium for insurance which may be passed on the borrower);

"(F) insures not less than 80 per centum of the unpaid principal of loans insured under the program;

"(G) does not provide for collection of an excessive insurance premium;

"(H) provides that the benefits of the loan insurance program will not be denied any student because of his family income or lack of need if his adjusted family income at the time the note or written agreement is executed is less than $15,000 (as determined pursuant to the regulations of the Commissioner prescribed under section 428(a)(1));

"(I) provides that a student may obtain insurance under the program for a loan for any year of study at an eligible institution; and

"(J) in the case of a State program, provides that such State program is administered by a single State agency, or by one or more nonprofit private institutions or organizations under the supervision of a single State agency.

"(2) Such an agreement shall—

"(A) provide that the holder of any such loan will be required to submit to the Commissioner, at such time or times and in such manner as he may prescribe, statements containing such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to determine the amount of the payment which he must make with respect to that loan;

"(B) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the State or nonprofit private organization or institution, as the case may be; and

"(C) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his function under this part and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"Certificates of Federal Loan Insurance—Effective Date of Insurance

"SEC. 429. (a)(1) If, upon application by an eligible lender, made upon such form, containing such information, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, and otherwise in conformity with this section, the Commissioner finds that the applicant has made a loan to an eligible student which is insurable under the provisions of this part, he may issue to the applicant a certificate of insurance covering the loan and setting forth the amount and terms of the insurance.

"(2) Insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall become effective upon the date of issuance of the certificate, except that the Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with regulations, to issue commitments with respect to proposed loans, or with respect to lines (or proposed lines) of credit, submitted by eligible lenders, and in that event, upon compliance with subsection (a)(1) by the lender, the certificate of insurance may be issued effective as of the date when any loan, or any payment by the lender pursuant to a line of credit, to be covered by such insurance was made. Such insurance shall cease to be effective upon sixty days' default by the lender in the payment of any installment of the premiums payable pursuant to subsection (c).

"(3) An application submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall contain (A) an agreement by the applicant to pay, in accordance with regulations, the premiums fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (c), and (B) an agreement by the applicant that if the loan is covered by insurance the applicant will submit such supplementary reports and statements during the effective period of the loan agreement, upon such forms, at such times, and containing such information as the Commissioner may prescribe by or pursuant to regulation.

"(b)(1) In lieu of requiring a separate insurance application and issuing a separate certificate of insurance for each student loan made by an eligible lender as provided in subsection (a), the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations consistent with section 424, issue to any eligible lender applying therefor a certificate of comprehensive insurance coverage which shall, without further action by the Commissioner, insure all insurable loans made by that lender, on or after the date of the certificate and before a specified cutoff date, within the limits of an aggregate maximum amount stated in the certificate. Such regulations may provide for conditioning such insurance, with respect to any loan, upon compliance by the lender with such requirements (to be stated or incorporated by reference in the certificate) as in the Commissioner's judgment will best achieve the purpose of this subsection while protecting the financial interest of the United States and promoting the objectives of this part, including (but not limited to) provisions as to the reporting of such loans and information relevant thereto to the Commissioner and as to the payment of initial and other premiums and the effect of default therein, and including provisions for confirmation by the Commissioner from time to time (through endorsement of the certificate) of the coverage of specific new loans by such certificate, which confirmation shall be incontestable by the Commissioner in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation of fact or patent error.

"(2) If the holder of a certificate of comprehensive insurance coverage issued under this subsection grants to a student a line of credit extending beyond the cutoff date specified in that certificate, loans or payments thereon made by the holder after that date pursuant to the line of credit shall not be deemed to be included in the coverage of that certificate except as may be specifically provided therein; but, subject to the limitations of section 424, the Commissioner may, in accordance with regulations, make commitments to insure such future loans or payments, and such commitments may be honored either as provided in subsection (a) or by inclusion of such insurance in comprehensive coverage under this subsection for the period or periods in which such future loans or payments are made.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, pursuant to regulations, charge for insurance on each loan under this part a premium in an amount not to exceed one-fourth of 1 per centum per year of the unpaid principal amount of such loan (excluding interest added to principal), payable in advance, at such times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such regulations may provide that such premium shall not be payable, or if paid shall be refundable, with respect to any period after default in the payment of principal or interest or after the borrower has died or becomes totally and permanently disabled, if (1) notice of such default or other event has been duly given, and (2) request for payment of the loss insured against has been made or the Commissioner has made such payment on his own motion pursuant to section 430(a).

"(d) The rights of an eligible lender arising under insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance issued to it under this section may be assigned as security by such lender only to another eligible lender, and subject to regulation by the Commissioner.

"(e) The consolidation of the obligations of two or more federally-insured loans obtained by a student borrower in any fiscal year into a single obligation evidenced by a single instrument of indebtedness shall not affect the insurance by the United States. If the loans thus consolidated are covered by separate certificates of insurance issued under subsection (a), the Commissioner may upon surrender of the original certificates issue a new certificate of insurance in accordance with that subsection upon the consolidated obligation; if they are covered by a single comprehensive certificate issued under subsection (b), the Commissioner may amend that certificate accordingly.

"Default, Death, or Disability of Student Under Federal Loan Insurance Program

"SEC. 430. (a) Upon default by the student borrower on any loan covered by Federal loan insurance pursuant to this part, or upon the death of the student borrower or a finding by the insurance beneficiary that the borrower has become totally and permanently disabled (as determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner) before the loan has been repaid in full, and prior to the commencement of suit or other enforcement proceeding upon security for that loan, the insurance beneficiary shall promptly notify the Commissioner, and the Commissioner shall if requested (at that time or after further collection efforts) by the beneficiary, or may on his own motion, if the insurance is still in effect, pay to the beneficiary the amount of the loss sustained by the insured upon that loan as soon as that amount has been determined. The 'amount of the loss' on any loan shall, for the purposes of this subsection and subsection (b), be deemed to be an amount equal to the unpaid balance of the principal amount of the loan (other than interest added to principal).

"(b) Upon payment by the Commissioner of the amount of the loss pursuant to subsection (a), the United States shall be subrogated to all of the rights of the holder of the obligation upon the insured loan and shall be entitled to an assignment of the note or other evidence of the insured loan by the insurance beneficiary. If the net recovery made by the Commissioner on a loan after deduction of the cost of that recovery (including reasonable administrative costs) exceeds the amount of the loss, the excess shall be paid over to the insured.

"(c) Nothing in this section or in this part shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the student borrower which may be agreed upon by the parties to the insured loan and approved by the Commissioner, or to preclude forbearance by the Commissioner in the enforcement of the insured obligation after payment on that insurance, or to require collection of the amount of any loan by the insurance beneficiary or by the Commissioner from the estate of a deceased borrower or from a borrower found by the insurance beneficiary to have become permanently and totally disabled.

"(d) Nothing in this section or in this part shall be construed to excuse the holder of a federally insured loan from exercising reasonable care and diligence in the making and collection of loans under the provisions of this part. If the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to an eligible lender, finds that it has substantially failed to exercise such care and diligence or to make the reports and state-

ments required under section 428(a)(3) and section 429(a)(3), or to pay the required Federal loan insurance premiums, he shall disqualify that lender for further Federal insurance on loans granted pursuant to this part until he is satisfied that its failure has ceased and finds that there is reasonable assurance that the lender will in the future exercise necessary care and diligence or comply with such requirements, as the case may be.

"(e) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'insurance beneficiary' means the insured or its authorized assignee in accordance with section 429(d); and

"(2) the term 'default' includes only such defaults as have existed for (A) one hundred and twenty days in the case of a loan which is repayable in monthly installments, or (B) one hundred and eighty days in the case of a loan which is repayable in less frequent installments.

"Insurance Fund

"SEC. 431. (a) There is hereby established a student loan insurance fund (hereinafter in this section called the 'fund') which shall be available without fiscal year limitation to the Commissioner for making payments in connection with the default of loans insured by him under this part. All amounts received by the Commissioner as premium charges for insurance and as receipts, earnings, or proceeds derived from any claim or other assets acquired by the Commissioner in connection with his operations under this part, and any other moneys, property, or assets derived by the Commissioner from his operations in connection with this section, shall be deposited in the fund. All payments in connection with the default of loans insured by the Commissioner under this part shall be paid from the fund. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations under this section may be invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States.

"(b) If at any time the moneys in the fund are insufficient to make payments in connection with the default of any loan insured by the Commissioner under this part, the Commissioner is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities during the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued hereunder and for that purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this subsection. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Sums borrowed under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund and redemption of such notes and obligations shall be made by the Commissioner from such fund.

"Legal Powers and Responsibilities

"SEC. 432. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this part, the Commissioner may—

"(1) prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part;

"(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this part without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in that office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this part from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

"(3) include in any contract for Federal loan insurance such terms, conditions, and covenants relating to repayment of principal and payment of interest, relating to his obligations and rights and to those of eligible lenders, and borrowers in case of default, and relating to such other matters as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to assure that the purposes of this part will be achieved; and any term, condition, and covenant made pursuant to this clause or any other provisions of this part may be modified by the Commissioner if he determines that modification is necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

"(4) subject to the specific limitations in this part, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal and interest or any portion thereof, or any other provision of any note or other instrument evidencing a loan which has been insured by him under this part;

"(5) enforce, pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such insurance; and

"(6) enforce, pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right or redemption.

"(b) The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this part—

"(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act; and

"(2) maintain with respect to insurance under this part an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act, except that the transactions of the Commissioner, including the settlement of insurance claims and of claims for payments pursuant to section 428, and transactions related thereto and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

"Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Students

"SEC. 433. (a) The Secretary shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Insured Loans to Students, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Secretary. The membership of the Council shall include persons representing State loan insurance programs, private nonprofit loan insurance programs, financial and credit institutions, and institutions of higher education.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, including policies and procedures governing the making of advances under section 422 and the Federal payments to reduce student interest costs under section 428.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members 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.

"Participation by Federal Credit Unions in Federal, State, and Private Student Loan Insurance Programs

"SEC. 434. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal credit unions shall, pursuant to regulations of the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, have power to make insured loans up to 10 per centum of their assets, to student members in accordance with the provisions of this part relating to federally insured loans, or in accordance with the provisions of any State or nonprofit private student loan insurance program which meets the requirements of section 428(a)(1)(C).

"Definitions for Reduced-Interest Student Loan Insurance Program

"SEC. 435. As used in this part:

"(a) The term 'eligible institution' means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (A) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (B) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any public or other nonprofit collegiate or associate degree school of nursing and any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5). If the Commissioner determines that a particular category of such schools does not meet the requirements of clause (5) because there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools in such category, he shall, pending the establishment of such an accrediting agency or association, appoint an

advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools in such category, which shall (i) prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify schools in such category to participate in the program pursuant to this part, and (ii) determine whether particular schools not meeting the requirements of clause (5) meet those standards. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

"(b) The term 'collegiate school of nursing' means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

"(c) The term 'associate degree school of nursing' means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

"(d) The term 'accredited' when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education.

"(e) The term 'eligible lender' means an eligible institution, an agency or instrumentality of a State, or a financial or credit institution (including an insurance company) which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State.

"(f) The term 'line of credit' means an arrangement or agreement between the lender and the borrower whereby a loan is paid out by the lender to the borrower in annual installments, or whereby the lender agrees to make, in addition to the initial loan, additional loans in subsequent years.

"Part C—College work-study program extension and amendments

"Transfer of Authority and Other Amendments

"SEC. 441. Parts C and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452) are amended as follows:

"(1) By striking out 'Director' in the first sentence of section 122(a) and inserting in lieu thereof 'Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this part referred to as the "Commissioner")', and by striking out 'Director' wherever that word appears in the other provisions of such part C and inserting in lieu thereof 'Commissioner';

"(2) By amending that part of section 121 that follows the section designation to read as follows: 'The purpose of this part is to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students, particularly students from low-income families, in institutions of higher education who are in need of the earnings from such employment to pursue courses of study at such institutions.';

"(3) By striking out section 123 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'Grants for Work-Study Programs

"'SEC. 123. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with institutions of higher education under which the Commissioner will make grants to such institutions to assist in the operation of work-study programs as hereinafter provided.

"'(b) For the purposes of this part—

"'(1) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (A) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate, (B) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (C) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (D) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (E) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (i) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (ii) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any public or other nonprofit collegiate or associate degree school of nursing and any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of clauses (A), (B), (D), and (E). If the Commissioner determines that a particular category of such schools does not meet the requirements of clause (E) because there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools in such category, he shall, pending the establishment of such an accrediting agency or association, appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools in such category, which shall (I) prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify schools in such category to participate in the program pursuant to this part, and (II) determine whether particular schools not meeting the requirements of clause (E) meet those standards. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

"'(2) The term "collegiate school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

"'(3) The term "associate degree school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

"'(4) The term "accredited" when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner.';

"(4) By striking out section 124(a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(a) provide for the operation by the institution of a program for the part-time employment of its students in work for the institution itself or work in the public interest for a public or private nonprofit organization under an arrangement between the institution and such organization, and such work—

"'(1) will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services,

"'(2) will be governed by such conditions of employment as will be appropriate and reasonable in light of such factors as type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee, and

"'(3) does not involve the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or is to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;';

"(5) By redesignating clauses (2), (3), and (4), of paragraph (c) of section 124 as clauses (1), (2), and (3), and by striking out so much of such paragraph as precedes such redesignated clauses and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(c) provide that in the selection of students for employment under such work-study program preference shall be given to students from low-income families and that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who';

"(6) By inserting before the period at the end of section 125 a comma and the following: 'and such share may be paid to such student in the form of services and equipment (including tuition, room, board, and books) furnished by such institution'; and

"(7) By striking out 'provided for in' in section 131 and inserting in lieu thereof 'for which he is responsible under'.

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 442. There are authorized to be appropriated $129,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $165,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the purposes of part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452). Any sums which are appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for the purpose of such part C pursuant to an authorization in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, or are allocated for such purpose from any appropriation for such year, shall be made available, to the extent unexpended on the date of enactment of this Act, to the Commissioner for carrying out such part C, and the total of such sums (including amounts expended prior to such date) shall be deducted from the authorization in this section for such year. Sixty million dollars of the authorization for title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, as contained in section 131 of such Act, shall be only for the purpose of part C of such title. No provision in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which authorizes the appropriation of funds to carry out that Act shall apply to such part C after June 30, 1966.

"Part D—Amendments to National Defense Education Act of 1958

"Definition of Institution of Higher Education

"SEC. 461. Section 103(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution,

and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (A) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (B) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II, such terms includes any school of nursing as defined in subsection (1) of this section, and also includes any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5). If the Commissioner determines that a particular category of such schools does not meet the requirements of clause (5) because there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools in such category, he shall, pending the establishment of such an accrediting agency or association, appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools in such category, which shall (i) prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify schools in such category to participate in the student loan program under title II, and (ii) determine whether particular school not meeting the requirements of clause (5) meet those standards. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.'

"Conditions of Agreements; Administrative Costs

"Sec. 462. Clause (3) of section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) provide that such student loan fund shall be used only for (A) loans to students in accordance with such agreement, (B) capital distributions as provided in this title, (C) routine expenses incurred by the institution in administering the student loan fund, except that the amount withdrawn from such student loan fund for such routine expenses by an institution in any fiscal year may not exceed either (i) one-half of such routine expenses as estimated for that year by the Commissioner with the advice of an advisory committee which the Commissioner is hereby authorized to appoint on an annual or such other basis as he may deem appropriate, or (ii) 1 per centum of the aggregate of the outstanding loans made from that fund as of the close of that year, whichever is the lesser, and (D) costs of litigation, and other collection costs agreed to by the Commissioner, arising in connection with the collection of any loan from the fund, interest on such loan, or charge assessed with respect to that loan pursuant to section 205(c);'.

"Technical Amendment for Part-time Students

"Sec. 463. (a) The portion of section 205 (b)(2) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which precedes clause (A)(ii) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides for repayment of the principal amount, together with interest thereon, in equal installments (or, if the borrower so requests, in graduated periodic installments determined in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Commissioner) payable quarterly, bimonthly, or monthly (at the option of the institution) over a period beginning nine months after the date on which the borrower ceases to carry, at an institution of higher education or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner, at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by that institution, and ending ten years and nine months after such date, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on any such loan, and installments need not be paid during any period (i) during which the borrower is carrying, at an institution of higher education or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner, at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution,'.

"(b) Clause (D) of such section 205(b)(2) is amended by striking out 'periodic', and by striking out 'part-time' and inserting in lieu thereof 'less than half-time'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to a loan outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the borrower and the institution which made the loan.

"Minimum Rate of Repayment

"Sec. 464. (a) Section 205(b)(2) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is further amended by striking out 'and' before '(E)' and by inserting at the end thereof before the semicolon ', and (F) the institution may provide, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, that during the repayment period of the loan payments of principal and interest by the borrower with respect to all the outstanding loans made to him from loan funds established pursuant to this title shall be at a rate equal to not less than $15 per month'.

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Cancellation of Loans for Teachers

"Sec. 465. (a) Section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'total' before 'amount' and by striking out ', which was unpaid on the first day of such service';

"(2) by inserting 'or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner)' after 'academic year'; and

"(3) by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'except that (A) such rate shall be 15 per centum for each complete academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner) of service as a full-time teacher in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school which is in the school district of a local educational agency which is eligible in such year for assistance pursuant to title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, and which for purposes of this clause and for that year has been determined by the Commissioner, pursuant to regulations and after consultation with the State educational agency of the State in which the school is located, to be a school in which there is a high concentration of students from low-income families, except that the Commissioner shall not make such determination with respect to more than 25 per centum of the total of the public and other nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in any one State for any one year, and (B) for the purposes of any cancellation pursuant to clause (A), an additional 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) may be cancelled but nothing in this paragraph shall authorize refunding any payment'.

"(b) The amendments made by clauses (1) and (3) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to service performed during academic years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment. The amendment made by clause (2) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to service performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of the National Defense Education Act Amendments, 1964, Public Law 88-665, whether or not the loan was made before or after such enactment.

"Charges

"Sec. 466. (a) Section 205 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is further amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"'(c) Pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner, an institution may assess a charge with respect to a loan from the loan fund established by the institution pursuant to this title for failure of the borrower to pay all or any part of an installment when it is due and, in the case of a borrower who is entitled to deferment benefits under section 205(b)(2) or cancellation benefits under section 205(b)(3), for any failure to file timely and satisfactory evidence of such entitlement. The amount of any such charge may not exceed—

"'(1) in the case of a loan which is repayable in monthly installments, $1 for the first month or part of a month by which such installment or evidence is late and $2 for each such month or part of a month thereafter; and

"'(2) in the case of a loan which has a bimonthly or quarterly repayment interval, $3 and $6, respectively, for each such interval or part thereof by which such installment or evidence is late.

The institution may elect to add the amount of any such charge to the principal amount of the loan as of the first day after the day on which such installment or evidence was due, or to make the amount of the charge payable to the institution not later than the due date of the next installment after receipt by the borrower of notice of the assessment of the charge.'

"(b) Clause (2) of section 204 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and (D)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(D) charges collected pursuant to section 205(c), and (E)'.

"(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Economics, civic, and industrial arts

"Sec. 467. (a)(1) Clauses (1) and (5) of section 303(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are each amended by inserting 'economics,' after 'geography,'.

"(2) Section 301 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years'.

"(b) Section 1101 of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'each of the three succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years'; and

"(2) by inserting 'economics, civics, industrial arts,' after 'geography,'.

"TITLE V—TEACHER PROGRAMS

"Part A—General provisions

"Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation

"Sec. 501. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Ad-

visory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of the programs carried out under this title and of all other Federal programs for complementary purposes. This review shall pay particular attention to the effectiveness of these programs in attracting, preparing, and retaining highly qualified elementary and secondary school teachers, and it shall include recommendations for the improvement of these programs. The Council shall consist of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and twelve members appointed for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Such twelve members shall include persons knowledgeable with respect to teacher preparation and the needs of urban and rural schools, and representatives of the general public.

"(b) Members of such Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such Council or otherwise engaged on business of such Council be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving 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.

"(c) The Council may appoint an Executive Secretary and such other employees as the Council deems necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

"Limitation

"SEC. 502. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this title for religious worship or instruction.

"Part B—National Teacher Corps

"Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 511. (a) The purpose of this part is to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low-income families and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation by—

"(1) attracting and training qualified teachers who will be made available to local educational agencies for teaching in such areas; and

"(2) attracting and training inexperienced teacher-interns who will be made available for teaching and inservice training to local educational agencies in such areas in teams led by an experienced teacher.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $36,100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $64,715,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

"Establishment of National Teacher Corps

"SEC. 512. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps (hereinafter referred to as the 'Teacher Corps'). The Teacher Corps shall be headed by a Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and a Deputy Director who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for grade 16 of such General Schedule. The Director and the Deputy Director shall perform such duties as are delegated to them by the Commissioner.

"Teacher Corps Program

"SEC. 513. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this part, the Commissioner is authorized to—

"(1) recruit, select, and enroll experienced teachers, and inexperienced teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent, in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to two years;

"(2) enter into arrangements, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education or State or local educational agencies to provide members of the Teacher Corps with such training as the Commission may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this part, including not more than three months of training for members before they undertake their teaching duties under this part;

"(3) enter into arrangements (including the payment of the cost of such arrangements) with local educational agencies, after consultation in appropriate cases with State educational agencies and institutions of higher education, to furnish to local educational agencies, for service during regular or summer sessions, or both, in the schools of such agencies in areas having concentrations of children from low-income families, either or both (A) experienced teachers, or (B) teaching teams, each of which shall consist of an experienced teacher and a number of teacher-interns who, in addition to teaching duties, shall be afforded time by the local educational agency for a teacher-intern training program developed according to criteria established by the Commissioner and carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher in cooperation with an institution of higher education; and

"(4) pay to local educational agencies the amount of the compensation which such agencies pay to or on behalf of members of the Teacher Corps assigned to them pursuant to arrangements made pursuant to the preceding clause.

"(b) Arrangements with institutions of higher education to provide training for teacher-interns while teaching in schools for local educational agencies under the provisions of this part shall provide, wherever possible, for training leading to a graduate degree.

"(c)(1) Whenever the Commissioner determines that the demand for the services of experienced teachers or of teaching teams furnished pursuant to clause (3) of subsection (a) exceeds the number of experienced teachers or teaching teams available from the Teacher Corps, the Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable, allocate experienced teachers or teaching teams, as the case may be, from the Teacher Corps among the States in accordance with paragraph (2).

"(2) Not to exceed 2 per centum of such teachers or teams, as the case may be, shall be allocated to Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs. The remainder of such teams or teachers, as the case may be, shall be allocated among the other States in proportion to the number of children counted in each State for the purpose of determining the amount of basic grants made under section 203 of title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, for the fiscal year for which the allocation is made.

"(d) A local educational agency may utilize members of the Teacher Corps assigned to it in providing, in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate.

"Compensation

"SEC. 514. (a) An arrangement made with a local educational agency pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 513(a) shall provide for compensation by such agency of Teacher Corps members during the period of their assignment to it at the following rates:

"(1) an experienced teacher who is not leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the rate paid by such agency for a teacher with similar training and experience who has been assigned similar teaching duties;

"(2) an experienced teacher who is leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate agreed to by such agency and the Commissioner; and

"(3) a teacher-intern shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for teaching full time in the school system and grade to which the intern is assigned.

"(b) For any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

"(c) The Commissioner shall pay the necessary travel expenses of members of the Teacher Corps and their dependents and necessary expenses for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of such members and their dependents, and such other necessary expenses of members as are directly related to their service in the Corps, including readjustment allowances proportionate to service.

"(d) The Commissioner is authorized to make such arrangements as may be possible, including the payment of any costs incident thereto, to protect the tenure, retirement rights, participation in a medical insurance program, and such other similar employee benefits as the Commissioner deems appropriate, of a member of the Teacher Corps who participates in any program under this part and who indicates his intention to return to the local educational agency or institution of higher education by which he was employed immediately prior to his service under this part.

"Application of Provisions of Federal Law

"SEC. 515. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(b)(1) Such members shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection:

"(A) the term 'performance of duty' in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a member of the Teacher Corps—

"(i) while on authorized leave; or

"(ii) while absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Commissioner; and

"(B) in computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed to be his actual pay or that received under the entrance salary for grade 6 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, whichever is greater.

"(c) Such members shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

"Local Control Preserved

"SEC. 516. Members of the Teacher Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational

agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in clause (3) of section 513(a), such agencies shall retain the authority to—

"(1) assign such members within their systems;

"(2) make transfers within their systems;

"(3) determine the subject matter to be taught;

"(4) determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems.

"Maintenance of Effort

"SEC. 517. No member of the Teacher Corps shall be furnished to any local educational agency under the provisions of this part if such agency will use such member to replace any teacher who is or would otherwise be employed by such agency.

"Part C—Fellowships for teachers

"Statement of Purpose

"SEC. 521. The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to improve the quality of education offered by the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation by improving the quality of the education of persons who are pursuing or who plan to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education. The purpose of this part is to carry out this policy by awarding fellowships for graduate study at institutions of higher education and by developing or strengthening teacher education programs in institutions of higher education. For the purpose of this part the term 'career in elementary and secondary education' means a career of teaching in elementary or secondary schools, a career of teaching, guiding, or supervising such teachers or persons who plan to become such teachers, or a career in fields which are directly related to teaching in elementary or secondary schools, such as library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, educational media, and special education for handicapped children.

"Fellowships Authorized

"SEC. 522. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award not to exceed four thousand five hundred fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, ten thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and ten thousand fellowships for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. Fellowships awarded under the provisions of this part shall be for graduate study leading to an advanced degree other than a doctor of philosophy, or equivalent degree, for persons who are pursuing or plan to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education. Such fellowships shall be awarded as provided in sections 523 and 524 of this part and for such periods as the Commissioner may determine but not to exceed twenty-four months.

"(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this part but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

"Allocation of Fellowships

"SEC. 523. The Commissioner shall allocate fellowships under this part to institutions of higher education with programs approved under the provisions of section 524(a) for the use of individuals accepted into such programs, in such manner and according to such plan as will most nearly—

"(1) provide an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the States, except that to the extent he deems proper in the national interest after consultation with the Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation the Commissioner may give preference to programs designed to meet an urgent national need, and

"(2) encourage experienced teachers in elementary or secondary schools and other experienced personnel in elementary or secondary education to enter graduate programs, attract recent college graduates to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education, and afford opportunities for college graduates engaged in other occupations or activities to pursue or return to a career in elementary and secondary education.

"Approval of Programs; Grants

"SEC. 524. (a) The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding—

"(1) that such program will substantially further the objective of improving the quality of education of persons who are pursuing or intend to pursue a career in elementary and secondary education,

"(2) that such program gives emphasis to high-quality substantive courses,

"(3) that such program is of high quality and either is in effect or readily attainable, and

"(4) that only persons who demonstrate a serious intent to pursue or to continue a career in elementary and secondary education will be accepted for study in the program.

"(b) For the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of high-quality programs for the training of personnel for elementary or secondary education, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of developing or strengthening graduate programs which meet the requirements of subsection (a).

"(c) The Commissioner may employ experts and consultants, as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), to advise him with respect to the making of grants and contracts and the approving of programs under this section, and he shall set forth in regulations the standards and priorities which will be utilized in approving such grants and contracts. Experts and consultants employed pursuant to this subsection may be compensated while so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and may be allowed while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Stipends

"SEC. 525. (a) The Commissioner shall pay to persons awarded fellowships under this part such stipends (including such allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a), the Commissioner shall pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his course of study an amount equivalent to $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

"Limitation

"SEC. 526. No fellowships shall be awarded under this part for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this section, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Fellowship Conditions

"SEC. 527. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this part shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 525(a) only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency and devoting full time to study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than such part-time employment in teaching, research, or similar activities related to his training as has been approved by the Commissioner.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 528. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $160,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $275,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums for the two succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable persons who have been awarded fellowships prior to July 1, 1968, to complete their study under the fellowships.

"TITLE VI—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

"Part A—Equipment

"Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 601. (a) The purpose of this part is to improve the quality of classroom instruction in selected subject areas in institutions of higher education.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education pursuant to this part for the acquisition of equipment and for minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(A).

"(c) There are also authorized to be appropriated $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the succeeding fiscal year, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education pursuant to this part for the acquisition of television equipment and for minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(B).

"(d) There is also authorized to be appropriated a sum not exceeding $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this part including expenses which he determines are necessary for the preparation of such plans.

"(e) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated for the purposes set forth in subsections (b)(c), and (d) of this section, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 602. (a)(1) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of section 601 for any fiscal year one-half shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-half as the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of students enrolled in such institutions in all the States; and the remaining

one-half shall be allotted by him among the States in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection. For the purposes of this subsection, (A) the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education shall be deemed to be equal to the sum of (i) the number of full-time students and (ii) the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations; and (B) determinations as to enrollment shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data with respect to such enrollment are available to him.

"(2) For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the funds being allotted pursuant to this paragraph as the product of—

"(A) the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State, and

"(B) the State's allotment ratio, bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States. For the purposes of this paragraph the allotment ratio for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (i) 0.50 and (ii) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per person for the State by the income per person for all the States (not including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam), except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than 0.33⅓ or more than 0.66⅔, and the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam shall be 0.66⅔. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the basis of the average of the incomes per person of the States and of all the States for the three most recent consecutive calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(b)(1) A State's allotment under subsection (a) from funds appropriated pursuant to section 601(b) shall be available in accordance with the provisions of this part for payment of the Federal share (as determined under section 604) of the cost of equipment and minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(A).

"(2) A State's allotment under subsection (a) from funds appropriated pursuant to section 601(c) shall be available in accordance with the provisions of this part for payment of the Federal share (as determined under section 604) of the cost of television equipment and minor remodeling described in section 603(2)(B).

"(c) Sums allotted to a State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 606 until the close of the next fiscal year, in addition to the sums allotted to such State for such next fiscal year. Sums allotted to a State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, or for any succeeding fiscal year, which are not reserved as provided in section 606 by the close of the fiscal year for which they are allotted, shall be reallotted by the Commissioner, on the basis of such factors as he determines to be equitable and reasonable, among the States which, as determined by the Commissioner, are able to use without delay any amounts so reallotted. Amounts reallotted under this subsection shall be available for reservation until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were originally allotted.

"State Commissions and Plans

"SEC. 603. Any State desiring to participate in the program under this part shall designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education in the State, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'State commission'), a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

"(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

"(2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 604, objective standards and methods (A) for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects for the acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment (other than supplies consumed in use), including audiovisual materials and equipment for classrooms or audiovisual centers, and printed and published materials (other than textbooks) for classrooms or libraries, suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, foreign languages, history, geography, government, English, other humanities, the arts, or education at the undergraduate level in institutions of higher education, and minor remodeling of classroom or other space used for such materials or equipment; (B) for determining relative priorities of eligible projects for (i) the acquisition of television equipment for closed-circuit direct instruction in such fields in such institutions (including equipment for fixed-service instructional television, as defined by the Federal Communications Commission, but not including broadcast transmission equipment), (ii) the acquisition of necessary instructional materials for use in such television instruction, and (iii) minor remodeling necessary for such television equipment; and (C) for determining the Federal share of the cost of each such project;

"(3) provides (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible projects submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part; and (B) for approving and recommending to the Commissioner, in the order of such priority, applications covering such eligible projects, and for certifying to the Commissioner the Federal share, determined by the State commission under the State plan, of the cost of the project involved;

"(4) provides for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the commission as to the priority assigned to such project or as to any other determination of the commission adversely affecting such applicant; and

"(5) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this part, and (B) for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part.

"Basic Criteria for Determining Priorities, Federal Share, and Maintenance of Effort

"SEC. 604. (a) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible projects, and the application of such standards and methods to such projects under such plans, shall be subject. Such basic criteria (1) shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part while leaving opportunity and flexibility for the development of State plan standards and methods that will best accommodate the varied needs of institutions in the several States, and (2) shall give special consideration to the financial need of the institution. Subject to the foregoing requirements, such regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria, including provision for considering the degree to which applicant institutions are effectively utilizing existing facilities and equipment, provision for allowing State plans to group or provide for grouping, in a reasonable manner, facilities or institutions according to functional or educational type for priority purposes, and, in view of the national objectives of this Act, provision for considering the degree to which the institution serves students from two or more States or from outside the United States; and in no event shall an institution's readiness to admit such out-of-State students be considered as a priority factor adverse to such institution.

"(b) The Federal share for the purposes of this part shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of the project, except that a State commission may increase such share to not to exceed 80 per centum of such cost in the case of any institution proving insufficient resources to participate in the program under this part and inability to acquire such resources. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for a project pursuant to this part in any fiscal year only if such institution will expend during such year for the same purposes as, but not pursuant to, this part an amount at least equal to the amount expended by such institution for such purposes during the previous fiscal year. The Commissioner shall establish basic criteria for making determinations under this subsection.

"Applications for Grants and Conditions for Approval

"SEC. 605. (a) Institutions of higher education which desire to obtain grants under this part shall submit applications therefor at such time or times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, and such applications shall contain such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make the determinations required to be made by him under this part.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application covering a project under this part and meeting the requirements prescribed pursuant to subsection (a) if—

"(1) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission;

"(2) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, the Federal share of the cost of the project, and sufficient funds to pay such Federal share are available from the applicable allotment of the State (including any applicable reallotment to the State);

"(3) the project has, pursuant to the State plan, been assigned a priority that is higher than that of all other projects within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section (other than this clause) and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved;

"(4) the Commissioner determines that the project will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be overly elaborate or extravagant; and

"(5) the Commissioner determines that the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances—

"(A) that Federal funds received by the applicant will be used solely for defraying the cost of the project covered by such application,

"(B) that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal portion of such cost and to provide for the effective use of the equipment upon completion, and

"(C) that the institution will meet the maintenance of effort requirement in section 604(b).

"(b) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"Amount of Grant—Payment

"SEC. 606. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this part, the Commissioner shall reserve from the applicable allotment (including any applicable reallotment) available therefor, the amount of such grant, which (subject to the limits of such allotment or reallotment) shall be equal to the Federal share of the cost of the project covered by such application. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments as he may determine. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application covering such project or upon revision of the estimated cost of a project with respect to which such reservation was made, and in the event of an upward revision of such estimated cost approved by him he may reserve the Federal share of the added cost only from the applicable allotment (or reallotment) available at the time of such approval.

"Administration of State Plans

"SEC. 607. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this part, finds—

"(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 603, or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this part until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"Judicial Review

"SEC. 608. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this part or with his final action under section 607, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"Limitation on Payments

"SEC. 609. No grant may be made under this part for equipment or materials to be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship, or primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"Part B—Faculty development programs

"Institutes Authorized

"SEC. 621. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term workshops or short-term or regular-session institutes for individuals (1) who are engaged in, or preparing to engage in, the use of educational media equipment in teaching in institutions of higher education, or (2) who are, or are preparing to be, in institutions of higher education, specialists in educational media or librarians or other specialists using such media.

"(b) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated for the purposes of this part, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"Stipends

"SEC. 622. Each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each dependent. No stipends shall be paid for attendance at workshops.

"TITLE VII—AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

"Expansion of Grant Purposes

"SEC. 701. (a) Section 106 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

"'Eligibility for Grants

"'SEC. 106. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this title only if such construction will, either alone or together with other construction to be undertaken within a reasonable time, (1) result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the campus of such institution, or (2) in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating urgently needed enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the campus of such institution.'

"(b) The first sentence of section 101(b) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out 'and each of the two succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and for the succeeding fiscal year, and the sum of $460,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966'.

"(c) The second sentence of section 201 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and the sum of $60,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the succeeding fiscal year' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966'.

"Technical amendments

"Making Section 103 Allotments Available for Section 104 Institutions Under Certain Circumstances

"SEC. 702. (a)(1) Section 103(b) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting '(1)' immediately after '(b)' in such section and by adding at the end thereof:

"'(2) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, any portion of a State's allotment under this section for a fiscal year for which applications from an institution qualified to receive grants under this section have not been received by the State Commission by January 1 of such fiscal year, shall, if the Commission so requests, be available, in accordance with the provisions of this title, for payment of the Federal share (as determined under sections 108(b)(3) and 401(d)) of the development cost of approved projects for the construction of academic facilities within such State for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 103(c) is amended by striking out 'for providing academic facilities for public community colleges or public technical institutes' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section'.

"(3) Section 105(a) is amended by striking out 'hereinafter' in the matter preceding clause (1).

"(4) Clause (3) of section 105(a) is amended by inserting '(except as provided in section 103(b)(2))' after 'section 103 will be available'.

"Making Section 104 Allotments Available for Section 103 Institutions Under Certain Circumstances

"(b)(1) Section 104(b) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting '(1)' immediately after '(b)' in such section and by adding at the end thereof:

"'(2) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, any portion of a State's allotment under this section for a fiscal year for which applications from an institution qualified to receive grants under this section have not been received by the State Commission by January 1 of such fiscal year, shall, if the Commission so requests, be available, in accordance with the provisions of this title, for payment of the Federal share (as determined under sections 108(b)(3) and 401(d)) of the development cost of approved projects for the construction of academic facilities within such State for public community colleges and public technical institutes.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 104(c) is amended by striking out 'for providing academic facilities for institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the purposes set forth in subsection (b) of this section'.

"(3) Clause (3) of section 105(a) is amended by inserting '(except as provided in section 104(b)(2))' after 'section 104 will be available'.

"Revising Federal Share for Public Community Colleges and Public Technical Institutes

"(c)(1) Section 105(a)(2) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out 'other than a project for a public community college or public technical institute'.

"(2) Section 107(b) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'other than a project for

a public community college or public technical institute', and (2) by striking out 'shall be 40 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'shall in no event exceed 40 per centum'.

"(3) Section 401(d) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before '40 per centum' the following: 'a percentage (as determined under the applicable State plan) not in excess of'.

"Three-Year Availability of Sums Appropriated Under Section 201

"(d) The last sentence of section 201 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows: 'Sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall remain available for grants under this title until the end of the second succeeding fiscal year.'

"Two-Year Availability of Title III Funds

"(e) Section 303(c) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: 'Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for any fiscal year shall remain available for loans under this title until the end of the next succeeding fiscal year.'

"Coordination With Part A (Grants for Expansion and Improvement of Nurse Training) of Title VIII of the Public Health Service Act

"(f) Effective with respect to applications for grants and loans submitted after the date of enactment of this Act, clause (E) of section 401(a)(2) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows: '(E) any facility used or to be used by a school of medicine, school of dentistry, school of osteopathy, school of pharmacy, school of optometry, school of podiatry, or school of public health as these terms are defined in section 724 of the Public Health Service Act, or a school of nursing as defined in section 843 of that Act.'

"Change in Interest Rate for Title III Loans

"SEC. 703. (a) Subsection (b) of section 303 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting '(1)' after 'shall bear interest at', and by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'or (2) the rate of 3 per centum per annum, whichever is the lesser'.

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Definitions

"SEC. 801. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any business school or technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5). For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

"(b) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

"(c) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to a school, agency, organization, or institution means a school, agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(d) The term 'secondary school' means a school which provides secondary education as determined under State law except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

"(e) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(f) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(g) The term 'local educational agency' means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

"(h) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

"(i) The term 'elementary school' means a school which provides elementary education including education below grade 1, as determined under State law.

"Method of payment

"SEC. 802. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant, loan, or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of grants or loans, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Federal administration

"SEC. 803. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

"Federal control of education prohibited

"SEC. 804. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or over the selection of library resources by any educational institution.

"(b) Nothing contained in this Act or any other Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization at an institution of higher education (other than a service academy or the Coast Guard Academy) which is financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by such institution."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
HUGH L. CAREY,
JOHN H. DENT,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
LISTER HILL,
PAT MCNAMARA,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
JOSEPH CLARK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
ROBERT KENNEDY,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
J. K. JAVITS,
PETER H. DOMINICK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9567) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amendment strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below except for clerical corrections, incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

TITLE I—COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Declaration of purpose

Section 101 of the House bill contained a number of congressional findings. These were that a greater involvement of institutions of higher education in the solution of problems brought about by increasing urbanization is essential to the rapid and effective solution of such problems, that an increase in the availability of educational offerings by such institutions for persons in the community is necessary in order to insure that the latest knowledge and techniques are brought to bear on urban and suburban problems, and that the strengthening of the resources of such institutions is desirable to facilitate a more effective utilization of such resources in meeting the growing needs of our urban and suburban communities. For these reasons it was declared to be the purpose of the title to provide a program of support for institutions of higher education in their establishing and maintaining community service programs designed to achieve these ends.

The Senate amendment provided that the purpose of the title is to assist the people of the United States in the solution of community problems, such as housing, poverty,

government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use, by enabling the Commissioner to make grants and contracts under the title to strenthen continuing education and extension methods and teaching and the public service resources of colleges and universities.

The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision, except that instead of speaking of strengthening continuing education and extension methods and teaching, and the public service resources of colleges and universities it mentions strengthening the community service programs of such institutions.

Authorization of appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 to enable the Commissioner to make grants under the title. For the 4 succeeding fiscal years there was authorized to be appropriated only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. The Senate bill authorized $25,000,000 for fiscal 1966, and $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

The substitute agreed upon in conference authorizes the appropriation of $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $50,000,000 for each of the next 2 fiscal year. For the fiscal year 1969 and the succeeding fiscal year it provides that only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Uses of funds

The House bill provided that the funds granted from the State's allotment must be used to provide new, expanded, or improved community service programs. "Community service program" was defined to mean an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program, specifically designed to assist in the solution of urban or suburban problems, or an educational program, activity, or service designed to assist in the solution of community problems where the institution offering the program, activity, or service determines that the proposed program, activity, or service is not otherwise available and that the content thereof is consistent with the institution's overall educational program and is appropriate to the effective utilization of its special resources and the competencies of its faculty. Under the House bill if the educational program, activity, or service involves course offerings, they must be university extension or continuing education courses and must be acceptable toward an academic degree or of a college level, but in no event can the course be of a frivolous nature.

The Senate amendment provided that funds granted from the State's allotment must be used for extension and continuing education activities and services designed to assist, particularly through new and advanced approaches, in the solution of rural and urban community problems.

The conference substitute adopts the term "community service program" and defines it to mean an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program and a university extension or continuing education offering, designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, but only where the institutions offering the program, activity, or service determines it is not otherwise available and that carrying it out is consistent with the institution's overall educational program, and that it is of such a nature as is appropriate to the effective utilization of the institution's special resources and competencies. Where course offerings are involved, they must be university extension or continuing education courses and either fully acceptable toward a college degree, or of college level as determined by the institution offering the course. The reference to rural, urban, and suburban areas includes rural nonfarm areas.

The requirement that an institution determine that its proposed program is not otherwise available is intended to preclude duplication of existing effort, including overlap with the Agricultural Extension Service. It is not designed to prohibit the use of funds to expand existing community service programs for which there is an unsatisfied demand.

The restriction of courses to those of college level should not be construed to exclude non-secondary-school graduates from participation in programs carried out under this title.

The omission of the prohibition against courses of a frivolous nature should in no way be interpreted as permitting courses to increase the competence of an individual in purely recreational or social activities.

Allotments to Puerto Rico

Under the House bill, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico would be given a preliminary allotment of $25,000, as was the case for Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. The Senate amendment provided that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico would receive a preliminary allotment of $100,000. The Senate recedes.

Matching

The House bill provided that the Federal share of the cost of programs under the title would be 75 percent in the fiscal year 1966, and 50 percent in the fiscal years 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970. The Senate bill provided that the Federal share would be 75 percent in the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, and 50 percent in the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment on this point.

Maintenance of effort

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment required that the State plan submitted under the title set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that the Federal funds made available will not supplant State or local funds or funds of institutions of higher education. The Senate amendment in addition provided that no payments could be made to any State from its allotment until the Commissioner finds that the institutions of higher education which will participate in carrying out the State plan have available during that year for expenditure from non-Federal sources for university extension and continuing education programs not less than the total amount actually expended by those institutions for such programs from non-Federal sources during the year 1965, plus an amount equal to not less than the non-Federal share of the costs with respect to which payment under the title is sought. The conference substitute includes this provision.

The Senate amendment also prohibited use of fee-related funds to meet the above requirement. This provision is dropped in the conference substitute.

Funds to cover administration of State plans

The House bill provided that no payment could be made to any State for developing and administering a State plan which exceeds 5 percent for the cost of developing and carrying out the State's plan for that year. The Senate amendment contained the same provision but added a provision to authorize the expenditure of $25,000 in any State where that amount is greater than 5 percent of such cost. The Senate provision is retained in the conference report.

Funds for experimental approaches and supplemental grants

The Senate amendment reserved 20 percent of the sums appropriated for purposes of the title for grants and contracts for experimental projects and for supplemental grants. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The Senate recedes.

Advisory Council

The House bill provided for the establishment in the Office of Education of a National Advisory Committee on Community Service Programs to advise the Commissioner in preparing general regulations and in the administration of the program provided for in the title. The Senate amendment directed the President to appoint a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education to advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of the title and also with respect to approval of State plans, and policies to eliminate duplication and effectuate coordination of programs under the title and other programs of extension or continuing education. The Council would also advise the Commissioner on approval of projects and activities under the title. The Council was required to review all federally supported extension and continuing education programs. Beginning on March 31, 1967, it would file an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the Secretary and to the President. This report would be transmitted to the Congress with the comments and recommendations of the President.

The Senate amendment also authorized the Secretary to engage such technical assistance as might be required to carry out the functions of the Advisory Council. It also authorized the Advisory Council to utilize the services and facilities of other Federal agencies.

This section of the Senate amendment is included in the conference report with only minor and conforming changes.

The House bill contained a provision, nothing comparable to which appears in the Senate amendment, under which the Secretary is required, during 1968, to appoint a Review Council on Community Service Programs to review the administration of community service programs carried out under the title and make recommendations for the improvement of that administration. The Council was to include persons knowledgeable in the field of extension and continuing education, State and local officials having special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to community problems, and persons representative of the public. The Secretary was also authorized to engage technical assistance. The Council would make its report to the Secretary not later than March 31, 1969. This provision is not included in the conference report.

Limitation

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, prohibiting the use of funds for activities and services related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity. This provision is retained in the conference report.

TITLE II—COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE AND LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Part A—College library resources

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and only such sums as may be hereafter authorized by law for the succeeding 4 fiscal years. The Senate amendment authorized $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years. The substitute agreed upon in conference authorizes the appropriation of $50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and the 2 succeeding fiscal years. It provides that for the fiscal year 1969, and the next fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Basic Grants

The House bill provided basic grants to institutions of higher education for acquisition of library materials. It provided that the basic grant to an institution could not exceed $5,000 for each institution. The comparable provision of the Senate amendment provided that the basic grant could not exceed $5,000 for each institution of higher education and each branch of such institution which is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located. The conference substitute adopts the Senate version, with an amendment under which what constitutes a "branch" will be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner. In permitting grants to be made to branches the conferees intend that grants be limited to branches which have college level programs for which library facilities are necessary, and that the proceeds of a grant on account of a branch be used to increase the library resources at the branch.

The Senate amendment also required the institution applying for a basic grant to provide for joint use of library facilities with other institutions where feasible. The House bill contained no comparable provision, and it is not included in the conference report. However, the managers on the part of the House expect that there will be joint use of library facilities where feasible.

Supplemental Grants

The Senate amendment provided that funds remaining after making basic grants, plus any funds not needed for special purpose grants, could be used for supplemental grants. The House bill provided for the use of funds remaining after making basic grants to make supplemental grants, but did not permit the use of funds not needed for special grants for this purpose. It provided, instead, that funds not needed for the other types of grants be used for special purpose grants. The provision of the Senate amendment is included in the conference report. The conferees do not expect an institution to qualify for supplemental grants unless it has received basic grants in excess of $1,500 on a matching basis.

The House bill provided that in awarding supplemental grants the Commissioner shall take into consideration the endowments and other financial resources of the institution. The Senate amendment required the Commissioner to give priority to institutions which need financial assistance for library purposes. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Special Purpose Grants

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for use of 25 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out the part for special purpose grants. The House bill also permitted the use of funds not needed for the other grant programs to be used for special purpose grants. The Senate amendment in contrast, provided that funds not used for special purpose grants could be used for supplemental grants.

In lieu of these provisions, the conference substitute provides that 25 percent of the sums appropriated to carry out the part for a fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner as follows:

1. 60 percent may be used to make special purpose grants.

2. The sums not used for special purpose grants will be used in the manner prescribed for supplemental grants.

The Senate amendment specifically includes physical and social sciences as being among those eligible for special purpose grants. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The Senate recedes.

The Senate amendment provided that special purpose grants must be matched on the basis of one institutional dollar for every three Federal dollars, and required that the institution maintain its effort in this area. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts the substance of the Senate amendment on this point.

State Agency Consultation

The House bill required consultation by institutions of higher education with State higher education agencies where they exist. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute requires these institutions to inform periodically the State agency (if any) concerned with higher educational activities in the State of such institution's activities under the part.

Part B—Library training and research

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and only such sums as may hereafter be authorized for the succeeding 4 years. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $7,500,000 for fiscal year 1966 and $15,000,000 for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for carrying out this part. For the fiscal year 1969 and the next fiscal year only such funds may be appropriated as the Congress hereafter authorizes by law.

Training Grants

The Senate amendment specifically includes training of specialists in the communication of information in the physical and social sciences as eligible training programs. The House bill did not specifically include these programs. The Senate recedes.

Research

The Senate amendment permitted research grants and contracts to individuals. The House bill did not. The Senate recedes.

The House bill permitted the Commissioner to appoint one nine-member advisory committee to assist in the administration of the program. The Senate amendment allowed the Commissioner to appoint the necessary number of technical advisory committee and panels of experts. The House provision is included in the conference report.

NDEA Library Institutes

The House bill repealed the authority for training institutes for elementary and secondary school librarians now contained in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, effective July 1, 1965. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The conferees agreed to the House provision, but delayed its effectiveness until July 1, 1967. The conference committee expects that after June 30, 1967, the librarian institutes now authorized under the National Defense Education Act will be carried on under part B of title II of this act.

Part C—Cataloging

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966, and only such sums as may hereafter be authorized for the succeeding 4 fiscal years. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $6,315,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $7,770,000 for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years. The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $6,315,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $7,700,000 for fiscal year 1968. For the fiscal year 1969, and the next fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Purpose of Program

The Senate amendment authorized the use of funds transferred under this part for distributing bibliographic information by printing catalog cards and by other means. The House bill did not authorize the use of these funds for such purpose. The conference report includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

TITLE III—STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

Authorization of appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $30,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 to carry out the title. For the 4 succeeding fiscal years only such sums could be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of the title with respect to developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during the year. It authorized $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of the title with respect to developing institutions which do not plan to award such degrees during the year. It authorized the appropriation of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966 and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967 and each of the 3 succeeding years for either of the foregoing purposes, or both, as determined by the Commissioner.

The substitute agreed upon in conference contains an authorization of $55,000,000 for 1 year—the fiscal year 1966. It provides that 78 percent of the sums appropriated for the title may be used only for developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during the year. The remainder may be used only for other institutions.

Qualifications of "developing institutions"

The House bill provided that for an institution to be a developing institution eligible for this program it must, among other things, (1) have been awarding bachelor's degrees for 5 years, and (2) be seriously handicapped in its efforts to improve its staff and services by lack of financial resources and a shortage of qualified professional personnel.

The Senate amendment permitted an institution of higher education (including a junior college or other 2-year institution) to be considered a "developing institution" if it met the accreditation requirements of the bill during the 2 preceding academic years.

The substitute includes the 2-year institutions within the scope of the title, but provides that all institutions must meet the accreditation requirements and must have been in existence for 5 academic years. This reflects the committee's determination that funds be used to support programs which will assist those institutions which are developing in the sense that they are unable to offer quality instruction, not simply because they are rapidly expanding.

The committee intends that the Commissioner in prescribing regulations defining the term "developing institution" will strictly adhere to the description of such institutions contained in both the House and Senate reports.

Types of programs

The Senate amendment, unlike the House bill, specifically included programs to strengthen the administration of developing institutions. The conference substitute includes this provision.

The Senate amendment permitted cooperative programs under which persons from developing institutions may receive fellowships leading to advanced degrees. No specific au-

thority was contained in the House bill. This provision is retained in the conference report.

TITLE IV—STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Part A—Educational opportunity grants

General

The House bill and Senate amendment both include programs to provide financial assistance to enable deserving students to attend college. However, the two programs differ completely as to the manner in which this assistance would be provided. The House bill amended the student loan title of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, to provide that 25 percent of the amount authorized for student loan funds could be used to make educational opportunity grants to needy students. The Senate amendment, in contrast, did not amend the National Defense Education Act, but instead provided an independent program under which grants would be made to institutions of higher education to enable them to provide scholarships.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the general structure of the Senate amendment, while retaining (as explained hereafter in detail) most of the requirements of the House bill relating to qualifications for and amounts of educational opportunity grants.

Authorization of Appropriations

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $70,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years for paying for the initial year of scholarships awarded under the program. The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $70,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and each of the next 2 fiscal years, for making payments for the initial year of educational opportunity grants (the name given these grants in the House bill and adopted in the conference report). For the fiscal year 1969, and the next fiscal year, the conference substitute permits the appropriation of only such sums as may hereafter be authorized by law.

Amount of Grant

Under the House bill the maximum educational opportunity grant which could be made to a student for any year was $800; and in no event could the grant constitute more than one-half of the total financial aid provided the student by the institution (excluding assistance from work-study programs) and by any State or private scholarship program. Under the Senate amendment the maximum size of a scholarship for a year was $800, but the maximum size was increased to $1,000 in the case of a student in the upper half of his class.

The conference substitute provides that the maximum amount of an educational opportunity grant may not exceed the lesser of $800 or one-half of the sum of the amount of student financial aid (excluding assistance from work-study programs) provided by the institution or by a State or private scholarship program. If the student is in the upper half of his class, the maximum amount will be increased $200, if needed.

Allotments Among States

Since the House bill provided that educational opportunity grants would be made from NDEA student loan funds, the effect was to allot funds for this program on the basis of the NDEA formula. Under that formula, funds are allotted among the States on the basis of the relative number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in the several States. The Senate amendment allotted the funds among the States, one-third as funds for NDEA student loan programs are allotted, one-third on the basis of relative numbers of secondary school graduates in the several States, and one-third on the basis of the relative number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000.

The conference substitute provides that all the funds will be allotted according to the formula used for allotting NDEA student loan funds.

State Scholarship Funds

The Senate amendment permitted payment (with 50-percent matching and maintenance of effort) of up to 15 percent of a State's apportionment for use in the State's scholarship programs which are comparable to the Federal program. The House bill did not contain this provision, and it is not included in the agreement reached in conference.

Coordination of Student Assistance Programs

As mentioned above, under the House bill educational opportunity grants had to be supplemented by assistance under other programs. The Senate bill did not include the House provision, but did require institutions, where appropriate, to combine financial assistance under this program with assistance derived from other public and private programs. Since the House provision referred to above was retained in the conference report, the Senate provision was dropped.

Cooperative Motivational Programs

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained provisions requiring institutions of higher education to make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths from low-income families and to encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school. The provision in the Senate amendment which permitted institutions to use up to 5 percent of their grants for these activities is not included in the conference report.

Transfers to NDEA Student Loan Funds

The Senate amendment permitted an institution to transfer 25 percent of funds granted it under the part to its NDEA student loan fund. The conference report retains this provision.

Part B—Guaranteed reduced interest loans

General

The House bill and Senate amendment contained generally similar provisions for Federal, State, and private programs of low-interest insured loans to students in institutions of higher education. There were a number of technical differences between the two versions, but the conference report accepts the provisions of the House bill, except as noted below.

Moratorium for Repayment

The Senate amendment provided a moratorium on repayment of federally guaranteed loans during the time the borrower is a full-time student and for a period of not to exceed 3 years during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces or a volunteer in the Peace Corps. This provision is retained in the conference report.

Beginning Date for Repayments

The House bill provided that repayment cannot be required to begin before 6 months after the end of the student's educational program. The Senate amendment substituted 9 months for the 6-month figure in the House bill. The 9-month figure is adopted in the conference report.

Advisory Council on Insured Loans for Students

The Senate amendment established an Advisory Council on Insured Loans for Students to advise the Commissioner in preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy needs arising in the administration of the program. There was no comparable provision in the House bill.

The conference substitute accepts this provision with two changes; it deletes the requirement that the Council advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations, and inserts a provision giving the members of the Council the usual per diem rates of pay.

Definition of "Eligible Institution"

The House bill limited the institutions which would be eligible to participate to 4-year and 2-year institutions which are accredited and provide courses acceptable for credit toward a bachelor's degree.

The Senate amendment broadened the definition of "eligible institution" to include (1) institutions which are not yet accredited but which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, will be accredited in a reasonable time; (2) collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing; and (3) other schools which provide not less than a 1-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Part C—College work-study program extension and amendment

Authorization of Appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $129,000,000 to carry out the part during the fiscal year 1966, and such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law for the next 4 fiscal years. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $129,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $165,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, and $235,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969 and the next fiscal year. The conference report authorizes the appropriation of $129,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $165,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1968.

Limitation on Types of Work

The Senate amendment made applicable to all work carried on under work-study programs, the requirements now applicable to off-campus work. It also adds a requirement that the work be such as would not otherwise be performed by nonstudents. The Senate provision was accepted in conference with an amendment deleting the requirement that the work be such as would not otherwise be performed by nonstudents.

Payment of Institutional Share

The present law requires institutions to bear 10 percent of the cost of work-study programs. The Senate amendment permitted institutions to pay this share to students in the form of services and equipment furnished by the institutions. This provision is included in the conference report.

Part D—Amendments to National Defense Education Act of 1958

Conditions of Agreements; Administrative Costs

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to clause (3) of section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (referred to as the NDEA) which required that agreements between the Commissioner and institutions participating in the loan program provide that student loan funds may be used for routine expenses (within specified limits) incurred by the institution in administering the student loan fund, and for collection costs (in addition to costs of litigation) agreed to by the Commissioner. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Technical Amendment for Part-time Students

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205(b)(2) of the

NDEA to authorize institutions to determine whether loans shall be repaid in equal (or if the borrower requests, in graduated periodic installments determined in accordance with schedules approved by the Commissioner) quarterly, bimonthly, or monthly installments. It also amended section 205 (b)(2) to provide that repayment of principal, together with interest, is to commence 9 months after the date on which the borrower ceases to carry at least half the normal full-time academic workload, and end 10 years and 9 months after such date except that interest shall not accrue and no installment need be paid while the borrower is carrying (at an institution of higher education or comparable institution outside the States, approved for this purpose by the Commissioner) at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload, as determined by the institution. The amendments made by this provision would apply to loans outstanding on the date of enactment only with the consent of the borrower and the lending institution.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Minimum Rate of Repayment

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205(b)(2) of the NDEA to authorize institutions to require that the rate of repayment by a borrower on all title II loans extended him must be not less than $15 per month. The amendment made by this provision would be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Cancellation of Loans for Teachers

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205(b)(3) of the NDEA in three respects: First, to provide that the portion of the loans to be forgiven teachers is to be calculated as a percentage of the original total of the loans in question rather than, as the law now provides, of the amount of the loan remaining unpaid on the first day of service as a teacher; second, to provide that the prescribed portions of the loan to be forgiven shall be forgiven for each academic year "or its equivalent"; and third, to provide that the cancellation rate for teachers shall be 15 percent for each complete academic year, or its equivalent, of service as a full-time teacher in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school which is in the school district of a local educational agency eligible in such year for assistance under title II (financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, and which has been determined to be a school in which there is a high concentration of students from low-income families. Such a determination may be made only with respect to 25 percent of the schools in a State. For purposes of such cancellation, an additional 50 percent of any loan (plus interest) may be canceled.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, but with a limitation that no borrower may receive a refund by reason of subsequent forgiveness of amounts he has repaid.

Charges

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 205 of the NDEA by adding a new subsection (c) to authorize institutions to assess charges against borrowers who fail to pay all or any part of an installment when due, and against borrowers who are entitled to deferment benefits or cancellation benefits but who fail to file timely and satisfactory evidence of such entitlement. Such charges may amount to $1 for the first month of late payment and $2 each month thereafter, except that for bimonthly or quarterly repayment intervals, the charge may be $3 and $6, respectively. Institutions would be authorized to elect whether to add these charges to the principal amount of loans as of the first day after the day on which such installment or evidence was due, or to make the amount of the charge payable to the institution not later than the due date of the next installment after receipt by the borrower of notice of the assessment of the charge. The amendment would be applicable only with respect to loans made after the date of enactment.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Economics, Civics, and Industrial Arts

The Senate amendment contained an amendment to clauses (1) and (5) of section 303(a) of the NDEA pertaining to State plans under which financial assistance is extended for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects, to include "economics" among subjects which may be included in programs by State educational agencies. This provision also authorized increased appropriations (from $90 to $100 million) for fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968 for carrying out title III of the NDEA.

In addition this provision amended section 1101 of the NDEA (authorizing short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study) to provide for the authorization of $50 million (rather than $32,750,000) for fiscal 1966 and for each of the 2 succeeding years. It also amended section 1101 to expand the categories of eligible support to include institutes to improve the qualification of individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching or the supervising or training of teachers, of economics, civics, and industrial arts.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

TITLE V—TEACHER PROGRAMS

Part A—General provisions

Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation

The Senate amendment provided for the establishment of an Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation in the Office of Education. The Commissioner would be Chairman of the Council, and he would appoint (with the approval of the Secretary) the 12 members of the Council. Such 12 members would include persons knowledgeable with respect to teacher preparation and the needs of urban and rural schools. The purpose of the Council would be to review the administration and operation of the programs carried out under this title and under all other Federal programs for complementary purposes.

The provision also provided for compensation of Council members who are not regular full-time employees of the United States, and allowed the Council to appoint an executive secretary and such other employees as it deemed necessary to carry out its functions under this part.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment, but changes the name of the Council to the Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation.

Limitation

The Senate amendment provided that nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this title for religious worship or instruction. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Part B—National Teacher Corps

Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

The Senate amendment provided that it is the purpose of this part to improve the educational opportunities available to children in areas having a concentration of low-income families, and at the same time to encourage the development of broader programs of teacher preparation in colleges and universities, by attracting and training both qualified teachers and inexperienced teacher-interns who will be made available to local educational agencies in low-income areas.

The Senate amendment authorized, for the purpose of carrying out this part, the appropriation of $36,100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $64,715,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopted this provision, but restricted the authorization to the first 2 years.

Establishment of National Teacher Corps

The Senate amendment provided that a National Teacher Corps, to be headed by a Director and a Deputy Director, would be established in the Office of Education in order to carry out the purposes of this part. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Teacher Corps Program

The Senate amendment authorized the Commissioner to (1) recruit, select, and enroll both experienced teachers and inexperienced teacher-interns (who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent) in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to 2 years; (2) enter into arrangements with institutions of higher education or State or local educational agencies to provide members of the Teacher Corps with appropriate training, including a maximum of 3 months' training before undertaking their teaching duties; (3) enter into arrangements (including the payment of cost of such arrangements) with local educational agencies to furnish experienced teachers and teaching teams (consisting of one experienced teacher and a number of teacher-interns) for service during regular or summer sessions, or both, in the schools of such agencies in areas having concentrations of children from low-income families, and under which arrangements teacher-interns would be afforded time by the local educational agency for a teacher-intern training program carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher in cooperation with an institution of higher education; (4) pay to local educational agencies the amount of compensation which such agencies pay to members of the Teacher Corps assigned to them; and (5) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof to assist the Commissioner in carrying out his functions under this part. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment provided that, wherever possible, arrangements with institutions of higher education to furnish training to teacher-interns while such interns are teaching, shall provide for training leading to a graduate degree. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, but omits authority for the employment of experts, consultants, or organizations.

The Senate amendment provided that when the demand for the services of Teacher Corps members exceeds the supply, the Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable, allocate those members available among the States in proportion to the number of chil-

dren counted in each State for the purpose of making basic grants under title II of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, for the fiscal year for which such allocation is made. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts a substitute for this provision of the Senate amendment which provides that if demand for Teacher Corps members exceeds supply, the Commissioner may allot up to 2 percent of the members to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The remainder would be allotted in accordance with the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment provided that Teacher Corps members may be utilized by a local educational agency to provide educational services available to children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Compensation

The Senate amendment required that an arrangement with a local educational agency must provide that Teacher Corps members must be compensated by that agency at the following rates: (1) Experienced teachers must receive pay equivalent to that received by teachers with similar training experience and duties who are employed by the local educational agency; (2) experienced teachers leading teaching teams must be compensated at a rate agreed upon by the Commissioner and the agency; and (3) teacher-interns must be compensated at the lowest rate paid by such agency for full-time teaching in the school system and grade to which the intern is assigned.

The Senate amendment authorized the Commissioner to pay stipends to Teacher Corps members while such members are in training. Such payments may include allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents, and are to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

In addition, the Senate amendment authorized the Commissioner to pay certain necessary expenses of Teacher Corps members, including travel, transportation of household goods, and readjustment allowances proportionate to service, and to arrange to protect the tenure, retirement rights, and similar employee benefits of any Teacher Corps member who wishes to return to the local educational agency or institution of higher education by which he was employed immediately prior to his service in the Corps.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

Application of Provisions of Federal Law

The Senate amendment provided:

(1) A Teacher Corps member is not to be deemed a Federal employee, except as is otherwise specifically provided in this section, and is not subject to those provisions of law relating to Federal employment.

(2) Teacher Corps members shall be deemed to be Federal civil employees within the meaning of section 40 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 790) for the purposes of the administration of that act, and the provisions of that act shall apply except as hereinafter provided. For purposes of this subsection the term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a member of the Teacher Corps while on authorized leave, or while absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by the Commissioner. In computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed to be his actual pay or that received under the entrance salary for GS–6, whichever is greater.

(3) Members of the Teachers Corps shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

Local Control Preserved

The Senate amendment provided that members of the Teacher Corps would be under the direct supervision of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned, and such agencies would retain the authority to assign such members within their systems, make transfers within their systems, determine the subject matter to be taught, and determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Maintenance of Effort

The Senate amendment provided that no member of the Teacher Corps may be used by any local educational agency to replace any teacher who is or would otherwise be employed by such agency.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Part C—Fellowships for teachers

General

Part C of title V of the Senate amendment provided for the establishment of a program of fellowships for elementary and secondary school teachers. The House bill did not provide for a comparable program. The conference report adopts a substitute for the provisions of the Senate amendment.

Statement of Purpose

The Senate amendment provided that the purpose of this part is to provide opportunities for advanced training, particularly in substantive field areas, for teachers and personnel serving in ancillary fields. The conference substitute states that it is the purpose of this part to carry out the policy of the United States to improve elementary and secondary education by improving the quality of career elementary and secondary school personnel by awarding fellowships for graduate study at institutions of higher education and by strengthening teacher education programs in institutions of higher education.

Fellowships Authorized

The Senate amendment authorized the award of fellowships to elementary and secondary school and postsecondary vocational school teachers for master's degrees in education, in the subject which the recipient teaches, or in certain ancillary fields. 4,500 fellowships were authorized for fiscal year 1966; 10,000 for fiscal year 1967; and 15,000 for each of the 3 succeeding years. 40 percent of the fellowships were reserved for recent graduates. The remainder were to go to teachers with at least 5 years' experience, of whom 20 percent could be teachers displaced from their employment by reason of the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or court orders. Between 20 and 25 percent of all fellowships were reserved for persons in fields ancillary to elementary or secondary education or to postsecondary vocational education.

The conference substitute provides for fellowships for graduate degrees, other than doctor of philosophy (or its equivalent) for persons pursuing or who plan to pursue a career of teaching in elementary or secondary schools; a career of teaching, guiding, or supervising such teachers or persons who plan to become such teachers; or a career in fields which are directly related to teaching in elementary or secondary schools. Four thousand five hundred fellowships are authorized for fiscal year 1966, and 10,000 each are authorized for fiscal years 1967 and 1968. Recipients of fellowships must study at institutions whose programs are approved under section 524. The provisions of the Senate amendment relating to the reservation of portions of the fellowships for certain categories of teachers have been dropped, but the conference committee expects that up to 20 percent of the fellowships will be awarded to persons who have been displaced in their employment as professional employees of local educational agencies as a result of changes of school populations brought about by the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or the carrying out of the purpose of such act.

Allocation of Fellowships

The Senate amendment provided that the Commissioner should endeavor to distribute fellowships equitably throughout the Nation, and that he should give preference in such awards to persons already serving, or intending to serve, in low-income areas.

The conference substitute provides that the Commissioner shall allocate fellowships to institutions of higher education with approved programs for the use of individuals accepted into such programs, in a manner (1) which provides an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the States (except that he may, after consultation with the Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation, give preference to programs designed to meet an urgent national need), and (2) which encourages experienced teachers in elementary or secondary schools and other experienced personnel in elementary or secondary education to enter graduate programs, attracts recent college graduates into the field of elementary or secondary education, and affords opportunities for college graduates engaged in other occupations or activities to enter or reenter the field of elementary or secondary education.

Approval of Programs; Grants

The Senate amendment (in pt. D of title V) authorized $5 million annually for a 5-year program of assistance, through grant or contract, to institutions of higher education for developing and strengthening graduate and high quality undergraduate teacher training programs, for the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of high quality programs for the training of elementary and secondary school personnel. The Commissioner was to set forth in regulations the standards and priorities which would be utilized in approving such grants and contracts.

The Senate amendment also set out the standards which the Commissioner was to use in determining whether or not a graduate program of an institution of higher education would qualify for assistance under this part. Such a program must (1) improve the quality of teacher education, (2) give major emphasis to high-quality substantive courses, (3) either be in effect or be attainable as a result of assistance received under this part, and (4) be open only to those with a serious intent to pursue a career in education.

Section 524 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions relating to assistance to graduate programs at institutions of higher education, but integrates this program of institutional assistance with the fellowship program by permitting assistance only to institutions participating in the fellowship program. The separate money authorization for assistance to institutions is omitted.

Stipends

The Senate amendment provided that a fellowship for recent graduates carries a

stipend of $2,000 for the first academic year and $2,200 for the second year. A fellowship for experienced teachers carried a stipend of $4,800 for each academic year of study. An additional $400 per year would be paid to each fellowship recipient for each of his dependents.

The Senate amendment authorized the payment of $3,000 per academic year to the institution of higher education where a recipient of a fellowship is studying. This amount will be less any amount charged any such recipient for tuition. The Commissioner was also authorized to reimburse a fellowship recipient for necessary traveling expenses of the recipient and his dependents.

The conference substitute permits the Commissioner to pay to persons awarded fellowships such stipends (including such allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs. In addition, the Commissioner will pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his course of study an amount equivalent to $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition and nonrefundable fees and deposits.

Limitation

The conference report adopts the provision of the Senate amendment which provides that no fellowship shall be awarded for study at a school or department of divinity, which means an institution or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to enter upon some religious vocation.

Fellowship Conditions

The Senate amendment provided that a recipient must, in order to remain eligible for his fellowship payments, maintain satisfactory proficiency in, and devote essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and must not engage in gainful employment other than part-time employment which has been approved by the Commissioner.

The conference report adopts this provision with an additional requirement that part-time employment be related to the recipient's training.

Appropriations

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part. The conference substitute authorizes $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1966; $160,000,000 for fiscal year 1967; $275,000,000 for fiscal year 1968; and such sums for the 2 succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable persons who have been awarded fellowships prior to July 1, 1968, to complete their study under the fellowships.

TITLE VI—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

Part A—Equipment

Statement of Purpose and Authorization of Appropriations

The Senate amendment stated that the purpose of this part is to improve the quality of classroom instruction in selected subject areas in institutions of higher education, and authorized:

(1) The appropriation of $35,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1967, and $60,000,000 for fiscal years 1968, 1969 and 1970, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education for the acquisition of equipment and for minor remodeling.

(2) The appropriation of $2,500,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $10,000,000 for fiscal years 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education for the acquisition (including purchase or lease) of television equipment and for minor remodeling.

(3) The appropriation of not more than $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants for the proper and efficient administration of State plans approved under this part, including expenses which he determines are necessary for the preparation of such plans.

The House bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference report adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment, but limits all of the authorizations to the first 3 years. For the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 only such sums may be appropriated as Congress hereafter authorizes by law.

Allotments to States

The Senate amendment provided that of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year for acquisition of equipment, one-half shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States on the basis of the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in each State. The remaining one-half would be allotted by the Commissioner among the States in accordance with a formula which would take into account the college enrollment of each State and its relative per capita income.

The Senate amendment provided that a State's allotment under the preceding paragraph would be available in accordance with the provisions of this part for payment of the Federal share of the cost of equipment and minor remodeling.

The Senate amendment also provided for reallotment of unused State allotments.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

State Commissions and Plans

The Senate amendment required a State desiring to participate under this part to designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education in the State. If no such State agency exists, the State may establish such an agency. The agency so designated or established (hereafter referred to as the "State commission") must submit to the Commissioner a State plan for participation. The Commissioner must approve any such plan which meets the following requirements: The plan must provide that it shall be administered by the State commission. It must set forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation (A) objective standards and methods for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects for the acquisition of specified laboratory and other special equipment, including minor remodeling of classroom or other space used for such materials or equipment; (B) objective standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible projects for (i) the acquisition of television equipment for closed-circuit direct instruction in specified fields (but not broadcast transmission equipment), (ii) the acquisition of necessary instructional materials for use in such television instruction, and (iii) minor remodeling necessary for such television equipment; and (C) objective standards and methods for determining the Federal share of the cost of each such project.

The plan must also provide (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible projects submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part; and (B) for approving and recommending to the Commissioner, in the order of such priority, applications covering such eligible projects, and for certifying to the Commissioner the Federal share, determined by the State commission under the State plan, of the cost of the project involved. The plan must provide for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the commission as to the priority assigned to the project or as to any other determination of the commission adversely affecting the applicant. Finally, the plan must provide for adequate fiscal control and fund accounting procedures and for the making of such reports as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Basic Criteria for Determining Priorities, Federal Share, and Maintenance of Effort

The Senate amendment provided that as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria governing the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible projects, and governing the application of these standards and methods to eligible projects. These basic criteria must be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part while leaving adequate flexibility for the development of State plan standards and methods. The basic criteria must give special consideration to the financial need of the institution. Subject to the foregoing requirements, these regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria.

The Senate amendment also provided that the Federal share for the purposes of this part would be 50 percent of the cost of the project, except that a State commission may increase this share to not more than 80 percent of that cost in the case of any institution proving insufficient resources to participate in the program under this part and inability to acquire such resources. An institution of higher education which obtains a grant for a project pursuant to this part in any fiscal year must agree to expend during that year for the same purpose an amount at least equal to the amount expended by such institution for that purpose during the previous fiscal year.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, with one change which would permit the Federal share to be less than 50 percent.

Applications for Grants and Conditions for Approval

The Senate amendment provided that institutions of higher education which desire to obtain grants under this part shall submit applications at such times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

The Senate amendment also provided that the Commissioner must approve an application covering a project under this part and meeting the requirements of the preceding paragraph if the following conditions have been met: (1) The project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission; (2) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner the Federal share of the cost of the project, and sufficient funds to pay such Federal share are available from the applicable allotment of the State; (3) the project has been assigned a priority that is higher than that of all other projects within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved; (4) the Commissioner determines that the project will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be overly elaborate or extravagant; and (5) the Commissioner

determines that the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances (A) that Federal funds received by the applicant will be used solely for the project covered by such application, (B) that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal portion of such cost and to provide for the effective use of the equipment upon completion, and (C) that the institution will meet the maintenance of effort requirement.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Amount of Grant—Payment

The Senate amendment provided that upon his approval of any applications for a grant under this part, the Commissioner shall reserve from the applicable allotment the Federal share of the cost of the project covered by such application. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may later be amended by him.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Administration of State Plans

The Senate amendment provided that the Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing. It also provided for terminating the eligibility of a State whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering the State plan, finds that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements for State plans, or that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such requirement.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Judicial Review

The Senate amendment provided for judicial review if any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this part or with his final action under the provisions relating to administration of State plans.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

Limitation on Payments

The Senate amendment provided that nothing contained in this part shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this part for any equipment or materials for religious worship or instruction.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts a substitute for this provision prohibiting grants under this part for equipment or materials for sectarian instruction or religious worship, or primarily in connection with the program of a school or department of divinity.

Part B—Faculty development programs

Institutes Authorized

The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $5 million for fiscal year 1966, and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term workshops or short-term or regular session institutes. These workshops and institutes would be for individuals who are engaged in (or preparing to engage in) the use of educational media equipment in teaching in institutions of higher education, or who are (or are preparing to be), in institutions of higher education, specialists in educational media or librarians or other specialists using such media.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment, but limits the authorization to 3 years.

Stipends

The Senate amendment provided that each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, plus an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each dependent. No stipends shall be paid for attendance at workshops. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate amendment.

TITLE VII—AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Authorization of appropriations

The House bill increased the authorization of appropriations for making grants under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 for construction of undergraduate academic facilities for the fiscal year 1966 from $230,000,000 to $460,000,000. The Senate amendment increased the authorization to $330,000,000. The conference substitute adopts the House figure.

The doubling of amounts for the construction of graduate academic facilities contained both in the House bill and the Senate amendment is intended to stimulate construction at all graduate schools, including those offering programs leading to a first degree in law.

Eligibility for grants

The present act provides that one of the requirements a construction project must meet for approval is that it will result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity. The Senate amendment added, as an alternative, that it could result in such an expansion of its capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs. The provision from the Senate amendment is included in the conference report, with an amendment making clear that the expansion of capacity must be for on-campus activities. The committee wishes to emphasize that the provisions of the existing act provide that special consideration will be given to projects designed to expand undergraduate enrollment capacity and that funds may only be used for the construction of "academic facilities."

Transfers of allotments

The Senate amendment contained a provision, not present in the House bill, which permitted, at the discretion of the Governor, the transfer of allotments for public community colleges and technical institutes to other public institutions of higher education, and the transfer of allotment for 4-year institutions to public community colleges and technical institutes. The conference agreed to a substitute under which either a State's allotment under section 103 for public community colleges and public technical institutes or its allotment under section 104 for other institutions could be transferred for use under the other section if the State commission has not received an application for grants under the section in question prior to January 1 of the year, and it requests such transfer.

Period of availability of funds

The Senate amendment provided that funds appropriated to carry out title II of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 would be available for 3 years, and makes funds appropriated for title III thereof available for 2 years. These provisions are included in the conference report.

Change in interest rates

The present law provides that loans for construction of academic facilities shall bear interest at a rate related to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt. The Senate amendment added a provision, which was retained in the conference report, under which the interest rate on such loans would not exceed 3 percent a year.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

The Senate amendment contained definitions of the terms "local educational agency", "State educational agency", and "elementary school". These terms were used in the provisions added by the Senate amendment which relate to fellowships for teachers and the National Teacher Corps.

The conferees, in adopting the provisions of the Senate amendment relating to teacher fellowships and the Teacher Corps, also adopted these definitions, but in doing so they omitted all reference to postsecondary vocational education in the definition of local educational agency.

Federal administration

The Senate amendment contained a provision permitting the Commissioner to contract out the printing of educational matter. The Senate receded.

Federal control of education prohibited

The House bill provided that nothing contained in this act or any other act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity or sorority, any private club or any religious organization of any institution of higher education.

The Senate amendment limited the application of the House provision to fraternal organizations, fraternities or sororities, private clubs or religious organizations at institutions of higher education, whose facilities were not owned by the institution of higher education and whose activities were financed by funds derived from private sources.

The conference committee agreed to a substitute for the House and Senate provisions which provides that nothing contained in this act or any other act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization at an institution of higher education (other than a service academy or the Coast Guard Academy) which is financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by such institution.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
HUGH L. CAREY,
JOHN H. DENT,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came before this House on August 27 to seek your support for the Higher Education Act of 1965, your response was overwhelmingly favorable—367 voted for passage; only 22 Members were against.

Today I bring this same bill back from conference tempered in the forge of 1

month's hard creative bargaining. Both Chambers and both sides of the aisle sought compromise with one goal in mind—the enactment this year of legislation that will revitalize the tired blood of our anemic colleges and universities and pump needy students into the all too upper class mainstream of academic life. I ask you to vote for this bill now as you already have done before.

The "care" package for higher education you will be approving contains contributions from Representatives, Senators, Republicans, and Democrats. It represents agreement by almost everybody, surrender by none. The House gave and got. Higher education in America will be the beneficiary of every change.

When Representatives prepare to engage in debate on an issue of national importance, they usually come armed with an arsenal of hard facts and stern logic, ready to meet every thrust and parry of the opposition. It is my sad duty today to report to this Chamber that my friends on the other side of the aisle are set to do intellectual battle without even knowing how properly to spell the name of the program they so vehemently attack. It is the "Teacher" Corps—not the "Teachers'" Corps.

Unfortunately for them and fortunately for us, their facts are no more accurate and their logic no more persuasive than their orthography. They have been informed by a colleague that the National Teacher Corps proposal contained in title V of the Higher Education Act would authorize $165 million to be spent over a 3-year period. I had assumed until now that we were all present at the same conference, for the bill I appended my signature to and which will be before you for consideration authorizes $100.2 million for 2 years. So much for reading, 'riting, and 'rithemetic.

The letter sent to all of our colleagues boasts of Republican solidarity against the Teacher Corps. It overlooked the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] voted with us on this section of the act. It is my hope that even more Republicans will see the wisdom of this position and avoid being carried away by shibboleths.

I had thought that when we voted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into law on March 26 of this year that at least 263 of us no longer saw red and stampeded at the slightest mention of Federal aid to education. Seven months ago 263 of us, many Republicans included, thought it fitting to allocate funds to pay for teaching personnel in elementary and secondary schools, for inservice training for teachers, for teacher institutes. What has happened since then to make it an anathema to help provide more and better trained teachers for these very same schools in the very same low-income areas?

It is not adequate to answer by stating that it is late in the session. It is even later in these schools, all too late to save some of the children unless we try our best this week, not January or February or March.

"Wait awhile," they caution, let the dangers be eradicated. What dangers are they referring to? The danger that the Federal Government will control local teachers? If I remember correctly it was the very same gentleman from Minnesota who suggested in conference that Corps members be paid directly by the Federal Government.

But where is this monster, this Federal control? Is it in the assignment of teachers to the school districts? No; they are free to accept and reject whom they will. They can refuse to participate in the program at all if they do not desire. The Federal Government only sees to the supply of available teachers, not to any demand component. The important fact to emphasize is that no school district—and I repeat— no school district—will receive a single teacher unless that school district requests such teachers and which it will supervise and can fire at will.

Does Federal control lurk in the supervision of the teachers? Not if the bill is read carefully. The local districts have the absolute, exclusive authority to assign the teachers within their systems, to determine the subject matter they will teach, to decide how long they will keep any teacher. If the boss is the man who hires and fires, then the local district is the boss, not the Commissioner of Education.

Is this mysterious danger present in federally paid for training of teachers? Then why do the same people who condemn this proposal willingly approve Federal fellowship and institutes under the National Defense Education Act and under the same title V of this bill? Inconsistency may be the hobgoblin of many minds, but there still is something to be said for intellectual clarity.

Is there a danger in routing Federal money through local educational agencies to the teachers? That would seem to be a major device for insuring that the teachers not bite the local hand that feeds them. That is what is currently and successfully being done with the VISTA volunteers who work in public schools.

Is there a booby trap in Federal recruitment of teachers? One of the needs that prompted this bill and was so starkly revealed in our hearings is the inability of many school districts to mount even the tiniest effective recruitment campaign. The teachers simply will not come to teach in tough areas as the system now functions. This program is designed to remedy this situation by relying upon one of the greatest American virtues—idealism.

We are not bribing persons to participate in the Corps by offers of fantastic salaries. They will earn in cash what their counterparts in the district in which they teach earn. But they will earn something more—a warm feeling of satisfaction in having tried to help where the need is greatest.

In line with the recognized problems posed by the Teacher Corps, I have asked the gentlewoman from Oregon, Representative EDITH GREEN, the distinguished chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, to maintain a continuing close scrutiny of the Teacher Corps as part of that subcommittee's investigation of the Office of Education. Hearings will begin shortly.

I want to take this opportunity to point out that we in the Education and Labor Committee are fully cognizant of the rapid changes taking place both in education in America and the Office of Education's administration of vast amounts of Federal funds. How well are these funds being administered? Is the Office of Education fulfilling its role as administrative watchdog of discriminatory practices in educational institutions receiving Federal funds? Is the Office of Education completely equipped within its administrative apparatus to shift from a comparatively unimportant agency to a major dispenser of Federal funds in American education? How professionally able and skilled are those administering the Office of Education? Does a cohesive ideological philosophy guide the Office of Education?

It is time to pause at this moment in our legislative deliberations and present to the Congress and the public a thorough and detailed picture of the operation of the Office of Education. Under Mrs. GREEN's subcommittee, this will be done.

I also want to state here today that the Senate conferees, in conference with the House for the higher education bill, agreed that it is now time for a joint Senate-House Committee on Education. Such a joint committee will be established in the next few weeks in cooperation with my distinguished and able counterparts in the Senate, Senators LISTER HILL and WAYNE MORSE.

The good qualities of this bill are manifest; its defects wildly overstated. As T. S. Eliot wrote:

> Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge? Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?

It is time to blow away the cloud of bombast that has surrounded this proposal, to ignore their nightmarish invocations of that old bogeyman, the Federal camel in the local tent. It is time to vote "nay" on the motion to recommit, and "aye" for final passage.

Mr. Speaker, what then does this revised bill contain? Title I, the provision encouraging institutions of learning to seek solutions for the problems faced by the communities they serve, is a perfect example of give and take. Even the name of the title has been changed to protect all parties concerned.

In fiscal year 1966 we will be authorizing $25 million—one-half of the House's previous figure—for community service and continuing education programs designed to aid our handling of crises in such areas as housing, poverty, employment, transportation, and health. In accordance with the Senate's wishes, community problems affecting rural areas will be encompassed by the program, although particular emphasis will be placed, as the House wanted it to be, on urban and suburban problems. The term "rural" is intended to refer to small mining communities and other nonfarm sections of the United States.

If any course offerings are to be funded under title I, they must be either of col-

lege level or acceptable toward a college degree, although participants might well include persons who lack high school diplomas, if their help is necessary in solving the problems under investigation.

Under no circumstances, however, do we intend to subsidize courses of the basket-weaving variety, which serve society only by filling people's idle time. It is the intent of the conferees that no funding of agricultural or home economics courses in rural areas be permitted, but that home economics offerings in urban and suburban areas could be supported. The use of the phrase "course offerings" as an example of one form of community service program is not meant to preclude the use of title I funds for workshops, meetings, or short-term institutes held in conjunction with an institution's continuing education program nor is it designed to prohibit funding of an institution's educational television offerings.

All of this was in accordance with the original House bill, as was the agreement to delete the reservation for grants for experimental approaches proposed by the Senate and the Senate prohibition against using fee-related funds to match Federal dollars. Although no money is specifically set aside for experimentation, it is expected that many States will allocate some of their resources for novel approaches to our age-old dilemmas, including interstate cooperative efforts to handle problems that transcend State boundaries. Actually, as this title stands, it is an experiment in its entirety.

While the bill permits the use of course fees for matching purposes, none of the conferees wants the cost of the courses to be borne entirely by the participating students, many of whom can ill afford to pay substantial tuition. To serve this objective, fees should be kept as minimal as is feasible, given the offering institution's financial condition.

The conferees determined to follow the Senate version in maintaining the Federal share of the cost of these programs at 75 percent for the first 2 fiscal years and at the same time, specifically requiring the colleges to continue their own financing of university extension and continuing education programs. To make absolutely certain that there will be no waste through duplication and that this new program will not merely be a carbon copy of the 50-year-old Agricultural Extension Service, the House conference members wholeheartedly accepted the Senate's creation of a National Advisory Council designed to coordinate all Federal extension and continuing education activities and services.

Our proposal for assistance to college libraries, library training, and research contained in title II is another excellent example of the fine art of mutual concession. Our authorizations for the purchase of library materials were identical, but both the House and the Senate versions of the act needed adjustment to assure that "the book gap" would be overcome or, at least, narrowed. To this end, the bill agreed upon would give each college in the country a basic grant of up to $5,000 on a matching basis and, in addition thereto, a nonmatching supplemental grant of up to $10 per full-time student with the allocation accent on the financial need of the institution with respect to its library resources. A minimal institutional contribution of $1,500 would be required as a token of good faith before the institution could qualify as a recipient of the supplemental grant.

The House conferees were willing to adopt the Senate's expansion of the category of institutional recipients of such aid to include branches located in different communities and offering college level programs which require library facilities. The distribution formula would work so as to allot 85 percent of the funds for library resources to the basic and supplemental grants, leaving 15 percent of the entire $50 million for special purpose grants to satisfy special national and regional needs and establish and strengthen joint use of combined library facilities. Our requirement of institutional consultation with State higher education agencies in carrying out this portion of the act was modified to a requirement of periodic informing.

The House $15 million authorization for library training and research was accepted by the Senate. None of the research grants are to be made to individuals. The training institutes for librarians which are currently being conducted under title XI of the National Defense Education Act will be phased out under that act and revived, perhaps in a new form, under this one, after June 30, 1967. The slightly stepped up Senate authorizations for the Library of Congress cataloging endeavors in fiscal years 1967 and 1968 have been adopted, as has the Senate permission for the Library to distribute bibliographic information by printing catalog cards.

Title III, the part to strengthen developing institutions, that is, smaller, inferior colleges that have been unable to provide quality education and are plagued by chronically inadequate teaching, course offerings, facilities, and equipment, was one of the major battlegrounds of the conference. The House had purposefully confined the operation of the title to 4-year institutions and accordingly limited the funds to $30 million for the first year. The Senate expanded the program to include junior colleges and a $55 million authorization.

The compromise we arrived at is intended to adhere closely to the original conception of the plan while, nonetheless, incorporating the Senate's inclusion of 2-year institutions and the Senate authorization. No institution can qualify as "developing" unless it meets the stringent standards described in the reports of both Chambers and unless it has been in existence for 5 academic years prior to its request to participate and receive assistance. It must either be accredited or making reasonable progress toward accreditation and, if a 2-year college, must have provided, for 5 academic years, a program acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree. The conferees expect the Commissioner and the Advisory Council that will assist him to translate these standards into regulations that will make this title operative and effective only where there is a genuine need to upgrade the quality of instruction. In order to be certain that this title is functioning in the manner we would like it to, we have decided to review it next year before authorizing any appropriation for fiscal 1967.

Two other minor changes in this title should be noted. First, the House acquiesced in the Senate's specific inclusion of programs to strengthen the administration of developing institutions, since poor administration may prove to be a significant factor in causing their weakness. Second, we concurred in the Senate's determination that money should be available not only for scholars from the best colleges to teach at developing ones, but also for the flow of personnel to be routed in the other direction on this two-way street—for persons from developing institutions to study for advanced degrees at superior schools.

To many in the outside world who have been anxiously watching the progress of this bill through the Congress and hope, as I do, for its speedy enactment, title IV, authorizing a major multilevel program of student assistance, is the heart of this bill. It has come out of the conference essentially intact. The changes that have been made do not affect the basic tripartite structure of both the House and the Senate bills—the combination of outright grants of money with interest-subsidized, principal-guaranteed loans, and work-study earnings that will open the classroom doors to a whole new generation of young men and women who previously have been barred from going to college because their family resources were insufficient to sustain the great expense involved.

The grants will be labeled "educational opportunity grants" as we had originally called them, but they will be parceled out not under the National Defense Education Act, but through an independent program that will enable many colleges which, for various reasons, including matching requirements, have been unable to join in the defense act loans, to participate now. This expansion of the program was a contribution of the Senate's as was the option provision allowing institutions to transfer 25 percent of their grant funds to their National Defense Education Act student loan fund, if they preferred to make loans rather than outright grants. The grants would be supported by an authorized appropriation of $70 million in fiscal year 1966. This is the Senate figure.

The amount of grant that any individual could obtain would be ultimately determined in the context of his need and this not being financially able to pursue a course of study at the institution of higher education but for the grant. Within that framework, there would be a ceiling of the lesser amount of $800 per person or one-half of the total financial aid provided the student by the institution and by State or private scholarships, excluding work-study assistance. This maximum would be upped by $200 if the student is in the upper half of his class.

With the exception of this last bonus for excellence, all of these qualifications and limitations are taken directly from the House bill.

The allotment of scholarship funds among the States would be based on the National Defense Education Act formula as suggested by the House. There would be no optional transfer of Federal grant money to State scholarship programs, which the Senate had provided. The money—up to 5 percent of the grants—the Senate authorized each institution to spend on the bill-endorsed cooperative motivational program to identify qualified youths from low-income families and to encourage them to seek a higher education was deleted. It is, however, the expectation of the conferees that the financial backing necessary for the success of this program will be indirectly obtained through the efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity in conducting its Project Upward Bound.

Part B of title IV establishing a comprehensive program of guaranteed, reduced interest loans was essentially the same in both bills and thus remains unchanged except in minor technical details. The Senate did add an amendment calling for a moratorium on repayment of federally guaranteed loans during a 3-year period while the student is a member of the Armed Forces or a Peace Corps volunteer. We accepted this because it is comparable to the moratorium in the National Defense Education Act, section 205(b)(2). We also agreed to hold the repayment requirement off for 9 months—not 6 months—in accordance with the Senate substitute and with the identical provision in the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965—H.R. 7743. An Advisory Council to help the Commissioner set up the policy lines to govern the implementation of this part was added by the Senate and we receded with the understanding that, in order to make sure that the loans will be available as soon as possible, the Commissioner need not have the regulations cleared by this Council. We further consented to the Senate's enlarging the category of institutions eligible to participate to include most nonprofit postsecondary educational institutions and to the Senate technical revisions to facilitate loans by Federal credit unions. There will be no overlap whatsoever with vocational student loans. The House specification that acceptable State and nonprofit guaranteed loan programs need only insure 80 rather than the Senate's 90 percent of unpaid principal was subscribed to by the Senate.

The work-study program contained in part C is no different than the one contained in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965, which has already become public law. The Senate version was adopted for technical reasons. It also makes certain restrictions presently governing only off-campus work applicable to all work-study programs and permits institutions to pay their 10-percent, non-Federal share in the form of services and equipment. All the conferees want to be certain that the funds for this operation be controlled by the Office of Education, not the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In the course of the hearings on this act held by Mrs. GREEN's Special Subcommittee on Education serious problems in the collection of National Defense Education Act loans were pointed out. Various methods for tackling these problems were propounded and discussed, but no amendments to this end were tacked onto the House bill. The Senate, however, did add to its title IV certain amendments carefully tailored to achieve the goals of substantially lowering the delinquency rate and enabling institutions to establish sounder collection procedures. Since these amendments would achieve the identical objectives the House subcommittee had in mind, we decided to give our assent to them in the conference report.

The amendments would allow the colleges to recoup some of their loan administration costs by giving them up to the lesser of one-half of the estimated expenses or 1 percent of the aggregate of the outstanding loans made from the fund, thus providing the colleges with an incentive to intensify their collection efforts. They would reduce the 2-year, postcollege break before the borrower had to begin paying off principal to a pause of between 10 and 12 months depending on whether monthly, bimonthly, or quarterly payments were contracted for. The accrual of interest and payment of installments would be tolled for part-time as well as full-time students. There would be a minimum monthly repayment rate on National Defense Education Act loans of $15 per month per borrower. Colleges could charge small service fees to certain delinquent or tardy borrowers in order to spur them into timely repayment or prompt notification to the affected institution of factors changing their liability.

A major change would extend the loan forgiveness provisions to encompass teachers who serve in a full-time capacity in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school with a high concentration of students from low-income families in the school district of a local educational agency eligible for educational assistance for children of low-income families under title II of Public Law 874, 81st Congress. This would serve to entice good teachers into such needy schools, since the forgiveness or cancellation rate would amount to 15 percent of the original total of the loan per academic year, although no borrower could receive any refund by reason of subsequent forgiveness of amounts already repaid. Eligible schools in which teachers desiring to have their loans forgiven might teach would be restricted to no more than 25 percent of the schools in a State.

The Senate also felt that it was advisable to broaden subject eligibility for support for special equipment and materials under title III of NDEA to include economics. An increase in the title III authorization of $10 million for the next 3 fiscal years would accommodate this broadening. Title XI short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study would be expanded to include institutes covering economics, civics, and industrial arts. A $17,250,000 increase is allotted for this purpose.

Title V of the conference report is new to the bill, although by no means new to our committee. We held 5 days of hearings on H.R. 9627, the National Elementary and Secondary Teacher Opportunities Act of 1965, which contained provisions quite similar to the ones the Senate inserted in this act. H.R. 9627 was approved by a voice vote of the full Committee on Education and Labor on August 26 and sent on to the Rules Committee. It has not been heard from since.

Title V of the conference report begins by creating an Advisory Council on Quality Teacher Preparation which would review the administration and operation of all of the programs carried out under title V and all other Federal programs for complementary purposes.

A major part of this title is devoted to the National Teacher Corps, a program whose operations were fully explained in every relevant detail by my colleagues, Messrs. PERKINS and BRADEMAS, yesterday. As it now stands, it appears that this is the only controversial portion of the bill. This controversy is a tempest in a teapot. The Federal control of local education that so many Republicans allege they have ferreted out is absolutely invisible from any reasonable point of view. I am unable to see how the Commissioner of Education or any other Federal official can force any school district to take a teacher of his choosing when the law specifically states that no teacher will go into any school unless the school district concerned both requests the presence of a Teacher Corps member and agrees to accept the particular team members who will work there. I am unable to understand how the Federal Government will be able to contol any Corps member's activities in a school district, when the law specifically gives the local districts the exclusive authority to assign the teachers wherever the districts choose within their systems and to determine the subject matter that will be taught. It escapes me how Washington is going to force any local school district to retain any Corps member already on the job, when the district is completely free to fire him in the same way that they fire any other teacher.

Where is this Federal hobgoblin? Where does he reside? In Federal teacher training? What are the National Defense Education Act fellowships and institutes all about, if not Federal teacher training? They have been in existence for 7 years and no one has voiced any loud objections to their continuance. Besides the training at stake here is only paid for by the Commissioner. It is to be administered by local colleges and universities. In Federal pay? There is none. Uncle Sam will not be signing a single Teacher Corps member's check. The hand that feeds him will be a local educational agency's hand.

All this much ado about nothing, about make-believe Federal control which is as real as a Halloween witch, completely ignores the excellences of this

program—its attempt to attract into the teaching profession the brightest, most dedicated college graduates in this country, its effort to help the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs get off the ground by providing experienced teachers where they are most needed and least likely to be available, its creation of a new type of on-the-job teacher training directed at teachers of the disadvantaged. It is time to be positive about the virtues of the Teachers Corps, not negative or defensive. This is a bill designed to help, not to harm.

Part C of title V is a skeleton idea contained in the Senate bill that has been fleshed out in the language set forth in H.R. 9627, sponsored by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS]. It would establish a program of 2-year fellowships for 4,500 elementary and secondary professional school personnel in fiscal year 1966, 10,000 in 1967, and 15,000 in 1968. The accent would be on high-quality substantive courses. The persons awarded fellowships would not be limited specifically to teachers but would also include persons engaged in the related professional vocations of, among others, teacher supervision and guidance, school library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, and special education for handicapped children. Up to 20 percent of the fellowships could and should be awarded to persons who have been displaced in their employment as professional employees of local educational agencies as a result of changes of school populations brought about by the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or the carrying out of the purpose of that act.

Equitable geographical distribution of the awards would be subordinated to any urgent national needs and to the general objectives of attracting into elementary or secondary education the cream of recent college graduates and college graduates who either left the field or have never entered as well as of encouraging experienced personnel to undertake graduate study. Fellowship stipends would be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs and, in addition, the institution attended by the fellow would receive $2,500 per fellow per academic year less any tuition or similar fee charged the fellow. Institutions who are participating in the fellowship program and want to develop and strengthen their graduate teacher training programs would receive appropriate assistance.

This concluding section of title V, while it was never part of the House bill, represents a significant accommodation on the part of the Senate to the views of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Title VI of the bill that came out of conference provides financial assistance, amounting to some $43½ million in this fiscal year and more in the 2 years thereafter, to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction through the use of the most modern laboratory and other special equipment, including audiovisual materials and nontextbook printed matter; $35 million would go into these equipment grants this year and the minor remodeling necessary to utilize these devices. The sum of $2½ million is allocated to closed-circuit television equipment and remodeling pursuant to the acquisition or lease of such equipment, and $1 million is for the administration expenses of State plans under the title and $5 million for educating the persons who will be employing this educational media equipment in the institutions, whether as teachers, specialists, or librarians. Institutes and workshops would be established by the institutions of higher education in order to develop the faculty equipped to handle such devices. This entire title was added by the Senate, but it was the unanimous opinion of the House conferees that it fulfilled the acute need for revising instruction methods to keep pace with the dizzying whirl of technological change.

The core of title VII amending the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is the amount of authorization for the construction of undergraduate academic facilities during the fiscal year 1966. The Senate agreed to accept our doubling of funds from $230 to $460 million and thereby recognized the burgeoning demand in this area for more and more aid. Bricks and mortar do not make a college, but without vital facilities no college can sustain high caliber education.

The House conferees were willing to adopt various Senate amendments to the 1963 act with certain House modifications. An alternative use of construction funds to finance a project that would result in the expansion of an institution's capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs was subscribed to, with the understanding that such expansion would be strictly for on-campus activities and that special consideration would be given to projects designed to expand undergraduate enrollment capacity. Transfers of allotments from public community colleges and technical institutes to 4-year institutions, and vice versa, at the discretion of the State commission administering the State plan, was approved on the condition that the transfer be made only if the State commission had grant funds but no applicants in the relevant class as of January 1 of a given year. Another Senate amendment would permit funds appropriated for graduate facility grants and academic facility loans to remain available for 3 and 2 fiscal years, respectively, to enhance the prospects of fund raising. Finally, the interest rate on loans for classrooms, libraries, and laboratories would be reduced from 3⅞ to 3 percent to conform to the rate currently charged on college housing loans and prevent the anomaly of the facilities floor of a building being built at 3⅞ percent, while the dormitories cost 3 percent interest.

The final section of the bill, section 804, merely retains the thrust of the Waggonner amendment which I accepted on the floor in August—the prohibition against any Federal official's withholding funds under this or any other bill from an institution of higher education simply because a privately financed fraternity or sorority composed of students from that institution engaged in discriminatory practices. The section from the original bill has been reorganized to avoid the unintended result of nullifying any application of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to institutions of higher education and the Senate restrictive language employed to make certain that the fraternities or sororities involved really are private within the meaning of the 14th amendment and do not subsist on handouts from the institution in the form of cheap or no cost facilities.

The overall pattern of the bill as it has emerged from conference is thus quite mixed. The House adopted with alacrity those portions of the Senate bill which sought to service legitimate needs the House had inadvertently overlooked. By the same token, the House conferees steadfastly maintained their position on parts of the bill that the House, not the administration, had written. The result is a better bill in almost every way. Its duration is generally 3 years with the exception of the 1-year authorization of title III on developing institutions and the 2-year authorization for the Teacher Corps. Its cost for the first year, fiscal 1966, if the full authorizations are totaled, is somewhere in the neighborhood of $851 million. Its real value to the colleges and universities of these United States is incalculable.

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

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. With reference to the Washington Post, the gentleman has incated that the Post was inaccurate yesterday. I should like to point out that it was not wholly accurate in its editorial today because, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has indicated, the Post editorial this morning says that teachers in the Teacher Corps would be paid by the local districts. They may get their checks from the local districts, but I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor will agree with me that the money will come from the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. POWELL. I agree 100 percent with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, a very valuable member of our committee. But that money goes to the local school district. The money paid to the teacher does not come from the Federal Government, and the local school district has the power to pay or not to pay—to hire and to fire. That is the way I believe education should be operated in this Nation. I do not believe in Federal control.

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

Mr. POWELL. I yield to my beloved friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Section 804 of the Higher Education Act, which is the section having to do with Federal control of education and the prohibitions

contained in the act, was amended on the floor of the House during the consideration of the legislation. The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], accepted an amendment which I offered at that time, calling attention to the fact then that he was the author on many occasions of the Powell amendment which I agree attempted to erase discrimination and made an honest effort to give protection to bona fide private organizations. The distinguished gentleman has made it abundantly clear that he never intended to penalize institutions because of the internal policies of bona fide private organizations.

The language in the conference report has been modified somewhat as compared to House language, inasmuch as the Senate adopted a little bit different version from that which the House adopted. In an effort to make legislative history and to clarify the subject in my own thinking, I should like to ask a couple of questions.

It is my understanding that under the amended language of the conference report, of section 804(b), privately owned facilities on long-term leased land would be exempt from any Federal supervision. Also, it is the intention of this language to prevent the subsidy of these organizations with public funds. Am I correct?

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then, to further prohibit the subsidy of these organizations, with public funds, a fair service and/or rental charge must be charged any organization which might use public facilities. Am I correct?

Mr. POWELL. Absolutely correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his clarification.

Mr. POWELL. I should like to read from page 55 of the conference report the amended language of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as it came out of the conference:

(b) Nothing contained in this Act or any other Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization at an institution of higher education (other than a service academy or the Coast Guard Academy) which is financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by such institution.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield further?

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. When we talk about being financed exclusively through funds derived from private sources, we are talking about these organizations referred to rather than the institutions, are we not?

Mr. POWELL. Absolutely correct, yes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I think the language as amended is perfectly fair, and I thank the gentleman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 374]

Andrews, George W.	Frelinghuysen	Resnick
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fuqua	Rivers, S.C.
Aspinall	Hagan, Ga.	Robison
Baring	Hosmer	Roudebush
Bell	Kastenmeier	Schisler
Berry	Keogh	Sisk
Bolling	Leggett	Sullivan
Callaway	Lennon	Talcott
Casey	Lindsay	Tenzer
Clausen, Don H.	Mackay	Thomas
Culver	Mailliard	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Wis.	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, Tex.
Diggs	Martin, Nebr.	Toll
Dingell	Matthews	Tunney
Dorn	May	Walker, N. Mex.
Edwards, Ala.	Mosher	Watkins
Flynt	O'Hara, Mich.	Willis
Ford, William D.	O'Konski	Wilson, Bob
	O'Neal, Ga.	
	Poage	
	Pool	
	Reifel	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. PRICE). On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. In the years I have been on the committee more legislation has been passed out of that committee during this first session of the Congress than in any other session it has been my privilege to serve on the committee. Just what the effect of this legislation will be, of course, remains to be seen.

When we talk in the Congress about how many bills have been passed, oftentimes we neglect to mention the cost that goes along with the passage of these bills. Also just the enactment of legislation, although it sounds good on the surface, does not necessarily mean it is going to be proven to be good legislation.

As you all know, Mr. Speaker, we have passed out the antipoverty bill with an authorization of approximately $1,700 million. Already it has become apparent that this program is having many, many growing pains. In fact a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor is currently conducting a very thorough investigation of this program.

You will also recall, Mr. Speaker, that when that program passed the House there was a limited Governor's veto provision in connection with the bill. We went to conference and the House provisions were not included in the final legislation.

Now in the bill we have before us today, we are confronted, at least many of us are, with the identical position we were in on the conference report on the poverty bill. The House has not considered the so-called Teacher Corps. This was not in the House-passed bill. It was incorporated in the Senate bill. During the course of the conference, the Senate provision prevailed. The conference report that comes back to us today has the Teacher Corps provision in it.

In view of the fact that the House has not considered this and also in view of the fact that it has no direct connection with higher education, many of us feel that the Teacher Corps provision should be considered later on its own merits.

When the poverty bill came back in the conference report, a motion was made to send the conference report back to conference with the instruction that the House provision on the Governor's veto be incorporated. At that time it was argued that if the conference report was recommitted, it might possibly delay at least or perhaps kill the poverty program. Of course, we all know that was not the case. Now we hear the same rumors going around that if the motion to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] to send the higher education bill back to conference and delete the Teacher Corps provision prevails, it will kill the higher education bill. This is not the case. The conferees are still all in town. The conferees can be called together and whatever the majority of that conference decides, that will be what will come back to the House. That can be done if necessary in a matter of hours.

Regardless of how you feel on the Teacher Corps provision, I think we would all have to agree that this proposal should be considered on its own merits. That can be done and I am quite certain that our able chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor will see that that is done in the next session of the Congress.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] will discuss the pros and cons of the Teacher Corps. The only thing I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, is that if Mr. QUIE's motion prevails and the conference report is sent back to conference, with the instructions by a majority of the House membership that the Teacher Corps be deleted, this in no way

jeopardizes the passage of the higher education bill in this session of the Congress. In fact, I will do my very best as the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor and as a member of the conference to see that the bill is brought back as quickly as possible and certainly before the Congress adjourns.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are making a very grave mistake when we base the passage of legislation keyed to our anxiety to adjourn.

If this provision is bad, it should not be included; if it is good, it should be. But, either way, our position should not be based on the fact that we would all like to see this Congress adjourn.

I repeat. Adoption of Congressman QUIE's motion would not jeopardize final passage of the higher education bill in this session of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on the seventh day, even the Lord sought rest.

Surely this Congress, as it nears its temporary sabbatical, shows signs of looking before it leaps, of pausing for the refreshment of contemplation, and of giving public affairs the benefit of a second thought. Whether this attitude is the result of weariness or wariness, it is long overdue.

We have enacted a flood of legislation dealing with education. If Federal law and billions of Federal dollars, plus the inevitable meddling and muddling of additional thousands of Federal bureaucrats, can solve all educational problems, the new age of enlightenment looms ahead. Only the worst pessimist would raise nagging problems. I hope my colleagues will pardon me for a few moments of pessimism.

We have now authorized far in excess of $50 million a year for educational research. Now, where do we find the researchers—notoriously in short supply—who can make a really profound, first-class contribution to basic knowledge about how people learn? A pessimist might suggest that we will end up paying for a good deal of third-class drivel.

We have now authorized thousands of additional Federal fellowships for graduate study, to add to the 50,000 or so graduate students already supported by Federal funds. Unfortunately, the additional fellowships do not solve the very difficult problem of the acute shortage of first-rate people to initiate, expand, and conduct graduate programs in our universities. If anything, it makes the problem even more acute, which again raises the question of whether by such quantity we do not seriously dilute quality.

In our Elementary Secondary School Act we authorized $100 million a year for supplementary education centers, but I do not think any of us have the faintest notion of where the experienced teachers and counselors are to be found for these centers in the face of a shortage of these people. I might add that the poverty program, with its unlimited expense account and fat salaries, is in heavy competition for the same people needed in our schools, particularly our vocational schools.

Once again, without much thought given to the problems, we are asked to approve a huge Federal Teacher Corps, composed in large part of experienced teachers who are in short supply. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, "Where are the teachers coming from?"

The question answers itself. They are coming from classrooms which will then have to be handled by a replacement, if one can be found. Experienced teachers already have jobs. In effect, the Federal Government proposes to remove a large number of them from the classrooms where they now teach and redistribute them in other classrooms, thereby refining the proverb of robbing Peter to pay Paul; we shall rob Peter to pay Peter.

Somehow this does not make a great deal of sense. Any experienced teacher licensed to teach in New York State who wishes to teach in central Harlem probably can get a job there. The National Teacher Corps offers to do no more than that. However, just to raise another problem, if a New York teacher wants to join the Teacher Corps to teach in a poor school in Mississippi—assuming this would meet with the approval of the local school board—she would have to do so for a Mississippi salary. The advantage to the teacher—however motivated by dedication to children—is hard to find.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal just has not been thought out and examined sufficiently for us to enact it into law. I join my colleagues on this side in urging that we send the bill back to conference with instructions to remove this one section. It is a large, complex, and in many ways experimental piece of legislation. It adds more responsibility on an already overloaded agency. It is enough to digest without including a program as controversial as a federalized Teacher Corps.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, since it is widely acknowledged that it will take us several years to correct the mistakes and flaws in the mass of legislation we have enacted, should not we simply avoid this one mistake now?

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I wish to commend the gentleman for a statement that should be heard and understood around the country. Somehow or other, unfortunately, many of the organizations interested in higher education around the country have gotten the impression—I do not know where they got it—that a vote for the motion to recommit with instructions to strike out the Federal Teachers Corps will, somehow, be a vote to kill the higher education bill. The gentleman from Ohio served with me as one of the House conferees. I know he agrees with me that there is no justification at all for any conclusion that the higher education bill would be killed by a vote to recommit. The climate of the conference did not indicate that we would have no higher education bill if the motion to recommit is adopted. In fact, I believe, along with the gentleman from Ohio, that there is every reason to believe we would be back with a conference report, without the Teachers Corps within a few hours if the House were to stand up on this issue today. Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. AYRES. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. There is no sense in any delay.

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

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

Mr. POWELL. There would be no conference unless the chairman of the House conferees agrees to go back to conference.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Do I correctly understand by the statement of the distinguished chairman that he would not go back to conference, and that he would be responsible for killing the bill if the motion to recommit were adopted?

Mr. POWELL. No, I am stating that no conferees go back to conference unless the chairman of the House conferees and the chairman of the Senate conferees agree.

With regard to killing the bill, every single Member of the other body who belongs to the distinguished gentleman's party signed this report, and every single one of them voted for the Teacher Corps. Only three votes in the other body were against it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not think that is the point.

Mr. POWELL. That is my point.

Mr. AYRES. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that the Senators were unanimous in their position, but I have never felt that merely because the other body was unanimous, this part of the legislative branch of the Government should be secondary. I think we not only have an obligation but we certainly have equal power when it comes to voicing our views.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman has talked for several minutes and I have listened attentively to what he has said. Though he has talked about the Teacher Corps, he has not stated his reasons for opposing it. As a former teacher, I would be interested to know what is wrong with it.

Mr. AYRES. I am glad my friend from Ohio is on the floor, because, as I announced in my opening remarks, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] will go into the details of the proposed legislation.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentlemen yielding. I am sure that the gentleman would agree that we have a

higher education program in this country primarily because of the bipartisan efforts of people such as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], the gentleman in the well [Mr. AYRES], and others who have worked very hard to develop a higher education program.

I was rather amazed to hear the chairman of our committee imply, as he clearly did, that if he did not have his way with reference to the Teacher Corps, he was willing to kill the higher education program, in which we believe so deeply.

The issue before the House today is not whether we are for or against the higher education bill. It is whether we are for this new Teacher Corps that has been added by the Senate and which was never adopted or considered in the House.

I wish to say to the gentleman that it is bad enough that we in this House at times seem to be a rubber stamp to the Executive, but I hope we will never reach the point where we automatically rubber stamp what goes on in the other body, whether it is the action of 100 Senators or fewer.

Mr. AYRES. I agree with the gentleman. When the gentleman from Minnesota makes his motion, the House will have an opportunity to determine whether or not they want to be considered merely a rubber stamp for the other body.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Federal Teacher Corps program added on to the Higher Education Act by the other body. Let me speak to some of the arguments made by proponents of the Federal Teacher Corps.

First. They point out that a teacher must be requested by the local school district. I will grant that, but the district can only request teachers who have been previously selected and trained by the U.S. Commissioner of Education according to standards established by him.

Second. They argue that once a Federal teacher is assigned to a local school he will be subject to local school authority. This is all but irrelevant, for the point is that local schools must make "arrangements" for the use and deployment of such teachers, "arrangements" that will be dictated by the one who has the money, the Commission of Education. Furthermore, the Commissioner will determine which school districts among those which have "concentrations of children from low-income families," will actually get the teachers.

Third. The proponents argue that a school district superintendent can fire a Federal teacher if he wishes. I suppose that is true, but he cannot fire a teacher from the Federal Teacher Corps. Teachers in a Federal Corps will not be in the same position as other teachers in a local school system because, in the final analysis, they are subject only to the control of the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

A federally selected, federally trained, and federally assigned corps of teachers would give Federal officials a powerful additional lever of control and direct influence over local schools. Suppose, for example, a local school district asks for a mathematics teacher who will teach mathematics in the traditional way. The Commissioner is likely to say: "Sorry, but our math teachers in the corps teach the new mathematics, and you will have to adopt the new system if you want to assign federally paid teachers to your district." The possibilities for Federal control must be obvious.

If one reads the Teacher Corps provisions carefully, he will find that the U.S. Commissioner will have sole authority to decide which school districts get this assistance. He needs no State approval, and he will have to consult with State education agencies only if he deems it appropriate.

This proposal is not only dangerous—it is impractical. Experienced teachers are not easy to find and they are already employed. The Federal Government will be luring a teacher from one area in order to assign a teacher in another area of the country.

The proposal has not been given enough consideration. It should be stricken from the higher education bill.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Of course, I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman is not totally accurate. The Commissioner will make the arrangements with the local school board, and the local school board will have the power to control and the power to fire immediately upon the arrival of the teacher.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but I still say that in subparagraph 3 of section 513 the Secretary would be authorized to enter into arrangements; he could determine what those arrangements would be in advance, and in those arrangements, if he saw fit to do so, he could set forth the conditions under which the teacher would teach.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it is not easy for me to stand before you and object to a higher education bill. I have worked hard for higher education legislation since I have been in Congress. I take pride in the influence I have had on higher education legislation. I wish I could stand before you and say that I agree with all of this conference report. Now, I realize it is not usual to fully agree with all details of legislation. I recognize that the majority prevails, and I have to take some things that I do not approve of. I do this as I go along.

However, the National Teacher Corps is too much to swallow. I cannot accept this higher education bill with the National Teacher Corps in it. Can you, as a fellow Member of the House, accept a National Teachers Corps? Can you go back home and say to your constituents, "We gave ample consideration to the National Teacher Corps after studying it thoroughly, that is, after the subcommittee studied it, after the full committee studied it, and after consideration on the floor of the House, and I decided it was good"? No, you cannot do it, because the subcommittee heard testimony on this bill for only 1 day.

On that day they heard from one person who came to testify on it. That was the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. The other people who appeared that day were asked about it but had not given it any prior study. That is the amount of consideration that was given to it in the subcommittee.

Now, what did we do in the full committee? Did we debate it and read the bill and go over it section by section? No. We gave 5 minutes to it in the full committee. Five minutes. Then it was reported out and the House never brought it up or considered it. So we have a bill before us today where you are being asked to buy a pig in a poke. Members of the House have never had a chance to give it consideration.

This conference report, which accepted the Senate language, is different. It is different from the bill which came out of the House committee. It is different to this extent: The conference report which we have before us provides that the Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the salaries of the teachers in the school districts. One hundred percent.

Now, under the bill that came out of the House subcommittee, the local school district would have paid for the salaries. I am concerned about this because I believe the amount of Federal control and Federal influence over our school systems which we can see here by the Federal Government paying the entire bill, is too great. When you talk about Federal control, I get the impression that you people who say there is no control at all, believe that the only way there would be control, is if the Federal Government stood there with a whip and said, you do this or else.

The Federal Government here will pay 100 percent of this bill. Think of the carrot that this places before every school district to bring in these Federal teachers. Just think of the idea of getting the additional teachers for which the school district will not have to put up 1 red cent. That is what is being offered to the school district, and I am concerned about it. Think of what the Federal Government did this year. We passed in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Public Law 89–10, a provision of which sets up Federal local schools where the Federal Government will again pay the salaries, will pay 100 percent of the schools and will have set up an arrangement of Federal-local schools.

We have already taken such a large leap toward Federal influence in our local school systems that we had better stop, look, and listen. This to me is the most dangerous step we would take this year if we pass a Federal National Teacher Corps.

I am not the only one who feels this way about it. Evidently the administration felt that way about it until they put pressure on us to accept the Senate National Teacher Corps.

In the report they put out on the question of whether the Federal Government should pay the entire cost of the teachers' salaries or not, I would like to read to you from the administration's statement. Here is what they say:

Local districts should be required to give some support to the corps as an indication of their belief in it. Otherwise there will be a strong tendency for school districts to apply for the "free ride" taking all the experienced Teacher Corps volunteers they can get, all paid for by Washington.

I did not say this, the administration said this. Then they go on to say:

We believe that it is an unwise precedent for the Federal Government to begin paying 100 percent of the salaries of local employees. While the administration is concerned with the improvement of teachers' salaries wherever they are inadequate, we question the wisdom of a precedent in which the Federal Government could ultimately be held responsible for 100 percent of the salaries of some 2 million local employees.

And they go on further and say:

We also believe it would be better from the viewpoint of internal control of personnel—

Listen—

from the viewpoint of internal control of personnel for the school district to be making the major payment of teachers' salaries.

This is not me saying this; it is the administration. People all over this government are concerned about the Federal Government's involvement in education and what can be done by executive decree. We all know what the Commissioner did in Chicago. He withheld $30 million because he did not like the way Chicago had located their school buildings and only after political pressure from the Mayor, did Commissioner Keppel send in the $30 million.

We also see in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in which he indicates that there is going to be an opportunity for the local school district to select the teachers in the Corps. However, the law, if you pass this conference report, will say that the Commissioner is authorized to select experienced teachers, and inexperienced teacher-interns.

I quote from section 513(a)(1):

For the purpose of carrying out this part, the Commissioner is authorized to—(1) recruit, select, and enroll experienced teachers, and inexperienced teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent, in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to two years.

Now it is most interesting to note that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner's letter does not coincide with the bill which is before us. It is also interesting to note that the letter of Mr. Gardner quoted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], in yesterday's RECORD supposedly dated October 15, is different from another letter dated October 15 by the Secretary, and the differences are these: The first letter said:

We will assure the maintenance of local responsibility in the selection of the members of the Corps team by: (a) Asking the local school district to indicate the types of teacher qualifications that would be most desirable in the teaching team they are requesting; and (b) requiring the local school district's approval of individual team members proposed by the Teacher Corps.

The second letter which was placed in the RECORD yesterday stated:

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will seek to guarantee maximum participation of local school authorities by: (a) Requesting them to indicate the teacher qualifications they judge to be desirable; and (b) submitting to them for approval the names of individual Teacher Corps members who are available for service.

In the first letter he said:

The local school district thus will have the right not only to indicate the type of Corps member desired in their local school situation, but will also have the right to reject any Corps member they feel is undesirable.

In the second letter it states:

The local school district retains full authority to select and reject, to appoint and fire those recruited through the Teacher Corps program.

If the position of the administration can change that fast before the bill is passed, you can imagine what can be done by the Commissioner if the National Teacher Corps is passed into law. He will recruit, select, and enroll experienced teachers and inexperienced teacher-interns—that is what the law says, and he will seek cooperative higher educational institutions to get the people trained and into the program which will give them the kind of training he wants; the school districts will have the opportunity then to accept the teachers and interns or not, but the Federal Government will hold out the carrot and pay 100 percent of the bill.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. Will there be any teachers in the Teacher Corps sent into any school district where the school district does not want them?

Mr. QUIE. The chairman is absolutely correct. No teacher will go into any school district unless the school district wants him. What I am pointing out here is that the Federal Government puts up all this money, 100 percent of the salaries, and, mind you, these teachers are not going to be paid exactly what their colleagues in the school system are going to be paid. The only one who will be is the experienced teacher, if you can find someone in the school system with similar teaching duties. Otherwise there will have to be some arrangement made.

Second, an experienced teacher who is leading a teaching team shall be compensated at a rate agreed to by such agency and the Commissioner. When the Commissioner pays the entire salary, who is going to have the decision on the rates of pay?

Third, the teacher-intern shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for teaching full time in the school system. But then it goes into subsection (b) of section 514 and says:

For any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps such stipends—

And, mind you, those interns will be in training in the Corps for 2 years, as you can read in section 513(a)(1) and (3). Let me repeat again—section 514(b):

(b) For any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

As you note, the stipend shall include allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents. The above evidently applies to anyone in training. This is the experienced teachers and interns during their original 3-month training period, and since the interns are to be in training for the total 2 years, it evidently applies to them during this entire time. The remaining provisions under section 514 apply to all in the Teacher Corps.

Subsection (c) reads:

The Commissioner shall pay the necessary travel expenses of members of the Teacher Corps and their dependents and necessary expenses for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of such members as are directly related to their service in the Corps, including readjustment allowances proportionate to service.

Subsection (d) reads:

The Commissioner is authorized to make such arrangements as may be possible, including the payment of any costs incident thereto, to protect the tenure, retirement rights, participation in a medical insurance program.

So you can see, the National Teacher Corps will not be compensated exactly the same as local teachers, and with this amount of money even greater than local teachers would receive, it would be quite an inducement for local school districts to accept what the Federal Government decides is the kind of Teacher Corps this country ought to have operating in the local school districts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] knows, I have been privileged to serve in this House of Representatives for a number of years and during that time I had the opportunity of serving in this House of Representatives under the late great Speaker of the House, the Honorable Sam Rayburn. I recall so vividly and so many, many times having heard him say that never would he agree to the principle of Federal money paying teachers in these United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I always applauded the late Speaker Rayburn for this and I know that he stood firm in this conviction through the many, many years that he served as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer a motion to recommit, to send the bill back to conference again, with the instruction that the Teacher Corps be dropped. If we do this, I shall support strongly and wholeheartedly the conference report. I shall work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle next year to develop a system of helping train teachers to go into the culturally and educationally deprived areas and teach the preschoolchildren where this program ought to be carried out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to the attention of all the Members of the House the remarks that have just been made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota has demonstrated by his record his commitment to Federal programs to help the field of higher education.

Mr. Speaker, it is largely due to the gentleman from Minnesota, and a few others who rose above many other considerations, that we have a higher education program today.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's statement is an eloquent one, because it points out how far we have gone from the initial principles that were laid down when we established a higher education program.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about teachers paid for 100 percent by the Federal Government, going into our high schools and our other schools to teach.

I would like to further point out that there is a section in here, section 516, that I know our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to point to, and it is the usual kind of provision. It is entitled "Local Control Preserved." It cites the powers that the local school officials will have. But, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to not neglect the phrase or clause that comes just before the listing of those four powers, and I quote:

Except as otherwise provided in clause 3 of section 513(a) such agency shall retain the authority to—

And lists the four powers.

Mr. Speaker, clause or section 513(a) is the section which gives the power to the Commissioner to make such arrangements as he deems appropriate in making these grants and in setting up these teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman will agree with me that all the powers guaranteed to local agencies are subject to the arrangements made by the Commissioner, and the power of the Commissioner to make those arrangements.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUIE. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question in terms of legislative history, if I may.

Is there anything with reference to the Teacher Corps program here which refers to whether or not the teachers in the Teacher Corps, and paid 100 percent by the Federal Government, may serve in private as well as public schools?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, it provides that the teachers will serve in the primary, elementary, and secondary schools as well.

This is section 513(d), where it says—

A local educational agency may utilize members of the Teacher Corps assigned to it in providing, in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended, educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for his answer. It is a matter of legislative history, and I want to commend the gentleman again for his very forceful statement.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 375]

Andrews, George W.	Ford, William D.	Poage
Andrews, N. Dak.	Frelinghuysen	Pool
Aspinall	Fulton, Tenn.	Reifel
Baring	Fuqua	Rivers, S.C.
Bell	Hagan, Ga.	Robison
Berry	Hanna	Rogers, Tex.
Bolling	Hansen, Wash.	Roudebush
Callaway	Harsha	Sisk
Casey	Hosmer	Staggers
Celler	Keogh	Sullivan
Clausen, Don H.	Leggett	Talcott
Corman	Lennon	Teague, Tex.
Culver	Lindsay	Tenzer
Davis, Wis.	Mackay	Thomas
Diggs	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	Martin, Nebr.	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn	Matthews	Toll
Edwards, Ala.	May	Tunney
Flynt	Mosher	Walker, N. Mex.
	O'Konski	Watkins
	O'Neal, Ga.	Willis
		Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). On this rollcall 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Teacher Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this time has been yielded to me so that I may outline my strong support for the Teacher Corps features of the higher educational bill conference report. The other aspects of the bill have been thoroughly reviewed. Since the Teacher Corps is the major item of controversy, and will be the subject of the motion to recommit, I want to set forth the reasons why I feel it is vital to establish the Teacher Corps.

As a former teacher, I would like to outline what this program would mean for West Virginia. During the first year of operation, 50 to 60 teachers could be recruited and assigned to West Virginia, with 100 to 120 being made available the second year. With the county school boards having full authority to hire and fire, and the Federal Government only paying the salaries of these highly trained teachers, I think the argument of Federal control or interference is a false one. Full control would be retained by the school board at the local level.

WEST VIRGINIA SCHOOLS WILL BENEFIT

Now on the positive side, I would like to point out how the Teacher Corps can directly benefit West Virginia schools. In our State, there are about 439,000 elementary and secondary school children taught by 16,400 hard-working and dedicated school teachers—most of whom do not receive as much of a salary as they really deserve. Throughout our Nation, under ideal circumstances, an equal education is afforded to all. But let us face it, there are some schools whose limited facilities and environment prohibit them from offering the same educational advantages and experiences to their students as those schools who can afford the very best in modern equipment, methods, and facilities.

We need a reserve of well-trained, enthusiastic teachers who can serve where they are needed, and they certainly are needed in localities which have been least able in the past to attract the best teachers. In various sections of West Virginia, these teachers of a high caliber could go to areas plagued by problems, and then work under the direction of local school officials who know best our needs and also need extra help to meet these needs.

SPECIAL SKILLS IN NEEDIEST SCHOOLS

A Teacher Corps gives us an opportunity to recruit on a national basis those dedicated teachers who have the special knowledge and skills to serve in our neediest schools.

Teacher teams will go into local school districts when their services are requested—and only when requested.

The local school district will specify its needs in teacher skills—a team can be shaped to fit those needs—and the local school administrations will be provided an opportunity to review the files of potential team members and make its own selections. No Corps member will be forced upon any district.

NO FEDERAL DICTATORSHIP IN TEACHER CORPS

Teacher Corps members, once assigned to a school district, will serve as local employees, subject to the authority of

local school administrations. They are not Federal employees.

Teacher Corps members will be paid at a level in keeping with the pay for other teachers in the same school system. Interns will get beginner's pay.

School administrators are finding it increasingly difficult to staff the schools attended by large numbers of disadvantaged children with top-quality teachers. But recruitment for Teacher Corps volunteers will be for a period of 2 years. Hence it is possible that hard-pressed schools will have, at the end of 2 years, as many as five excellent, experienced teachers who might well remain on the job as ex-volunteers.

As a nation we are spending $39 billion a year or more on education. The cost of the Teacher Corps, an investment in children, can only be measured against the far greater costs of neglect and all the resultant social and economic ills associated with poverty and lack of education.

Of far greater significance than the cost are the benefits that will accrue to our country when youngsters who might have been cast aside become, instead, valued members of our society.

A CROWNING ACHIEVEMENT IN EDUCATION

The 89th Congress, which has accomplished so much in new strides for education, can—with the same sense of mission that we are seeking in our teachers—help perfect a good year's work with approval of the Teacher Corps and the entire Higher Education Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is a reasonable and sensible approach to the problem of enriching our teaching staffs. I cannot see any value in the arguments raised against it. Above all, I cannot agree that the Higher Education Act should be placed in jeopardy because of misunderstandings and misreadings of the Teacher Corps proposals.

I intend to continue to support this fine piece of legislation and I sincerely urge every Member of the House to join me in this effort.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report and especially in favor of the concept of the Teacher Corps.

The Teacher Corps is a logical and necessary extension of the purposes of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which we passed earlier in this session of Congress. That act struck hard at the problems of the urban and rural slum schools. And we still have a long way to travel before all those problems are solved.

But the Teacher Corps is clearly consistent with our earlier legislative achievement and deals directly with the most pressing problem of the slum school: good teachers.

The Teacher Corps has two great objectives: to bring dedicated teaching help to depressed urban and rural areas where it is needed the most, and to attract able and idealistic young Americans into the teaching profession.

Many Americans young and old have responded successfully to the challenge of doing a difficult and useful job in service organizations at the local, State, and national levels. Probably the most obvious example is the Peace Corps, but there are many others, too. The Teacher Corps offers a similar challenge.

I am completely assured that the Teacher Corps will be made up of experienced teachers as well as able young college graduates. Its members will volunteer for 2 years of service and professional training.

We are not looking forward to putting green, untrained teachers into our most needy schools and then just leaving them there. As every Member here knows, we have quite enough of that going on already in our home States and home districts because of the great pressures of enrollment and the teacher shortage in general.

But under the Teacher Corps, we will have at least nothing less than college graduates go into our schools and our classrooms as teacher interns. And we will at least give each one of them an additional 3 months of intensive training at a university center. Then these interns will work in small, teaching teams led by an experienced teacher.

All Corps members will teach part of the time and spend the other part of their time attending seminars conducted by the faculties of cooperating universities. Corps teachers may also take additional university work to help them earn an advanced degree by the end of their 2-year Teacher Corps service.

It is increasingly apparent to me that we must make every effort to attract the most capable and the promising young Americans into the teaching profession. Last month the national supply of new teachers fell 118,000 short of the 248,000 we really needed. This shortage is most acute in the schools of our city slums and depressed rural areas.

The Teacher Corps will help fill the ranks of the teaching profession, yes. But it will also offer a worthy challenge to idealistic young Americans, providing them with valuable classroom service and professional training. It will also help place dedicated teachers in those very slum schools where they are needed most.

No other legislation enacted or contemplated by this Chamber contains provisions to meet this pressing problem of quality teacher supply.

The Teacher Corps may be a new program, but it does not contain untried ideas. The internship method of teacher training has been widely accepted for the past 70 years. The paid intern-team approach has been in operation at Cardozo High School here in Washington for 2 years. Nearly 200 other such programs are now operating in local schools around the country.

We are not legislating an experiment here. We are legislating what the schools want—what they need—and what they actually use today, despite the great pressures of limited money and time.

I am convinced that the Teacher Corps puts tested—not untested—ideas to work and so I support it wholeheartedly. I am convinced that its object is to train teachers for our disadvantaged children and we are already on public record as knowing this to be a great national need.

And I am also convinced that the Teacher Corps—without violating any of the rights and prerogatives of local school administration and control—that the Corps will make available these teachers to those districts where they are desperately needed.

I support this measure and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the legislation before the House today and particularly that portion of the bill providing for a National Teacher Corps.

I feel there is a great need for this National Teacher Corps because of the unfortunate displacement of many Negro teachers by the changing conditions of our educational system. This distressing situation, which has thrown hundreds of Negro teachers out of jobs, and which threatens to displace thousands of Negro teachers in the very near future, has been directly caused by the desegregation of our schools.

As one of the first introducers of this legislation in the House, my feeling was and is that something must be done to raise the educational level of all of our teachers especially those who were threatened by the loss of their jobs by the desegregation of schools.

Dr. Gilbert Porter, former president of the Florida State Teachers Association, the Negro teachers organization in my State, pointed out in a meeting this summer that between 1,000 and 1,500 Negro teachers faced displacement because they did not have the qualifications to score 500 or higher on the national teachers examination, which is a requirement under Florida law for all Florida teachers.

I believe a National Teachers Corps would help guard against these displacement problems not only in Florida and other Southern States, but also throughout school systems across the country. I also believe that the mere fact that there are over 1,000 teachers in my State who cannot make an acceptable score on the national teachers examination is evidence that this National Teacher Corps was needed long ago.

The charge that this Teacher Corps would establish a federalized teaching system is unfounded. The authority to employ and dismiss teachers is retained by the local school boards.

What we are trying to do is to upgrade the teaching abilities of those who are threatened by displacement and to help Negro and white teachers provide for quality education in all our schools, insofar as this limited measure can accomplish this large objective.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], a member of the committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, including

the Teacher Corps on which the committee has done such an effective job.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], who has done a remarkable job in the field of higher education as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and who is the author of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to our very distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Oregon has done such an excellent job in the field of higher education that it is my desire as chairman of the full committee to ask her to look into the Teacher Corps in depth. As we pass it today, it will only be for 18 months. In general, we have reached a Federal commitment to education which has grown from $450 million, when we started together as a committee, to $5.2 billion. This is the equivalent of the appropriation for NASA. I would like the gentlewoman to look into the entire Office of Education, and to support, if she will, a tentative agreement that the chairman has reached with the chairman of the committee in the other body, that we should set up, if the Congress agrees next year, a joint committee of the Senate and the House to look into the whole field of the expenditure of $5.2 billion for education.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the very able and gracious chairman of the committee. Of course, I wholeheartedly support his suggestion that there be a joint legislative committee of the House and the Senate on education, and I think through such cooperative efforts there could be accomplished the elimination of a great deal of overlapping and duplication. Also I am very pleased that the chairman has asked my subcommittee to look into the Teacher Corps and to start this study immediately.

There are criticisms and there are questions raised about this, and I think some of the criticisms are legitimate.

May I say, as one of the previous speakers has indicated, that hardly ever would a conference committee come out with everything that every member of the conference committee likes. When I weigh the advantages of this total conference report and the disadvantages it seems to me that the House would be well advised to support the higher education bill.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. The gentlewoman has referred to the fact that there are questions with regard to the Teacher Corps. One question which is settled on the surface but, in my opinion, is not settled securely is whether or not the pay, the compensation of members of the Teacher Corps would affect the salary scales of local teachers or would disrupt the pay arrangements of local boards of education.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I had intended to spend the time which the chairman yielded to me on other parts of the bill, because I think the House deserves an explanation of the conference agreement and also the other titles need the attention of the House as does the Teacher Corps. I had intended to leave the matter of the Teacher Corps explanation to the gentleman from Indiana the chief proponent in the House. But since the gentleman from Maryland has asked the question, and as I have discussed this with the chairman, and certain facts have led to the chairman's recommendation that my subcommittee look into this during the next few months, I must say to you in all honesty that the Teacher Corps provisions has been my chief concern over the higher education conference report. My subcommittee never even considered this Teacher Corps. We never had any hearings on it. Another subcommittee did consider it, however.

I do agree with the gentleman who spoke recently, the very distinguished member of the committee from Minnesota. There might very well be different salaries set up that would be paid within the local school district. I think that this is really one of my deepest concerns about this. I think that the ultimate goal, the purpose of having a Teacher Corps that would go into areas where there are disadvantaged children is very appealing on the surface—and certainly we know there is a shortage of teachers. But this must not be bought at the high price of ruining local salary schedules and destroying the morale of local permanent teachers who stay on the job not just for 2 years but for 20 and who are just as dedicated and contribute fully as much—if not more. However, the gentleman, I believe, is correct that the "leader teacher" of the Teacher Corps would have a salary which would be negotiated between the Commissioner of Education and the local educational agency, and it might or might not be the same as the local salary schedule would indicate. The chairman of the committee is absolutely right that the local school district does not need to accept the Teacher Corps.

However, I would point out that this is true in every single educational program that is before the House. There is not a single education program that the Congress has ever passed where it is mandatory that the local district or the State accept it, and this program is no different. They can accept it or not. But where there are millions and hundreds of millions of dollars involved, the districts will want to be involved in it if they are paying taxes to support it. So we are obligated to draw provisions that are educationally sound and indisputably fair.

The second provision which I think is an oversight—and this is why I am particularly appreciative of the chairman's suggestion of a few minutes ago for an immediate study of the Teacher Corps. In rereading the bill last night and this morning it does say that with the teacher-interns, there is a 2-year training program and those of you who have a conference report in front of you can read it. It is covered on page 40 of the conference report.

Beginning in section 513(a)(3) under item B the language reads:

> Teaching teams, each of which shall consist of an experienced teacher and a number of—teacher interns who, in addition to teaching duties, shall be afforded time by the local educational agency for a teacher intern training program developed according to criteria established by the Commissioner and carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher in cooperation with an institution of higher education.

Then on the same page, section 513(b) reads:

> Arrangements with institutions of higher education to provide training for teacher interns while teaching in schools for local educational agencies under the provisions of this part shall provide, wherever possible, for training leading to a graduate degree.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me clear from this language in the conference bill that the interns are in a period of "training" for the full time in which they may be teaching in any district under the terms of this act.

Then on page 41, section 514(a)(3) reads:

> A teacher intern shall be compensated at a rate which is equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for teaching full time in the school system and the grade to which the intern is assigned.

This is immediately followed by the language in section 514(b) that "for any period of training under this part." May I repeat that "for any period of training under this part" the Commissioner shall pay to the members of the Teacher Corps such stipends—including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents—as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I can read the law, this clearly says that while the intern will be paid with 100 percent Federal funds through the local school district, it also says that the Commissioner shall pay directly to the members of the Teacher Corps other stipends that he may determine to be consistent with other federally supported training programs. May I also point out this program is not part of the State plan and completely by-passes State department's of education.

Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished and able gentleman from Minnesota, in my judgment, has accurately pointed out that in a given school district this bill, as drafted may create a great deal of friction between the permanent teachers who are working under a fixed salary schedule and a Teacher Corps team of interns and one experienced teacher who may be paid salaries completely out of line with the local schedule. As I said a moment ago, I wish that there might have been time to more carefully consider these possibilities and there might also have been time to discuss this with teacher representatives and school superintendents to learn their reaction to such a provision. Again, may I repeat that it would be a very high price to pay

for a Teacher Corps team if there were any possibility that the local salary schedule would be upset and the morale of the permanent teachers seriously impaired.

Let me add I think that the intent of the original Senate draft may have been to provide additional stipends only for the 3-month training program and not for the 2 years.

I think it was an oversight in the conference bill written in haste and under great pressure and I would hope that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] might later discuss this particular point.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. At that point I think the direct answer is that the gentlewoman is quite correct. The answer is "Yes."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That these additional amounts are for the full 2 years under the bill?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Training stipends would be paid during a 3-month training period.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. And during the 2-year period. The bill states the stipends are to be paid for any training period. It does not limit it to the 3-month training period.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is not my understanding.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would refer the gentleman to pages 40 and 41 of the bill and I would hope he would discuss it later. In section 513(a)(3) there is set forth a 2-year training program, which I would like to have the gentleman clarify and perhaps by legislative history we can do something even today on the floor of the House. Section 514(b) clearly says "for any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps stipends."

I hope I have answered the question for the distinguished Representative from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. I thank the gentlewoman for her very candid and helpful answer to my question.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Let me say again though I have questions about this particular provision, there are other provisions of the higher education bill that far outweigh the reservations and criticisms we have over this one part. May I point out other conference agreements and I shall quickly try to go over some of the other titles, because questions have been raised by the various Members as to what the conference report does provide. I know Members also have letters to answer on this.

Mr. Speaker, in title I, I think the House retained most of the provisions that were brought to the House a few weeks ago. Instead of a 1-year authorization, however, we compromised with the Senate. They had a 5-year authorization and now we have a 3-year bill, except in the two titles: the Teacher Corps will be a 2-year program and title III for "Developing Colleges," will be a 1-year program.

Also, Mr. Speaker, no part of the bill, as I suggested, is compulsory, whether it be the Teacher Corps or whether it be some other title of the bill.

The implementation of every single part of the bill would be up to the local school districts or the States to accept or reject as they wish.

Mr. Speaker, title I of the bill was specifically designed to respond to the President's plea that the time has come—and this is a quote from one of his speeches——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, title I of the bill was specifically designed to respond to the President's plea that "the time has come for us to help the university to face the problems of the city as it once faced the problems of the farm."

Mr. Speaker, we do know that 70 percent of the people of this country live in urban areas.

Mr. Speaker, we retain the House provision that the special emphasis shall be upon the urban and suburban areas, though it will also include the rural areas.

The compromise title retains the four most essential elements of the House bill.

Under the title $25 million in the first year and $50 million in each of the next 2 years is authorized to help institutions of higher education establish community service programs to solve community problems in rural, urban or suburban areas—however, and most important, let me repeat, the bill requires that particular emphasis be given to urban and suburban problems.

Where continuing educational courses are offered the conference report retains the House limitation on the use of funds to courses which are of college level. All of the funds becoming available will be allotted through a formula without any reservation for the Commissioner of Education as proposed in the Senate bill for experimental approaches in university and continuing education. The House conferees were also successful in maintaining the House position that fees can be used for matching purposes. One very desirable Senate amendment has been accepted which establishes a National Advisory Council which will result, at least hopefully, in the coordination of all federally supported community service programs including university extension and continuing education programs, and also including programs of the Commerce Department and the Department of Agriculture.

There were very few important differences in the House and Senate versions of title II—college library assistance and library training and research. The resulting compromise will provide $50 million each year for 3 years to help college libraries buy books and library materials. The design of the program has been modified to insure that the congressional intent is met to bring assistance to libraries. Over 50 percent of our 4-year institutions of higher learning and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted minimum standards in library materials, we are advised.

With respect to special purpose grants—grants to assist in meeting unique needs—national and regional needs and to establish or strengthen joint use facilities—institutions will be required to maintain their existing effort and to match $1 for every $3 in Federal funds. Fifteen million dollars a year will be made available for library training and research. In order to avoid overlap and duplication in Federal programs, the House conferees successfully maintained the House position with respect to the repeal of existing institute training authority in the National Defense Education Act. Under the conference report the authority for training institutes for elementary and secondary school librarians is repealed effective July 1, 1967, instead of 1965 as originally recommended by the House.

The conference report also provides $5 million in funds this year, $6.3 million in 1967 and $7.8 milion in 1968, to help the Library of Congress expand, speed up, and improve its cataloging services. This is vitally important to every library in the country.

I must report there has been a considerable modification of the House approved program of support to assist, through cooperative arrangements, in raising the academic standards of developing institutions. The original House bill was specifically designed to assist struggling 4-year institutions only. The Senate proposed assistance to junior colleges also. Under the conference report the authorization has been increased to $55 million for fiscal year 1966—and 22 percent of the funds are reserved for junior colleges. The inclusion of junior colleges concerned the House conferees greatly as it was feared that the objectives of the House provision were being distorted. I believe, however, that the provision before us today is acceptable. We did place a 1-year authorization on this title. It limits assistance to those institutions, both 4-year and junior college, which have been in existence for 5 years—thus assistance will not be made available to those institutions which are developing by virtue of their recent establishment or because of rapidly expanding enrollments. Rather the House intent is maintained—to assist developing institutions—outside of the academic stream which over the years have been struggling for survival. The fact that this program is only authorized for 1 year—and that the committee will have an opportunity to reexamine and reevaluate it next year also makes it more acceptable and satisfactory.

The House bill amended the National Defense Education Act of 1958, to provide that 25 percent of the amount authorized for student loan funds could be used to make educational opportunity grants to needy students. The Senate amendment provided an independent program under which grants would be made to institutions of higher education to enable them to provide scholarships.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the design of the Senate amendment and authorizes an independent program of educational opportunity

grants for the next 3 years. The substitute retains most—the majority—of the House requirements. Under the proposal, $70 million a year for 3 years is authorized for opportunity grants to promising, exceptionally needy students, plus sufficient funds to continue the awards beyond the first year so that recipients might complete their college education. Funds will be allotted to institutions under the National Defense Education Act student loan formula, which is based on the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education.

In order for a student to be selected for an educational opportunity grant, the college or university must determine that the student first, shows evidence of academic or creative promise; second, is of exceptional financial need; and, third, would not, except for an opportunity grant, be able financially to pursue studies at an institution of higher education. The opportunity grants will range from $200 to $800, with an additional $200 available for students in the top half of their class who have demonstrated need for the added funds. The basic grant may not be more than one-half of the total amount of student assistance which the institution makes available to the student, excluding funds under work-study programs.

The provision will make it possible for the exceptionally needy student with promise to attend college. Costs at private colleges have increased 40 percent since 1954. And there is no relief in sight in either public or private colleges. In fact the estimate is that during this next decade there will be an increase of 50 percent in college costs.

It is important to note that of male students in families that have incomes of less than $3,000 and who are in the top 25 percent of the class academically, 29 percent of that income group do not go to college the first year after high school graduation; and of the girls in the top 25 percent of the class academically and who come from families with less than $3,000 income, 69 percent are not able to go to college within 1 year of high school graduation. We do not know how many of these never go to the university. All of the studies have indicated that financial need is one of the most important reasons why qualified students do not attend college. This high percentage of able students who do not go on is a loss that I think this Nation cannot afford. This proposal will insure that the full development and education of our most precious resource—our Nation's youth—is not lost. A qualified student who wants to go and is willing to really work and study can go under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there were few substantive differences in the respective provisions authorizing guaranteed reduced interest loans. The program authorizes a Federal program of insured loans for students who do not have reasonable access to an equivalent State or private insured loan program and also authorizes $17.5 million for advances to the reserve funds of State and private nonprofit programs. The maximum annual insurable loan would be $1,000 for undergraduates and $1,500 for graduate students, and the maximum aggregate of insured principal would be $5,000 for undergraduates and $7,500 for graduate students. The maximum rate of interest may not exceed 6 percent. For students from families having annual incomes of less than $15,000 the Government would pay the interest while the student is in college and 3 percentage points of the interest thereafter. These provisions are very similar to the National Defense Education Act loans. However, there is no provision for forgiveness of loans for teachers in this part.

The repayment of principal on a federally guaranteed loan, which could begin no earlier than 9 months or later than 12 months after the student leaves school, could be deferred for up to another 3 years while the borrower is in the Armed Forces, the Peace Corps, or in graduate school.

The House provision that State and nonprofit private programs would be required to insure at least 80 percent of the principal of loans has been retained in the conference report. This guaranteed loan program is designed especially for the students from middle income families who are also having great difficulty in financing college education for perhaps three or four or more children.

Amendments to the college work study program will transfer the administration of the program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education where it surely belongs and liberalize the program to permit participation by students other than those from very low income families. $129 million is authorized for the current fiscal year, $165 million in fiscal 1967, and $200 million in 1968.

The Special Subcommittee on Education gathered considerable testimony on the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act during the hearings on the higher education bill. At the time the subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee we believed that the subcommittee did not have sufficient evidence to make legislative recommendations for tightening loan procedures. We wanted more information. The Senate however, insisted on changes.

The Senate bill included the following National Defense Education Act amendments: First, to authorize use of Federal funds, up to 1 percent of outstanding loans, to pay up to half an institution's administrative costs, including collection costs, in the National Defense Education Act student loan program; second, to require minimum repayment of $15 a month to begin 9 months after the borrower stops carrying at least half the normal academic workload; third, to authorize 15 percent forgiveness for each year of teaching in an area where there is a high concentration of disadvantaged children. This means that for these teachers there might be a 100 percent forgiveness. May I be perfectly frank with my House colleagues and say that this is a provision that gives me some concern. First of all, the Senate language which was adopted in conference allows the 15 percent forgiveness for each year of teaching in a poverty area plus a 50 percent forgiveness. In effect this means if a teacher taught in a poverty area for only 2 years she would receive a 30 percent forgiveness and then if she went to another school or to a college and taught for 5 years she would have an additional 50 percent forgiveness, or a total of 80 percent. This seems to me to raise questions as far as equity is concerned. The other part which seems to me to be inequitable is that a college student may borrow up to $10,000 under National Defense Education Act loans if such student is needy and may have a 50 percent forgiveness or in the case which I just described, an 80 percent forgiveness—or a 100 percent forgiveness under certain conditions—and yet another student whose family income may be only slightly higher is not allowed to borrow under National Defense Education Act and must borrow under the guaranteed loan program and under the guaranteed loan program there is no forgiveness for any teacher.

A student coming from a family with a $7,000 income might validly raise the question as to why he cannot be forgiven at least one-half of his loan if he goes into teaching while another student classmate coming from a family with perhaps a $5,000 income may benefit to the tune of several thousand dollars by the forgiveness feature under the National Defense Education Act. This is a matter to which we did not give our attention in the conference report but one to which I think the attention of the committee and the attention of the House should be directed; fourth, the Senate National Defense Education Act amendments also include economics, civics, and industrial arts in the teacher institute program; fifth, and to add economics to the equipment purchase section for elementary and secondary schools.

The above five amendments are included in the conference report. I should point out, however, that the Special Subcommittee on Higher Education does intend to undertake a thorough and an in-depth study of the entire National Defense Education Act next year. We believe there may be several other changes that should be made in loan procedures and collections.

Finally may I say, Mr. Speaker, I believe the amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to be the most important and significant parts of the conference report. The original House-approved amendments to double the authorizations of funds to build undergraduate and graduate academic facilities have been retained. Such an increase was necessary and justifiable on the evidence presented to the special subcommittee. We also deleted the categorical limitations in title I which will result in an even greater demand for Federal funds for facilities—funds for the humanities as well as math, science, engineering buildings.

As I said during the original House debate on the higher education bill, I believe if we were to address the college presidents and administrators and ask

them what they needed the most it would be Federal funds to provide classrooms, libraries, and laboratories so that they will be able to adequately accommodate the increasing college enrollments. The needs are well documented.

The conference report includes other amendments to facilitate better administration of this program at the State level. If finally enacted—Federal grants for the construction of academic facilities at public community colleges and technical institutes may be made up to 40 percent of construction costs rather than exactly 40 percent. We believe this was the original congressional intent in the 1963 bill.

Funds allocated for public community colleges and funds allotted for 4-year institutions may be transferred for use in the other sections if the State commission has not received an application for grants under this section in question prior to January 1 of the year and if the State commission requests the transfer.

A maximum interest rate of 3 percent will be charged on loans made under title III of the Facilities Act. This brings the program in line with the recently revised dormitory loan program. This, I believe, is a highly desirable change and has wide support.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to cover the ways in which the programs contained in the original House bill have been modified by the conference committee. The fellowship program and equipment grants will be discussed by others. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the goals and objectives we discussed on August 26, when the House considered the higher education bill, will be met by the provisions in the conference report. Without question the colleges and universities and the youth of this Nation will be helped immeasurably by this legislation. Today's challenge is a challenge of change. Let us help colleges to meet it. And even though not as completely satisfactory, perhaps as each of us would like it, I believe and hope the House will sustain the House conferees in their recommendations.

May I express my deep sense of gratitude to the staff of my subcommittee and to the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle who have worked so diligently and contributed so much.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this higher education conference report.

This bill, which authorizes an expenditure of $841 million in the current fiscal year, contains a wide variety of programs to aid colleges and universities. Included in the bill are: Increased funds for college construction; purchase of library books and training of librarians; grants to developing institutions; grants to help colleges solve community problems, mainly through university extension programs; financial aid for the needy and the overburdened middle-income family; and proposals for a National Teacher Corps and a teacher fellowship program.

I point out to my colleagues in the House that all of the Democratic conferees in the House, all of the Democratic conferees in the Senate, and all of the Republican conferees in the Senate signed the conference report; so that this measure does have very strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to concentrate my remarks on title V of the bill, partly because I have been one of the chief sponsors and advocates of the two programs it authorizes and partly because one of them, the Teacher Corps, has come under heavy attack here in the past 2 days. These two programs, to both of which I give full support, are the teacher fellowship program and the National Teacher Corps.

The purpose of the teacher fellowship program is to improve the quality of the education offered by the country's elementary and secondary schools. To do so, we must improve the quality of the education available for persons who pursue or intend to pursue careers in elementary and secondary education. My colleagues should note that the fellowship program includes not only persons presently teaching in elementary and secondary schools but also those who teach, guide, or supervise such teachers. Further, persons who plan careers either as elementary or secondary teachers or in fields directly related to elementary and secondary education, such as library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, educational media, and special education for handicapped children, are also eligible for fellowships under the bill.

The purpose of this part of the bill is pursued, first, by awarding fellowships for graduate study at institutions of higher education and, second, by developing or strengthening teacher education programs in institutions of higher learning.

A total of 24,500 fellowships is authorized in the 3-year program: 4,500 in fiscal 1966 and 10,000 each in fiscal years 1967 and 1968. Total authorizations for the same 3-year period are $475 million, consisting of $40 million in the current fiscal year, $160 million in fiscal 1967, and $275 million in fiscal 1968.

The Commissioner is to allocate the fellowships to institutions of higher education with approved programs for quality graduate education for teachers. He is to encourage those presently pursuing a career in elementary and secondary education to enter these graduate programs and he is also to encourage recent college graduates to go into teaching as a career, as well as college graduates in other occupations to enter or return to a career in elementary or secondary education.

To gain approval for its program, the institution must show that its effort will improve the quality of education of elementary and secondary school teachers, and it must emphasize high-quality substantive courses, rather than the traditional methods courses. If any methods courses are offered, they must be directly related to the substantive courses and clearly secondary to them in the program.

In order to obtain equitable geographical distribution of the high-quality programs envisioned here, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants and contracts with institutions of higher education to pay part of the costs of developing or strengthening graduate programs which meet the requirements of approval and of developing or strengthening high-quality undergraduate programs for training those planning to pursue an elementary or secondary education career.

The stipends available, including subsistence and dependents allowances, are to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs. In addition, payments of $2,500 per participating student are to be paid to the institution of higher education for each academic year the student is in the program. The amount, of course, will be reduced by any tuition or other nonrefundable charges which the student must bear.

The grantee, for his part, must be a full-time student or researcher in his field, must not be engaged in gainful employment—other than part-time teaching, research, or similar approved activities related to his training—and must maintain satisfactory proficiency in his work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the fellowship program, for we need the high-caliber teachers which it will help to prepare.

I should like now to comment on the National Teacher Corps provision, about which there has been some controversy. I shall not review its provisions at this time, for I believe the discussion in the House yesterday more than adequately outlined the nature and substance of this imaginative proposal. I refer in particular to the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], who outlined the major features of the National Teacher Corps as well as to the colloquy between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and myself.

I want especially to address myself to what my colleague from Minnesota said a little while ago when he argued that he had to oppose the Teacher Corps proposal because, he said, it had not been considered in the House. The fact of the matter is that the Teacher Corps proposal was considered in hearings by the General Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor and was voted on by the full Committee on Education and Labor.

There are several items in this conference report which were not considered at all either by a House subcommittee or a full committee of the House. Yet it is very strange, Mr. Speaker, that I did not hear the gentleman from Minnesota attack any of these items. For example, I did not hear the gentleman from Minnesota or his Republican colleagues say a word in opposition to title VI of this report which, for educational equipment and minor remodeling of buildings, authorizes half again as much money than is authorized by the Teacher Corps part of the bill.

If failure of the House to consider a proposal is grounds for opposing it, why have our friends on the university side

not announced their intention to kill title VI of the bill?

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that it is surely unfair to attack the Teacher Corps on the grounds that it was not considered by the House of Representatives when there are other parts of this bill which were either supported by the minority or not objected to in their proposed motion to recommit, that were not even considered by a House subcommittee, not to speak of winning approval of the full committee, as did the Teacher Corps.

I want to take this opportunity also to read into the RECORD a letter I have just received from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner, with respect to the issue of local control.

This letter from Secretary Gardner, a distinguished Republican who is already serving with great distinction in President Johnson's Cabinet, reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1965.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: In accordance with our telephone conversation I have reviewed the discussion which took place on the House floor yesterday between you and Congressman QUIE.

I wish to reiterate that the Teacher Corps will impose no Federal control over the authority of the local school district. In particular, the local school district retains full authority to select and reject, to appoint and fire those recruited through the Teacher Corps program. Local school authorities will be free to set the criteria for members they may wish to employ. No community need accept any teacher unsuitable to its needs.

The Office of Education will seek to guarantee maximum participation of local school authorities by (a) requesting them to indicate the teacher qualifications they judge to be desirable; and (b) submitting to them for approval the names of individual Teacher Corps members who are available for service.

I believe the Teacher Corps program will greatly improve the educational opportunities for our Nation's disadvantaged school children. At the same time, it preserves the valuable tradition of local control over the schools in each community.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. GARDNER,
Secretary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me here also clarify one matter raised in the colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] concerning the use of Teacher Corps members in private schools.

I believe the question put by Mr. GOODELL to Mr. QUIE is answered by a simple reading of the language of title V, section 513(d) of the conference report, as follows: "A local educational agency may—" I believe Mr. GOODELL here used the word "will"—

SEC. 513(d). A local educational agency may utilize members of the Teacher Corps assigned to it in providing, in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended, educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in my remaining brief time, I would like to say an additional word to clarify my earlier response to the question raised by the distinguished gentlelady from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] with respect to the payments to be made to Teacher Corps interns during the time when they are both teaching and pursuing some training, as provided by the bill. Stipends may be paid to Teacher Corps members when they are undergoing full-time training, whether in the 3-month period preceding their employment or during the summers between the school years.

It is not intended that stipends would be paid concurrently with the times in which Teacher Corps members are receiving regular teachers' salaries.

The Federal Government would reimburse colleges and universities and local school systems for the entire cost of training, whether preservice or inservice, but it is of course not intended that Teacher Corps members would be receiving two different incomes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out why I tried to get the gentleman from Indiana to yield to me.

I will say that while it is true that the subcommittee did consider the Teacher Corps, it did so for only 1 day and only one person came to testify on that subject. If you will all read a copy of the hearings which I am holding in my hand, you can see it yourself. The cover lists teacher fellowships and the National Teacher Corps which may appear to indicate 4 days of hearings but 3 days were only on the fellowships. The only witnesses who appeared other than Senator NELSON came prepared to testify on the fellowships and they were only asked about the Teacher Corps after they arrived.

The second part of my reason is that no matter what the Secretary says now the question is, Who are we going to believe and what are we going to believe? Are we going to believe as the Secretary says in a letter that the school districts will select the teachers? Or do we believe the bill itself which says the Commissioner is authorized to select the teachers? Who are we to believe? Is the 3-month preliminary period of training the only period where they will receive subsistence under section 514(b) as the gentleman indicates or will the period of training that the interns receive subsistence be for 2 years? The bill itself says subsistence will be paid for any period of training.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the pending conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, we cannot claim for this or any other legislation that there are no imperfections. This bill is certainly not perfect. But let me point out that this bill has been carefully considered by the general Subcommittee on Education in 4 days of hearings and in extensive staff work. It was reported to the full committee and then reported to the Committee on Rules.

Perhaps we can find ways to perfect it and make it work more effectively in the future, guided by the experience gained in its administration. But I am satisfied that this legislation is urgently needed now to provide supplemental teacher services to the areas of this country, to the slum sections and to the rural areas where we have today a shortage of teachers in the elementary and secondary schools of the country. It is the purpose of this bill not only to increase the supply but also to improve the quality of the teaching service in the elementary and secondary schools in disadvantaged areas of the country. The evidence before us as to need is overwhelming and requires the wholehearted support of the conference report. Let me here recite a few pertinent facts as to need:

Five million American school age children are in families with annual incomes below the poverty line of $2,000.

They constitute 11 percent of the 5-to-17 age group.

They are distributed throughout 95 percent of the Nation's 3,100 counties.

Their parents and older brothers and sisters make up the one-fifth of America—one out of every five Americans—which has completed less than 8 years of formal schooling.

Eighty-two thousand full-time teachers in U.S. elementary and secondary schools have less than standard certification.

The national supply of new teachers this year fell more than 128,000 short of the 248,000 needed by our schools.

These are the facts but the need for a Teacher Corps can probably best be summed up in three words—people shun poverty.

From the ranks of the undereducated comes a vast army of chronically unemployed. Young men and women—the products of educational and economic poverty—lack simple reading, writing, and math skills, and the ability to communicate verbally as well. Without these they cannot get or hold jobs. When they do, the job contributes little or nothing to the individual himself, to our society, or to the national economy.

To break out of the tradition of poverty, disadvantaged youngsters must receive the best—not the least—in education. The Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 is a giant stride. Though it provides over a billion dollars in aid to low-income areas, it does not provide the means to attract the thousands of men and women with the enthusiasm, the dedication, the understanding, and the talent that are essential to make effective use of the newly available Federal funds.

To reach the poor child, to stir the child's curiosity, takes a very special quality in a teacher. It takes a warmth and insight which can only be the fusion of natural disposition, a sense of mission, and proper training. One of the most pathetic wastes of our times and our resources is that we have tried to teach every child, regardless of background and capabilities, by standards, conceived for children from a comfortable, middle-class, white background. In many cases the standards have been woefully inadequate for the children for whom they were intended. For the uneasy children of poverty, they have been disastrous.

By providing money, training, and opportunity the Teacher Corps would bring together qualified men and women who wish to meet and defeat poverty. Corpsmen would go, in President Johnson's words, "to the places in their country that need them the most."

As teachers gravitate in increasing numbers to wealthier schools, problems in poverty schools grow more acute. Attempts to recruit fresh personnel for poverty schools are generally fruitless. Even schools of affluence today have difficulty attracting and holding talented teachers. One result has been that slum schools have been forced to employ large numbers of substitute or temporary personnel. Many of the teachers in the schools of poverty have qualifications below standards acceptable for teaching children from middle-class families. More are completely ill equipped to deal with the special problems of the disadvantaged.

The Teacher Corps would give status and professionalism to teaching the poor. The 6,000 members of the Teacher Corps would demonstrate that America's desire to break the poverty cycle has a strong element of human understanding and compassion, as well as sound and practical techniques.

Equal educational opportunities for all could well be the most influential element in our program of equal economic opportunity for all.

I am hopeful that the Members of this body will not be led astray by the derogatory remarks and misinformation that has been related. Let me now turn to other important features of H.R. 9567 as reported by the House managers.

Mr. Speaker, title I authorizes $25 million for fiscal year 1966 and $50 million for each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968, to assist in the solution of community problems in such areas as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use. States would designate a State agency or institution broadly representative of higher education in the State to administer community service programs developed under this title. This title has significance for all communities large and small, as the legislation would authorize provision of the new program in rural areas, and in those rural nonfarm mining communities seeking technical knowledge as to means of attacking community problems and needs.

A community service program is defined as an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program and university extension or continuing education offering, which is designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, where the institution offering such program, activity, or service determines—First, that the proposed program, activity, or service is not otherwise adequately available; and second, that the conduct of the program or performance of the activity or service is consistent with the institution's overall educational program and is of such a nature as is appropriate to the effective utilization of the institution's special resources and the competencies of its faculty.

When course offerings are involved, such courses must be, first, fully acceptable toward an academic degree; or second, of college level as determined by the institution offering such courses.

A National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education will be appointed by the President. Its main purpose will be the elimination of duplication, and the coordination of programs under this title and other programs of extension or continuing education. Further, the committee will advise the Commissioner on the approval of projects and activities under this title and will file an annual report which will recommend changes in Federal laws relating to extension and continuing education activities.

Federal funds will cover 75 percent of the costs of the program in fiscal year 1966, 75 percent in fiscal year 1967, and 50 percent in fiscal year 1978.

Up to 5 percent of the expenditures for which Federal payments are made, or $25,000, can be used for developing and administering the State plan.

Mr. Speaker, title II initiates a program to help institutions of higher education acquire library materials needed for their expanded responsibilities in research, teaching, and student use; to encourage new and enlarged college and university training programs to prepare individuals for service in the information sciences and in libraries; to promote research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries and library and information sciences; and to expand and improve the centralized cataloging service in the Library of Congress. The title is divided into three parts, each of which is designed to meet a special need for assistance.

Part A of title II authorizes $50 million for each of fiscal years 1966–68 for the purchase of library resources. Provision is made for basic grants of up to $5,000 to institutions of higher education for the purchase of library resources such as books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials.

The Commissioner is authorized to make supplemental grants not to exceed $10 for each full-time student. Supplemental grants will be made on the basis of such criteria as size and age of library collection, student enrollment, and endowment and other financial resources. The basic grants must be matched by the institution. Each institution or combination of institutions must give assurances that their previous year's expenditures for materials would be maintained.

Fifteen percent of the funds appropriated for this part are set aside by the Commissioner for special grants. These special grants might be made to institutions of higher education demonstrating a special need for additional library resources; or to institutions engaged in meeting special national or regional needs in library and information sciences; or to combinations of institutions which need special assistance in establishing joint facilities.

An Advisory Council on College Library Resources will be established to assist the Commissioner in the development of criteria for the making of supplemental grants and special-purpose grants.

Part B authorizes $15 million for each of fiscal years 1966–68 for grants to institutions of higher education for training students in librarianship, including the training of communications specialists in the physical and social sciences. The Commissioner will make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations for research and demonstration projects and for the dissemination of information derived from research. However, no grant can be made to a private group other than a nonprofit one. The Commissioner will appoint panels of experts to evaluate various types of research and demonstration projects.

Part C of title II authorizes $5 million for fiscal 1965, $6,315,000 for fiscal 1966, and $7,700,000 for fiscal 1968 to be used by the Library of Congress for two purposes: First, to expand and improve the centralized cataloging service which is already in operation, and second, to purchase library material from all over the world which would not otherwise be included in the Library of Congress collection and, therefore, not cataloged.

This part can relieve all types of libraries from much of the expensive cataloging process, since a larger number of catalog cards would be more readily available for purchase, at a minimal cost, through the Library of Congress.

Title III authorizes $55 million for fiscal year 1966 to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of the Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life. This is particularly important to the small 2- and 4-year colleges of the district I am privileged to represent.

The program will authorize the Commissioner to pay part of the cost of planning and carrying out cooperative arrangements for strengthening the academic programs of qualified developing colleges. These cooperative arrangements might be between developing institutions and organizations, agencies, and business entities.

The cooperative projects might include: exchange of faculty or students, including visiting scholars; faculty improvement programs; introduction of new curriculums; development of cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of academic study and employment; joint use of facilities such as libraries or laboratories; fellowships leading to advanced degrees for the faculties of developing institutions; or other arrangements which offer promise of strengthening the academic programs of developing colleges.

The Commissioner will be authorized to award national teaching fellowships to graduate students and junior faculty members to encourage them to teach at developing institutions.

Of the funds appropriated, 22 percent will be used specifically for junior colleges.

An Advisory Council on Developing Institutions will assist the Commissioner in identifying qualified developing institutions and in establishing priorities for use in approving applications for grants.

Title IV establishes a program of student financial assistance to make the benefits of higher education available to academically qualified students in need of financial assistance. The title provides four types of assistance:

First. Undergraduate educational opportunity grants;

Second. Reduced-interest loans to both undergraduate and graduate students through private lenders, insured by State and nonprofit private loan insurance programs;

Third. An expanded work-study program to provide part-time employment for students; and

Fourth. Improvements in the national defense student loan program. The "opportunity grants" are of vital importance to our students in eastern Kentucky many of whom will not be able to secure college opportunities without it.

This part authorizes $70 million for educational opportunity grants during fiscal year 1966—the first grants would be used during the academic year 1966–67. Institutions of higher education must determine that recipients of the grants show academic promise, are of exceptional financial need, and would not, but for an educational opportunity grant, be financially able to pursue a higher education.

Grants would be no less than $200, or more than one-half of the total amount of student assistance—excluding work-study—provided to the same student, or $800, whichever is the lesser; an additional $200 would be awarded to students who were in the upper half of their class during the preceding year. Funds would be allocated among the States on the basis of college enrollment. Institutions would be permitted to transfer up to one-fourth of their funds under this part to their national defense education student loan funds.

Institutions of higher learning would be expected to make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youth of exceptional financial need and encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school. Colleges would establish close working relationships with secondary schools and could make tentative commitments of scholarships to qualified students enrolled in grade 11 or lower and to secondary school dropouts. An institution would be required to maintain its efforts in its own scholarship and loan program.

The Commissioner is also authorized to enter into contracts, not to exceed $100,000 per year, with State and local educational agencies and other public or nonprofit organizations for the purpose of, first, identifying qualified youths of exceptional financial need and encouraging them to continue their education, second, publicizing existing forms of financial aid, and third, encouraging secondary school and college dropouts to reenter educational programs.

Part B of title IV authorizes advances totaling $17,500,000 through fiscal year 1968 to assist in establishing or strengthening the reserve funds of State and private nonprofit student loan insurance programs. Advances would be made to the State program and, if for any year the State program were not comprehensive, to private nonprofit programs to the extent necessary to enable students in every eligible institution to be covered by an insured loan program.

A Federal insurance program would be authorized on a standby basis of adequate State and private plans are not reasonably accessible to students in every eligible institution of higher education. Total new federally insured loans could not exceed $700 million for fiscal year 1966, $1 billion for 1967, and $1,400 million for fiscal year 1968.

For students from families having adjusted family income of less than $15,000 the Federal Government would subsidize all of the interest while in school and 3 percentage points thereafter; for students from families having higher incomes there would be no interest subsidy but the insurance would cover loans to such students. Adjusted income would take into account number of family members and number attending institutions of higher education.

The interest subsidy would be available for federally insured loans and for loans insured under State and private nonprofit programs which meet specified standards as well as loans made by State programs. For the first 2 years of the program, the interest subsidy would be available for State and private plans which insure loans: first, charging no higher than 6 percent annual interest on the unpaid balance, and, second, requiring repayment to begin no earlier than 60 days after the student ceases his course of study. After June 30, 1967, the interest subsidy would not be available unless all specified standards are met.

State and private programs must be authorized to insure loans of not less than $1,000 and not more than $1,500 per year for any student and must be authorized to insure loans to any student for at least 6 years and would be required to insure 80 percent of unpaid principal in order to qualify for advances and—after June 30, 1967, under the legislation's 2-year transitional period—interest subsidies.

The Federal insurance program where operative would cover 100 percent of unpaid principal, excluding interest and would cover loans up to a maximum of $1,000 per year for undergraduates and $1,500 for graduate students and up to a maximum aggregate unpaid principal of $5,000 for undergraduates and $7,500 for graduates.

Federally insured loans, or loans over $2,000 insured by a State or private program, must provide for repayment period of not less than 5 years—unless sooner repaid—nor more than 10 years, beginning 9 months to 1 year after the student leaves school, with a maximum loan period of 15 years. Minimum annual repayment in the case of Federally-insured loans would be $360. The loan, whether insured Federally or by a State or private program, must be made without security, but endorsement may be required.

Maximum rate of interest chargeable by the lender would be set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on a national, regional, or other appropriate basis, but it could not exceed 6 percent per year on the unpaid principal balance of the loan if insured under a State or private program. Federally insured loans would be subject to rates of interest no higher than 6 percent, except that under circumstances which threaten to impede the carrying out of the program rates may be set as high as 7 percent.

The revised program would be authorized to make advances to State and private plans and to insure loans for 3 years—until June 30, 1968.

The work-study program under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 would be transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education.

Under this program institutions of higher education receive from the Federal Government 90 percent of the cost of providing part-time employment opportunities. Institutions may pay their share to students in the form of services and supplies furnished by the institution. The proposed amendments would expand the opportunities for part-time employment but preference must be given to students from low-income families.

The appropriations authorization for fiscal year 1966 would be $129 million. Of this amount $60 million is carried in the budget requests for the Office of Economic Opportunity for fiscal year 1966.

The provisions concerning agreements with institutions establishing student loan funds under title II of the National Defense Education Act would be amended to provide that the fund may be used to pay one-half of the administrative costs incurred by the institution, including collection costs, up to 1 percent of outstanding loans.

The requirements for repayment of student loans would be altered to require payment to commence 9 months after the borrower ceases to carry at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload. The minimum rate of repayment would be $15 per month, and no interest would accrue while the borrower is carrying at least one-half the

normal full-time academic workload. A provision would be added to permit institutions to assess delinquency charges.

The loan forgiveness provision of the national defense student loan program is expanded to permit persons who teach in areas of high concentration of low-income families to cancel their entire obligation at the rate of 15 percent per year.

The legislation amends the National Defense Education Act to include economics among the critical subjects to be covered in title III—equipment—and to include economics, civics, and industrial arts among the subject areas in title XI—teacher training institutes.

The National Defense Education Act title III authorizations are increased by $10 million and title XI authorizations by $17.25 million.

Part A of title V establishes in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps with an authorization of $36,100,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $64,715,000 for fiscal year 1967. Experienced teachers and teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree would be enrolled in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to 2 years.

Arrangements will be made at the option of local educational agencies to furnish experienced teachers and teaching teams to local schools in areas having concentrations of children from low-income families. Same concept as Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, title I.

Before undertaking their teaching duties, members of the Teacher Corps will be provided training by institutions of higher education or State educational agencies. For this period of training—up to 3 months—the Teacher Corps member will be paid stipends consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported training programs. Teacher-interns will, while working in local schools, participate in in-service training programs carried out by experienced teachers in cooperation with institutions of higher education.

Costs of the arrangements with local educational agencies—including salaries for Teacher Corps members—will be paid entirely by the Federal Government to the local school district. Members of the Teacher Corps will not be Federal employees but locally paid and supervised teachers. An experienced teacher who is not leading a teaching team will be paid a rate equal to a teacher with similar training, experience, and duties in that agency. An experienced teacher who is leading a teaching team will be compensated at a rate to cover his supervisory and training responsibilities. A teacher-intern shall be paid a salary equal to the lowest rate paid by such agency for full-time teachers in that school and grade.

Members of the Teacher Corps will be under the direct supervision of the appropriate official of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned.

Part B of title V authorizes the Commissioner to award 4,500 fellowships in fiscal year 1966 and 10,000 fellowships in each of fiscal years 1967 and 1968. These fellowships will enable persons pursuing or planning to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education to undertake 2 years of graduate study leading to a master's degree or its equivalent.

Experienced teachers and other experienced personnel in elementary and secondary education, recent college graduates, and college graduates engaged in other occupations who wish to enter or reenter elementary or secondary education are eligible to receive fellowships. Fellowships must be allocated so as to provide an equitable distribution throughout the States, except that the Commissioner may give preference to programs designed to meet an urgent national need.

Fellowship recipients will receive stipends consistent with prevailing practice under comparable federally supported programs. The Commissioner will pay the institution of higher education at which the fellowship recipient studies an amount equivalent to $2,500 per academic year less any tuition charged the recipient.

The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education to develop graduate programs that will substantially further the objective of improving teacher education.

Forty million dollars is authorized for this part for fiscal year 1966, $160 million for fiscal 1967, and $275 million for fiscal 1968.

Part A of title VI makes available to institutions of higher education $35 million for fiscal year 1966, $40 million for fiscal year 1967, and $50 million for fiscal year 1968, for the acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment, including audiovisual materials and equipment and printed materials—other than textbooks—suitable for use in undergraduate instruction in science, mathematics, foreign languages, history, geography, arts, humanities, government, English, or education.

This part also authorizes $2.5 million for fiscal year 1966 and $10 million each for fiscal year 1967 and 1968 to be used by institutions of higher education for the acquisition of television equipment and materials for instruction in the above fields and for minor remodeling necessary for the use of such equipment. An additional $1 million is set aside for administration of the State plans approved under this part.

One-half of the authorized funds will be distributed among the States on the basis of the ratio of students in institutions of higher education in each State to the number of students in institutions of higher education in all States. The remaining one-half will be allocated among the States by an allotment ratio based on relative per capita income.

A State desiring to participate in the program must designate or establish a State commission to administer the program, and this commission would submit to the Commissioner of Education a State plan setting forth basic criteria for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects.

The Federal share of approved projects will be up to 50 percent of the cost except that the State commissions may increase such share to 80 percent in the case of institutions which otherwise would have insufficient resources to participate in the program. The application of an institution of higher education must provide assurance that the institution will maintain its level of expenditures during the preceding fiscal year for the same purposes.

Part B authorizes $5 million for fiscal year 1966 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years for the operation of short-term workshops or short-term or regular-session institutes for individuals preparing to use educational media equipment in teaching in institutions of higher education or individuals preparing to become specialists in educational media or librarians or other specialists using such media.

Each person attending such an institute will receive a stipend of $75 per week plus $15 per week for each dependent. No stipends may be paid for attendance at workshops.

Under title VII, authorizations for grants to construct undergraduate academic facilities will be increased from $230 million to $460 million for fiscal year 1966. Categorical restrictions on the types of facilities to be constructed will be removed. The title II authorization—grants for construction of graduate education facilities—is increased from $60 million to $120 million.

The Commissioner will be given discretion to transfer allotments for public community colleges and technical institutes to other public institutions and the allotments for 4-year institutions to public community colleges and technical institutes in States where the demand for one of the categories is not sufficient to use the appropriated funds.

Interest on loans for construction of academic facilities under title III will be set at a maximum of 3 percent rather than based on the going Federal rate.

Under existing law, the Federal share for construction grants to public community colleges and public technical institutes is fixed at 40 percent of the development cost. The bill amends the act to provide that the Federal share for such projects shall be a percentage as determined under the applicable State plan but not in excess of 40 percent.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Teacher Corps would be locally activated and locally controlled. It is an activity of vital interest to cities and towns. The program would be within the complete control of the local community. We see that the Republican members of the conference from the Senate are in agreement with it. It is amazing to me that my Republican friends in the House can oppose a meritorious project of this kind.

Mr. PERKINS. The Speaker is absolutely correct.

The teachers would be local employees. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], has always advocated that the

teachers be paid directly by Federal check from the Federal Government. He has always held fast to that belief. I cannot understand his argument here today in respect to Federal control in view of his past recommendations.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report on the higher education bill should be approved.

Every year brings stronger evidence of the need for enlarged opportunity for our young people in higher education, and the trend is likely to continue for years to come.

This Congress has already demonstrated its keen interest in meeting this problem by overwhelmingly approving H.R. 9567, with only 22 votes against it on final passage.

The conference has substantially accepted the House position on this bill, and its product is a good one fully deserving of our support.

I hope and trust the report will be approved by an emphatic majority vote.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this Congress, through bipartisan effort for the most part, has distinguished itself as being the greatest education Congress of all time. The proposed Teacher Corps is another part of the total education effort. If I am not improperly advised, every Member of the U.S. Senate, including all Republican Members, supported the program when it was before that body.

One of the great legislative landmarks of this session was the Secondary and Elementary Education Act. This Teacher Corps provision, which provides for excellence in teacher training and excellence in teaching leadership, backstops that legislation. I urge all Members of the House to support it.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been closely connected with education before I came here, I have listened with great interest to the arguments on the other side. The burdens of the argument of the gentleman from Minnesota seemed to be two: First, that it was not debated long enough in the House; that is, the Teacher Corps; second, that the Federal Government was going to pay for it.

The gentleman from Minnesota said, "How are you going to answer this when you go home?"

The question they are going to ask in the undermanned schools—and nearly everyone of them is undermanned, with too many pupils per teacher—is not how long it was debated in the House but, if it is killed, they are going to ask who killed it and why.

There is not an elementary school or a secondary school that I know of in the whole United States that does not need more teachers. I can remember when I taught in a high school that we got students there all the time who could not properly read. If they cannot read, they cannot learn. They were pushed on because the teachers had 40 to 45 students in a class and they could not devote the time they needed.

If there is anything we need, it is more teachers to lower the load on each teacher in the elementary schools and in the secondary schools, and to give the pupils in those schools the educational background that they need so that they can go on and be productive citizens.

I am for this measure, and I hope it passes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], a former member of this committee, the balance of the time.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report on higher education. I particularly support the provision with regard to the National Teacher Corps. We have strengthened and protected this country by the widest distribution possible of knowledge. We have done that through education. As the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], who just preceded me, said, the greatest need in the public schools of this country today is for more teachers. The Teacher Corps provision in the conference report would provide it.

The criticism I have heard from my Republican friends today on the Teacher Corps provision reminds me of the reply of the central character in Mildred Savage's novel, "In Vivo," when the central character, Will Caroline, was arguing with his board of directors about giving more money for research to discover some of the things he felt the company ought to have in its program. A member of the board of directors replied to him, "Oh, research is a shot in the dark." And Will Caroline said the very strong and true statement, "All progress beyond established knowledge is in the dark, and one man must see the light and creep forward with that light."

In this instance one Congress, one party, one administration has sought knowledge beyond the dark, beyond that which is established, and in seeking that has discovered needs crying out for the very things we are providing in this legislation. The Democratic Party, the administration in Washington, is inching forward with the light to spread the knowledge to a wider group of people to make this country stronger, to give it greater protection.

This conference report ought to be adopted overwhelmingly and there ought not to be a dissenting vote against providing the public schools of this country with additional well-trained, qualified teachers regardless of where the money comes from.

Why?

We have been paying money into vocational home economics and for vocational agricultural teachers, from the Federal Government, since 1917, and they have been working in the public schools. We just passed this year Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools with the highest authorization for money and education in the history of this country, and it has gone to pay teachers' salaries and to build classrooms.

I say to my friends, I hope and sincerely trust you will support this conference report and vote down overwhelmingly the motion to recommit.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Teacher Corps.

President Johnson has said:

> Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation.

Education offers the children of the poor the brightest hope for escape from this bitter cycle of ignorance and poverty. Yet the shortage of good teachers is most acute where the children of the poor are most numerous.

The Teacher Corps can go far toward alleviating this shortage. It will not only recruit men and women to teach in areas where good teachers are in shortest supply and greatest demand—it will recruit the best possible men and women to teach in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind my colleagues that members of the Corps will be volunteers for teaching in city slums and depressed rural areas. They will be seeking assignments which others have shunned. They will bring to their classrooms a sense of mission which will support them in the face of whatever hardships and difficulties they encounter.

We know that dedicated teachers are the best teachers. We can assume, I think, that the best teachers of disadvantaged children will be those who have dedicated themselves to the teaching of disadvantaged children.

The Teacher Corps will be made up of both experienced teachers and young college graduates who may make a career of teaching. I think this is a very promising combination of forces.

The teacher interns will serve as members of teaching teams under the guidance of older teachers with many years of experience in education. Before starting on their teaching assignments these interns will undergo intensive 3-month training to equip them for their work. Later they will receive inservice training conducted by experienced teachers at seminars in the schools where they teach.

Thus, the program will also serve as a realistic training ground for young teachers, benefiting both themselves and the children they will be teaching in the years ahead.

It is likely that many of these devoted young teachers will choose to continue their careers as they have begun them—as teachers of disadvantaged children. In this way, Mr. Speaker, the Teacher Corps can serve as the nucleus of an expanding force which will bring education to those children who need it most—to the great benefit of our society for years to come.

The Teacher Corps is a natural extension of the wise and far-reaching legislation enacted earlier in this same session of Congress: the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1955. This act gives special attention to improving education in economically deprived areas.

The new programs and expanded resources made possible by the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act will go far toward improving education in the areas where the greatest improvement is needed.

But no school can be better than its teachers.

Now, as always, our ultimate hopes for progress in education rest with the teachers in our classrooms. The most promising programs will fail without good teachers to run them. The finest textbooks are of little value without good teachers to guide children in their use.

The American people have challenged us to bring reality to the concept of equal educational opportunity. They have asked us to provide every child in every school with an education that matches the highest range of his ability. We have responded to that challenge by enacting the most comprehensive program of Federal assistance for education in our Nation's history. We must not undo that great program by omitting the keystone to that triumphal arch of accomplishment: more and better teachers.

That need for teachers can be supplied by retaining the Teacher Corps as an integral and necessary part of the Higher Education Act. It offers the only prospect of bringing more and better teachers to the schools where the jobs are waiting. It would supply school districts throughout the country with those very teachers who are hardest to obtain and who would carry out the most difficult assignments with the greatest promise of success.

Mr. Speaker, it remains for us to match the energy and idealism of our teachers with the need of our schools. We can do it and we should do it.

THE CONCEPT

Experienced teachers and highly qualified college graduates like those who made the Peace Corps such a success would be enrolled for 2 years of service and training to improve the educational opportunities for children living in areas having a concentration of families with low incomes. Effective professional training for the teacher interns will be provided in the most deprived rural and urban slum schools through cooperative arrangements between those schools and local colleges and universities.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

To attract and train bright young people who might not otherwise enter the teaching profession or choose to teach in deprived schools.

To bring able and spirited teaching help to our most needy schools.

OPERATION OF THE TEACHER CORPS

Recruitment: College graduates and experienced teachers will be recruited for the Teacher Corps in a national campaign. A corps of some 6,000 members is eventually contemplated. An expected enrollment of 3,750 Teacher Corps members is expected the first year.

Interns: College graduates will serve in teams under the direction of an experienced Teacher Corps member. They will receive 3 months of intensive teacher training at a college or university before going into local school districts requesting their services. They will be paid at the lowest rate paid by that district for a full-time teacher.

Experienced teachers will serve either individually in schools requesting them or as leaders of Teacher Corps teams. Individual experienced teachers will be paid at the prevailing local rate for teachers of comparable experience and training. Team leaders may receive additional compensation in keeping with their added responsibilities.

Local control: Teacher Corps members will serve only at the request of local educational agencies. They will be under the same local authority as any other teacher in the system. Members will be employees of the local school district and these districts will retain full authority over curriculum and will have the customary rights of firing and hiring.

Training: Colleges and universities will carry out the intensive 3-month teacher intern training program. It is modeled on the successful programs in teacher education for college graduates now operated by some 40 institutions of higher education. After being accepted by local school districts, interns, while working in local schools, will participate in inservice training programs carried out by the experienced teacher team leader and in cooperation with a college or university. It is expected that—at the end of 2 years of teaching and further academic study—Teacher Corps interns will be able to earn advanced degrees and receive professional certification. Tuition and university program costs will be paid by Federal grants.

FACTS AND FIGURES

The Teacher Corps provisions are contained in sections 513 through 517 of title V–B of the Higher Education Act as passed by the Senate. These provisions establish a National Teacher Corps in the Office of Education with authorizations of $36,100,000 for fiscal year 1966 and $64,715,000 for fiscal year 1967.

What is the Teacher Corps?

Under title V–B of the Higher Education Act, dedicated and able young men and women—like those who have made the Peace Corps such a success—will be recruited and trained to teach where they are most needed, in city slums and areas of rural poverty across the Nation. Teacher Corps members will be recruited nationally on the basis of talent and promise and will be trained by the Nation's colleges and universities. They will serve up to 2 years—side by side with local teachers—on request from State and local educational authorities. Some will be experienced teachers; others, teacher interns who will work in teams under the direction of experienced teachers. All will get university pre-service training as well as a program of in-service graduate education leading to an advanced degree.

How much money is available for the National Teacher Corps?

Just over $36 million has been authorized for fiscal year 1966 and there will be $64.7 million for fiscal year 1967.

Why is the Teacher Corps necessary?

In 1964, there were more than 82,000 full-time teachers with less than standard certificates. The majority of these were concentrated in low-income areas, those areas which need the best teachers. The National Education Association estimates that there is a shortage of 128,000 teachers this year. Moreover, the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has created a need for an additional 30,000 teachers to staff the new programs funded.

Who will pay the teachers' salaries?

Local school districts will employ Teacher Corps members and pay their salaries. The local district costs for the program will be covered by Federal grants to the district. This is in line with the precedent set by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides that Federal funds may be used by local districts to pay teachers' salaries in low-income areas.

Will this program lead to Federal control of the schools?

Teacher Corps teachers and teams are employees of and under the direct control of local school authorities. The authorities of these districts request Teacher Corps members in the first place and have the right to fire them at any time, thus assuring that local control of education will be preserved.

Section 516 of title V–B specifically states:

LOCAL CONTROL PRESERVED

SEC. 516. Members of the Teacher Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in clause (3) of section 513(a), such agencies shall retain the authority to—

(1) assign such members within their systems;

(2) make transfers within their systems;

(3) determine the subject matter to be taught;

(4) determine the terms and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems.

Will Teacher Corps members be adequately trained?

All inexperienced teacher interns will receive 3 months of intensive training at a college or university before going into local schools requesting them. Their training will continue in the school under the close supervision of an experienced teacher and in cooperation with the university.

Are there any precedents for this kind of training program?

Yes. Intern training programs for college graduates have been operating successfully in the country since 1895. Now more than 40 institutions including Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and the University of Wisconsin have such programs leading to master's degrees.

Who is eligible to be a Teacher Corps member?

A college graduate with a bachelor's degree, whether or not he has had teaching experience, will be eligible to become a teacher intern. Experienced teachers will also be eligible to be Teacher Corps intern team leaders or to serve individually.

Where will the Teacher Corps members work?

Local schools, both urban and rural, having the highest concentrations of low-income children will be eligible to request Teacher Corps members.

Will this program take away competent teachers from other areas?

No. While some experienced teachers will be drawn to schools in poverty areas for 2 years of service, it is expected that they will be returning at the end of that period to their home districts. By encouraging dedicated college graduates, who would not normally enter the teaching profession, to become teachers and work with the disadvantaged youth of this country, it is expected that the Teacher Corps will strengthen significantly the Nation's teaching resources.

What will be the role of State educational agencies in National Teacher Corps?

The State educational agencies will act as advisers and consultants on every step in the program—recruitment, selection, training, and assignment.

Now has this measure been given adequate consideration by Congress?

The bill was considered at length by the Congress. Four days of hearings on this legislation were held before the General Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Further, the bill was reported out by the committee. As a result of careful scrutiny in the Senate, the bill was included in the Higher Education Act of 1965. The majority of the members of the House-Senate conference agreed to its inclusion.

Does the Teacher Corps really belong in the Higher Education Act of 1965?

Yes. For two reasons: First, this measure will give the grade and high schools of this country supplementary teaching services. It will provide extra teachers and extra teaching skills in these areas. Second, for higher education, the Teacher Corps will stimulate and encourage college graduates to enter the teaching profession—supplementing their classroom experience with on-the-job contact with students. Further, the program also includes fellowships and grants for individuals seeking to improve their teaching ability through further academic training. It is an education measure on all of these counts.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues today to finish the monumental work which this education Congress has begun for the children of the poor. This past spring, in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, we made an historic effort to upgrade education for the disadvantaged and the culturally deprived.

But that effort will not suceed unless we address ourselves to the critical point of quality education, and that means quality teachers. Therefore, I urge the support of all my colleagues for the Teacher Corps. The Teacher Corps is designed to bring quality teaching where it is most needed and often least provided—to the city slums and the rural areas of poverty.

The goals of the Teacher Corps merit our approval:

To attract and train bright young people who might not otherwise enter the teaching profession;

To attract dedicated teachers to our deprived schools;

To bring able and spirited teaching interns to our most needy schools;

To develop public awareness of the dramatic challenges faced by those schools; and

To encourage greater contact and cooperation between universities and the schools of the disadvantaged.

The Corps will enroll experienced master teachers and teacher interns with no less than a bachelor's degree—able and dedicated young people who will make teaching a career. They will receive 3 months of additional, special training in education and in the complex problems of urban and rural poverty. In addition, the teacher interns, while working in local schools, will take part in university-level training programs given by experienced teachers from institutions of higher education.

Working in teams under the supervision of master teachers, the teacher interns will have the unique opportunity of meeting their future teaching challenge head on—but not all by themselves, as so often happens in our schools today. The young teacher will not be left to his own devices and his own wits. The children will not be left in the hands of inexperienced college boys.

The Teacher Corps is specifically set up to prevent this kind of thing from continuing. Interns will work with a master teacher, someone with responsibility and experience, a teacher not only dedicated to better education but also dedicated to enriching the classroom experience of every child.

I can think of no better way to insure quality teachers for our schools of poverty than through the proposed Teacher Corps.

Beyond serving the needs of the culturally deprived, the Corps is sure to stimulate a new spirit among the other teachers working in the same schools. Many teachers in the past have avoided serving in urban slum schools or remote rural schoolhouses. It meant less professional status for qualified teachers. The result is often a large number of substitute or temporary personnel—exactly where experienced and dedicated teachers are desperately needed.

Through the example of the Teacher Corps, teaching in deprived schools will become the new challenge for every member of the profession. It can stimulate other dedicated teachers to apply themselves to the educational problems of the disadvantaged.

We need those teachers now. We needed them yesterday. Certainly it is in our power and it is in the Nation's highest interests that we need and provide those teachers tomorrow with the help of the National Teacher Corps.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I support most strongly retention of the National Teacher Corps in this bill. I introduced legislation, H.R. 9879, that is nearly identical with this part of the present bill, because I believe that those experienced and new teachers who volunteer for service in economically and culturally deprived areas of our country will contribute immeasurably to the task we have undertaken to eliminate poverty and ignorance and their unspeakably deplorable consequences.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives—nearing adjournment after a long and fruitful session—will vote on the Higher Education Act of 1965.

I intend to vote for the bill. I support this measure because it will do for our colleges and universities what other legislation has done for our country's elementary and secondary schools.

I intend to vote for this bill because the Higher Education Act of 1965 is the final measure by this session of Congress that will help assure that every child in this country will have the best education we can offer—an education that will carry our children as far as their individual ability can be stretched.

I intend to vote for this bill because it is clear that we in the United States—legislator or farmer, city dweller or teacher—can never have a Great Society without having an educated society.

Thomas Jefferson once said that any nation that expects to be both ignorant and free expects "what never was and never can be."

Years later, President Kennedy termed our Nation's educational efforts the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress.

And, at the beginning of this Congress, President Johnson made it emphatically clear that education in the United States is "the first work of our times."

Education is important to our every endeavor. When the Nation gears for national defense to meet our critical role in the world, we call upon our schools to support this effort by providing the kind and quality of education required for competent, well-trained personnel.

When this Nation fights poverty, we turn to education as the most basic means to break the cycle of poverty and ignorance typical of culturally deprived children.

We want and expect the best for our children and when the Nation and the people of the State of Washington look for a place to provide this, we turn to our schools for the answer. And to help these schools play their part, this Congress has taken steps to meet their needs.

The heart of my concern for the people living in my congressional district is that education, first and foremost, is an investment in the future of my district and my State. The funds authorized by this Higher Education Act of 1965 will do much in my district and State just as it will do a great deal for the entire Nation.

In the State of Washington, nearly 100,000 students are enrolled in colleges and universities and junior colleges alone. We have a total of 31 colleges and universities, both public and private, where this money will be directed to help solve the educational problems of the next decade.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I have helped to develop the other educational measures in this Congress, just as it was my privilege to work on the Higher Education Act of 1965.

I want to outline briefly the provisions and potential contained in this act.

Title I of the Higher Education Act will directly benefit our cities by turning to the most logical source of research, information, and guidance: our higher educational institutions. Over $400,000 is authorized for the State of Washington.

For example, in my congressional district, the fantastic problems created by the rapid growth of the area between Seattle and Everett would stun any city planner. An urban area such as this needs help to solve the intertwined problems of water and air pollution, of transportation and conservation, of proper schools and decent housing. Some men, and I suspect men of vision rather than visionaries, predict a day when the areas between Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, British Columbia, in Canada will be one gangling metropolis. The problems that situation would conjure are nearly beyond comprehension.

Under title I, the University of Washington in Seattle and Western Washington State College, in Bellingham, can help solve these problems through community service and continuing education programs.

Both of these schools are eminently qualified in many areas to set a pattern for future development and both of these schools have a strong tradition of community service. This bill will aid that tradition of service by providing Federal funds to help solve community problems in a wide variety of topics.

I am also glad to see that the legislation contains a provision specifically stating that the operation of these programs will be consistent with the overall educational program of any participating institution. No one wants to, nor should the program be allowed to, impair the primary goal of a university—to educate the student. But, within the framework there is a great deal that can be done.

The second title of this legislation provides assistance for our college libraries and for library training and research.

This measure will help universities and colleges in several ways. First, it will allow them to acquire library materials needed for expanded responsibilities in research, teaching and student use. Second, it will encourage enlarged college and university training programs, and in other ways, is designed to help give the best to the center of any undergraduate program: a library with books in all fields to satisfy the thirsty minds of our young men and women.

The third title of the Higher Education Act has a provision which will directly assist the improvement of the academic facilities of certain "developing institutions" in the United States and I am happy to see that this legislation provides that 22 percent of the funds authorized will be reserved for junior colleges.

This title will, for example, help facilitate the exchange of faculty or students with smaller colleges. I am sure that the colleges of Washington State will be eager participants in this assistance to developing colleges in our State and throughout this Nation.

Every parent, every mother and father, knows the problems and costs of a college education. I believe this is the most urgent crisis facing our college students: just how can we insure that no child will be denied a college education simply because of lack of finances. I have been a strong supporter of the National Defense Education Act and for this reason indorse title IV of this bill which provides additional funds for student assistance.

The fourth title will give educational opportunity grants to needy students. Nearly $1,400,000 is authorized for Washington State. Finally, and most important, it is going to provide some technical amendments to improve the National Defense Education Act.

The fifth title of this legislation will establish the National Teacher Corps, a program through which dedicated college graduates can teach in areas of the United States having a concentration of low-income families.

This title also sets up fellowships for teachers to solve the crisis of the classroom. We all know that experienced teachers and other personnel in our grade and high schools need time to pursue graduate study and then reenter the teaching field.

In addition, this fellowship program will allow other college graduates—recent or otherwise—to go into the teaching profession after graduate study.

The three remaining titles of this legislation—VI, VII, VIII—are basic.

Title VI will give additional financial support to acquire laboratory and special equipment and materials to improve undergraduate instruction.

Title VII simply increases the funds authorized under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, legislation which allowed the schools of the State of Washington to construct undergraduate academic facilities. I am happy to note that public community colleges and technical institutions will be eligible in this measure to States where the demands from four-year institutions is not sufficient to use the appropriated funds.

That, briefly, is the Higher Education Act of 1965, very significant and important piece of legislation because the foundation of our Great Society, as I have said, must be an educated society. This program is reasonable for it gives the money where it is needed most: to our colleges and universities and to our developing colleges in this country, to the students and to the people who want to pursue teaching careers.

A decade of education confronts us. Even this measure, it is clear, is only one strong step on the path of our education goal in this country.

That goal is the continued assurance that we will meet the challenge of the growing tide of students on our campuses. That challenge is—as the University of Washington describes its program of undergraduate instruction—the "years of discovery."

Let us, today, vote in concert to make sure that those "years of discovery" on the college campuses of this country are the best years in the lives of our young men and women.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, no matter what our individual views may be on the merits of the Teacher Corps proposal in the conference report now before us, I believe the House has an obligation to remove it from this bill. I shall, therefore, vote to recommit the conference report for that purpose.

As an idea, the proposal to enlist school teachers to go into school districts to teach culturally deprived children is a very attractive one. But can Congress legislate simply on the basis of an attractive idea? Can we enact laws which have too few conditions or standards, too little by which to control the administration of the program and measure its performance? Not, I suggest, if we take seriously our obligation as legislators.

There have been practically no hearings on this proposal in the House. There is a great deal of evidence that this was a sort of last-minute idea of the administration. There is very little evidence that the idea was thoroughly studied, carefully considered, and recommended to Congress in a manner which indicated the administration was prepared to administer the program effectively.

This has been a problem with a great deal of legislation this year. We have received recommendations from the executive branch but not the detailed proposals for the proper administration of the program which would give the Congress confidence in the readiness and ability of the administration to do the job. The majority leader of the Senate recently complained that Congress will have to spend much of its second session repairing the omissions and deficiencies of the legislation we passed this year. I see no reason to compound the problem.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today we are committed to the war against poverty in our country.

The different forms poverty takes are sadly familiar. There is hunger and undernourishment. Many schoolchildren arrive each day at school without any breakfast and return home to dinners of peanut butter and jelly. There is chronic ill health. There is unemployment and underemployment. For too many Americans there is no home and no joy.

The causes of this devastating poverty are many, surely. But, at the heart of this problem is lack of education. For lack of education and training is what, in most cases, makes it impossible for a person to qualify for available jobs. It is what limits a mother's knowledge of how to budget properly and how best to feed her family. And, it is what inhibits learning and putting into practice beneficial health measures.

A National Teacher Corps, specially trained and dedicated, can be one of the best instruments for providing disadvantaged youngsters in our urban and rural slums with the kind of education they need to lift themselves out of poverty.

The National Teacher Corps proposed by title V of the Higher Education Act is patterned after the Peace Corps.

The National Teacher Corps would give highly motivated individuals who are now teachers, or who want to become teachers, the opportunity to serve their country and their fellow man by teaching the children of our poor.

Basically, the program would operate in this way:

First, members of the National Teacher Corps will be specially trained and oriented for teaching service in schools with large numbers of underprivileged youth. Equipped with these special teaching skills, and with a broad understanding of the problems of the underprivileged, they will be ready to go into schools to teach.

Once in these schools, the members of the National Teaching Corps will apply specialized training to help give educationally underprivileged youngsters the particular enriched learning experiences they need in order to bridge the heritage of dispair. Understanding the children's handicaps, the teachers will be better able and prepared to teach these students the academic skills that must be mastered to be successful in school and in life, and to begin to enjoy both. And, they will introduce their pupils to the rewarding world of cultural life around them—a life which heretofore has been remote or unknown.

In order to attract a wide variety of dedicated teachers, and also, to train a new supply of teachers, the membership of the National Teacher Corps will comprise both experienced teachers and college graduates who wish to be teachers.

The experienced teachers will work in schools singly or as members or leaders of teaching teams. They will contribute both to the schools in which they will teach and to the young would-be teachers at their side.

To the classrooms of the disadvantaged the experienced teachers will bring their many years of teaching. The children and youth they teach will have the opportunity of being instructed by individuals who have had a wide range of educational experience and a deep knowledge of the art of teaching.

To the young teacher-interns in the program, these experienced teachers would also serve as instructors through leading inservice training programs carried out in cooperation with institutions of higher education. They would help to teach these young teacher-interns classroom skills while these young instructors are actually on the job in the schools of the underprivileged.

The teacher-interns, for their part, will contribute vigor and enthusiasm to the classrooms of the disadvantaged. Their original and fresh ideas and approaches will stimulate an atmosphere of excitement about learning which cannot help but communicate itself to children and youth who need to be convinced of the value, wonder, and pleasure of learning.

Teacher interns who will already have B.A. degrees would also be continuing their schooling at a nearby institution of higher education while they are actually teaching. At the end of their 2 years of service in the Corps teacher-interns would be able to have earned an advanced degree in education. With this degree, plus their training in the teaching of the disadvantaged and their actual 2 years of practicing this knowledge, members of the National Teacher Corps would be well prepared to teach underprivileged children. As a group, they would also provide a valuable supply of well-prepared future teachers for America's youth.

Although the cost of the program would be borne entirely by the Federal Government, the members of the National Teacher Corps will not be employees of the Federal Government but will be, in effect, a part of the local school system. Federal funds will go to the local education agency which will pay the Teacher Corps members and directly supervise them.

The pay of the teacher in the Teacher Corps will be the same as for teachers in the local school system. Members of the Corps who are experienced will be paid the same as a teacher with similar training, experience and duties in the local system plus an extra amount if they are leading a teaching team. Teacher-interns will be paid at the beginning of the scale at the lowest rate paid by the local agency for full-time teachers in a particular school and grade.

Mr. Speaker, the National Teacher Corps offers a concrete plan for attempting to raise the quality of education in our schools.

It will also stimulate respect for learning on the part not only of disadvantaged youngsters, but also on the part of youths and citizens in all parts of America.

I urge support for the Teacher Corps and trust that the Quie motion to recommit will be defeated.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

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

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. QUIE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. QUIE, of Minnesota, moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9567) to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon the deletion of part B of title V of the bill, which would authorize the establishment of a National Teacher Corps.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 226, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

YEAS—152

Abbitt	Bates	Buchanan
Abernethy	Battin	Burleson
Adair	Belcher	Burton, Utah
Anderson, Ill.	Betts	Byrnes, Wis.
Andrews, Glenn	Bolton	Cabell
	Bow	Cahill
Arends	Bray	Casey
Ashbrook	Brock	Cederberg
Ashmore	Broomfield	Chamberlain
Ayres	Broyhill, N.C.	Clancy
Baldwin	Broyhill, Va.	Clawson, Del
Cleveland	Harvey, Ind.	Pool
Collier	Harvey, Mich.	Quie
Colmer	Henderson	Quillen
Conable	Herlong	Reid, Ill.
Corbett	Horton	Reinecke
Cramer	Hull	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Roberts
Curtin	Jarman	Rogers, Fla.
Curtis	Johnson, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.
Dague	Jonas	Rumsfeld
de la Garza	Jones, Mo.	Satterfield
Derwinski	Keith	Saylor
Devine	King, N.Y.	Schneebeli
Dickinson	Kornegay	Schweiker
Dole	Kunkel	Shriver
Dowdy	Laird	Sikes
Downing	Langen	Skubitz
Duncan, Tenn.	Latta	Smith, Calif.
Dwyer	Lipscomb	Smith, N.Y.
Ellsworth	Long, La.	Smith, Va.
Erlenborn	McClory	Springer
Findley	McCulloch	Stafford
Fisher	McEwen	Stanton
Ford, Gerald R.	McMillan	Taylor
Fountain	MacGregor	Teague, Calif.
Fulton, Pa.	Mahon	Thomson, Wis.
Gathings	Mailliard	Tuck
Gettys	Marsh	Utt
Goodell	Martin, Ala.	Waggonner
Griffin	Mathias	Walker, Miss.
Gross	Michel	Watson
Grover	Minshall	Whalley
Gubser	Mize	White, Tex.
Gurney	Moore	Whitener
Haley	Morton	Whitten
Hall	Nelsen	Widnall
Halleck	Passman	Williams
Hansen, Idaho	Pelly	Wyatt
Hardy	Pirnie	Wydler
Harsha	Poff	Younger

NAYS—226

Adams	Foley	McGrath
Addabbo	Ford, William D.	McVicker
Albert		Macdonald
Anderson, Tenn.	Fraser	Machen
	Friedel	Mackie
Annunzio	Fulton, Tenn.	Madden
Ashley	Gallagher	Matsunaga
Bandstra	Garmatz	Meeds
Barrett	Giaimo	Miller
Beckworth	Gibbons	Mills
Bennett	Gilbert	Minish
Bingham	Gilligan	Mink
Blatnik	Gonzalez	Moeller
Boggs	Grabowski	Monagan
Boland	Gray	Moorhead
Bonner	Green, Oreg.	Morris
Brademas	Green, Pa.	Morrison
Brooks	Greigg	Moss
Brown, Calif.	Grider	Multer
Burke	Griffiths	Murphy, Ill.
Burton, Calif.	Hagen, Calif.	Murphy, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Halpern	Murray
Callan	Hamilton	Natcher
Cameron	Hanley	Nedzi
Carey	Hanna	Nix
Carter	Hansen, Iowa	O'Brien
Celler	Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara, Ill.
Chelf	Harris	O'Hara, Mich.
Clark	Hathaway	Olsen, Mont.
Clevenger	Hawkins	Olson, Minn.
Cohelan	Hays	O'Neill, Mass.
Conte	Hechler	Ottinger
Conyers	Helstoski	Patman
Cooley	Hicks	Patten
Corman	Holifield	Pepper
Craley	Holland	Perkins
Daddario	Howard	Philbin
Daniels	Hungate	Pickle
Davis, Ga.	Huot	Pike
Dawson	Ichord	Powell
Delaney	Irwin	Price
Dent	Jacobs	Pucinski
Denton	Jennings	Purcell
Donohue	Joelson	Race
Dow	Johnson, Calif.	Randall
Dulski	Johnson, Okla.	Redlin
Duncan, Oreg.	Jones, Ala.	Reid, N.Y.
Dyal	Karsten	Resnick
Edmondson	Karth	Reuss
Edwards, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Rhodes, Pa.
Edwards, La.	Kee	Rivers, Alaska
Evans, Colo.	Kelly	Rodino
Everett	King, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.	King, Utah	Ronan
Fallon	Kluczynski	Roncalio
Farbstein	Krebs	Rooney, N.Y.
Farnsley	Landrum	Rooney, Pa.
Farnum	Long, Md.	Rosenthal
Fascell	Love	Rostenkowski
Feighan	McCarthy	Roush
Fino	McDade	Roybal
Flood	McDowell	Ryan
Fogarty	McFall	St Germain

St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—54

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Bolling
Callaway
Clausen, Don H.
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Hagan, Ga.
Hébert
Hosmer
Keogh
Kirwan
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Mackay
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Poage
Reifel
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roudebush
Sisk
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex
Toll
Tunney
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Wilson, Bob

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hagan of Georgia for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mr. Tenzer against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Culver against.

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

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. George W. Andrews for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Walker of New Mexico against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. JONES of Missouri changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 313, nays 63, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

YEAS—313

Abbitt
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bennett
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Donohue
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—63

Abernethy
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Belcher
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Curtin
Dague
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Erlenborn
Findley
Fisher
Fountain
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Henderson
Hutchinson
Jones, Mo.
Laird
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McMillan
MacGregor
Martin, Ala.
Michel
Nelsen
Passman
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Tex.
Satterfield
Saylor
Smith, Calif.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watson
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Younger

NOT VOTING—57

Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Bolling
Callaway
Clausen, Don H.
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Hagan, Ga.
Harsha
Hébert
Hosmer
Jonas
Keogh
Kirwan
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Mackay
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Poage
Reifel
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roudebush
Sisk
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Wilson, Bob

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Don H. Clausen against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Matthews against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Tenzer for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Robison for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Walker of New Mexico with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Berry.

Messrs. TUCK and McCLORY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11135) entitled "An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE SUGAR BILL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11135) with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, POAGE, ABERNETHY, PURCELL, MORRISON, MATSUNAGA, DAGUE, BELCHER, and TEAGUE of California.

RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT OF 1965

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1170)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

"TITLE I—NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES WATER SUPPLY

"SEC. 101. (a) Congress hereby recognizes that assuring adequate supplies of water for the great metropolitan centers of the United States has become a problem of such magnitude that the welfare and prosperity of this country require the Federal Government to assist in the solution of water supply problems. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to cooperate with Federal, State, and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89-80) to meet the long-range water needs of the northeastern United States. This plan may provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the United States of (1) a system of major reservoirs to be located within those river basins of the Northeastern United States which drain into the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into the Atlantic Ocean north of the Chesapeake Bay, those that drain into Lake Ontario, and those that drain into the Saint Lawrence River, (2) major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between these river basins to the extent found desirable in the national interest, and (3) major purification facilities. Such plans shall provide for appropriate financial participation by the States, political subdivisions thereof, and other local interests.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain those reservoirs, conveyance facilities, and purification facilities, which are recommended in the plan prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and which are specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(c) Each reservoir included in the plan authorized by this section shall be considered as a component of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the river basin in which it is situated, as well as a component of the plan established in accordance with this section.

"TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

"SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain any water resource development project, including single and multiple purpose projects involving, but not limited to, navigation, flood control, and shore protection, if the estimated Federal first cost of constructing such project is less than $10,000,000. No appropriation shall be made to construct, operate, or maintain any such project if such project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. For the purpose of security consideration of such approval the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report of such proposed project, including all relevant data and all costs.

"(b) Any water resource development project authorized to be constructed by this section shall be subject to the same requirements of local cooperation as it would be if the estimated Federal first cost of such project were $10,000,000 or more.

"SEC. 202. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law, the authorization for any flood control project authorized by this Act requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

"SEC. 203. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"SEC. 204. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein. The necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program. The projects authorized in this title shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements. Penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

"Saint John River Basin

"The Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, is hereby authorized as approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964, which is a supplement to the July 1963 report of the International Passamaquoddy tidal power project and upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development, at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

"Housatonic River Basin

The projects for flood protection on the Housatonic, Naugatuck, and Still Rivers at Derby and Danbury, Connecticut, are hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 324, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,100,000.

"New England-Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection at Westerly, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,287,000.

"Long Island Sound area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Stratford, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the

recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 292, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,340,000.

"Hudson River Basin

"The project for flood protection at Yonkers, Saw Mill River, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 258, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,924,000.

"New York-Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,620,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 181, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,230,000.

"Elizabeth River Basin, New Jersey

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Elizabeth River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,769,000.

"Rahway River Basin, New Jersey

"The project for flood protection on the Rahway River, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 67, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,514,000.

"Neuse River Basin

"The project for the Falls Dam and Reservoir, Neuse River, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 175, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,600,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at New Bern and Vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,400,000.

"Middle Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,636,000.

"Flint River Basin

"The project for the Lazer Creek Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,378,000.

"The project for the Lower Auchumpkee Reservoir, Flint River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $48,275,000.

"Central and Southern Florida Basin

"Comprehensive plan

"The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items:

"The project for flood protection in Hendry County, west of levees 1, 2, and 3, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 102, Eighty-eighth Congress, at a estimated cost of $4,986,000.

"The project for flood protection in Southwest Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 20, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,903,000.

"South Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on Biscayne Bay, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 213, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,954,000.

"Phillippi Creek Basin, Florida

"The project for flood control on Phillippi Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,592,000.

"Lower Mississippi River Basin

"Comprehensive plan

"The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928 (45 Stat. 534), as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $181,109,000, except that (1) any modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, Floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the Act of May 15, 1928, (2) the pumping plant in the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers, (3) the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and (4) the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be reviewed by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with particular reference to Federal and non-Federal cost sharing, and he shall report results of such review to Congress within one year after the date of enactment of this Act. No appropriation made pursuant to the authorization contained in this paragraph shall be available for any project other than those set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, Eighty-eighth Congress.

"The project for the St. Francis River, Missouri and Arkansas, within Drainage District No. 7, Poinsett County, Arkansas, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 57, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,372,000.

"General Projects

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,500,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Morgan City and Vicinity, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,049,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 231, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army in that document shall apply with respect to the Seabrook Lock feature of the project. The estimated cost is $56,235,000.

"Ouachita River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 328, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $520,000.

"Red River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Bayou Bodcau and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

"The project for Caddo Dam and Reservoir, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in Senate Document Numbered 39, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,934,000.

"The project for Sanders, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Texas, as authorized in the Act of October 23, 1962 (76 Stat. 1187), is hereby modified in order to provide for a highway crossing Pat Mayse Reservoir to replace the present FM Highway 1499 across Sanders Creek, at an estimated cost of $310,000. Such crossing shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

"Gulf of Mexico

"The project for flood protection on the Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, White Oak Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 169, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000.

"The project for flood protection on Highland Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 168, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,500,000.

"The project for flood protection on Taylors Bayou, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,004,000.

"Rio Grande Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Rio Grande at El Paso, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 207, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,493,000.

"Arkansas River Basin

"Comprehensive Plan

"The multiple-purpose plan for improvement of Arkansas River and tributaries, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide replacement outfall facilities for the Kansas Street outfall sewer in the city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, including such new pumping facilities as may be necessary, at the most economical Federal expense, but

including in the Federal expense the reasonable capitalized cost of operation and maintenance of the pumping facilities over the cost of pumping now required in the existing system.

"General Projects

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Las Animas, Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,541,000.

"The project for flood protection on Lee Creek, Arkansas and Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 270, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $10,000,000.

"The project for flood protection at Little Rock, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 55, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $363,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Great Bend, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,030,000.

"The project for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Grand (Neosho) River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 27, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $730,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Walnut River, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $66,036,000.

"The project for the Shidler Dam and Reservoir, Salt Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 242, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,150,000.

"The project for flood protection on Crutcho Creek, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 47, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,801,000.

"The project for Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colorado, House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-fourth Congress, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to provide that in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in paragraph 2(a) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 22, 1954, published in said document, local interests shall maintain the channel of Purgatoire River through the city of Trinidad. The conditions set forth in paragraphs 2(b) and 2(c) of said report shall be applicable to the project.

"The John Martin Reservoir project (formerly known as Caddoa Reservoir), Arkansas River, Colorado, as authorized by the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), is modified to authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers to use not to exceed ten thousand acre-feet of reservoir flood control storage space for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a permanent pool for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes, at such times as storage space may not be available for such permanent pool within the conservation pool as defined in article III F, Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145) except that—

"(1) The State of Colorado shall purchase and make available any water rights necessary under State law to establish and thereafter maintain the permanent pool.

"(2) The rights of irrigators in Colorado and Kansas to those waters available to them under the terms of the Arkansas River compact and under the laws of their respective States shall not be diminished or impaired by anything contained in this paragraph.

"(3) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to give any preference to the permanent pool over other project purposes.

"(4) No permanent pool as herein defined shall be maintained except upon written terms and conditions acceptable and agreed to (A) by the Chief of Engineers in the interest of flood control, and (B) by the Colorado State Engineer, the Arkansas River Compact Administration, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board, in the interest of establishing, maintaining, and operating the permanent pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

"(5) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed so as to limit the authority of the Chief of Engineers to operate John Martin Reservoir for the primary purposes of the prevention of floods and the preservation of life and property.

"Missouri River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Big Creek at Hays, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 22, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,702,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Little Nemaha River and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,524,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,400,000, except that such portion of the project as relates to the area above the city limits of Sioux City, Iowa, shall be compatible with a fish and wildlife mitigation plan and also a flood control plan for the upper basin of the Big Sioux River, both to be approved by the States of Iowa and South Dakota.

"The project for flood protection on the James River and tributaries, North Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 266, Eighth-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,083,000.

"The project for flood control on the Fishing River and tributaries, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 281, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,260,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 238, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,167,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $218,009,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the construction of Linneus Reservoir on Locust Creek, St. Catherine Reservoir on East Yellow Creek, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, nor hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonsburg Reservoir on Grand River; the Secretary of the Army shall conduct a review of such reservoirs, local protection works, and hydroelectric power facilities, at an estimated cost of $75,000, and the funds authorized by this paragraph for project planning are authorized to be used for such review. The Secretary shall submit to Congress, at the earliest practical date, a new feasibility report on such projects based upon such review.

"The project for flood protection on the Platte River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 262, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $26,889,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Sun River at Great Falls, Montana, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297; Public Law 85–500) is hereby modified to waive the requirement that local interests contribute in cash 2.16 per centum of the actual construction cost of all items of work provided by the United States.

"Ohio River basin

"The project for flood protection on Chartiers Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 302, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,207,000.

"The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at Du Bois, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,654,000.

"The project for the Hocking River, Ohio, in the vicinity of Athens, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 287, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,520,000.

"The project for the Lincoln, Clifty Creek, and Patoka Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana and Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $72,900,000.

"The project for the Lafayette and Big Pine Dams and Reservoirs, Wabash River, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 29, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,800,000.

"The project for the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $133,548,000: *Provided*, That the power features of this project shall not be undertaken until such time as the Federal Power Commission has completed action on any applications that may be pending before that agency for private development of the pumped-storage facility of the project: *Provided further*, That should the Federal Power Commission act in the affirmative on any pending applications, the authority for such project shall not include Federal power features and the estimated cost of such project shall be $88,402,000: *And provided further*, That in the event the Federal Power Commission dismisses any pending applications, Federal construction of such pumped-

storage power facilities is hereby authorized and approved.

"The project for the Martins Fork Reservoir, Upper Cumberland River Basin, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 244, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,860,000.

"The Yatesville, Paintsville, and Panther Creek Reservoir projects and the Martin, Kentucky, local protection project on the Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of of $51,491,000. Prior to initiation of construction the Secretary of the Army shall prepare an analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed projects, including such reformulation as may be necessary to comply with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

"Red River of the North Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Roseau River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 282, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,550,000.

"Upper Mississippi River Basin

"The project for flood protection at East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 329, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,180,000.

"The project for the Kaskaskia River, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 232, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby modified substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 351, Eighty-eighth Congress, to provide for the deletion from the items of local cooperation the requirement of a cash contribution due to changed land use, at an estimated increased Federal cost of $3,498,000, if local interests make a cash contribution of an amount equal to the full cost of acquisition of flowage easements in those lands which are no longer needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of Carlyle Reservoir.

"The project for the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Madison County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $179,000.

"The project for Ames Dam and Reservoir, Skunk River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, as modified by the Secretary of the Army, in House Document Numbered 267, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,893,000.

"The projects for flood protection at Marshalltown and Waterloo on the Iowa and Cedar Rivers, Iowa, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $17,570,000.

"The project for the Zumbro River, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $975,000.

"The project for the Big Stone Lake and Whetstone River, Minnesota and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-seventh Congress, and House Document Numbered 193, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,885,000.

"The project on the Des Moines River for flood protection of Des Moines, Iowa, House Document Numbered 651, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorized by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified to eliminate the requirement recommended in paragraph 10(a)(2) of the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 13, 1943, that local interests bear the expense of repairs and provision of gates on existing drains.

"Great Lakes Basin

"The project for flood control and navigation on the Chagrin River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 35, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,200,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Grand River at and in the vicinity of Grandville, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,373,000.

"Little Colorado River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Little Colorado River at and in the vicinity of Winslow, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 63, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,775,000.

"Gila River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Indian Bend Wash, Maricopa County, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 303, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,250,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Santa Rosa Wash, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,430,000, except that the development of recreation and fish and wildlife facilities shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act.

"The project for flood protection at Phoenix, Arizona, and vicinity, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,310,000.

"Eel River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Eel River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,732,000.

"Sacramento River Basin

"The project for the New Bullards Bar Dam and Reservoir, Yuba River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 180, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,979,000.

"The project for the Lakeport Dam and Reservoir with supplemental channel improvements, Scotts Creek, Cache Creek Basin, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 259, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,360,000.

"San Francisco Bay Area

"The project for flood protection on Sonoma Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 224, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,400,000.

"The project for the Napa River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 222, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,950,000.

"Whitewater River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Tahquitz Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 223, Eighty-ninth Congress, except that the amount of local contribution required due to enhancement of land shall be reduced by the amount of contribution determined on lands under Indian ownership at the time of project authorization and not subject to taxation due to Federal statutory restrictions. The amount of contribution on this basis is presently estimated at $508,000. The estimated cost is $3,442,000.

"Santa Ana River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Lytle and Warm Creeks, San Bernardino County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,750,000.

"San Diego River Basin

"The project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 212, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000, except that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse local interests for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

"Columbia River Basin

"The projects for the Lower Grande Ronde and Catherine Creek dams and reservoirs, Grande Ronde River and tributaries, Oregon, are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 280, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,440,000. The Chief of Engineers shall construct, operate, and maintain such projects.

"The project for flood protection on Willow Creek, Oregon, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 233, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,680,000.

"The project for acquisition of additional lands for water-fowl management at John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $706,000, except that the parcels of land, in Oregon, between the Columbia River and the management area boundary within sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of Township 4 North, Range 25 East, Willamette Meridian, as shown on plate 1 of Senate Document Numbered 28, Eighty-ninth Congress, estimated at 611.02 acres, shall not be part of the management area, and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to purchase such additional lands in sections 22, 27, 29, and

30, Township 5 North, Range 26 East, Willamette Meridian, outside the present indicated management area boundary on plate 1, as he determines necessary to replace the lands so excluded.

"SEC. 205. That the flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962, is hereby modified to authorize the construction of the local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, at such time as the reservoirs on Alum, Mill, Big Darby, and Deer Creeks are under construction. In the event the Mill Creek and Alum Creek Reservoirs are constructed by an agency other than the Federal Government, the Federal Government shall not construct such local protection works at Chillicothe, Ohio, until said agency shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that (1) it will provide flood control storage in those reservoirs equivalent to that proposed for the Federal reservoir projects, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, in accordance with the plan set forth in House Document Numbered 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, and (2) that such reservoirs shall be operated for flood control in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

"SEC. 206. (a) That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to prepare under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, a comprehensive plan for the development and efficient utilization of the water and related resources of the region drained by streams which discharge, within the State of Michigan, into the Saint Clair River, Lake Saint Clair, the Detroit River and Lake Erie. Such plan may provide for importation of water from points not located within the region as defined above.

"(b) Said comprehensive plan shall be designed to meet the long-range needs of the region for protection against floods, wise use of flood plain lands, improvement of navigation facilities, water supplies for industrial and municipal purposes, outdoor recreational facilities, the enhancement and control of water quality, and related purposes; all with a view to encouraging and supporting the optimum long-range economic development of the region and enhancing the welfare of its people.

"SEC. 207. That the project for flood protection on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minnesota, authorized in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–500, 72 Stat. 297) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to such project for any work necessitated by extreme high water done by such interests on such project between April 1, 1965, and February 1, 1966, if he approves such work as being in accordance with such project as authorized.

"SEC. 208. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the localities specifically named in this section. After the regular or formal reports made on any survey authorized by this section are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions.

"Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

"Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"The Rio Grande and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

"Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coastlines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes, and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

"Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

"Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana (water supply).

"Boyer River, Iowa.

"Keokuk, Iowa.

"Mississippi River, north of Dubuque, Iowa.

"Black Hawk Creek, Iowa.

"Mount Vernon, Indiana.

"Orange Lake Basin, Florida.

"Mayfield Creek, Kentucky.

"Hatchie River and Tributaries, Tennessee and Mississippi.

"Spoon River, Illinois.

"Grand (Neosho) River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

"Verdigris River, Kansas.

"Verdigris River, Oklahoma and Kansas (including navigation).

"Arkansas River and tributaries at and above Tulsa, Oklahoma.

"Sanderson, Texas.

"Abbeville, South Carolina.

"All streams which drain directly to Pacific Ocean from San Mateo County, California.

"Big Mineral Creek, Texas, particularly with reference to construction of a highway bridge.

"Irondequoit Creek, New York, and tributaries, including Allens Creek, New York.

"Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California to determine advisability of protection work against storm and tidal waves.

"SEC. 209. Nothwithstanding the first proviso in section 201 of the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes', approved May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163), the authorization in section 204 of such Act of projects for local protection on the Yakima River at Ellensburg, Washington, shall expire on June 10, 1970, unless local interests shall before such date furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required local cooperation in such project will be furnished.

"SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers, is hereby authorized to replace the roads described and set forth in the provisions of their contract numbered DA–41–443–eng–939 with Hill County, Texas, which are subject to flooding; such roads being a part of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Whitney, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, at an estimated cost of $130,000.

"SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, subject to the provisions of this section, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that portion of the tract of land lying above elevation 454 feet mean sea level now occupied by such Society at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tennessee, under a lease executed by the Secretary of the Army and dated February 10, 1958.

"(b) The conveyance authorized by this section shall be made upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and upon such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as he shall deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States. In determining the fair market value of the property, the Secretary shall exclude the value of any improvements made by or at the expense of the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

"(c) The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized by this section shall be borne by the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated.

"(d) Title to the property authorized to be conveyed by this section shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Incorporated, shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

"SEC. 212. The authorized Justice Reservoir on the Guyandot River, West Virginia, hereafter shall be known and designated as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which the authorized Justice Reservoir is referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir as the R. D. Bailey Reservoir.

"SEC. 213. In recognition of the flood control accomplishments of the water resource project proposed to be constructed on Calispell Creek, Washington, by the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a monetary contribution toward the construction cost of such project and the amount of such contribution shall be determined by the Secretary of the Army, subject to a finding by him approved by the President, of economic justification for allocation of the amount of flood control, such funds to be administered by the Secretary of the Army. Prior to making the monetary contribution or any part thereof, the Secretary of the Army and the Pend Oreille County Public Utility District Number One, shall have entered into an agreement providing for operation of the proposed project in such manner as will produce the flood control benefits upon which the monetary contribution is predicated, and such operation of the project for flood control shall be in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 890). Unless construction of the project is undertaken within three years from the date of enactment of this section, the authority for the monetary contribution contained herein shall expire.

"SEC. 214. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is author-

ized to cooperate with the State of New York, political subdivisions thereof, and appropriate agencies and instrumentalities thereof, and with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States, in the preparation of comprehensive plans for the development, utilization, and conservation of the water and related resources of drainage basins within the State of New York, and to submit to Congress reports and recommendations with respect to appropriate participation by the Department of the Army in carrying out such plans.

"SEC. 215. The Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities at reservoir areas', approved September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 509), is hereby amended by striking out 'before November 1, 1956,'.

"SEC. 216. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made, under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, an investigation and study of San Francisco Bay, California, including San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and other adjacent bays and tributaries thereto, with a view toward determining the feasibility of, and extent of Federal interest in, measures for waste disposal and water quality control and allied purposes.

"SEC. 217. (a) In the prosecution for projects of rivers and harbors and other waterways for the benefit of navigation, the control of destructive flood waters, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and for other purposes, authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans adopted and authorized by the Congress, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, that whenever such projects are located wholly or partially within an area which is eligible for financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding fifty years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of such projects within such areas.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, not to exceed $10,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

"SEC. 218. The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse any common carrier by railroad for the cost of protective works constructed by such carrier during the years 1965 and 1966 along the banks of the Eel River, California, to deter recurrence of damage to such banks by floods or high waters, but such reimbursement shall not exceed $3,000,000.

"SEC. 219. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to accept orders from other Federal departments and agencies for work or services and to perform all or any part of such work or services by contract.

"SEC. 220. Section 206(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 709a) is amended by striking out '$1,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,500,000'.

"SEC. 221. The Joanna Dam proposed for construction at or near mile 63 of the Salt River near Joanna, Missouri, and the Joanna Reservoir to be created by such dam, authorized to be constructed by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1180), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such dam and reservoir are referred to as the Joanna Dam and Reservoir shall be held to refer to such dam and reservoir as the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir.

"SEC. 222. Title II of this Act may be cited as the 'Flood Control Act of 1965'.

"TITLE III—RIVERS AND HARBORS

"SEC. 301. The following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated. The provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"Navigation

"Weymouth-Fore and Town Rivers, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $12,500,000;

"Providence River and Harbor, Rhode Island: Senate Document Numbered 93, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,900,000;

"Rondout Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 288, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,000;

"New York and New Jersey Channels-Entrance to Kill Van Kull from Upper New York Bay: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,581,000;

"New York Harbor, New York (Anchorage Areas): Senate Document Numbered 17, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $44,852,000;

"Shrewsbury River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 274, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,090,000;

"Tred Avon River, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 225, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $323,000;

"Potomac and Anacostia Rivers—Removal of Drift in the Washington Metropolitan Area: House Document Numbered 286, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance;

"Channel to Newport News and Norfolk Harbor, Hampton Roads, Virginia: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

"Channel to Newport News, Norfolk Harbor, and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: House Document Numbered 187, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,600,000;

"Hampton Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 201, Eighty-ninth Congress, modification of items of local cooperation;

"Cape Fear River, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 252, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,510,000;

"Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Documents Numbered 226 and 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,569,000. The plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 263, Eighty-ninth Congress, shall include facilities to mitigate damages to presently improved areas southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge at an estimated additional cost of $40,000. The Chief of Engineers may include additional facilities to mitigate damages to additional lands southeast of the Savannah Wildlife Refuge if he determines them to be necessary and justified, at an estimated additional cost of $60,000. All such facilities to mitigate damages shall be maintained by local interests.

"Jacksonville Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 214. Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,484,000;

"Ponce de Leon Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,104,000;

"Broward County and Hillsboro Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,093,000;

"East Pass Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 194, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,151,000;

"Perdido Pass Channel, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 94, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $625,000;

"Bayou La Batre, Alabama: House Document Numbered 327, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $262,000;

"Mermentau River, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 239, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,690,000;

"Alpena Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $806,000. In order to compensate for existing low water levels in Lake Huron, an additional increment of one foot in channel depth is hereby authorized;

"Frankfort Harbor, Michigan: Senate Document Numbered 16, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $237,000;

"Lexington Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $570,000, except that the modified recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, contained in letter of April 5, 1965, from the Department of the Army to the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, shall apply with respect to recreational fishing facilities on the main breakwater;

"Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $437,000;

"Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $664,000;

"Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 269, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,840,000;

"Rocky River Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $235,000;

"The project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–645; 74 Stat. 480) is hereby modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct such bank stabilization works at cut numbered 1 as may be necessary in his discretion to keep the navigation channel in its proper alignment at an estimated additional cost of $1,600,000. Local interests shall contribute to the cost of the project an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of this project that would have been required for cut numbered 1, but for this modification.

"West Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 245, Eighty-eighth Congres, at an estimated cost of $544,000;

"Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 227, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $96,000;

"Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 160, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. The Secretary of the Army may reimburse the State of Indiana for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Unless construction of the project is initiated within three years from the date of enactment of this Act, the authority to reimburse the State of Indiana contained in this paragraph shall expire. The State of Indiana shall furnish assurance

satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize any adverse effects on public recreational areas in the general vicinity of the Harbor. No appropriation is authorized to be made for the construction of this project until the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has been voted upon by both Houses of Congress during the same Congress.

"Chocolate Bayou, Texas: House Document Numbered 217, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,254,000;

"Houston Ship Channel (Greens Bayou), Texas: House Document Numbered 257, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $470,000;

"Trinity River and tributaries, Texas: House Document Numbered 276, Eighty-ninth Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and there is hereby authorized $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project. Prior to expenditure of any funds for construction of those features designed exclusively for navigation, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress a re-evaluation based upon current criteria.

"San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California: House Document Numbered 208, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $46,853,000. The works for wavewash protection within the limits of the modified San Joaquin River navigation project shall be repaired or restored by the United States as determined to be necessary by the Secretary of the Army over the life of the project.

"Crescent City Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 264, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,980,000;

"Bodega Bay, California: House Document Numbered 106, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $853,000;

"Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,360,000;

"Oceanside Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-ninth Congress, maintenance. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to reimburse local interests for any work done by such interests on such project after August 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the project as otherwise authorized.

"Port Orford, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 62, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $696,000;

"Chetco River, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 21, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,308,000;

"Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,000,000;

"Edmonds Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-eighth Congress, maintenance;

"Coasts of the Hawaiian Islands, harbors for light-draft vessels, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,737,000;

"Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 68, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $680,000;

"Honolulu Harbor and Barbers Point Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 93, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,928,000;

"Kawaihae Harbor: House Document Numbered 75, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,291,000;

Beach erosion

"Cliff Walk, Newport, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $340,000;

"Perth Amboy, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $82,000;

"Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-eighth Congress, periodic nourishment;

"Hunting Island Beach, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 323, Eighty-eighth Congress, at an estimated cost of $319,000;

"Duval County, Florida: House Document Numbered 273, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,266,000;

"Fort Pierce, Florida: House Document Numbered 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

"Evanston, Illinois: House Document Numbered 159, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $392,000;

"Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 107, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $572,000.

"Waikiki Beach, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 104, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,490,000.

"SEC. 302. Section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300), as amended by section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173, 1180), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

'SEC. 104. (a) There is hereby authorized a comprehensive program to provide for control and progressive eradication of waterhyacinth, alligatorweed, Eurasion watermilfoil, and other obnoxious aquatic plant growths, from the navigable waters, tributary streams, connecting channels, and other allied waters of the United States, in the combined interest of navigation, flood control, drainage, agriculture, fish and wildlife conservation, public health, and related purposes, including continued research for development of the most effective and economic control measures, to be administered by the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. Local interests shall agree to hold and save the United States free from claims that may occur from control operations and to participate to the extent of 30 per centum of the cost of such operations. Costs for research and planning undertaken pursuant to the authorities of this section shall be borne fully by the Federal Government.

'(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts, not in excess of $5,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Any such funds employed for control operations shall be allocated by the Chief of Engineers on a priority basis, based upon the urgency and need of each area, and the availability of local funds.'

"SEC. 303. The consent of Congress is hereby granted for the purposes of section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), to the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a dam on the Susquehanna River, downstream from the Bainbridge Street Bridge at Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

"SEC. 304. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following locations and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

"Jonesport Harbor, Maine.

"Blue Hill Harbor, Maine.

"Great and Little Bays and their tributaries, New Hampshire, and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, with a view to determining the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of navigation and allied purposes.

"Popponesset Bay, Massachusetts.

"Niagara River, New York, with respect to nature and extent of measures necessary to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the American Falls.

"Great Lakes and Saint Lawrence Seaway: Investigation and study of means of extending the navigation season on the waterways at an estimated cost not to exceed $75,000. Report to include a full and complete investigation and study of waterway deicing systems, including a review of any previous pertinent reports by the Department of the Army, any available information from any of the other Departments of the Government, and waterway deicing methods in use by private concerns and foreign governments, for the purpose of determining the practicability, means, and economic justification for extending the navigation season on the Great Lakes (including connecting channels and harbors) and the Saint Lawrence Seaway by eliminating ice conditions to the extent possible. The Chief of Engineers may submit such interim reports as may be deemed advisable, and shall submit his final reports, together with his recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as he may deem advisable, not later than two years after funds are made available for the study.

"Lake Dauterive and Chareton Floodgate, Louisiana.

"Dickinson Bayou, Texas.

"Manchester Harbor, Washington.

"Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi.

"Calumet River, Illinois.

"Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, from about mile 29 West of Harvey Lock to U.S. Highway No. 90 in vicinity of Boutte, Louisiana.

"Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Withlacoochee River, Florida, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the project, with particular reference to provision for a side channel or connecting channel improvement through Cross Bayou to Old Tampa Bay, in the vicinity of Howard Frankland Bridge, for navigation, flood control, and related purposes.

"San Francisco County, California (beach erosion).

"Lake Michigan Shoreline, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin (beach erosion).

"Indian River County, Florida (beach erosion).

"Marquette County, Michigan (comprehensive).

"SEC. 305. The first proviso in the paragraph which begins 'James River, Virginia:' in section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874) is amended by striking out 'after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time' and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 23, 1971, unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project by that date'.

"SEC. 306. Section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1174) is amended by striking out '$5,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$22,000'.

"SEC. 307. That portion of the East River, in New York County, State of New York, lying between the south line of East Seventeenth Street, extended eastwardly, the United States pierhead line as it existed on July 1, 1965, and the south line of East Thirtieth Street, extended eastwardly, is hereby declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

"SEC. 308. The old channel of the River Raisin in Monroe County, Michigan, lying between the Monroe Harbor range front light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, is declared to be not a navigable stream of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and the consent of Congress is hereby given for the filling in of the old channel by the riparian owners on such channel.

"SEC. 309. Section 111 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 303) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may, if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for (1) the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable cost of replacing, relocating, or reconstructing such facility to such standard as he deems reasonable but not to exceed the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision for the same type of facility involved, except that if the existing facility exceeds the minimum standard of the State or political subdivision, the Chief of Engineers may provide a facility of comparable standard, or (2) the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost thereof. This section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of July 3, 1958, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States.'

"SEC. 310. (a) (1) Subsection (a) of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577) is amended by striking out '$2,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000,000'.

"(2) Subsection (b) of such section 107 is amended by striking out '$200,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$500,000'.

"(b) Section 3 of the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property', approved August 13, 1946, as amended (33 U.S.C. 426g), is amended (1) by striking out '$3,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000,000', and (2) by striking out '$400,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$500,000'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any project under contract for construction on the date of the enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 311. The project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, as authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1173), is modified in order to authorize the Chief of Engineers, at his discretion, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost (1) such protection for the Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway bridge over the Calumet River, Chicago, Illinois, as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet, (2) such temporary protection for the center pier and the south abutment of the New York, Chicago, and Saint Louis Railroad bridge (Nickel Plate) as is necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south bridge draw to the depth of twenty-seven feet prior to its replacement, and (3) such modification of the channel limits as is necessary to insure full use of each such draw.

"SEC. 312. (a) The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including the waters of the Baltimore Harbor and including, but not limited to, the following: navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall construct, operate, and maintain in the State of Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. Such model and center may be utilized, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary, by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, in connection with any research, investigation, or study being carried on by them of any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. The study authorized by this section shall be given priority.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $6,000,000 to carry out this section.

"SEC. 313. The Secretary of the Army shall transmit to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1968, a suggested draft of legislation revising and codifying the general and permanent laws relating to civil works projects by the Corps of Engineers for navigation, beach erosion control, flood control, and related water resources development. The Secretary shall also submit a report explaining the proposed legislation, and making specific reference to each change in or omission of any provision of existing law.

"SEC. 314. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall make a study of the need for, and the feasibility of, the Federal Government reimbursing States, political subdivisions thereof, and other public entities, for expenditures incurred by them in connection with authorized projects for improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, hurricane protection, beach erosion control, and other water resources development purposes, to the extent that such expenditures are incurred after the initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for such authorized projects. The Secretary shall report to Congress, not later than January 31, 1967, the results of such study together with his recommendations in connection therewith.

"SEC. 315. Title III of this Act may be cited as the 'River and Harbor Act of 1965'."

And the House agree to the same.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
ED EDMONDSON,
JIM WRIGHT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCNAMARA,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
FRANK E. MOSS,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary for minor technical, clerical, or clarifying purposes.

SAINT JOHN RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorizes the Dickey-Lincoln School project on the Saint John River, Maine, as it was approved by the President on July 12, 1965, and substantially in accordance with the plans included in the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August, 1964, which is a supplement to the report of July 1963 of the International Passamaquoddy Tidal Power project and Upper Saint John River hydroelectric power development at an estimated cost of $227,000,000.

The House amendment directs the Secretary of the Army to make a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the Saint John River, Maine, separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy tidal power project. This survey is to include a detailed study of alternative methods of providing power, including thermal power development using nuclear energy. This report is to be submitted to the Congress not later than March 30, 1966.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate bill.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorizes the modification and expansion of the project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, to include the projects and plans substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319, 88th Congress, at a cost not to exceed $181,109,100. This authorization is limited specifically to those projects set forth in House Documents Numbered 308 and 319. The Senate bill further provides that modified easements required in the improvement of the Birds Point-New Madrid, Missouri, floodway shall be acquired as provided by section 4 of the act of May 15, 1928, and that the pumping plant on the Red River backwater area shall be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers.

The House amendment is the same as the Senate provision with the following exceptions: First, the authorization for the total lower Mississippi River project is increased by the estimated cost of $181,109,000 and thus this authorization is not limited solely to the projects set forth in House Documents 308 and 319. The House amendment also provides that the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget shall apply with respect to improvements for fish and wildlife, and that the requirement of local cooperation for the improvements in the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, shall be the same as required in paragraph (q) under the heading "Lower Mississippi River" in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the following exceptions: First, it limits the authorization to those projects set forth in House Documents Nos. 308 and 319 and second, it provides that the requirement of local cooperation for improvements in the St. Francis Basin shall be reviewed by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief

of Engineers, with particular reference to Federal and non-Federal cost sharing and requires a report of the results of such review to Congress within 1 year. The conferees expect that the Secretary will remain within the authorization in his expenditures for these projects and should there be necessity for expenditures in excess of the authorized amount, he will submit a request for additional authorization.

RED RIVER BASIN

The House amendment contains a revision of the Waurika project, Oklahoma, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to acquire lands for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir at an estimated cost of $418,000 whenever the Secretary of the Interior approves the establishment of this refuge.

The Senate bill does not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this provision.

GRAND RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MISSOURI AND IOWA

The Senate bill authorizes the project on the Grand River and tributaries substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 241, 89th Congress, at an estimated cost of $278,635,000.

The House amendment authorizes this project at a reduced figure of $218,900,000 and specifically provides that the Linneus River Reservoir, Saint Catherine Reservoir, the Honey Creek-No Creek local protection works, and the hydroelectric power facilities at Pattonburg Reservoir are not authorized.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that the Secretary of the Army is required to review the reservoirs, local protection works, and hydroelectric power facilities which are not authorized and to submit to Congress at the earliest practical date, a new feasibility report on these projects based on this review. The cost of this review is estimated at $75,000, and these funds are to come from those authorized for project planning for the authorized project.

SAN DIEGO RIVER BASIN

The Senate bill authorized the project for flood protection on San Diego River (Mission Valley), California, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 212, 89th Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,600,000.

The House amendment is the same as the Senate bill with the exception that the House amendment provides that the Secretary of the Army is authorized to credit local interests against their required contribution for any work done by them on the project after the date of enactment of this act if he approves such work as being in accordance with the authorized project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill with the exception that in lieu of the provision relating to crediting local interests for work done contained in the House amendment the proposed conference substitute provides that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse local interests for expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the provision as approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under supervision of the Chief of Engineers. The conferees on the part of the House expect that the supervision by the Chief of Engineers required in this provision shall be only that which is necessary to insure that the actual construction is in accordance with the approved plan.

MINNESOTA RIVER AT MANKATO, MINN.

The House amendment provides for the modification of the project on the Minnesota River at Mankato in North Mankato, Minn., authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1958 to permit the Secretary of the Army to credit local interests against their required contribution to the project for any work done by them on the project after April 1, 1965, if he approves such work as being in accordance with the authorized project.

The Senate bill does not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill with the following modifications: The Secretary is authorized to credit local interests for any work necessitated by extreme high water which is done between April 1, 1965, and February 1, 1966, if he approves it as being in accordance with the authorized project.

MILFORD DAM AND RESERVOIR

The House amendment contains a section requiring the Secretary of the Army to pay to a lessee or permittee owning improvements situated totally or partially on a railroad right-of-way, the fair value of those improvements which are rendered or will be rendered inoperative or otherwise adversely affected by the construction of the Milford Dam and Reservoir project on the Republican River, Kans. In no case is the owner of such improvements to receive dual compensation and the Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide funds necessary from moneys appropriated for Milford Dam and Reservoir project.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute contains no such provision.

LOCAL COOPERATION REQUIREMENTS

The Senate bill contains a provision which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not exceeding 50 years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects within those areas which are declared eligible for financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or any similar act. There is no dollar limitation on the amount authorized to be expended for these purposes in the Senate bill.

The House amendment contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute contains a section which provides that in the case of river and harbor, flood control, hurricane protection, and beach erosion control projects which are authorized by Congress and which are prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and which are located wholly or partly in an area eligible for financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans for a period not to exceed 50 years to enable responsible local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation pertaining to contributions toward the cost of construction of only those projects. Further, a limitation is imposed on the authorization of not to exceed $10,000,000 per fiscal year for this purpose for the present fiscal year and the next 4 succeeding fiscal years.

LORAIN HARBOR, OHIO

The House amendment modifies the project for Lorain Harbor, Ohio, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1960 to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct a steel bulkhead at cut No. 1. Local interests are required to contribute an amount equal to the value of the land on the date of the original authorization of the project that would have been required for cut No. 1 but for this modification.

The Senate bill did not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that instead of authorizing the Secretary of the Army to construct a steel bulkhead at cut No. 1, he is authorized to construct such bank stabilization works at that cut as may be necessary in his discretion to keep the navigation channel in its proper alinement, at an estimated additional cost of $1,600,000. It is the intention of the conferees on the part of the House that by this modification the Secretary of the Army is given a greater latitude to construct whatever bank stabilization works (including bulkheads) he determines necessary to protect the proper alinement of the channel, which is totally a Federal responsibility.

BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, INDIANA

The Senate bill authorizes the project for Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana, House Document No. 160, 88th Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,000,000 with a proviso that any funds appropriated for construction are not to be utilized until such time as the Indiana Dunes have been preserved and protected as a national lakeshore by act of Congress.

The House amendment also authorizes this project at an estimated cost of $25,000,000, with provision for a monetary contribution toward the cost of construction of the harbor by the State of Indiana on condition that the design be agreed upon by the State of Indiana and the Secretary of the Army together with certain other conditions specifically designed to protect the interests of the United States. Further, the House amendment provides that this authorization is not adversely to affect or otherwise prejudice the establishment of all or any part of the Indiana Dunes as a national lakeshore.

The proposed conference substitute authorizes this project at an estimated cost of $25,000,000. It further provides that the Secretary of the Army may reimburse the State of Indiana for the expenditure of funds used to construct such portions of the project as are approved by the Chief of Engineers and constructed under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers. Construction is required to be initiated within 3 years from the date of enactment of this act or authority to reimburse the State of Indiana expires. The State is further required to furnish satisfactory assurances to the Secretary of the Army that water and air pollution sources will be controlled to the maximum extent feasible in order to minimize any adverse affects on public recreational areas in the general vicinity of the harbor. No appropriation is authorized to be made for the construction of this project until the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has been voted upon by both Houses of Congress in the same Congress. The conferees on the part of the House expect that the supervision by the Chief of Engineers required in this provision shall be only that which is necessary to ensure that the actual construction is in accordance with the approved plan.

TRINITY RIVER, TEX.

The House amendment authorizes the project for the Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, in House Document No. 276, 29th Congress, including navigation, except that the recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 14, 1963, shall apply, and further authorizes $83,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The Senate bill does not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the addition of a requirement that prior to expenditure of any funds for construction of those features designed exclusively for navigation the Chief of Engineers shall submit to Congress a reevaluation based upon current criteria.

CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, ILLINOIS AND INDIANA

The House amendment modifies the project for Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1963 to authorize the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to provide at Federal cost protection to two bridges over the Calumet River necessary to permit dredging of the full width of the south draw to a depth of 27 feet, together with modifications of channel limits necessary to insure full use of each draw.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment with the exception that the phrase "at his discretion" has been inserted to grant the Chief of Engineers full latitude to determine the necessity for this work.

CHESAPEAKE BAY BASIN

The House amendment contains a provision authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to make a complete investigation and study of water utilization and control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and to construct, operate, and maintain in Maryland a hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center. It provides that this model and center may be utilized, subject to the terms and conditions of the Secretary, by the Federal Government and the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania in connection with research, investigations, or studies being carried on by them on any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin. This provision further authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $8,500,000.

The Senate bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House amendment except that the authorization has been reduced from $8,500,000 to $6,000,000.

CITY OF CLINTON BRIDGE COMMISSION

The House amendment contains a provision which would revive and reenact the act approved December 21, 1944, as amended, to extend the period of time during which a bridge or bridges may be constructed across the Mississippi River, in the vicinity of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., by the city of Clinton Bridge Commission, provided actual construction thereof is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of enactment of this act. It would also authorize the commission to use any available bridge revenues or other funds, or to borrow money and issue its negotiable interest-bearing notes in evidence thereof to defray the cost of designing, engineering, and planning a new bridge or bridges, and to acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto. It would further amend existing law, relative to the issuance of bonds, by removing the present limitations that refunding bonds shall mature within 25 years and shall not exceed in principal amount the principal amount of outstanding bonds replaced by such refunding bonds, and by authorizing the commission to issue refunding bonds to pay any indebtedness of the commission and to include as a part of the issue of bonds to finance the cost of a bridge additional bonds to refinance any outstanding bonds and notes. Also, the required weekly publication of advertisement for bids for the sale of bonds would be reduced from 4 to 2 consecutive weeks. It further provides for the payment, or a sinking fund sufficient for the payment, of notes, and interest thereon, issued to pay the cost of designing, engineering, and planning any new bridge or bridges and to acquire lands for the location and approaches thereto, in addition to bonds and interest, before the commission shall convey any bridge or bridges to the States of Iowa and Illinois, or any municipalities or agencies thereof, and keeps intact the requirement of existing law that any bridge or bridges shall be operated by the commission free of tolls, after all of the outstanding indebtedness thereon has been retired, until accepted by the States of Iowa and Illinois, or any municipalities or agencies thereof.

The Senate bill does not contain such a provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agreed that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation and the conferees on the part of the House agreed to this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second session of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3788 as passed the House.

MUSCATINE BRIDGE COMMISSION

The House amendment contains a provision which would amend the act of July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 669, Public Law 811, 84th Cong.), to which the act of April 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 59, Public Law 87-441), was made applicable, to extend the period of time during which a bridge may be constructed across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., by the Muscatine Bridge Commission, provided that actual construction of such bridge is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of enactment of this act.

The Senate bill does not contain such a provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain such a provision. The conferees agree that the deletion of this provision is not to be construed to prejudice in any way the full consideration of the necessity for this legislation, and the conferees on the part of the House agreed on this deletion only after having received assurances that at an early date of the second session of this Congress the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold full and complete hearings on H.R. 3976 as passed the House.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
ED EDMONDSON,
JIM WRIGHT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us the conference report on the bill S. 2300. The work on this bill began back last January when the Members of the House started to introduce bills for projects in their districts, and reports from the Corps of Engineers began to accumulate. It was necessary to have reports from the different agencies in order for us to be able to make a comprehensive study of each project. I do not think there was a day when I came on the floor that a Member did not say something to me in regard to a project he had before our committee.

Hearings were held by the subcommittee chairman of the rivers and harbors [Mr. BLATNIK] and chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control [Mr. JONES]. These gentlemen held 6 weeks of hearings, at which time they considered every project that was before our committee.

Only those projects were included which had a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio and which in our judgment would further the economy of this country. In many instances, of course, these projects involve flood control to protect the lives and property of our citizens all over these United States.

The full committee met on a number of occasions to consider and mark up the reports of the subcommittees. On some of the projects contained in this bill, I differed with the committee's report and voted against them in committee. But when the bill was marked up and finalized, I supported the judgment of the full committee and supported the bill on the final vote in committee and certainly supported it on the floor of the House when it was brought to us for the consideration of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Committee on Public Works since the reorganization of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and Roads Committee and the formation of the Committee on Public Works. In all of that time I have never had a project in my district. Not because the committee would not listen or consider a project, if I had one, but because we did not need the type of projects that are considered in the omnibus rivers and harbors bills.

In my time spent here in the House of Representatives as a member of this committee, I have visited almost every State in the Union where we were asked to consider a public works project.

We visited those States and those areas because we wanted to have a better understanding of the needs of the particular district and the States so that we could come back to the House with the information so that the proper consideration could be given to these requests on the basis of the needs of the State and of the people. Of course, there were many times when I was not able to go but the subcommittee chairmen took the committees into the States where projects were being inspected. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, has visited every State that has suffered a catastrophe whether it was the result of a flood or hurricane so that he could bring back that firsthand knowledge and understanding that is so necessary for us to legislate properly.

Mr. Speaker, I think the committee did a good job when it brought the bill here to the House at first. When the bill went to conference, they did the best job that could be done under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I realize we have before us today an issue that is extremely difficult. Practically every Member of this House, as I am, is concerned as to what, on the merits, should be done. So far as I am concerned, the action taken leaves, in my opinion, if the proper rights of the House and the prerogatives of this great coequal legislative body, coequal

with the Senate, if we are to sustain our rights as conferees and as a coequal body, little alternative but to vote down the conference report. It is my understanding and as you will see by the RECORD of yesterday at page 26442 that it will be in order, and I have no reason to believe such a motion would not be made, because there are many projects in this, some $2 billion worth, of which $1,700 million is relatively noncontroversial that has been approved by the conference. I support those projects. I do not support, however, the Dickey-Lincoln project. It is not a small project, for it involves $300 million—$233 million is the Federal cost and $73 million is the estimated transmission cost if it is a Federal project.

The merits of the Dickey-Lincoln School project have been discussed in previous debate. The House sustained the position of those in opposition to the Dickey-Lincoln project by a substantial vote of 207 to 185. The merits of Dickey-Lincoln remain exactly the same as they were at the time the House voted a few weeks ago on that specific project. Now we are in a parliamentary procedure position that if, in fact, we want again to assert the House position in opposition to this project, this 98-percent power—and very little other benefits other than that resulting from area redevelopment—we have no alternative but to vote down the conference report. I have reason to believe a motion would initially be made, and which is in order—and this was confirmed on my inquiry of the Speaker yesterday—to recommit the bill to the conferees with instructions that the previous House position on Dickey-Lincoln be sustained.

What was the position of the House on Dickey-Lincoln? It was very reasonable. On the Clark motion, which was adopted, we said that there should be a thorough study of the Dickey-Lincoln project. There was adequate money put into the measure for such a study. We committed ourselves as members of the committee to consider the matter in the Committee of the House soon, where the facts could be developed. There has never been a separate study relating to this Dickey-Lincoln phase of the Passamaquoddy project, so we are not talking about a small project. We are talking about $300 million. We are not talking about an insignificant issue, at least in my opinion. We are talking about a critical issue.

I repeat. The facts have not changed relating to Dickey-Lincoln. I wish to make sure that all the facts are brought before the Members. We had a letter submitted in conference by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], who is very much interested in the project, for it would be in his State. Although the people who would use the power are a long way off, the project would be in his State. The fact is that he submitted the Federal Power Commission letter which was written to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative O'NEILL, to the effect that it appeared, after very brief consideration by the Federal Power Commission, that perhaps the cost of the power would be greater than that previously estimated if the private power people did it, compared with a public power project. But in analyzing the basis of those facts, they just do not hold up.

For example, consider the Federal interest cost of 3.8 or 3⅛ percent. The cost would actually be, as we all know, 4¼ percent, which is the cost of Federal money.

They did not consider taxes which would be foregone which private enterprise would pay. They included a total of $73 million for transmission lines which would be necessary if the project is a Federal project, but would not be necessary if it is a private matter. If it is private, it would be $3.8 million. So obviously they weighted the matter and tried to bring in different figures. But they did not ask the opinion of the Atomic Energy Commission, which states that, with the use of that power, you can do it at about one-fifth of the cost. As far as I am concerned, the facts are the same now as they were when the issue was considered before.

So we get to the parliamentary situation. What is the issue there? As I see it, the issue there is whether we in this body should accept the procedure that is being forced upon us by the other body, which is to take it or leave it, a blackjack approach of the other body. If we thus let them subvert the rules of this House, which are very clear, that the party asking for the conference, the other body has the right to act first on the conference report—and if that had been done, we would have had an opportunity to vote on a motion to recommit, for or against the Dickey-Lincoln School project a second time and so instruct the conferees—we will see that the other body is acting to prevent us from acting.

So if we are going to substitute, by accepting this conference report, for the rule that is on the books now, and which has generally been observed, a rule that might be termed the "If you kidnap the papers, you can keep these projects out," then Members will vote for the conference report. But if you are going to oppose such an approach, stand by the prerogatives of this House, and stand by the right of this body to have another vote on this project, then it is a very simple procedure. I think these issues are fundamental. The issue of Dickey-Lincoln is fundamental. But the issue of procedure is equally fundamental.

In conference a member of the conferees asked the chairman the question: "Is it not true that the other body, the Senate, having asked for this conference, we, the House, have a right to the papers and to act first?" The answer was "Yes" by the chairman of the conference, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. MCNAMARA.

I am not charging anyone with bad faith. I am charging them with knowing precisely what they were attempting to do and what they will accomplish if we let them. I object to it. I do not believe we should substitute a "kidnap the paper" rule for a good faith relationship between these two bodies now and in the future.

These are the basic issues involved. The Dickey-Lincoln project can be considered under the study amendment that was adopted by the House, and it would be in order after the conference report is voted down, under instructions to the conferees. This project will get fair consideration, I am convinced, by the committee and by the House after adequate study has been had.

A question has been raised as to "What will happen to me, if I have a project in this bill? Will I or will I not have an opportunity to vote on this this year? Is my project going to be killed?"

I say to the Members, in all candor, I believe it is quite obvious that there are enough problems for enough Members involving enough projects so that it will be insisted on that the matter be returned to conference, not next year but this year. As soon as the conference report is voted down, in my opinion, a motion will be made, and the conferees will be able to immediately reconvene. Then the issue before the conferees will be Dickey-Lincoln.

The argument which I have heard in the Chamber and otherwise is, "Gee, I cannot vote against this report, or for the motion to recommit, because I have a project in it." I have a project in it, too—not a very big project, but I do have a project in it. That argument does not hold water. We are talking about a principle.

If the Members believe in these principles, if they are opposed to Dickey-Lincoln, as some 207 Members were, they will vote against the conference report.

This has been done before. Such an effort was made on the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. The issue then was not nearly as clear. The issue here is clear. Either we are for or against Dickey-Lincoln. If we are for it, we will vote for the conference report. If we are against it, we should vote against the conference report. That is the issue which basically is before us.

It is my hope that this House will vote down the conference report and will then immediately vote for a motion to recommit the bill to the conferees with instructions that the study of Dickey-Lincoln be undertaken immediately, under the instructions of the Congress, as provided in the Clark amendment.

I understand that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] had intended to offer a motion to recommit. I ask the distinguished gentleman whether that is correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. He is denied the opportunity to do so by this procedure, intentionally. There is not any question about the intention.

As I say, I am not charging anyone with bad faith, but I do say they intended to keep us from voting, when we had, under the rules, a right to vote. If we do not vote down the conference report they will succeed.

A new unofficial statement of the Federal Power Commission, dated October 5, 1965, which purports to be a "Comparative Analysis" of the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School project is being circulated in Congress in an attempt to get the House to restore the authorization for the project in S. 2300, the

omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. The statement contains figures supposedly representing comparative costs of four alternatives: First, the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School project; second, some theoretical steam plants in Massachusetts and Maine described in an FPC letter of February 16, 1965; third, a pumped storage-nuclear combination plan developed in an FPC staff study dated September 30, 1965; and, fourth, the New England utilities' plan. No supporting material is available showing how the FPC figures were derived. However, by reference to earlier very meager information contained in Interior's August 1964 report, the basic criteria used in their preparation is quite evident. They would represent for alternatives 2, 3, and 4 what FPC and the Government agencies consider power values or benefits—not costs of production. This is clear in the case of alternative 2 as shown in paragraph 2, page 4, of the Secretary of the Interior's July 9, 1965, report to the President on the "Conservation of the Natural Resources of New England—The Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project and Upper St. John River Hydroelectric Development," which states:

> Since the initiation of this study, in 1961, the utility industry has developed generating units of 500,000-kilowatts capacity which are now scheduled for installation in the Boston area, and a unit of 125,000-kilowatts capacity is being installed in Maine. New steam-electric plants in the Boston area are estimated to cost $125 per kilowatt and plants in Maine $140 per kilowatt. On the basis of these larger more economical developments which have taken place during the course of these studies, the Federal Power Commission on February 16, 1965, furnished revised power values for application in Maine and the Boston area. The revised at-market values were computed to be $22.50 per kilowatt-year and 2.3 mills per kilowatt-hour in the Boston area, and $24.50 per kilowatt-year and 2.9 mills per kilowatt-hour in Maine. A composite power value would be $23.50 per kilowatt-year and 2.6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

These are the same figures appearing in the FPC October 5, 1965, statement for alternative No. 2 and were derived from the same factors used in the 1964 report but applied to more modern lower unit cost plants similar to those built by the electric companies in New England in recent years. These factors include allowances for taxes of all kinds and going market rates for cost of money. Obviously, FPC followed its traditional practice in using these same factors in estimating power values or benefits—not costs—for alternatives 3 and 4, but this is not the case with respect to the figures shown for the Dickey-Lincoln School project which are Federal production and transmission costs only. The Dickey-Lincoln School figures include no allowance for taxes and a 3⅛-percent rate of interest.

The factors used in arriving at annual costs and subsequently capacity and energy costs for alternatives, 2, 3, and 4, are 6.25 percent of the total investment costs for cost of money, 1.20 percent for depreciation and replacement, 5.72 percent for taxes, and 2 percent for operation and maintenance. Corresponding factors used in the case of Dickey-Lincoln School are 3.125 percent for cost of money, 0.86 percent for amortization, or depreciation, and replacements, nothing for taxes, and 0.45 percent for operation, maintenance, and insurance. In other words there is a 5.72-percent tax charge and a 3.125-percent additional interest charge for alternatives Nos. 2, 3, and 4 not applied to alternative No. 1. Obviously, the figures for alternatives 2, 3, and 4 cannot be compared to the figures for Dickey-Lincoln School project because they are not comparable things. The figures for alternatives 2, 3, and 4 also do not conform to the instructions contained in Senate Document No. 97, the Federal agencies' bible. For an interpretation of its requirements we can go to no less an authority than the Corps of Engineers. In its reply to certain questions propounded by Senator COOPER with respect to the Devils Jumps project, the Corps of Engineers stated:

> The comparability test which the Corps employs is designed specifically to show the relative economic efficiency of the project and available alternatives. In making this test for the power purpose the cost of producing equivalent power by the most likely alternative new power source is determined using the same method of financing (same interest rate, tax assumptions, etc.) as for the Federal project.

This reference is found on page 296 of the Senate hearings on S. 2300, dated April 21, 1965. Note that the Corps of Engineers says that the comparability test is designed to show the "relative efficiency" of the project and alternatives, and that for the power purpose the cost of producing equivalent power is determined by using the same interest rate, tax assumptions, et cetera, as used for the Federal project. This is the only way any meaningful conclusions can be drawn. The comparison must compare comparable things. This, the FPC statement of October 5, 1965 has not done.

Now for the specifics. The FPC statement claims that the New England utilities analyses omit transmission costs and losses, and project operation and maintenance expense, and that they do not "reveal the period used comparable to the payout period for the Dickey-Lincoln School project." The information on transmission costs and losses, and operation and maintenance expense, is contained in the material submitted by the companies to the House Public Works Committee. These figures are included in the estimates of the electric companies. Furthermore, if FPC staff had taken the time to read the record of the hearings of the House Committee on Public Works, it would have found on page 506 a table showing the true comparative costs of the New England utility companies' plan and the Dickey-Lincoln School project on a 50-year amortization basis, with and without taxes. It will be noted here, also, that the electric companies with full interest claim only a 30-percent tax load—1.3 mills more than the 4.3 mills for energy without taxes, or 5.6 mills with taxes.

In the case of alternatives 2, 3, and 4, taxes as computed by the FPC, represent some 40 percent of the total figure shown in the FPC statement. Failure to include taxes does not remove the burden on the economy. The cost to the general economy exists whether or not as a matter of policy it is paid by the Federal Government. Moreover, it is not a cost of production to the entities involved in any non-Federal development, but a cost of carrying on a business. If the comparison is to measure the actual costs of the various alternatives, it must accordingly be computed on a comparable basis.

The comparability analysis also has nothing to do with the question of whether or not taxes should be charged on Government operations. That is a matter of pricing policy and not of cost comparisons.

Another large discrepancy in the FPC October 5, 1965, statement is the fact that in the case of the Federal project an artificial interest rate of only 3⅛ percent is used, whereas the actual cost of money to the United States is 4¼ percent and for the non-Federal alternatives an interest rate of 6.25 percent is used, or twice the rate used for the Federal project. These widely divergent factors were employed even though the Corps of Engineers correctly states that for the comparability test the same method of financing is essential.

While no brief is held for the New England electric companies' plan or cost estimates, it appears that, except for operation and maintenance and transmission, FPC accepts the companies' figures. In this connection a simple comparison of the percentage of investment costs used in the FPC statement for the two sets of alternatives might be enlightening:

	Federal Dickey-Lincoln School project	Non-Federal alternatives
Cost of money	$3.125	$6.25
Depreciation and replacement	.860	1.20
Taxes		5.72
Operation, maintenance, and insurance	.450	2.00
Total	4.435	15.17

From the above it should be clear that even if greater allowances for transmission, operation, and maintenance were included, as proposed by the FPC, the cost, at least for alternatives 3 and 4, when corrected to provide for comparable taxes and interest, would still be far less than for the proposed Federal Dickey-Lincoln School project. This is the comparability test which the Corps of Engineers employs to show the relative efficiency of a project and its alternatives. It measures the cost of the economy of the various alternatives. Under such an analysis Dickey-Lincoln School is found wanting.

The short history of Dickey-Lincoln School is also very revealing. Under standard planning practice all possible alternatives are explored before a particular proposal is adopted. Among other things the alternative advanced by the New England electric companies had never been examined by the Government

agencies. In fact, the first quickie study of something along these lines evidently came after the House Public Works Committee hearings in August 1965 on S. 2300. The FPC October 5, 1965, statement indicates that such a study was made on September 30, 1965. What more or better argument can be made as to the need for a real study of the Dickey-Lincoln School project? Furthermore, it is of interest to note that each time a new set of figures are supplied by the Federal agencies, the benefits from Dickey-Lincoln School go down and the costs of alternatives are reduced. As the planners become more familiar with the situation, Dickey-Lincoln School becomes progressively less attractive. The August 1964 Interior report used a composite power value for alternative non-Federal generating plants of $27.50 kilowatt-year. In Interior's July 1965 report the figure was reduced to $23.50 kilowatt-year. In FPC's October 5, 1965, statement a pumped storage nuclear combination—alternative 3—showed a value of $20.40 kilowatt-year. The New England utilities' alternate plan was shown as $11.70 kilowatt-year. If this trend continues, it might be that the project may eventually be priced out of the market even by the Government planners.

With such a shady record, the House can do no other than provide the time for a real objective, unbiased study of the Dickey-Lincoln School project by the Corps of Engineers, the agency which would be responsible for its construction. Certainly, we cannot afford to embark on a $300-million-plus venture on the basis of existing data, particularly when we can in several months have the material we need to make a sound judgment. Opposition to such a short delay can only be suspect and be interpreted as a fear of exposure of the truth about the project. If Dickey-Lincoln School is as good as claimed by its proponents, nothing will be lost by the proposed study as directed by the House in September. If it cannot stand such close scrutiny, it should not be authorized in any event. A 5-month deferment will do no harm and is not an exorbitant price to pay for verification of the project's claimed merits, and assurance that it will fulfill its promises. The earlier House action should be sustained.

First. A statement has been made that Maine Public Service Co. was purchasing hydropower from the New Brunswick Power Commission at a very low cost—5 mills per kilowatt-hour—and was reselling it to company customers at nearly three times what the company paid for it.

Maine Public Service Co. serves an area in northern Maine.

It reports that the 5 mill power referred to is dump power, so called, which cannot be relied to meet system requirements and therefore has little value. In 1964 this company's purchases of "dump power" at 5 mills represented only three-tenths of 1 percent of its total system input. For the 8 months ended August 1965, such dump-power purchases represented only three one-hundredths of 1 percent of its total system input.

For "firm power" which can be relied to meet system loads and, therefore, has a higher value, Maine Public Service Co. paid the New Brunswick Power Commission an average price of 9.8 mills per kilowatt-hour in 1964 and 13.4 mills per kilowatt-hour for the first 8 months of 1965.

Second. A statement has been made that Central Maine Power Co., the largest electric utility in Maine, has announced rate reductions only twice in its history; first, when the Passamaquoddy-St. Johns report was published, and secondly, prior to recent congressional hearings.

This statement is extremely erroneous. In a decree dated July 23, 1948 the Maine Public Utilities Commission stated:

> It (Central Maine Power Co.) has had no general rate increase in over 30 years but had effected substantial reductions in rates during that time. In 1945 and 1946 residential rates were reduced $600,000, commercial $150,000 and street lighting $53,000, a total of $803,000.

In just the 10-year period preceding the commission's decree, Central Maine Power Co., in addition to the specific rate decreases, listed by the commission, made eight general and six special rate decreases totaling over $800,000 per year. So, over the entire period 1937 to 1946, this company made 16 rate decreases aggregating over $1,625,000 per year.

Over the last 2 years it has made rate decreases totaling over $1,630,000.

Third. A statement has been made that a Maine housewife wrote to her Senator that she did not get a rate reduction in the 1963 decrease made by Central Maine Power Co., and discovered in subsequent bills that her rates had gone up, rather than down, after the announced rate reduction.

The company's answer is that this customer was probably one of the few customers in a water heating group owning large—80 gallon—water heaters who did not get a rate decrease; but actually because of a change in rate form got a small increase. This was corrected in the 1965 rate decrease—the problem having been worked out in two steps over the 2-year period.

Fourth. It has been stated that although the Electric Coordinating Council of New England was formed in 1948, for the purpose of bringing cheaper power to the area, power rates had actually increased in the area 18.3 percent during that period while they had increased in the United States by only 4 percent.

This is not a fact. During that period the average cost to the consumer of each kilowatt-hour of electricity actually decreased by 10.4 percent in the United States and by 6.92 percent in New England.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Public Works comes now to the end of many, many months of long, arduous, and painstaking study on many, many projects throughout the entire United States.

In an effort to serve the House we have done our very best to see that justice and fairness is performed in every instance.

I believe it is important to stress that the bill whose fate we are deciding by the vote which will next be held contains not one project but 142 projects. It is a bill which affects the citizens residing in the congressional districts of some 240 Members of this House. So it is not a question of whether we like one given project; it is a question of whether we want to hold up and delay the development of the water resources of the United States in 240 of the congressional districts, on 142 different projects—or whether we want to have a bill this year.

The suggestion has been implicit in some of the things that have been said that this is a question of upholding the prerogatives of the House. The implication is present that your conferees, serving you and the Members of the House, have failed to uphold those prerogatives of the House. I should like to point out to you that the chairman of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], has never had a project in this bill nor has he ever asked for one.

I should like to stress to you further that the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], served long and hard and arduously in this conference committee, gaining in 9 cases out of 10 the side of the House over the side of the Senate. He has no project in this bill for his area, and he undertook to do this grueling work at a time when he was suffering severe physical pain.

I should like to point out also that the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, had spent several weeks in the hospital at a crucial point in the session and came back in order to hold hearings on these projects in this bill.

These men effectively upheld the position of the House in the conference. The House receded in conference on only six items. The Senate receded in conference on 67 items. For each time that the House conferees receded the Senate conferees receded on 11 separate counts. I ask you, have we failed to uphold the prerogatives of the House?

Obviously we could not get everything we wanted. Obviously we could not insist that the House position prevail every time when there is another body to consider. Henry Clay said:

> Do not despise compromise, for it is the cement that holds the Union together.

Now, particularly in a matter of a conference committee, compromise is the name of the game. If both bodies went to the conference table absolutely unyielding and absolutely unwilling to give in on a single point, why, there would be no purpose in having a conference committee. There would be no possibility of having legislation.

So, ironically, we have some groups coming in here and saying we should vote down the entire bill, the entire conference committee report, because it contains one project that they do not approve of personally. On the other hand,

there are Members here who have been gravely disappointed because it does not contain projects that they wanted and felt entitled to. The House did not yield easily on any of these points.

On the two points at issue on which we did yield, we debated with the Senate conferees for 1 hour on one of them and for 2 hours on the other one. On one of them we got assurances from the other conferees that a separate bill would be considered by their body next year to accommodate the position of the House. We have done as well as we could, and I think we have brought before you a good bill.

The question is clear. The question you will answer when you answer the roll is, do you want a bill this year or do you not want one. That is just what it amounts to. It is just that simple. Let nobody deceive you into thinking that we can go back into conference at this late date and resolve differences that we were not able to resolve in 2 long days of difficult conferences.

So you decide and you give the answer. You answer your constituents, your conscience, and your country. When your name is called on that roll, you will be answering this question: Do you want to delay the development of the natural water resources of this country by another year? Do you want to assume that responsibility at a time when we need more desperately than ever in our history to develop the water resources of our land? If you do not, then vote for the conference committee report.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we get inundated by all the verbs and adjectives of our orations. I would like to take a few minutes to draw a picture of what we are talking about on this Dickey-Lincoln project. The dams are located here on the St. John River, at the farthest end of Maine, over 400 miles away from the area in which the power would be used.

This huge land area encompasses nearly 700 square miles and is lightly populated, by less than 100,000 people. It could be roughly compared to the square-mile area of Connecticut and Rhode Island which have a combined population of 3,500,000.

The transmission problem involves some 400 miles to the major load centers at Boston, and so forth. Equivalent transmission spans would string across the country from Altoona, Pa., to Boston, or, for instance, from Buffalo to New York, or from Washington to Boston. There is a difference of over 400 miles.

I say to you when you are going to build a northern dam in the northern part of Maine where you are going to have a hydroelectric dam compared to what we already have in the Massachusetts-Connecticut-Rhode Island area of nuclear and thermo power, then I think you can see that in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in DAN FLOOD'S district, which has all this coal that we need so badly to be used, this coal cannot be used, but it could be used if we had a thermo plant in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. It would be closer from Wilkes-Barre, Pa., to Boston, the load area, than it would be from the Maine Dickey-Lincoln project.

I say to you not only in the transmission lines where you have a $80 million project from Dickey-Lincoln down into the load center areas of New England, where we have 24 of the Congressmen representing the New England area who are against this Dickey-Lincoln project, is it fair for the House to stick a project down these gentlemen's throats in order to help the Dickey-Lincoln project 400 miles from Boston?

Another thing I would like to bring up is the fact that a year ago we had on the floor another power project and it was stated that we had no agreement with Canada. I say to you that the Interior Committee, and no other committee, is going to say whether the Dickey-Lincoln project should be approved or disapproved because of the treaty agreement.

There is a 95-percent power factor in this project. Five percent is in what they call flood control and recreation.

Now look at that area. In the Dickey-Lincoln area we have 360 people. So 360 people are going to get 5 percent of recreation and flood control. Now we look across the river into the Canadian side, and what do we have? We do one thing. We are going to be helping the Canadians on the recreation and flood control, and we are not going to be helping our Maine Dickey-Lincoln supporters for flood control in Maine.

So as a result, I ask you to vote down this conference report, and I am sure, although the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] said if this report were voted down there would not be a conference report, I say to you that I feel that there would be because, if you remember, the Trinity River project is in this bill.

So I ask you to vote down the conference report, and I am sure we will get another chance to vote on this bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report on S. 2300. This does not mean that I agree with all portions of this conference report, because I do not.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I continue to be opposed to the St. John River public power project in Maine. I did not believe that the evidence presented before our committee was sufficiently conclusive to warrant the commitment of $227 million of Federal funds for this public power project, particularly when we had testimony before our committee that private enterprise in that area was working rapidly toward the development of nuclear powerplants to provide power and particularly because we had a letter submitted to us, and which is printed in the printed hearings, to the effect that the various public utilities in that area estimate that through the development of nuclear energy they can cut their cost and their rates by 40 percent over the next 15 years.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, it did not seem to me that we should commit the taxpayers to pay a $227 million commitment. I felt that the House of Representatives acted properly when it voted to eliminate this project and simply authorized a study of comparative costs of using other means of developing the power needed for the area.

However, Mr. Speaker, a conference is a matter of give and take. There were two major public power projects that had been authorized by the other body in their version of the bill that had not been authorized by the House in our version of the bill. One of them was the St. John project. The other was the Devils Jump project. The House conferees did succeed in upholding the position of the House as to the Devils Jump project, a $151 million project which had been authorized in the Senate bill. Therefore, that project does not appear in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, as a whole, the House conferees upheld the position of the House on a majority of the disputed items.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss one particular aspect of this bill which may present a problem between now and the time when the President makes his decision as to his action on the bill.

Some of the conferees have been informed by at least one or more of the legal advisers of some of the administrative agencies involved in this bill that they may recommend to the President that the President veto this bill because of section 201 of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, section 201 of the bill authorizes a simplified procedure for the clearance of projects under $10 million. Those projects today have to wait for an omnibus bill. This is the first omnibus bill which we have had for a period of 3 years and, therefore, some projects have waited for 3 years for an omnibus authorization bill.

Under section 201 if a project is less than $10 million in scope, from now on it can be authorized simply by the passage of a resolution by the House and Senate Public Works Committee. When such a resolution is passed by those two committees, the project becomes an authorized project and can be carried out by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, these legal advisers who have contacted some of our conferees from the administrative agencies involved have implied that they may recommend a veto because they feel that the constitutional powers of the executive branch may be jeopardized by this provision. I do not feel that is the case at all. As a matter of fact we have two similar procedures regularly being followed as a result of legislation enacted years ago by the Congress and signed by the President. One is in the case of soil conservation projects. Such projects regularly only come before the House and Senate Public Works Committees if they involve dams of a certain size and they only require resolutions to be passed by the two committees, and then they become authorized projects, no matter what the projected cost may be.

This is the result of legislation enacted by the Congress and signed by the President.

The second example is the Public Buildings Act passed by the Congress and signed by the President, which provides that a public building, no matter what its cost may be, $40 or $60 million, only needs to be authorized by a resolution passed by the House and Senate Public Works Committees, and once this resolution is passed by those two committees the building is authorized, and does not require any further legislative act by this Congress. So it is clear a precedent has been established in this field, and section 201 of the present bill is consistent with that precedent.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from California on his statement on section 201 of this bill. That was carefully drawn as the result of the experience of the two public laws the gentleman referred to.

I would like to point out in addition to that that we have been faced with these reimbursement situations where a community will start a project in anticipation of the passing of legislation authorizing flood control, beach erosion, or some other type of project which would normally come from the Public Works Committee. The local community in anticipation of that project being authorized makes expenditures because we are dealing here for the first time in 3 years with a Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act.

We are not acting in good faith, so, consequently we are not keeping up to date, and not being responsive to the needs on this question of what we are supposed to cover, and section 201 is the most beneficial section, as far as I am concerned, and from my observation of these problems in that section of this bill. So I hope those Members who have fears and apprehensions that this is going to become a constitutional question from the executive branch of Government will lose their fears and look with favor upon the legislative act of being responsive.

I again commend the gentleman from California on the great work he has done on this committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because the gentleman now in the well of the House has rendered to this body and to the Committee on Public Works some of the most constructive services I have had the privilege of witnessing in my time of service in this body. Both the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, have been practically heroic in the dedication they have given to this committee in the face of very serious illness that both of them suffered earlier this year.

I particularly appreciate the contribution they have made in cosponsoring the section just commented on by the gentleman from Alabama, because I think it is a very constructive step forward. It recognizes the fact we need to expedite the handling of some of these flood problems across the country that have cost us so many millions of dollars in damages this year. It would be tragic if we were to delay approval of this conference report and thereby delay for even a single day the forward movement of the great flood control projects authorized by this report.

I hope that the report of the conferees will be approved by an overwhelming vote, and I congratulate the gentleman from California for the constructive attitude he has taken with reference to it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Alabama for their very gracious comments.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to protest the regrettable parliamentary situation that we find ourselves in here today, having the Dickey-Lincoln project back in this bill when it was taken out specifically as we all know by a specific vote of the House of 207 to 185 just a few days ago. Time has not changed that situation.

It is also regrettable that the time is controlled completely by the majority. I think the time is long overdue that the rules of this House be reformed so that there will be an absolute right of the minority to have time.

The need for a thorough study of the Dickey-Lincoln project by itself and separate from the combined Passamaquoddy project was established thoroughly during the September 22 debate. In recommending authorization of Dickey-Lincoln, the conference report relies on the report of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers dated August 1964 and which is a supplement to the 1963 report on the Passamaquoddy project.

I have read that supplemental report with great care and find that far from resolving any discrepancies, it creates new ones. For example, on page 4 of the August 1964 report, the estimated cost of a privately developed steam-generating alternative to Dickey-Lincoln is given as $23.50 per kilowatt-year. In fact, this is about double what it ought to be. In my State of New Hampshire, Public Service Co. has signed a contract for a 350,000-kilowatt installation at Bow for a cost of $12.34 a kilowatt-year. The figure used by the Government report would have been accurate 10 years ago but costs are coming down, largely because it is cheaper to build large installations such as the project at Bow. Thus, the Government's effort to contrast the public versus private building costs is way off base. This particular figure is a key one to the Government's case but it is wrong and is just one more reason for undertaking a thorough study of the situation before committing the country to this $300 million project.

Another fallacy or erroneous assumption in the report is pointed out in a letter, which is included in the report, from former Secretary of the Treasury Dillon. He notes that the Government has assumed interest charges at the rate of 3⅛ percent per annum when, Mr. Dillon wrote:

> In this Department's judgment, the interest rate most appropriate for both cost-benefit analysis and the determination of reimbursement and cost sharing arrangements should reflect the Government's current borrowing costs and, therefore, should be determined on the basis of current market yields on outstanding long-term Treasury obligations. At the present time, the market yield on long-term obligations is close to 4¼ percent.

He finds, also, that:

> In view of past experience, that the costs, in particular, may be seriously underestimated.

In sum, if this House approves this project, it will be doing a very careless thing. It would be committing the Government to expenditures of upward of $300 million on a project which is more than 90 percent for electric power production but where there has been no proper analysis of the potential market for power in New England; where there has been no accurate consideration of alternative means for meeting the future power needs of the region; and where there appears to be no sound estimate of the actual costs.

In contrast, it is known that private, taxpaying companies with plans to meet the power needs of New England in the future can produce the same power at no expense to the Government and for a cost of only $71 million.

In my earnest opinion, it would be irresponsible and profligate to abandon the position we took not so many days ago in this House and accede to granting authority for this project without first conducting a thorough study.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because he was unable to obtain time from his own side, I am pleased to yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in all the years that I have been a Member of the Congress I have always been a public power man. I have been one who believes that we need public power when you cannot provide private power. I have been one who, when the people of an area and the Congressmen from an area want public power, I have supported them.

Mr. Speaker, from the New England area there are 25 Congressmen. Twenty of them voted against this project. Why should you try to stick it down our throats? We are not trying to stick anything down your throats in Oklahoma. We are not trying to stick anything down the throats of you who come from Alabama. We are not trying to stick anything down the throats of you Members from Texas. This is a project, and we all realize what it is all about—

this will cost $303 million including the transmission lines—that is what it is going to cost—$303 million.

What will you be giving us in this project? You will be giving us a project by which we will be turning back the clock and going back to the days of the horse and buggy and the days of the high button shoes. This is an antiquated hydroelectric powerplant.

How much power is this proposed project going to produce? It will produce less than 1 percent of the power that is used in New England in the present time. As the population of the New England area increases, it is going to be even worse. This is one of the worst projects that I have ever seen in my life. We from New England, 20 out of the 25 Members from New England, have asked you not to give us this project.

Now what happened on this? You went to conference on this bill. What happened in the conference? I have been in public life for 30 years and any time there has been a rollcall vote on the floor of the House that was taken to determine what the will of the Congress was, the conferees went into the conference and upheld the will of the Congress. I can remember when we passed a bill here having to do with stockpiling of certain materials. The bill went to conference. Senator HAYDEN said, "Why, the Senate by a rollcall vote voted against this and I will not even bring the matter up." That is what the chairman of our committee and the members of the conference committee should have done.

If you give us this project, you will be selling out 20 Members of the Congress from New England. We do not want this project. We know our area better than you from Alabama and better than you from Oklahoma. We are well on the road of getting cheap electricity in our area. I have heard so many bleeding hearts talk about New England and our problems. High power costs have not been the cause of our problems in our area because I think the power in our area is not too much higher than the power out in the Midwest. There are four hundred reasons why industry has left New England—transportation, cheap labor, antiquated buildings, nearness to the market, and all kinds of reasons. But New England, because of its technical knowledge, its universities and colleges, is doing well. There is no cheap power here for Massachusetts. This is a waste of the taxpayers' money. I hope the conference report is defeated.

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman from Massachusetts has been saying. Let me also say that the gentleman has pointed out that the House conferees caved in. The conference caved in on this particular project. Why? Simply because the majority of the conferees were in favor of the Dickey-Lincoln project and, no doubt, were delighted and anxious to yield to the other body.

But worse still, Mr. Speaker, and I am not concerned too much about the House conferees yielding on this project—I am more concerned about the fact that we lost the papers and conveniently enough to the Senate. This has not been done—and I do not recall that it has ever been done at any time while I have been a Member of this House of Representatives. This action, of course, makes it impossible for the House to vote on the Dickey-Lincoln project. All that is left to us is to vote the conference report up or down.

I serve on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works. Look at my record. I have voted for public power all over this country. I voted for the great dams of the Northwest and the Southwest. I have voted for flood control and navigation projects all over this country. I have consistently supported the Tennessee Valley Authority. So I am concerned about what we have done here. I think we should rightfully be concerned. Those who support this project should have been satisfied with the study proposed by the action of the House. There has never been a study of Dickey-Lincoln on its own merits. We ought to follow the will of this House and stick by its position for a study and report back to Congress by next March. I have said to those who are interested in this project, if the report is favorable and if it is economically feasible, I will vote for it and I will support it and defend it on this floor. That is exactly what I have been doing with all of the public works projects as provided for in appropriation bills for some 11 years. I intend to keep on doing so. But I do not intend to support this project at this time. Do you know what else happened yesterday?

Do you know what happened yesterday in the supplemental? The Senate has already put in $1,850,000 for this project. The supplemental bill is now being considered on the Senate floor. The bill will be passed in the Senate with the $1,850,000 intact for planning Dickey-Lincoln. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations on Public Works has not even seen the thing, and we will not get a chance to consider it at the rate we are going.

The gentleman from Texas made a great speech, but you can bet your bottom dollar that if we vote down this conference report, there will be another conference. And there ought to be.

Let us make this project stand on its own two feet. Sometime ago I said I would not get in a debate on this matter. but the way this matter has been handled by this committee, or by some of the Members, forces me to take this position.

Mr. Speaker, I have no illusions about the fate of this conference report. There are many, many worthwhile projects in this bill affecting a great number of the Members of the House. I can readily understand their reluctance at this late date—the waning days of this session—to vote against this report and hence, vote against themselves. And this is particularly so in the face of the remarks of the distinguished member of the committee, Mr. WRIGHT, that the some 200-odd Members with projects in the bill will be in the untenable position of losing the whole bill because of the disagreement on only the Dickey-Lincoln project.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD].

Mr. MACDONALD. I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]. I shall not take 5 minutes.

I hate to be in dispute with other Members from my native State of Massachusetts, and perhaps in dispute with some other members from New England. But I think what they say about the fact that this matter has not been studied and has not been evaluated by the Corps of Army Engineers and by the other people who are in charge of checking out whether this would be a good project or not happens to be in error. Actually this study, in my memory, started back in 1960. There was a study made under the request, I should say, of our late President Kennedy, who thought that this project would be a very good one. I think the fact that it is now being confused with the study made about Passamaquoddy must be in error.

I know that no one would do that on purpose. There were separate studies made of the Dickey project and of the Quoddy project. I am sure the Members from Massachusetts and other Members from New England who have spoken must not be speaking for the consumers of public utility power in Massachusetts and rest of New England, because it is clear beyond any doubt that we in New England, especially we in Massachusetts, have the highest rates charged to any consuming public in the United States.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. I will yield in a second.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell the House how this bill would help Massachusetts rates any? Your home is 400 miles from where this project is.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will yield to the gentleman when I have time. He knows that what I am saying is correct. I am the first to say that Maine will be the primary beneficiary of this project when it is passed. But also in Massachusetts, including Greater Boston and in the other congressional districts from which other people have testified, it has been demonstrated that during the peak power period time, during the time that power is most used, which is from 4 o'clock in the afternoon to, perhaps, 8 o'clock at night, when this project is completed, the people of Greater Boston will get lower rates for the power than they are now receiving from private utilities.

I have no quarrel with private power. They have done a good job. In fact, they are so bright that it is my understanding they are now buying public power that is generated on the Canadian side of the border.

They are buying public power which is being generated, and selling it to the people of New England at private power rates. It is sold to the people of New England at the rates established by a

quasi-judicial group which is very handily controlled from the statehouse in Boston, the Public Utilities Commission. I cannot see any possible reason why anybody from the New England States would object to helping another New England State.

I agree that this project will help primarily Maine. I ask anybody from the State of Massachusetts, what is wrong with helping a neighbor, when we have been consistently voting to help Wyoming, California, Nevada, Hawaii, and all the other States of the United States?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman asked a question. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. We are helping all the States of the United States. What is wrong with helping a neighbor, when the spinoff is going to help the Commonwealth of Massachusetts?

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield so that I can answer the question?

Mr. MACDONALD. I understand that the people here who are talking against this bill also represent the people who would be benefited by lower rates.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield so that I can answer the question?

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

Mr. BOLAND. I will tell the gentleman why. You cannot point to another project like this, where we have helped other States, that has had such unreliable information that has been developed by the supporters and opposers. Despite what has been said, this project has not been studied on its own. It has been tied into the complex of the much talked about and controversial Passamaquoddy tidal power project. Projects that we voted on for other areas, in the majority of cases have had substantial flood control and navigation benefits. The record clearly shows and the figures prove that there is little flood control and no navigation benefits connected with Dickey-Lincoln School.

You cannot point to another such project that is as costly as this, has had more conflicting and chaotic testimony and that has been studied so little that has been approved, at least in my service here, by the House.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will say to the gentleman——

Mr. BOLAND. I am giving you the answer.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I yield no further.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. MACDONALD. I point out to the gentleman that he cannot point out to me another State in the United States which has a higher rate for its public utilities than the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] and I will yield to him.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has declined to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD] has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, your conferees bring back to this body today what we consider to be an excellent conference report on the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1965, S. 2300.

What this body has before it today embodies in one form or another the legislation that was reported by the House Committee on Public Works and which passed this body a short time ago. The modifications agreed to by the conferees on the part of the House are ones that the House conferees believe in the long run would be helpful to the individual projects that were affected thereby.

The conferees agreed to the restoration of a most worthy project in its entirety rather than wait for a further study as originally intended by this body when it restored the authorization for the Dickey-Lincoln project on the St. John's River. Minor modifications were made in the overall authorization for flood control improvements on the Lower Mississippi River Basin. A provision relating to use of funds for the establishment of a National Wildlife Refuge on the Waurika project in Oklahoma was deleted by the conferees. A further study of projects already deleted from the bill covering Grand River and tributaries, Missouri and Iowa, is authorized by the conferees.

Several modifications in existing projects such as the San Diego River Basin, the Minnesota River at Mankato, Minn., dealing with reimbursement for local interests for work performed or to be performed were worked out by the conferees. In addition we believe this conference report brings a most satisfactory solution to the problem of the Burns Waterway Harbor project in Indiana while at the same time taking due recognition of the importance of a project for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

There are in addition several minor changes made in the legislation as it passed this body originally. This is a good conference report and one that I trust this body will accept. The disastrous floods and hurricanes of the last year have indicated quite clearly the pressing need for legislation such as that we are considering today. These projects that are authorized in this legislation will prove their value many times over as has already been shown by those which have been authorized by the Congress, constructed and provided emergency protection in property and human lives through the years.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to reiterate some of the merits of the Dickey project. Although many of these points have been made before when the omnibus rivers and harbors bill was debated in the House a few weeks ago.

History has shown that Federal hydroelectric plants bringing low-cost electricity into an area have stimulated the demand for power from fossil fuel generating plants, this is, plants using coal, oil, or gas, so that the demand for such fuel is enhanced.

The project was thoroughly reviewed by the Federal Power Commission which gave the project a green light only after making the finding that there was no better alternate.

All computations were made in accordance with Senate Document No. 97. Computation for the marketing of the power included load factor, capacity, and energy and repayment within 50 years which included both the cost of the project—$227 million—plus the transmission line—$73 million. All figures were studied and approved by the Federal Power Commission.

The project has the support of the appropriate executive agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Interior, and the Corps of Engineers. Furthermore, the project has the personal endorsement of the President.

Power costs in New England are the highest of any region in the country; there is no public power yardstick in any of the six New England States.

The Dickey-Lincoln School project would be located in an economically depressed area where, for example, 33 percent of the families have incomes of less than $3,000 per year; 48.6 percent of the population is over 65 or under 15 years of age. This is an area where wholesale rates for electric energy average three times what Dickey-Lincoln School rates delivered would be.

Furthermore, and this point is extremely significant, the Dickey-Lincoln School project has a benefit-cost ratio of 1.86 to 1. The huge Colorado River storage project, authorized April 11, 1956, had a ratio of only 1.3 to 1. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project, passed by a voice vote in August 1962, had a ratio of 1.65 to 1.

The 1962 omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill, as passed by voice vote, included 13 multipurpose projects with power. Only three had better benefits-to-cost ratios than Dickey-Lincoln School; 10 had lesser benefits.

In the report now under consideration it is striking to note that of 133 projects for which a benefit cost ratio is given 72 have benefit-cost ratios below 1.86. Fifty-four percent of the projects in this report have benefit-to-cost ratios which are less than the Dickey project. Shall we draw the line at 1.86 and throw out all projects at that line or below thereby eliminating over half the projects in the bill?

In 1953, the New England and New York Interagency Committee took note of the upper St. John River and two possible sites for development were studied—Rankin Rapids and Big Rapids-Lincoln School. They submitted a report in 1955. In 1956 the Corps of Engineers undertook a study of the Passamaquoddy project and looked over several separate sites which would be desirable for development of the upper St. John River as a

supplement to the Passamaquoddy project. The two sites chosen for further study were Rankin Rapids and Big Rapids-Lincoln School. There was at that time an engineering analysis of both sites. In 1959, the International Engineering Board filed a report with the International Joint Commission, recommending Rankin Rapids. However, in 1961 at the request of President Kennedy, the department of the Interior undertook a study of the upper St. John, including Big Rapids-Lincoln School and Rankin Rapids, and the alternate to Big Rapids, which was Dickey-Lincoln School was decided on. At that time an independent engineering and economic analysis was made on the Dickey-Lincoln River project which offers more storage and saves the Allagash. The economic benefits and feasibility studies were made separately for Dickey-Lincoln School and Passamaquoddy. These studies were completed in 1963 and submitted to the President. There was a subsequent analysis between 1963 and 1964 and this report was concurred in by the Corps of Engineers and submitted to the Senate Public Works Committee. The final stage came last winter and this spring when the Department of the Interior reevaluated Dickey-Lincoln as a separate project and separated it completely from Passamaquoddy.

It is important to note that even though the studies the Dickey-Lincoln School project was combined with the other projects. The engineering, benefit-cost and power generation studies were always made separately. The last analysis simply took all the background information and refigured the cost and benefits with the new factors involved and came up with the final benefit-cost ratio. Nothing more can be learned by further study.

The Corps of Engineers are satisfied that there has been enough study. The Department of the Interior is satisfied that there has been enough study. The U.S. Senate is satisfied that there has been enough study and President Johnson is satisfied that there has been enough study.

So much for the merits of the project. The real issue today is whether the managers on the part of the House have worked out with the Senate managers an acceptable compromise. We must realize that compromise plays a paramount role in legislation. Provisions in our Constitution as well as in our most significant laws have come about as the result of compromise. Obviously legislation coming from a legislative branch of government composed of two separate bodies must be the result, in many instances, of a give-and-take process. Neither this body nor the other body can dominate the legislative scene. During this session so far 46 bills have gone through conference and have been approved and signed by the President. Certainly these 46 conference reports were not wholly in accordance with the desire of all the Members of this body nor of the other body but they reflected final judgment of the agents of both Houses working together to bring about a rational settlement of their differences.

Conference is the instrument for final compromise between the House and the Senate, and we should respect the judgment of the conferees. Without such compromise we would not have passed the excise tax cuts, we would not have had the Medicare Act. In that act the conferees had to reach agreement on 513 differences between the House and the Senate versions. Conference reports have been accepted by the House, because we realize that not to accept a rational compromise might mean having no legislation at all.

The same is true with respect to the compromise now before the House. Initially, according to figures obtained from the public works committee staff, the Senate public works bill contained 113 projects. The House bill contained 144 projects which included the 113 of the Senate and in addition the House bill contained the northeastern U.S. water-supply provision and a flood control provision neither of which were contained in the Senate bill. The compromise, the conference report, which contains 142 projects plus the water-supply provision and the flood-control provision shows that managers on the part of the House were able to persuade the representatives from the other body to accept 28 of the 31 projects that were in our bill and not in the Senate bill, to accept title I, the northeastern U.S. water supply provision and to accept the flood control provision in exchange for losing only two projects, two bridge commission extensions and accepting one project, the Dickey-Lincoln School project hydroelectric dam, which had not been rejected by the House but had simply been postponed for future study. So that Senate managers in addition to the water supply and flood control provision accepted 28 projects which the Senate had not even considered and asked us only to accept one project about which we had manifested some hesitancy. Under such conditions, how could we in good conscience reject this entire report and ask for a new conference? We would be saying in effect that we have 90 percent of the hog but we want the whole hog or nothing at all, and I am sure the answer from the other body would be "nothing at all."

The managers on the part of the House should be commended for the excellent compromise they have been able to obtain and we should support them by voting to accept the conference report.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, there has been extended discussion of the Dickey project but since others have held themselves out as experts on power needs, in the State of Maine, I ask your indulgence to again remind the House that this hydroelectric project is desperately needed by my State. There has been a lot of sound and fury but the facts are that our people are paying 20 percent more than the average paid by electricity users throughout the Nation, and as much as 300 percent more than that paid in some areas.

For example, in Augusta, Maine, a family paying $15.70 for a months's electricity would pay $6.10 if living in Clarksville, Tenn., a city of similar size. In Rockland, Maine, a family paying $15.70 for a month's electric power would pay $5.50 if living in Hopkinsville, Ky. A family in Greater Portland paying this same amount of $15.70 would pay $7.46 in Tacoma, Wash.

We cannot expect to get sufficient industries to come to our State to provide jobs for our people with exorbitantly high power rates.

Maine private power companies have had many years to lower rates in a meaningful way and have offered only promises and token reductions when pressed.

Opponents have argued that thermal power will be cheaper—but the Atomic Energy Commission has stated, and I quote: "The Dickey-Lincoln School project which is being recommended will produce lower cost power than a nuclear alternative."

The Federal Power Commission approves construction of this project, as well as the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of the Interior. Certainly the expert advice of these Federal agencies can be relied upon. President Johnson and every New England Governor has endorsed this project—certainly these endorsements were not lightly given.

I think it is appropriate to remind those in the Appalachian region that Maine Representatives supported development of their area.

This project will not mean that less coal will be sold to Maine—none is now being used in Maine for development of electricity. On the contrary, if the project is built, it will increase use of coal through greater industrial growth.

And may I remind my fellow Republicans that if our party is to present itself as the party of all the people, we must show that we care for all the people. Republicans recognize that where private initiative has abjectly failed in a given area, there is nothing wrong in asking for a helping hand from our Federal Government.

And finally to my fellow New Englanders, may I remind them of the countless times Representatives from the State of Maine have cast their votes to help other New England States.

I ask all colleagues today to help us in Maine in our aspirations for a more equal share in the Nation's prosperity.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, a most significant provision in the conference report on the rivers and harbors bill now before this body contains the wherewithal to save one of our Nation's most valuable natural resources, the Chesapeake Bay.

The bill would authorize a thorough study of the entire bay basin, and the construction of a hydraulic model and associated technical center to serve as factual clearinghouse to deal with such problems as pollution, erosion and salinization which currently threaten this overburdened national asset.

Consideration of this legislation is the culmination of many months of research, of proposing, and of prodding since I first suggested the feasibility of this project in the early days of the 88th Congress in 1963. At that time, I became convinced that only by an all-out assault on the environmental factors that jeopardize

the Chesapeake Bay could we save this productive waterway.

All along the way, evidence mounted to support my suggestion. First the Corps of Engineers agreed that a complete study of the bay and its tributaries was in order. A visit to the operating model of San Francisco at Sausalito, Calif., confirmed the view that such a scale reproduction would offer new and valuable insights into bay problems and would save untold millions of dollars in the process.

On February 19, 1965, with all of the information of 2 years of study at my disposal, I met with Gov. J. Millard Tawes of Maryland and with the top officials of the State agencies dealing with Chesapeake Bay matters. Their enthusiasm and support for a Bay study, and construction of a model and technical center were unanimous. The very next day, I met with members of the Maryland and Virginia delegations and submitted legislative drafts embodying the language and basic details of the Chesapeake Bay proposals now contained in the rivers and harbors bill. It has been a long, hard campaign, with new allies and fresh troops joining the fight at every turn. But the battle, while joined, is not yet won. The carefully prepared and widely sponsored legislation before us, dealing with the Chesapeake Bay is, I believe, the last, best hope for this much misused and irreplaceable resource.

Every day, pollution of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries by an industrialized civilization is on the increase. Every day the recreational demands of a multiplying population are on the increase. Every day salinization and other phenomena take their toll of a weakened fishery. Every day acres of beautiful and valuable shoreline disappear beneath the water. Every day the burdens of men and nature increase while the resistance of the Chesapeake Bay declines.

For years, dedicated and able Federal, State, and local agencies have studied and attacked these exploding problems, but their individual and combined efforts have been unable to stem the tide. Now we have the chance to throw the full weight of science and technology into the fray in a last ditch coordinated assault.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and in commendation of the House conferees for maintaining the position of the House so successfully.

The detractors of this report have used every argument that has ever been used against every public works bill ever introduced. If their views had prevailed over the years, then the progress of the Nation would have been fixed at 1860 levels.

There would have been no controlling of the Mississippi River. No Intercoastal Canal and our vast system of inland waterways. No development of the Missouri, no Erie Canal, and the hundreds of other programs that have meant so much to us.

The bill before you now is a continuation of this necessary progress and development of our national water resources.

This bill has received months and even years of study. It has selected those that are most vital to the Nation as a whole and with an eye ever out to insure that only those needed and economically feasible were included.

This bill represents another great milestone in our Nation's growth.

I sincerely urge your enthusiastic support of the bill before you.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I regret most exceedingly that the conferees on the part of the House were forced because of circumstances beyond their control to delete two most meritorious pieces of legislation. Those sections would authorize the Muscatine Bridge Commission in Iowa to construct, maintain and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., and another somewhat similar bill which would revise and reenact previous legislation which had set up the city of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorized said commission to construct, maintain and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.

Both of these measures which were agreed to by the House in S. 2300 as it passed the House had previously been acted upon as separate legislation earlier in the session of Congress, had been reported out unanimously by the Committee on Public Works, and passed this body by a unanimous vote.

Full credit for the action on these two important bridge commissions in Iowa belong to Congressman JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, an outstanding freshman member of the Committee on Public Works and Congressman JOHN C. CULVER, of Iowa. Congressman SCHMIDHAUSER fought hard and vigorously for the enactment of the Muscatine Bridge Commission and his colleague from Iowa, Congressman CULVER, fought equally as well for the Clinton Bridge Commission.

The conferees on the part of the House felt strongly about the merit of these two bills and as a result a firm commitment was received from the Senate conferees; such a statement is included in the statement of managers on the part of the House on S. 2300 to the effect that early in the next session of the Congress the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate would hold hearings on this legislation.

I personally believe most strongly in this legislation and I am certain that in the next session of Congress through the efforts of these two able Congressmen, JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER and JOHN C. CULVER, of Iowa, that the Senate, after full hearings are given to these bills, will approve them in the proper form and they will become the law of the land.

May I close by stating that the work of men such as Congressmen JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER and Congressman JOHN C. CULVER has been most effective in adding to the great record the Congress has compiled this year in the field of needed legislation and, in the case of my colleague, JOHN SCHMIDHAUSER, not only do I know his outstanding work as a Member on the floor of the House but I have seen him at close hand during long and arduous sessions of the Committee on Public Works contributing valiantly and most ably to the discussion of the very heavy workload the committee carried through so successfully this year.

I trust and I am sure that in the end both of these commissions will become law and when they do the tribute belongs to these two fine Members from Iowa.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, my vote today against accepting the Senate-House conference report on the omnibus public works bill is a matter of political conscience and personal integrity.

Earlier this month, I successfully joined together with a majority of the Members of the House to remove from the public works bill the Dickey-Lincoln School power project on the St. John River in Maine. I did so because this $300 million project was challenged on the grounds that it had not been approved by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and private power alternatives had not been thoroughly studied. Now the Senate-House conference has restored the Dickey-Lincoln project to the public works bill.

Under the parliamentary procedure of the House I am unable to vote specifically against the Dickey-Lincoln project and we are unable to vote to recommit the entire bill to committee for further study. Therefore, though I support the vast majority of the projects in the omnibus public works bill, I want to reaffirm my stand against the Dickey-Lincoln School power project. Earlier I gave the following reasons for my original vote and I have seen no evidence in the meantime to change that vote. Let me restate them now.

First. No public hearings were held on the Dickey-Lincoln power project in the Senate in 1965.

Second. As a separate project, the Dickey-Lincoln project has never been approved by the Corps of Engineers, and only belatedly by the Bureau of the Budget.

Third. The electric companies of the region have offered a tangible, practical, effective alternative to this project without the support of Federal funds. The New England utilities supplied much information regarding this project to the House Public Works Committee.

Fourth. This project, by the expenditure of $300 million of the taxpayers' money in direct competition with private investors would jeopardize the development of the atomic industry in New England where there are three nuclear powerplants in operation or under construction in Connecticut and Massachusetts.

Fifth. This is virtually a pure power project with less than 5 percent for recreation and flood control for a region that has no power shortage.

With all this in mind does it seem unreasonable to await further study by the Corps of Engineers before we examine alternative methods to this project that will cost the American taxpayer more than $300 million. I believe that my vote against the Dickey-Lincoln School power project is in the best interests of the citizens of Connecticut.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today contains many projects

which I consider beneficial both to the residents in the specific areas where they are located and to the entire Nation. I regret, however, that the conference committee has reported a bill which still includes the Dickey-Lincoln School project, in northern Maine. This body voted to defer authorization of the Dickey-Lincoln School project until a detailed report could be prepared and considered, next year.

During the past few days, I have held discussions with representatives of the Electrical Coordinating Council of New England and of the Federal Power Commission, in an attempt to assess several different cost analyses prepared on the project. Just this morning, I received additional information from the Federal Power Commission, which provides new insight into the matter. It is clear to me that questions remain—important questions—relating to the amount of transmission line and equipment required by the various alternative proposals.

After analysis of the documents which I have obtained in the last few days, there appears to be little difference in cost between the Dickey-Lincoln School project and the nuclear pump hydrostorage project advocated by the coordinating councils. Furthermore, neither project supplies more than a small fraction of the total electrical demand for the area. Finally, I see no reason to believe that location of the dam in Maine will provide any significant industrial development in the State of Maine—a State I have learned to know and love from many months of residence there.

If this project had promised any substantial saving in the cost of power in New England, it would have had my complete support. Should the proposed study definitively indicate such potential savings, I shall support the project. But given the lack of pertinent information I must oppose the Dickey-Lincoln School project at this time. I can only express this opposition, I am sorry to say, by voting against the entire conference report on the omnibus public works bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. 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 221, nays 139, answered "present" 5, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

YEAS—221

Abbitt	Anderson, Tenn.	Bandstra
Adair	Annunzio	Barrett
Adams	Ashley	Beckworth
Addabbo	Baldwin	Bennett
Albert	Barrett	Bingham
Blatnik	Hamilton	Pepper
Boggs	Hanley	Perkins
Bonner	Hanna	Philbin
Brademas	Hansen, Idaho	Pickle
Bray	Hansen, Iowa	Pool
Brooks	Hansen, Wash.	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Hardy	Price
Burton, Calif.	Harris	Pucinski
Byrne, Pa.	Harvey, Ind.	Purcell
Cabell	Hathaway	Randall
Callan	Hawkins	Redlin
Cameron	Hechler	Reid, N.Y.
Carter	Helstoski	Resnick
Casey	Herlong	Reuss
Celler	Hicks	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chelf	Horton	Rhodes, Pa.
Clevenger	Howard	Rivers, Alaska
Cohelan	Hull	Roberts
Conyers	Hungate	Rodino
Corman	Huot	Rogers, Colo.
Craley	Ichord	Rogers, Fla.
Daniels	Jacobs	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Joelson	Ronan
Dawson	Johnson, Calif.	Roncalio
de la Garza	Johnson, Okla.	Rooney, N.Y.
Delaney	Johnson, Pa.	Rosenthal
Denton	Jones, Ala.	Rostenkowski
Donohue	Jones, Mo.	Roush
Dow	Karsten	Roybal
Dowdy	Karth	Ryan
Downing	Kee	Satterfield
Duncan, Oreg.	Kelly	St Germain
Dwyer	King, Calif.	Scheuer
Dyal	King, Utah	Schisler
Edmondson	Kluczynski	Schmidhauser
Edwards, Calif.	Krebs	Scott
Edwards, La.	Long, La.	Senner
Ellsworth	Long, Md.	Shipley
Evans, Colo.	McCarthy	Shriver
Everett	McDowell	Sickles
Evins, Tenn.	McFall	Sikes
Fallon	McGrath	Skubitz
Farbstein	McVicker	Slack
Farnsley	Macdonald	Smith, Iowa
Farnum	Machen	Springer
Fascell	Mackie	Stafford
Feighan	Madden	Stephens
Fogarty	Mahon	Stratton
Foley	Matsunaga	Stubblefield
Ford, William D.	Meeds	Sweeney
Fraser	Miller	Teague, Tex.
Friedel	Mills	Trimble
Fulton, Pa.	Minish	Tupper
Fulton, Tenn.	Mink	Tuten
Gallagher	Mize	Udall
Garmatz	Moeller	Ullman
Gathings	Morris	Van Deerlin
Gibbons	Morrison	Vanik
Gilbert	Moss	Waggonner
Gilligan	Murphy, Ill.	Weltner
Gonzalez	Murray	White, Idaho
Gray	Natcher	White, Tex.
Green, Oreg.	Nix	Willis
Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.	Wilson, Charles H.
Greigg	O'Hara, Mich.	Wright
Grider	Olson, Minn.	Yates
Hagen, Calif.	Ottinger	Young
Halleck	Passman	Zablocki
Halpern	Patman	
	Patten	

NAYS—139

Abernethy	Colmer	Gubser
Anderson, Ill.	Conable	Gurney
Andrews, Glenn	Conte	Haley
Arends	Cooley	Hall
Ashbrook	Corbett	Harvey, Mich.
Ashmore	Cramer	Hays
Ayres	Cunningham	Henderson
Bates	Curtin	Hutchinson
Battin	Curtis	Irwin
Belcher	Daddario	Jarman
Betts	Dague	Jennings
Boland	Dent	Jonas
Bolton	Derwinski	Kastenmeier
Bow	Devine	Keith
Brock	Dickinson	King, N.Y.
Broomfield	Dole	Kornegay
Broyhill, N.C.	Duncan, Tenn.	Kunkel
Broyhill, Va.	Erlenborn	Laird
Buchanan	Findley	Langen
Burke	Fino	Latta
Burleson	Fisher	Lipscomb
Burton, Utah	Flood	Love
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford, Gerald R.	McClory
Cahill	Fountain	McCulloch
Cederberg	Gettys	McDade
Chamberlain	Giaimo	McEwen
Clancy	Goodell	McMillan
Clark	Grabowski	Mailliard
Clawson, Del	Griffin	Marsh
Cleveland	Griffiths	Martin, Ala.
Collier	Gross	Mathias
	Grover	Michel
	Minshall	Reinecke
	Monagan	Rooney, Pa.
	Moore	St. Onge
	Moorhead	Saylor
	Morton	Schneebeli
	Nedzi	Schweiker
	Nelsen	Secrest
	O'Brien	Selden
	O'Neill, Mass.	Smith, Calif.
	Pelly	Smith, Va.
	Pirnie	Stalbaum
	Poff	Stanton
	Quillen	Steed
	Race	Taylor
	Reid, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
		Thomson, Wis.
		Todd
		Tuck
		Vivian
		Walker, Miss.
		Watson
		Watts
		Whalley
		Whitener
		Whitten
		Widnall
		Williams
		Wydler
		Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Holland	Pike	Utt
Murphy, N.Y.	Quie	

NOT VOTING—67

Andrews, George W.	Harsha	Reifel
Andrews, N. Dak.	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Aspinall	Holifield	Robison
Baring	Hosmer	Roudebush
Bell	Keogh	Rumsfeld
Berry	Kirwan	Sisk
Bolling	Landrum	Smith, N.Y.
Callaway	Leggett	Staggers
Carey	Lennon	Sullivan
Clausen, Don H.	Lindsay	Talcott
Culver	MacGregor	Tenzer
Davis, Wis.	Mackay	Thomas
Diggs	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	Martin, Nebr.	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn	Matthews	Toll
Dulski	May	Tunney
Edwards, Ala.	Morgan	Vigorito
Flynt	Morse	Walker, N. Mex.
Frelinghuysen	Mosher	Watkins
Fuqua	Multer	Wilson, Bob
Hagan, Ga.	O'Konski	Wolff
	Olsen, Mont.	Wyatt
	O'Neal, Ga.	
	Poage	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Olsen of Montana for, with Mr. Pike against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Quie against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Harsha against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. May.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Walker of New Mexico with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Aspinall.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Berry.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Morse.

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Dulski.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on S. 2300.

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

There was no objection.

SHIP MORTGAGE BONDS

Mr. DOWNING, on behalf of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he will advise us as to any changes in the program which may be anticipated.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has advised that he will call up, under unanimous consent, on Friday, S. 1098, to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes.

If the second supplemental appropriation bill comes over from the Senate subsequent to the commencement of special orders, we announce now that we will undertake to send it to conference.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the gentleman if there are any other changes in the program for tomorrow which he knows of?

Mr. ALBERT. We have listed for today, as the gentleman knows, a number of bills from the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman from Arkansas has advised that it is satisfactory to put those over until tomorrow.

We have another conference report today, so I am quite sure we will put over the Committee on Ways and Means bill until tomorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at this point let me say I have earlier received permission to file two resolutions from the Committee on Rules by midnight tonight, by direction of that committee, providing travel authority for two committees of the House, one the Committee on Agriculture and the other the Committee on Banking and Currency. I understood I would be permitted to call them up tomorrow if time permitted.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as far as the gentleman from Oklahoma is concerned, I have no knowledge of that, but I am glad to have that information available from the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. Also I may advise that tomorrow we may have a conference report which will be eligible and may be called up from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I am advised also that we may have some printing resolutions tomorrow. As far as I know, those are the only immediate changes in the program. May I say also that if the supplemental comes over tonight, as I stated before, we are going to send it to conference even though special orders have already commenced. If it is ready, it will be in order to call it up tomorrow. We would like to dispose of that bill early, because it is very important.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I wonder if it is possible for the leadership on the majority side to make any predictions as to the time when the House might be called upon to consider a sine die resolution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is why we are trying to take extraordinary procedures in the consideration of bills and sending bills to conference. We are hoping we can adjourn very soon, and we will if we dispose of our business.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] was absent when the debate today occurred on the education bill. Had he been here, he would have voted for the higher education bill.

The SPEAKER. You mean the gentleman from New York is stating how another Member would have voted if he had been present?

Mr. GOODELL. At the request of Mr. BELL I am making this statement as to how he would have voted if he had been here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes that statement on his own responsibility?

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. WHITTEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1186)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8370) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 12, 26, 30, 37, 38, 42, 45, 47 and 52.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 31, 34, 41, 43, 53 and 54; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$123,622,500, of which not to exceed $11,418,000 shall remain available until expended for plans, construction, alteration, and improvement of facilities, without regard to limitations contained herein"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$74,299,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "; and not to exceed $400,000 from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, pursuant to Public Law 88–250 to be transferred and merged with this appropriation; $1,600,000 in addition to funds otherwise available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$54,795,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,671,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

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

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,536,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,755,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$76,192,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$103,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$126,278,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$81,933,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,184,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,699,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$365,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That in the event the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund is insufficient to meet indemnity payments and other charges against such Fund, not to exceed $250,000 may be borrowed from the Commodity Credit Corporation under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, but repayment of such amount shall include interest at a rate not less than the cost of money to the Commodity Credit Corporation for a comparable period."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,800,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 27 and 55.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
W. R. HULL, Jr.,
THOMAS G. MORRIS,
GEORGE MAHON,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
By S.L.H.
CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Research: Appropriate $123,622,500 instead of $114,394,000 as proposed by the House and $124,369,800 as proposed by the Senate and provide for the transfer of $18,100,000 from section 32 funds instead of $24,600,000 as proposed by the House and $16,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The amounts agreed to include the sums approved by the House for cotton and pesticide research facilities, plus $500,000 for the Water Pollution Laboratory at Durant, Okla.; $500,000 for the Poultry Laboratory at Georgetown, Del.; $300,000 for plans for the Animal Research Center at Clay Center, Nebr. (total cost $3,750,000); and $339,000 for repairs and alterations at Beltsville, Md. They also include planning funds for the following facilities: U.S. Range Livestock Experiment Station, Miles City, Mont., $40,000 (total cost $521,000); Poultry Research Facilities, Glendale, Ariz., $50,000 (total cost $750,000); Southwest Great Plains Research Center, Bushland, Tex., $25,000 (total cost $350,000); Grain Marketing Research Laboratory, Manhattan, Kans., $225,000 (total cost $3,385,000); Cereal Rust Laboratory, University of Minnesota, $50,000 (total cost $650,000); National Sedimentation Laboratory, Oxford, Miss., $100,000 (total cost $1,035,000); Soil and Water Research Laboratory, Pendleton, Oreg., $45,000 (total cost $425,000); Pasture Research Laboratory, University Park, Pa., $40,000 (total cost $400,000); and Human Nutrition Laboratory, University of North Dakota, $50,000 (total cost $633,000).

Increased funds are also provided as follows: Acceleration of research at Chickasha, Okla., and Madison, S. Dak., $105,000; research on salmonella to be conducted on a nationwide basis, $50,000; mechanization research on dates, $45,000; staffing new laboratories and expanding research facilities, $144,600; additional labor, subprofessional and junior scientific help, $1,000,000; Clay Center, Nebr., $100,000; research on wool fineness, University of Wyoming, $70,000; and

$225,000 each for the Southeast and Northeast hydrology research watersheds at Athens, Ga., and State College, Pa.

Funds in the amount of $224,700 are provided to continue activities of the Food Wholesaling and Retailing Branch. The conferees believe it be unsound to announce closing of research stations or other major research reductions in advance of committee hearings and request that in the future formal presentations be made prior to any such announcements.

Amendments No. 3 and 4: Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriate $74,299,500 instead of $71,119,000 as proposed by the House and $75,060,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes the following: Plant quarantine inspection, $182,500; Animal quarantine inspection, $128,000; Virus-Serum-Toxin Act, $50,000; fire ant eradication, $770,000; cereal leaf beetle, $75,000; hog cholera eradication, $230,000; and screwworm survey in Mexico, $70,000.

The bill includes $2,806,200 for the maintenance of a barrier zone to protect the screwworm-freed areas of Texas and New Mexico and other parts of the country from future infestations from Mexico. The bill also provides $1,000,000 for eradication activities in Arizona, $600,000 of which will be matched by funds from other sources, incident to the extension of the barrier zone to the west coast. The Department should plan, conduct and finance the Federal portion of the cost of barrier zone operations within the funds provided. The policy of requiring matching by State and local sources of funds expended for the production, irradiation and release of flies used to eradicate infestations within the areas involved is expected to be continued.

The cereal leaf beetle presents a serious threat to production of cereal grains in the United States. The host crops susceptible to attack by this pest are grown in all of the States and have an estimated value of $7 billion. It is essential that steps be taken to prevent further spread from the presently infested States of Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio, which States are expected to cooperate in financing eradication measures.

The conferees expect that the full amount of $3,270,000 appropriated in this bill will be required for the conduct of the cooperative fire ant eradication program and will be used only for that purpose.

Amendment No. 5: Special foreign currency program: Appropriates $3,000,000 instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Cooperative State Research Service

Amendments No. 6 through 9: Payments and expenses: Appropriate $54,795,000 instead of $51,695,000 as proposed by the House and $55,695,000 as proposed by the Senate, including increases of $1,000,000 for Hatch Act pay adjustments, $500,000 for grants for forestry research, and $1,600,000 for grants for basic research, and restore House language authorizing the transfer of $400,000 from section 32 funds for basic research grants.

Extension Service

Amendments No. 10 and 11: Payments to States and Puerto Rico: Appropriate $75,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $72,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Farmer Cooperative Service

Amendment No. 12: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,141,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,241,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 13: Conservation operations: Appropriates $106,373,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $105,373,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: Watershed protection: Appropriate $65,671,000 instead of $64,171,000 as proposed by the House and $65,746,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide loan funds of $5,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Separate funds for the Shelby County Tennessee river basin study have not been included in this bill, since it has not been the practice to carry separate amounts for individual projects under this program. The conferees agree that the Department should give consideration to the need for a river basin study in Shelby County, Tennessee, in formulating the overall plan for inclusion in the 1967 budget.

In its report language affecting the Yazoo-Little Tallahatchie watersheds, it was the purpose of the House Committee to point out that the intent of Congress in Public Law 712, 80th Congress, was to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out necessary work projects anywhere within the Yazoo-Little Tallahatchie river watersheds.

Amendment No. 16: Great Plains Conservation Program: Appropriates $16,000,000 instead of $14,864,000 as proposed by the House and $17,432,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18: Resource conservation and development: Appropriate $4,303,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,813,000 as proposed by the House, and provide $1,500,000 for loans as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees do not intend for this to become a large program or to replace or duplicate any of the existing programs of the Department.

Economic Research Service

Amendment No. 19: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $11,536,000 instead of $11,072,000 as proposed by the House and $11,591,000 as proposed by the Senate. The additional amounts agreed to include $44,000 for economic analysis of water management, $30,000 for economic analysis of exports and imports, $200,000 for a study of away-from-home markets to be fully matched by funds from industry sources, $40,000 for economic research on flowers and ornamentals—to be fully matched by funds from the floral industry, and $150,000 for a study of egg pricing.

Statistical Reporting Service

Amendment No. 20: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $13,755,000 instead of $13,595,000 as proposed by the House and $13,875,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes $40,000 for one-half the cost of crop estimates on fruit, nuts and vine crops in California and $120,000 for one-half the cost issuing annual estimates on the mushroom crop and for full completion of the first phase of the long-range program for improving crop and livestock estimates.

Consumer and Marketing Service

Amendment No. 21: Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs: Appropriates $76,192,000 instead of $75,852,000 as proposed by the House and $76,412,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes $240,000 for meat and poultry inspection and $100,000 for administration of the U.S. Warehouse Act.

Amendment No. 22: Payments to States and possessions: Appropriates $1,750,000 instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Special Milk Program: Appropriates $103,000,000 instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House and $108,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 24 and 25: School Lunch Program: Appropriates $157,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $155,000,000 as proposed by the House. The additional $2,000,000 for distribution to needy schools under Section 11 of the School Lunch Act is to be considered as an experimental program for the next year only and should not be considered a part of the regular permanent school lunch program.

Amendments No. 26 and 27: Food Stamp Plan: Provide $100,000,000 for the next year, of which $20,000,000 is to be derived from prior year funds.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

Amendments No. 28 and 29: Expenses: Appropriate $126,278,500 instead of $111,714,000 as proposed by the House and $135,350,000 as proposed by the Senate, and limit the transfer of funds from Commodity Credit Corporation to $81,933,500 instead of $96,615,000 as proposed by the House and $75,390,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds from both sources total $208,212,000 instead of $208,329,000 as proposed by the House and $210,740,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees note the change in the administration of certain commodity loan programs, so as to eliminate handling by convenient local financial institutions and the requirement that disbursements be made through the County offices frequently at considerable inconvenience to the producer. The conferees take further note that the surety bond of County office personnel is limited to losses from fraud, dishonesty, culpable negligence or breach of trust, and that facilities of County offices for protection of warehouse receipts are limited. The conferees call on the Secretary to restore the use of local financial institutions and to make certain that the Federal government is protected against loss in the handling of the documents involved.

The conferees wish to reaffirm the statements contained in both House and Senate Committee reports which call on the Department to retain present practices concerning skip-row planting of cotton. They agree that the elimination of such practice would increase production costs and would fail to utilize the results of extensive research in this area by the Department.

With new farm legislation just enacted, and with the many new problems related thereto, the conferees also agree that no changes should be made in prior year Agricultural Conservation Program practices which would tend to increase costs of farm production. Any changes from the 1965 practices should be made only where requested by the local county committee and approved by the State committee. The Committee recommends that full and complete information be submitted in the Congressional hearings before changes in practices are proposed in the future.

Amendment No. 30: Cropland Conversion Program: Appropriates $7,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Conservation Reserve Program: Appropriates $146,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $140,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 32: Emergency Conservation Measures: Appropriates $24,000,000 instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $30,000,000 proposed by the Senate based on a supplemental estimate of $20,000,000 submitted subsequent to House consideration (S. Doc. 38).

Rural Community Development Service

Amendment No. 33: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $625,000 instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Inspector General

Amendment No. 34: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $10,491,000 as proposed by the

Senate instead of $10,416,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of General Counsel

Amendment No. 35: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $4,184,000 instead of $4,139,000 as proposed by the House and $4,229,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Agricultural Library

Amendment No. 36: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,699,000 instead of $1,599,000 as proposed by the House and $1,865,000 as proposed by the Senate. The balance of the proposed expansion in library services has been deferred until the new library building is available.

Office of Management Services

Amendment No. 37: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,483,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Administration

Amendment No. 38: Salaries and expenses: Eliminates Senate language earmarking $60,000 for agricultural services to Guam.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendments No. 39 through 41: Loan authorizations: Provide $365,000,000 for electrification loans instead of $350,000,000 as proposed by the House and $380,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, including a contingency reserve of $60,000,000 and place $15,000,000 of telephone loan funds in reserve as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Farmer's Home Administration

Amendment No. 42: Rural housing grants and loans: Eliminates $10,000,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Direct loan account: Authorizes real estate loans of $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44: Rural housing for domestic farm labor: Appropriates $3,000,000 instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Rural housing for the elderly revolving fund: Appropriates $2,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 46 and 47: Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $44,000,000 instead of $42,733,000 as proposed by the House and $44,692,000 as proposed by the Senate, and restore language prohibiting the use of funds for rural housing grants.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

Amendments No. 48 through 50: Administrative and operating expenses: Appropriate $8,000,000 instead of $7,478,000 as proposed by the House and $8,478,000 as proposed by the Senate, authorize the use of $4,000,000 of premium income for administrative expenses instead of $4,138,000 as proposed by the House and $3,638,000 as proposed by the Senate, and restore language to permit the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to borrow on a temporary basis not to exceed $250,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation to meet indemnity payments under special or unusual circumstances.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendments No. 51 and 52: Reimbursement for net realized losses: Appropriate $2,800,000,000 instead of $2,300,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,226,800,000 as proposed by the Senate and restores House approved language which eliminates cumulative interest charges on unreimbursed realized losses.

The conferees are of the opinion that future budget estimates for reimbursement appropriations for net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation should include the full amount of the realized losses for any fiscal year as reflected in the accounts and shown in the report of the financial condition of such corporation as of the close of business of such fiscal year.

Amendment No. 53: Public Law 480: Restores language which would appropriate separate amounts for each title of P.L. 480 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of a single amount as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54: Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile: Eliminates entire appropriation pursuant to budget amendment (S. Doc. 38).

National Commission on Food Marketing

Amendment No. 55: Salaries and expenses: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to concur in the $1,500,000 proposed by the Senate with a proviso that $250,000 of this amount shall be used solely for preparation and submission of the final report and complete and final liquidation of the Commission's activities, including full salary and terminal leave payments, not later than June 30, 1966.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
W. R. HULL, JR.
THOMAS G. MORRIS,
GEORGE MAHON,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, we bring to the Members of the House the conference report for the appropriation bill for the U.S. Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the 1966 fiscal year. Due consideration has been given in the figures contained herein to the fact that we have been operating under a continuing resolution for about 4 months.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that the conference report we have here has been signed by all the conferees, both for the House and the Senate. I wish to thank the House conferees for their cooperation and assistance in working out the final conference settlement.

While the sum total of the figures in the bill are high, relatively, we feel we have held them in line with other agencies of Government, particularly in view of the fact that food, clothing, and shelter still remain the basic essentials of life and represent the best buy that the American people have.

Mr. Speaker, in this bill the regular activities total carries $1,685,251,500. This represents an increase of $51 million over the House figure and is $28.5 million under the figure of the other body. The total in the bill is $6,242,929,500. This is approximately $40 million under the budget and is about $471 million under the figure of the other body. It is over the House figure by about $525 million.

However, Mr. Speaker, subsequent to our going to conference the financial position of the Commodity Credit Corporation was reviewed and the Bureau of the Budget today sent down a request for an additional $500 million to meet its needs. This is the major item in the increase over the House bill. It will not be expended except in line with the requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation which it is directed to carry out by law. This we felt was sound business in that it would probably prevent the Congress from having to consider a supplemental request or a deficiency early in the next session.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we have tried to give proper attention to the various research needs, the price support program, the extension service, meat inspection, soil conservation, and other programs, particularly with respect to those phases of the activities of the Department that have to do with the health and the protection of the consumer.

The amounts agreed to for research include the sums approved by the House for cotton and pesticide research facilities, plus $500,000 for the Water Pollution Laboratory at Durant, Okla.; $500,000 for the Poultry Laboratory at Georgetown, Del.; $300,000 for plans for the Animal Research Center at Clay Center, Nebr.—total cost $3,750,000; and $339,000 for repairs and alterations at Beltsville, Md. They also include planning funds for the following facilities: U.S. Range Livestock Experiment Station, Miles City, Mont., $40,000—total cost $521,000; Poultry Research Facilities, Glendale, Ariz., $50,000—total cost $750,000; Southwest Great Plains Research Center, Bushland, Tex., $25,000—total cost $350,000; Grain Marketing Research Laboratory, Manhattan, Kans., $225,000—total cost $3,385,000; Cereal Rust Laboratory, University of Minnesota, $50,000—total cost $650,000; National Sedimentation Laboratory, Oxford, Miss., $100,000—total cost $1,035,000; Soil and Water Research Laboratory, Pendleton, Ore., $45,000—total cost $425,000; Pasture Research Laboratory, University Park, Pa., $40,000—total cost $400,000; and Human Nutrition Laboratory, University of North Dakota, $50,000—total cost $633,000.

Increased funds are also provided for acceleration of reasearch at Chickasha, Okla., and Madison, S. Dak., $105,000; research on salmonella to be conducted on a nationwide basis, $50,000; mechanization research on dates, $45,000; staffing new laboratories and expanding research facilities, $144,600; additional labor, subprofessional and junior scientific help,

$1 million; Clay Center, Nebr., $100,000; research on wool fineness, University of Wyoming, $70,000; and $225,000 each for the Southeast and Northeast hydrology research watersheds at Athens, Ga. and State College, Pa.

I would also like to refer to several items contained in the conference report which were the subject of special consideration by the conferees.

The bill includes $2,806,200 for the maintenance of a barrier zone to protect the screw-worm freed areas of Texas and New Mexico and other parts of the country from future infestations from Mexico. The bill also provides $1 million for eradication activities in Arizona, $600,000 of which will be matched by funds from other sources, incident to the extension of the barrier zone to the west coast. The policy of requiring matching by State and local sources of funds expended for the production, irradiation, and release of flies used to eradicate infestations within the areas involved is expected to be continued.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees also reaffirmed the statements contained in both House and Senate committee reports which call on the Department to retain present practices concerning skip-row planting of cotton. They agreed that the elimination of such practice would increase production costs and would fail to utilize the results of extensive research in this area by the Department.

The conferees also agreed that no changes should be made in prior year agricultural conservation program practices which would tend to increase costs of farm production. They felt that any changes from the 1965 practices should be made only where requested by the local county committee and approved by the State committee and recommended that full and complete information be submitted in the congressional hearings before changes in practices are proposed in the future.

The conference report also called attention to the fact that, in its report language affecting the Yazoo-Little Tallahatchie watersheds, it was the purpose of the House committee to point out that the intent of Congress in Public Law 712, 80th Congress, was to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out necessary work projects anywhere within the Yazoo-Little Tallahatchie River watersheds.

In addition, the conferees noted the change in the administration of certain commodity loan programs, so as to eliminate handling by convenient local financial institutions and the requirement that disbursements be made through the county offices frequently at considerable inconvenience to the producer. The conferees further noted that the surety bond of county office personnel is limited to losses from fraud, dishonesty, culpable negligence or breach of trust, and that facilities of county offices for protection of warehouse receipts are limited. The conferees call on the Secretary to restore the use of local financial institutions and to make certain that the Federal Government is protected against loss in the handling of the documents involved.

Mr. Speaker, last week we considered the 1966 supplemental appropriation bill (H.R. 11588) in which $2 million additional was included for meat inspection. In the report on that bill we pointed out that in February 1965, meat inspection and poultry inspection activities were brought together under this agency for the purpose of better coordination and reduction of supervisory costs. We stated further that the committee is of the view that under present conditions consolidations below the supervisory level would not be best for the public, the service, or the industry, and for that reason should not be made.

Also in connection with the supplemental bill, the committee took note of the passage of the rural water and sanitation facilities legislation which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide assistance to nonprofit public and quasi-public agencies and corporations for water supply, water systems, and waste disposal systems in rural areas. While it did not have a budget estimate upon which to act, the committee recognized the need for and value of such program.

I would like to repeat that this conference report before you today represents a reasonable settlement between the amounts approved by the House and Senate. A summary table of the 1965 appropriations, 1966 budget estimates, amounts approved by the House and Senate, and final conference action, appears below:

Departments of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1966

Item	1965 appropriation	1966 budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1965 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I, general activities	1,565,032,200	1,707,486,000	1,633,693,000	1,713,835,800	1,685,251,500	+120,219,300	−22,234,500	+51,558,500	−28,584,300
Title II, credit agencies	59,367,000	79,626,000	60,367,000	77,826,000	62,634,000	+3,267,000	−16,992,000	+2,267,000	−15,192,000
Title III, corporations	5,173,629,000	[1]4,494,022,000	4,023,022,000	4,920,822,000	4,493,544,000	−680,085,000	−478,000	+470,522,000	−427,278,000
Title IV, related agencies	700,000	1,500,000	750,200	1,500,000	1,500,000	+800,000		+750,000	
Appalachian regional development	28,320,000					−28,320,000			
Grand total, appropriations	6,827,048,200	6,282,634,000	5,717,382,000	6,713,983,800	6,242,929,500	−584,118,700	−39,704,500	+525,097,500	−471,054,300
Loan authorization	795,000,000	787,000,000	787,000,000	852,000,000	837,000,000	+42,000,000	+50,000,000	+50,000,000	−15,000,000

[1] Includes $500,000,000 budget amendment submitted on Oct. 20 (subsequent to passage of bill by House and Senate and while pending in conference).

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the conference report. As the chairman of our subcommittee indicated, while it may be somewhat distressing to some to learn this conference report is $525,097,500 over the bill passed by the House, the chairman has pretty well pointed out that the Senate bill was $926 million over our bill, in the main to restore net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. We did not feel we should go along with such a big amount if it was not altogether needed. You will realize that to restore a net realized loss you have already, in effect, spent the money, and this simply restores the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I shall place in the RECORD the President's letter together with Budget Bureau's official supplemental request for an additional half billion dollars just received. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not do it now, sure as you are born when we come back in January we will have a request for either this amount or a bigger amount.

In January of this year you will recall we had the supplemental request for the fiscal year 1965 for the Agriculture Department for $1.6 billion to restore to CCC account for net realized losses.

The breakdown in title I reflects a $51,558,500 increase over the House bill. I would point out that $20 million of this has to do with that west coast conservation emergency measure passed earlier in the year. The balance is for research, extension, soil conservation, watershed protection, meat and poultry inspection, and other items.

In title II the report shows an increase of $2,267,000 over the House bill. This involves the two items of migrant labor and FHA salaries and expenses.

Under title III we have pretty well discussed the increase for Commodity Credit Corporation. While the conference report shows $470,522,000, the Senate took out an additional $30 million over the House reduction in the barter program which wipes out the program altogether. In agreeing with the Senate's further reduction of $30 million in the barter program, and with the supplemental request of $500 million added we arrive at the figure of $470,522,000 increase in this overall item in the confer-

ence report over the amount appearing in the House bill.

The letter and request mentioned above follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 20, 1965.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $500 million for the Department of Agriculture.

The details of this proposed appropriation, the necessity therefor, and the reason for its submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $500 million for the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

"For an additional amount to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for unreimbursed net realized losses sustained but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to the act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a–11, 713a–12), $500 million."

This proposed supplemental appropriation is to provide needed funds to carry out the mandatory price support programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The funds would partially reimburse the Corporation for price support and related losses realized through the fiscal year 1964.

Based on latest estimates of record crop production it appears that the amount previously requested for the Corporation will not be adequate to finance price support operations during the remainder of the fiscal year.

I recommend that the foregoing proposed supplemental appropriation be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

In title IV under related agencies, there is an item of $750,000 over the House bill for the Food and Marketing Commission. This will fully fund the activities of that Commission. We require that they do come through on the appointed closing date with a final report.

In the loan authorization there is an item of $50 million over the House bill. Twenty million dollars of this is in rural housing. The other $30 million reflects itself in increases in the REA. To give you a quick summary of what the situation is with respect to the REA, in the House bill, in this year's bill we appropriated $350 million for the REA and included in that $350 million was $65 million for the contingency fund. The Senate voted $380 million for the REA with a $50 million contingency. We compromised on the $365 million figure with $60 million of that for the contingency. I would point out to the Members, this is exactly the amount of money appropriated last year for the REA, $365 million, although last year we retained $90 million rather than $60 million in the contingency.

In the rural telephone account, both the House and Senate agreed on the $97 million figure. While the House bill had $7 million in the contingency, the Senate earmarked $15 million for contingency and the conferees stayed with the Senate figure. So all in all, Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are able to come to an agreement even in this late closing hour of this session. I support the conference report and I would urge all Members to do likewise.

Mr. Speaker, the following table gives some measure of comparative figures for initial budget requests to fund the Department of Agriculture's activities, the net expenditures by fiscal year, new obligational authority, and changes between the years from 1951 through 1965.

Department of Agriculture and related agencies, new obligational authority (NOA)

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Initial NOA request [1]	Net budget expenditures	Enacted NOA [1]	Change between initial NOA request and enacted NOA in previous year	Change in enacted NOA from previous year
1951	1,670.3	649.8	1,408.0		
1952	1,682.0	1,151.2	1,886.9	+274.0	+478.9
1953	1,525.5	3,217.2	1,509.5	−361.4	−377.4
1954	1,659.2	2,917.1	4,283.2	+149.7	+2,773.7
1955	2,935.3	4,636.5	2,840.8	−1,347.9	−1,442.4
1956	1,515.6	5,176.8	3,597.6	−1,325.2	+756.8
1957	3,150.2	5,005.9	6,085.6	−447.4	+2,488.0
1958	5,157.6	4,874.9	6,796.1	−928.0	+710.5
1959	4,106.6	7,091.4	5,925.8	−2,689.5	−870.3
1960	5,514.5	5,418.9	5,683.5	−411.3	−242.3
1961	5,081.4	5,929.4	5,559.5	−602.1	−124.0
1962	5,509.0	6,668.7	7,409.7	−50.5	+1,850.2
1963	6,426.0	7,735.3	8,031.7	−983.7	+622.0
1964	8,144.5	7,896.9	8,051.6	+112.8	+19.9
1965	5,956.0	[2] 7,330.0	[2] 8,289.9	−2,095.6	+238.3

[1] From the budget of the United States 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966.

[2] From preliminary Treasury Department budgetary appropriations and other authorizations, expenditures, and unexpended balances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27. Page 18, line 10, insert:

"*Provided*, That, in addition, not more than $20,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this head for the previous fiscal year may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", of which $20,000,000 shall be derived from amounts appropriated under this head for the previous fiscal year, which amount shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 55. Page 38, line 5, strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,500,000".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield myself such time as I may require and yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and one of the conferees.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and the entire subcommittee for the good work they have done on this very difficult bill.

May I call special attention to the following language in the statement of the managers:

The conferees wish to reaffirm the statements contained in both House and Senate committee reports which call on the Department to retain present practices concerning skip-row planting of cotton. They agree that the elimination of such practice would increase production costs and would fail to utilize the results of extensive research in this area by the Department.

With new farm legislation just enacted, and with the many new problems related thereto, the conferees also agree that no changes should be made in prior year agricultural conservation program practices which would tend to increase costs of farm production. Any changes from the 1965 practices should be made only where requested by the local county committee and approved by the State committee. The committee recommends that full and complete information be submitted in the congressional hearings before changes in practices are proposed in the future.

I wish to join Mr. WHITTEN, chairman of the subcommittee, in insisting that the Department follow the statement of the managers in the foregoing matters.

The skip-row practice to which reference has been made is absolutely vital in certain areas of the Cotton Belt and the agricultural conservation program is vital to farmers throughout the Nation.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$1,500,000, of which $250,000 shall be available solely for preparation and submission of the final report and complete and final liquidation of the Commission's activities not later than June 30, 1966."

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the conference report and include certain tables.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 8370.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

I DO NOT LIKE DEMONSTRATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it was an extremely disagreeable thing to me to see the recent wave of demonstrations against U.S. involvement in Vietnam. America has been shamed by the spectacle of organized treason and blatant cowardice which we have witnessed. It should be obvious that nationwide demonstrations do not just happen. There is careful planning and organization back of it, and certainly it is Communist inspired. The press has played up pictures of young punks tearing up or burning draft cards. This sort of thing is encouraged by half-baked professors and Communist sympathizers, as well as by professional agitators.

Fortunately, such demonstrations involve an extremely small percentage of college students, but they make noise and attract attention. I am highly gratified to note that the administration has ordered the FBI to crack down on the ringleaders. The right of peaceful assembly envisions responsible and loyal Americans assembled together in righteous indignation against the elements of oppression and injustices; not a lot of crackpots who have little comprehension of world problems or American responsibilities. America needs a solid and unified front before the world. We cannot allow the American image to be dimmed and distorted by spectacles such as we have witnessed.

More than a crackdown is needed. We should be witnessing a tremendous outpouring of patriotism from the campuses of the Nation. University officials should be leading a crusade for America to give students an opportunity to show that the very great majority of them are sincere and patriotic young Americans who love this country and who refuse to be involved in the things we have witnessed.

RESTORE RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter sent to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased to see the editorial in yesterday's New York Times urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore the full $30 million in rent supplement payments requested by the administration. The editorial reads as follows:

RESTORE RENT SUBSIDIES

In a surprise move, the House last week voted to kill the funds needed to start the new rent subsidy program for low-income families. The House Appropriations Committee had already reduced the figure far below the administration's request. Since the House had its opportunity to vote on the substantive merits of the program when it approved the housing bill, it was irresponsible and demagogic for opponents to exploit a vote on a routine money bill in order to reverse that decision.

We urge the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore the full $30 million requested by the administration. Rent subsidies are a promising innovation. They deserve a full and fair trial.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the Harvey amendment on the House floor last Thursday was most regrettable. Despite the fact that the House early in the year in a close battle had worked its will to authorize a rent supplement program and despite the further fact that the Appropriations Committee had drastically slashed the $30 million authorization for the first year to $6 million, the foes of this promising new program were able to mount a successful ambush.

The ammunition used by the supporters of the Harvey amendment was drawn from preliminary regulations issued by the agency which were purely tentative and distributed for discussion purposes and to stimulate early interest from prospective sponsors. The Members of the House will recall certain hypothetical "horror cases" the opposition dreamed up to argue that the benefits of the rent supplement program could in some cases go to families with very substantial assets.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress to my colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle that because of apparent misunderstanding or misinterpretation these purely tentative regulations have in effect been withdrawn and I am confident they will be revised to make certain that the benefits of the rent supplement program are available only to families and individuals in the public housing income group and will rule out those with any substantial amounts of liquid assets. The attached letter sent on Monday by the FHA Commissioner clearly emphasizes the tentative and preliminary nature of the original regulations and that substantial revisions will be made before they are issued in final form.

Mr. Speaker, it is my deepest hope that the Senate will be able to restore a substantial amount of funds to launch the rent supplement program and that the final conference report will contain such funds. This program which would harness the resources of private enterprise and private capital to provide housing for low-income families is a crucial part of President Johnson's attack on urban problems and the Congress must not let him down.

The letter follows:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1965.

To: All approved mortgagees.

Subject: Rent supplement program.

In the rent supplement program letter 65–11 which was distributed on September 28, 1965, it was emphasized that the material was being supplied so that preliminary discussions could be held with sponsors and other prospective participants. It also was to afford an opportunity for review within and outside the Agency so that the feasibility of the requirements and procedures could be reviewed and considered. This was because the program cannot be made operative until funding is authorized.

None of the distributed regulations or procedures should be considered as effective or governing. As a result of comment and suggestions received, appropriate revisions will be made to strengthen various provisions. In the event funding is provided the necessary regulations and instructions will be issued in final form.

Sincerely,

PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN,
Commissioner.

SOVIET UNION PRACTICING A POLICY OF ANTI-SEMITISM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, for some time now we have been aware that the Soviet Union, despite its denials, has been practicing—consciously and deliberately—a policy of anti-Semitism. We have been uncertain about its reasons, although it would seem clear that Moscow is seeking to impose a terrible uniformity upon its citizens, while at the same time currying favor with the Arab countries. This week there occurred at the United Nations an incident which, in my view, exposes to the entire world the Soviet Union's hypocrisy. I see no means now for Moscow to deny that it has embraced the heinous doctrines that

it fought so well in the war that ended only 20 years ago.

I am proud that in performing an act of great righteousness our own Government exposed the Soviet hypocrisy. On October 8, the United States introduced an amendment to the draft convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. The U.S. amendment reads:

States parties condemn anti-Semitism and shall take action as appropriate for its speedy eradication in the territories subject to its jurisdiction.

It was not easy, Mr. Speaker, for the United States to introduce that amendment. There are many countries besides the Soviet Union that do not sympathize with efforts to erase anti-Semitism from the earth. Political expediency might have demanded that the United States remain silent. That we did not remain silent merits the commendation of this House. The United States took a courageous stand.

I might note that, once it was submitted, the Arab countries did put pressure on the United States to withdraw the amendment. These countries rarely miss an opportunity to fan the flames of anti-Semitic hatred. But the United States stood firm. Ambassador Goldberg personally assured me that we will not withdraw our proposal, but will, on the contrary, do everything possible to press its consideration to a successful conclusion.

But barely had the United States introduced its amendment when the Soviet Union sought to change it. I read the text of the alternate Soviet proposal:

States parties condemn anti-Semitism, zionism, nazism, neo-nazism and all other forms of the policy and ideology of colonialism, national and race hatred and exclusiveness and shall take action as appropriate for the speedy eradication of those inhuman ideas and practices in the territories subject to their jurisdiction.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, such an outrage as the equation of zionism with nazism and anti-Semitism? How does the Soviet Union dare to make such a shambles of honesty? How can it perpetrate such a thought? What hypocrisy. One would have thought that even the Soviet Union, in its unprincipled pursuit of political advantage, would have been less shocking or, at the least, less clumsy. Can there be any doubt in anyone's mind that the Soviet objective is to assist the Arabs in their efforts to destroy Israel? In mentioning zionism in the same breath with nazism, the Soviet Union surpassed even its own sorry record of deceit.

I need not dwell for my colleagues on the egregious effort to obscure truth. Let me say simply that zionism is not, like nazism, an expression of hate but an expression of love. It is not, like nazism, a message of destruction but a measure of construction. It does not, like nazism, seek to debase a people but to exalt them. It is not, like nazism, a philosophy of negation but of affirmation. Zionism is the movement to restore the Jewish homeland to the Jewish people. Its only relation to nazism is in its attempt to repair, in some measure, the wreckage that nazism caused. Zionism, Mr. Speaker, is—and I scarcely need say it—the very antithesis of nazism.

The Soviet Union knows, of course, what I have said to be true, but Moscow is attempting to exploit anti-Semitism both at home and now in the United Nations, to extend its influence into Africa and the Middle East. I am sure that the United States has succeeded in exposing its unworthy objectives for what they are and for all to see. The Soviet Union cares nothing about Jews or about justice. To Moscow, Jews and justice are merely tools to further its ignoble end.

The Bolivian Government, to whom we must all be grateful, took the initiative in countering the Soviet slander in the United Nations. Bolivia moved to amend the Soviet proposal to eliminate the distasteful reference to zionism, while retaining the noble thoughts in which Moscow has hypocritically wrapped it. I state the Bolivian text:

States parties condemn anti-Semitism, nazism, in all its forms and manifestations, and all races involved in the policy and ideology of colonialism, national and race hatred and exclusiveness; and shall take action as appropriate for the speedy eradication of those inhuman ideas and practices in the territories subject to their jurisdiction.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the decent peoples of the world will take note of the Soviet Union's unprincipled deception. I hope it casts doubt on the integrity of that country and on its pretentions to lead oppressed peoples around the world. The Soviet Union's purpose was to exploit Jews to serve its national interest. It would not hesitate to exploit any peoples for that purpose. I think the events which I have described at the United Nations gives ample testimony to Moscow's real aims and methods.

ANNUAL AWARDS BY CLEVELAND CIVIC LEAGUE

Mr. FEIGHAN. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Civic League held its first annual civic award night banquet and ball on October 15, 1965, at the Pick-Carter Hotel. At an impressive ceremony the league paid honor to 11 Clevelanders for "Outstanding achievement in community service."

Those honored were: Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press; our distinguished colleague, CHARLES VANIK, who ably represents the 21st Congressional District of Ohio; Leo Jackson, an outstanding councilman on the Cleveland City Council; Judge Paul D. White of the Cleveland Municipal Court; Helen Lyons, clerk of the Cleveland Municipal Court; State Representative Carl B. Stokes; Dr. Kenneth Clement; Ellsworth H. Harpole; John O. Holly; Joseph Polo, and Harold Williams.

The purpose of these awards, in the words of James W. Wilson, president of the league, is "to encourage other citizens to participate in civic activity in Cleveland thereby elevating its standards to the level that we may be proud to say, "Cleveland is the best location in the Nation."

The success of self-government is dependent upon citizen interest and participation in the many phases of community activities. This is particularly true in our large metropolitan centers such as Cleveland. When citizen initiative fails to encourage voluntary activities for the advancement of a community one of two results follow. Either government must take on more functions that can best be accomplished by voluntary action, or the community falls behind in meeting the challenges of progress. The Cleveland Civic League is dedicated to a six-point civic program which is aimed at encouraging maximum citizen participation in the affairs of the community.

The program of the league is as follows:

1. Voter registration: It is the purpose of this organization to foster and encourage as many persons of legal voting age to become registered voters. Good government can only result from maximum participation by all of its citizens.

2. Political evaluations: It is the intention of this organization to function as a screening and investigative body for the benefit of the public at large; as we feel that a well-informed public is an intelligent voting public.

3. Political endorsements: It is our intention to support and endorse political issues and/or candidates; without regards to political affiliation. We feel that all political parties have something of value to offer the general public. We, however, shall work for the best interest of the public at large.

4. Civil rights program: We favor full and complete implementation of all civil rights laws and programs of the Federal, State, and local governments with all possible speed. We feel strongly, that everyone's rights and freedoms are in jeopardy; so long as anyone's rights and freedoms are in jeopardy.

5. Community improvements: We the members of the Cleveland Civic League intend to assist and lend our every effort and support to any and all projects and programs initiated to improve and make our Cleveland community a better place in which to live.

6. Community cooperation: This organization stands ever ready to work in cooperation with other civic, social welfare, and other organizations in fostering and promoting a better environment, civic progress, and development of our city; for the good of all of its citizens.

GOVERNMENT BY CRONYISM

Mr. RUMSFELD. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks President Johnson has made two appointments to high Federal office which have created considerable controversy. The first was the appointment of Mr. Francis X. Morrissey for a district Federal judgeship in Boston, and the second was the appointment of Mr. David G. Bress as U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

As reported in the press, a major qualification of each of these individuals was their excellent political connections. Mr. Morrissey is a close political associate of the Kennedy family and Mr. Bress was a former attorney for Bobby Baker and/or his business interests. The press has been filled with such comments as those which I will insert at the conclusion of my remarks from the October 15 Chicago Sun-Times, which describes the Morrissey appointment as a shabby affair, and the Chicago Daily News editorial of Friday, October 15, calling it an outrageous appointment. Certainly these appointments reflect seriously on President Johnson. Whatever his reasons may be, it is he who has affronted the American people by naming men of questionable qualifications for these high posts.

Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Judiciary Committee was supposed to meet in an extraordinary special session to reconsider the Bress nomination. This notwithstanding the fact that they had previously met and voted to approve his nomination. The basis for this second and most unusual committee meeting appears to have been the submission of a second U.S. Justice Department report on Mr. Bress. The second Justice Department investigation which culminated in the second Justice Department report appears to have been initiated as the result of the numerous press stories which brought forth information on Mr. Bress and his connection with Bobby Baker and questions as to the possibility of his involvement in a stock fabrication case, matters which apparently had not been fully investigated by the Senate Judiciary Committee during the first hearing on the subject. More significantly, these matters had apparently not been fully reported on by the initial Justice Department report. Even more significantly, it is reported that even in the second report the Justice Department may have failed to bring full details on these matters to the attention of the Senate committee.

The whole question of government by cronyism has been widely discussed in the press. What has not been discussed, and the question which I believe must be answered, is this: What faith can the American people and the Congress of the United States place in the Attorney General and his Department of Justice when they purportedly have checked out both Morrissey and Bress and gave them a clean bill of health? In fact, it is my understanding that the Attorney General himself testified on behalf of Bress. Apparently it was not until the press, Members of Congress, and other interested citizens turned up additional facts concerning these gentlemen that the Justice Department actually undertook the second investigation.

With respect to Mr. Morrissey, the question appears to involve his claim of residency in Georgia for a 6-month period standing in direct conflict with his certification that he was at that time a resident of Massachusetts. As to Mr. Bress, the problem seems to involve questions as to the degree of his possible involvement in the fabrication of corporation stock. Apparently this possibility is sufficiently serious to cause the Senate Judiciary Committee to reconsider the matter, notwithstanding the fact that they had already approved his nomination and it was pending on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, public eyebrows were raised when the Senate Rules and Administration Committee issued a U.S. Justice Department report by Mr. Katzenbach, dated February 25, 1965, on their résumé of their investigation of Mr. Don Reynolds' testimony which seriously challenged his credibility, and at the same time appeared to whitewash the Bobby Baker case. Public eyebrows again today should be raised with respect to Mr. Katzenbach and the Justice Department and their conveniently inadequate background checks on both Morrissey and Bress.

Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Chicago Daily News indicates the types of details which the Department of Justice apparently failed to bring to the attention of the Senate committee in their first report:

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON, October 20.—The records of a Chicago printing company are playing a major role in the GOP drive to block Senate confirmation of President Johnson's candidate for the key post of U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

The records tied the nominee's law firm into secret efforts to fabricate corporate stock in the contest of a will and estate valued at $3 million, court documents show.

The degree of involvement by the nominee, Washington Attorney David Bress, in the stock manipulation was to have been explored in an extraordinary session today by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The meeting was postponed at the last minute, however, to allow committee members to further study the court records.

Scheduling the closed session was unusual because the committee already has voted to recommend Bress' confirmation to the full Senate.

It did so despite Republican protests that Bress had defended ex-Senate Staffer Robert G. (Bobby) Baker in the civil suit that touched off the exposé of Baker's extracurricular business activities.

Baker is now under investigation by a Federal grand jury in the District of Columbia—the jurisdiction Bress would head if the President's nomination is confirmed.

The Justice Department says Bress' contacts with Baker are immaterial because two attorneys from Justice Department headquarters are handling the Baker grand jury, not the District of Columbia District Attorney's office as would usually be the case.

Today's meeting of the Judiciary Committee was called by Chairman JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, at the demand of Republicans, to study new evidence in the Bress case dug up by the GOP's sleuthing Senator, JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware.

Here is the picture, as pieced together from 10-year-old court records, and sworn, secret testimony taken by a Judiciary subcommittee that took a quick, preliminary look at the case last week.

On January 28, 1955, Melvin Viner, president of a Washington laundry firm, Sunshine Arcade, died leaving a widow and children plus two brothers who had been business partners.

Bress, then the Viner family lawyer and secretary of the corporation, was chosen to handle the estate. The two brothers, thanks to papers filed by Bress, were made executors of the will.

On February 28, 1955, the widow, Jeanne, suspicious of Bress' performance, dropped Bress and got a new lawyer, Bruce G. Sundlun, a former assistant U.S. attorney here.

One matter at issue was a sizable block of stock, about one-third of the total outstanding, held in the name of the brothers, Robert and Leonard Viner.

The stock, dated 1950 and 1951, mentioned, and appeared to support, the authenticity of a controversial "management agreement" signed by the three brothers in 1949. If still valid, the agreement would have required Mrs. Viner to sell her stock to the brothers at a cut rate, and end up with only $30,000 instead of at least one-third of $3 million.

Playing a hunch about the stock's authenticity, Sundlun flew to Chicago to query officials of the Goss Lithographing Co., which had printed the blank certificates used to prepare the stock.

Sundlun wanted to know if the stock blanks had changed over the years or remained the same. Goss officials at first said the forms hadn't changed since 1927.

But under persistent inquiry, they dug out the fact that they had used a new printing process since March 1953, and that the stocks in question were among those produced under the new process.

Without tipping his hand, Sundlun then maneuvered the Viner brothers and Bress into a deposition hearing in which the brothers swore that the stock had been issued in 1950 and 1951.

One week later, Sundlun went to another of Bress' law partners, Alvin Newmyer, disclosed his proof about the manufactured certificates, and warned that he'd make the whole thing public unless a settlement could be worked out.

After nearly a year of negotiation, the widow was given a settlement in excess of $1,300,000—instead of the $30,000 that first appeared likely.

The Viner brothers were then permitted to officially change their deposition testimony regarding the signing of the stock, with the explanation that the new stock was fabricated after Melvin Viner's death as replacement for old that had been misplaced.

In early 1957, after the case was closed, Sundlun, at the widow's urging, told the U.S. attorney's office here about the stock manipulation.

But no prosecution resulted, Sundlun says, because no one had actually been bilked through use of the fabricated certificates.

Bress now insists that he knew nothing about the stock manipulation, contending that a then-partner in the firm, Albert Philipson, handled that aspect of the matter.

Philipson affirmed for the judiciary subcommittee last week that Bress knew nothing about the stock matter, even though Bress had handled virtually every facet of the case.

He said replacement of the stock was routine because the originals were lost.

Philipson has not yet been asked why the brothers prevaricated about the stocks issuance date during the deposition and why the new stock was made without notifying

the court, the widow, or the children, as normal procedure would require.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Oct. 15, 1965]

OUTRAGEOUS APPOINTMENT

The more that is revealed about Francis X. Morrissey, the Boston crony of the Kennedys, the more outrageous becomes his rose-strewn march toward a Federal judgeship. There is now the matter of a law degree from a Georgia "diploma mill" to add to the record of Morrissey's flunking the Massachusetts bar exams twice and his lack of judicial experience.

The American Bar Association, represented at the Senate hearing by Albert E. Jenner of Chicago, summed it all up by calling Morrissey the worst-qualified judicial candidate it had ever encountered. Yet the Senate Judiciary Committee approved his nomination for the U.S. district court in Boston by a vote of 6 to 3.

No one has questioned Morrissey's character or personality. He emerges as a likable fellow—just the type you'd want to take along on a fishing trip. And he's loyal; Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK attests to that. He may also be thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent.

The trouble is that the Senate is not judging the merits of fishing companions or Eagle Scouts; it is judging a candidate for high judicial office. And men who know the law and the responsibilities of a Federal judge say he is not qualified.

What Morrissey has going for him, of course, is the power of the Kennedy family, to which he has indeed been loyal. His sponsor is Senator EDWARD (TED) KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and no holds are barred.

The late President Kennedy backed away from nominating Morrissey for the Boston judgeship when it became apparent that he would be strongly opposed. The office has remained vacant since, evidently waiting for Morrissey, who was nominated just last month by President Johnson.

There is much speculation as to why the President, knowing the flurry it would cause, placed Morrissey's name before the Senate. One obvious theory is that he was repaying a political debt to the Kennedys. Another is that Mr. Johnson, in a Machiavellian mood, reasoned that the backfire might damage TED KENNEDY'S political future and perhaps ROBERT KENNEDY'S as well.

The whole affair reflects on the Kennedy brothers' wisdom—and on Mr. Johnson's. Whatever his reasons, it was he who affronted the people by naming a man so obviously unqualified in every respect.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, October 15, 1965]

A SHABBY AFFAIR

The proposed appointment of Francis X. Morrissey, now a municipal court judge in Boston, to the Federal district court has passed the Senate Judiciary Committee. The Senate must now vote on confirmation or denial of the appointment.

Judge Morrissey is sponsored by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, Democrat of Massachusetts. The charge is made that Senator KENNEDY is paying off a political debt of long standing to Judge Morrissey. Of itself that is not cause for great concern. Many political appointees have given great and good service to the people. It depends on the man appointed.

In this case the American Bar Association says that Judge Morrissey is the wrong man. The ABA says he does not possess, in any measure, the background or qualifications it considers essential for service in the Federal district court.

Morrissey has been considered for this same position twice before. In sponsoring him in this third attempt Senator KENNEDY is playing precinct politics with a Federal position of great importance to reward a man whose only apparent qualification is that of a good precinct worker. Senator KENNEDY ignores the fact that the authority of the Federal district court cuts across State lines. As Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican of Illinois, pointed out, Illinois lawyers may have to have their cases heard before Judge Morrissey, if he is appointed, in such matters as citizenship, antitrust and patent cases, to name only a few. Nothing in Morrissey's background, as the ABA has documented, qualifies him for the exercise of such judicial responsibility.

The whole affair is politically tawdry. It demonstrates Senator KENNEDY'S primary concern to reward a political hack and let the larger consequence of serving the people go by the board. Senator KENNEDY may win in his foray against principle but it might turn out to be a Pyrrhic victory.

THE RAPIDLY DETERIORATING POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of postal matters.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in August 1964 I took the floor of the House to discuss the rapidly deteriorating postal service in this country and to recount specifically a few of the dozens of complaints which had come to me from the 13th District of Illinois up to that time. I was extremely gratified shortly thereafter to read in the press that the Postmaster General had recognized the problem and that he was pledging himself to correct it.

I regret to report, 14 months later, that the situation has not improved. In fact, if anything, it is worse now than when I first spoke on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, there is no segment of our country, there is no individual or corporation or school or union or institution which does not rely on mail service for communication. We are the greatest Nation in the world. We not only need a modern, efficient, dependable system of communication through the mails; we virtually must have it, and there is no excuse for not having it.

Surely, if we can wend our way to the moon, and meet that schedule precisely, we should be able to move our mail 50 miles overnight. There is no reason why the people of this country should be forced to suffer with a second, third, or fourth rate postal system. And from the file I am building on this subject, it appears that this is exactly what we are burdened with. I stand here today, taking the floor of the House again, to report on the "progress" which has been made in our mail service in the past 14 months. I unfortunately do not have the answers as to how to run the Post Office Department. It is a congressional responsibility to legislate for that department, not to administer it. Further, I am aware that there are many fine men and women in the Department, both in Washington, D.C., and around the Nation earnestly trying to improve postal services and procedures. My remarks today are not a condemnation of them but rather an attempt to point out problem areas with the hope that together the administration and the Congress can take the steps necessary to correct the mess we find ourselves in.

Since I came to Congress in January of 1963, hardly a week has gone by without at least one letter of complaint about the postal service in the 13th District of Illinois. And the complaints, in many cases, are extremely serious. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the complaints are so numerous and so serious that I feel compelled to set forth here a few representative examples of the types of problems involved. I might add that, in addition to the following letters of concern, I have also received a variety of comments about political activity by postal employees—activity engaged in even while conducting postal business.

The comments and complaints include such concerns as:

Advise me regarding the proper person to whom I would write concerning the archaic methods used in our local post office.

It's 2:15 p.m. and the mail is not here. The phone answerer at the post office says there are vacancies and no one wants to work for $2.48 per hour. What can we do about it?

This (a label enclosed) was sent from Watseka, Ill., about 115 miles away, on September 23, and arrived here on the afternoon of the 29th. The package contained my daughter's birthday present which was mailed to arrive on time. It didn't.

My monthly salary check from Amsterdam, N.Y., is mailed direct to ——— Bank. * * * The stub of the check is forwarded separately to my attention at our offices in the Merchandise Mart in Chicago. For the past 6 months, I generally receive the stub of the check in the office 2 days prior to the actual check being received by the bank 18 miles way.

Other comments have included:

One day last fall I received two mail deliveries in one day. The mail delivered the second time that day was all postmarked October 28 and I received it November 5. * * * Then at Christmas, my husband mailed his check to our bank. After 5 days and no confirmation from the bank, we called and they had just received our check that day.

A package mailed to me from Chicago Heights, postmarked there July 14, and arrived at the Roselle Post Office July 27, via insured parcel post. That is a 55 mile trip.

My mail is delivered between 3 and 4 p.m. even though I am living within the city limits of———.

After waiting for 2 weeks for an important receipt from the bank in Chicago and expensive phone toll calls calling back and forth to see if it was sent, finally the bank found it in their returned mail. Our address is 502 West Thomas and the bank sent it to 503 West Thomas and the post office sent it back to the bank.

Just recently my brother moved out here with me. He orders regular medicine from a Chicago drugstore. They mail the prescription first class. One day, he got the bill (mailed the same day the drug was mailed). He phoned the post office here and they gave him a lot of excuses. The next day the rural route man brought the package of medicine

to the door, saying it was mailed to Rochelle, Ill. * * * Address was typewritten and easy to read, Roselle, Ill.

My family in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, has a habit of writing to me by special delivery on weekends very frequently. Although postmarked in Cedar Rapids on Friday night, or early Saturday, these letters are rarely delivered before Monday morning (prior to regular service). * * * I would have received the same letter by 1st class mailing at 5 cents no later than this. * * * I have also had the same sort of experience with parcel post delivery. Although insured, sent special handling, etc. * * * in many instances packages sent to me from Cedar Rapids have not arrived here for more than a week. Cedar Rapids is only 225 miles from Chicago.

And the following comments:

Recently before our vacation I went to the post office and requested that our mail be held for 2 weeks. * * * I signed a change-of-address card, etc., which they advised me to do * * * when we arrived home, much to our surprise, there was a large stack of mail that had accumulated. Also I went to the local post office and some of our mail (very little) had been withheld.

During January the two most important items were an airmail special delivery parcel which cost over $1 to mail and was delivered by regular carrier and a large brown envelope which cost $1 for first-class postage and laid in the post office for 2 days. First-class postal service is expected when you pay for first-class service.

If there is a substitute for the regular carrier, we can expect mail to be delivered at noon and without fail we always receive someone else's mail in addition to our own.

The reports of delayed mail—3, 4, 5, days; 2 weeks in some cases—are numerous. My own mail is evidence of the quality of the service, for it generally takes a letter from my suburban Chicago area 3 or 4 days to reach my Washington office. Last spring, I sent my annual questionnaire to the residents of the 13th District of Illinois; using the postal patron local mailing procedures, we tagged and bundled and labeled the packages of envelopes. To my utter amazement, hundreds of the envelopes were returned to my office—no postmarks—stamped "insufficient address," "undeliverable," and, of all things on a postal patron—local, 13th Congressional District, Illinois, address—"addressee unknown."

I have listed numerous examples of inadequate postal service from my recent correspondence. The instances I have listed dramatize the serious inconveniences which citizens of our area are suffering. I have more serious instances to cite, however, and these should give the Post Office Department and the Members of the House and Senate pause to reflect on just what has truly happened to the postal service of the United States of America in recent years. Last year, Mr. Speaker, the president of one of our banks wrote me, in part, as follows:

Our monthly statements and cancelled checks for July were mailed on Monday, August 3. We have received telephone calls from 40 to 50 customers living in Chicago complaining that they have not received their July statements. We have been very much concerned over this and have been in touch with the Evanston post office every day and they have been most cooperative in their efforts to find the missing mail.

One of my close friends * * * the letter continued, a well-known realtor, telephoned about 10 days ago to tell me that their Chicago mail on August 3, containing deposits of about 170 checks ranging from $50 to $8,000 representing rentals and mortgage payments was never received by their Chicago bank.

It certainly puts this bank in a poor light with our customers.

On August 28, the same bank president sent the following report:

On Wednesday morning, August 26, our Chicago customers started telephoning to inform us that the missing statements had been received in good order; the only mark on the envelopes being the August 3 postmark. The envelopes were not soiled in any way and there was no rubber stamp indicating that they had been missent to some other city.

On September 25, I received the following report from the Post Office Department:

We are happy to inform you that subsequent to the complaint filed by the bank, the missing bank statements were delivered to all the addresses. Unfortunately, no endorsements were placed on the envelopes which would have explained the delay in delivery. We assume that they may have been located in supposedly empty postal equipment.

In March of 1965, the following report reached me:

We purchased a home in the unincorporated area of Northbrook in 1959. On July 8, 1960, a letter containing a check was mailed to us * * *. It was never received. From that time on, we have not received 24 letters, letters that we actually know were mailed, most of them containing checks.

We have notified the local post office a number of times, have had three postal inspectors come to my home, take notes, and never hear from them again.

It appears to your writer that * * * our lost mail * * * is placed in someone's box who is not returning it to the mailman or to us. The strange part is, there never has been one check cashed.

My verbal report from the Post Office Department in July was that the investigation was in progress, but that the section of the Post Office Department which handles such matters has a heavy backlog—small wonder—and, therefore, there would be an unduly long delay.

I wrote to the Post Office again on September 20, 1965, Mr. Speaker, and I have not yet had an answer to that followup letter.

Another file contains correspondence with a large company in my district, and its latest letter follows:

We have had previous correspondence on the subject of poor postal service here in * * *. You acknowledged my letters of April 23 and May 5, but there has been no sign of any postal inspectors as yet.

A more urgent matter was brought to my attention yesterday morning (June 1, 1965). On May 19 we sent our usual daily deposit of checks to our bank in Chicago by first-class mail. This envelope has not been received by the bank as yet. In talking with officials at the bank yesterday morning, I was informed that a number of deposits have "disappeared" in the mail, starting with New Year's weekend and then on Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Good Friday weekend, and now May 19.

My last report on this from the Post Office Department, dated July 6, states in part as follows:

The inspector in charge at Chicago, Ill., has advised there have been other losses of mail addressed to this bank. Postal inspectors have been working on this case for several months, but have not solved the case as yet.

There is nothing further than can be done about this loss until the inspection service has solved the case.

In September, another large firm in my district wrote:

Lately we have become very concerned about the poor mail service we are receiving. Customers who swear they have sent in their payments 4 or 5 days previously, are being needlessly antagonized by dunning notices. Merchants are angry because their charge vouchers arrive after our cut-off dates, when they were mailed 2 days early.

In short, our system, which depends so much on the efficiency of the mail, has been completely upset. We implore you to take immediate corrective action.

This case is pending also, Mr. Speaker, although after the evidence which has piled up, I feel I can predict what the final report of the Post Office will be.

And yesterday I received two carbon copies of letters. One was addressed to the postmaster in Chicago, and I quote in part:

Unfortunately, the same mail which brought your nice letter (about an earlier complaint) brought two other indications of extremely slow handling of mail matter, and we wonder what is happening. Here, for example, is a bid which we mailed to Vancouver, British Columbia on August 20, due at 5 p.m. on August 27, and it was declined by the recipient because it was received after the date of bid closing, which would mean that it was delivered on the 28th. On this bid, we were quoting on $660 worth of business.

Here is another incident that is even more serious. We were low bidders on a quantity of microscopes desired by the Tacoma, Wash., public schools but they asked for a sample to be delivered within 5 days. We airmailed a sample microscope (air parcel post) on August 30, and it was not delivered until September 8. This is the 10th day following dispatch, and we would consider that this would be slow for even regular parcel post, and certainly almost inexcusable for air parcel post.

The second letter concerns the efforts of the Schaumburg National Bank, located in Schaumburg, Ill., with a population of over 7,000 to transact its business as any other bank does. The letter is quoted in full as follows:

OCTOBER 12, 1965.

MR. DONALD L. SWANSON,
Regional Director, Department of the Post Office, Main Post Office Building, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. SWANSON: The Schaumburg State Bank is a new bank which opened April 30, 1965, in the rapidly developing community of Schaumburg, Ill.

Schaumburg, Ill., has an approximate population of 7,000, and we have over 2,000 accounts here at the bank. This puts the Schaumburg State Bank among the fastest growing banks in the State outside the city of Chicago. We endeavor to serve our customers as quickly and accurately as possible, but have run into several problems along this line due to improper post office facilities. We have discussed this problem with

Mr. Atcher, village president, and he stated that DONALD RUMSFELD, 13th District Representative, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, has written you in regard to a post office in Schaumburg, and that you do not feel that post office facilities are necessary at this time.

I do not believe that you understand the grave circumstances that can arise because of improper postal facilities. I would like to reiterate several things that have happened since we opened which could have cost us money, and criticism from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in Washington, D.C.

We sold funds to the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, in the amount of $100,000, 6 days ago. These funds were credited back to our account yesterday, October 11, and the advice advising us of the $100,000 deposit was mailed from LaSalle National Bank and Trust Co., Chicago, Ill. yesterday. We have not yet received the advice of the $100,000 or the interest due us, and as a result our books will not correctly reflect our cash position. This is not the first time this has happened. On many occasions our "return checks," that is, checks which customers have presented to us on other banks and are being returned to us for various reasons which can include nonsufficient funds or account closed, are received 1 or 2 days later than they normally should be. This could cause us a loss of a considerable amount.

Several weeks ago one of our customers had transferred $5,000 from a bank in California to our account through First National Bank of Chicago. First National Bank of Chicago mailed us an advice of the transfer. The advice was mailed to the "Schaumburg State Bank, Schaumburg, Illinois," and it was returned to the First National Bank marked "no town in Illinois." This could have caused us undue embarrassment and could have cost our customer considerable money as these funds were to be used for a real estate closing.

Chase Manhattan Bank in New York mailed me a letter several weeks ago which was returned "no such town in Illinois." This could have caused them to wonder—was there such a bank in Illinois? This could cause any customer to ask—Is there such a bank in Illinois?

We have mailed one of our loan customers in Chicago several overdue notices, and marked his credit that the payment is late, only to find that the Chicago Post Office returned his payment to him marked "no such town in Illinois."

I do not know what is required for a town to be recognized by the Federal Government, but the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago has requested that we do not mail our remittance to them which is normal procedure. This remittance ranges from $25,000 to $100,000 daily. They have asked us instead to send it by armored carrier. It seems ironic that the Schaumburg State Bank, which is in a way a part of the Federal Government because of our membership in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, is discriminated against because of lack of postal facilities—a lack that could possibly cost us considerable money and does cause us considerable embarrassment.

I realize that you have many problems facing you, and that your problems are ever as important as ours. I know you are trying to serve a region for which you are responsible as conscientiously as I am trying to serve the customers, directors, and stockholders of the Schaumburg State Bank, but I do hope that you will give your personal attention to the problem we have here in Schaumburg before the bank, or any of its customers, suffers a loss because of improper postal service.

Sincerely,

WARD A. WEAVER, *President.*

Perhaps the saddest commentary on the postal service is that evidenced by a certified letter—return receipt requested, incidentally—received on October 13, 1965, from a postal employee, who wrote in part as follows:

In my position as postal clerk at the ——— installation, I have received many, many complaints from patrons about poor service; loss of mail; misdelivery of mail; pilfering of mail. This ranges from third-class to registered mail.

I have also had similar experience—and can fully sympathize with each patron. Sympathy is not the answer. The patron is entitled to better service.

Many of the residents have told me that they have written complaints to you about poor postal service. * * * Have you received these letters? With the great number of lost letters, it makes one ask if this is the reason why something hasn't been done to correct this situation.

I could go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker, for my files are full. I will not take the time of the House to explore this further now for I am sure there must be many who could submit similar files and similar complaints and similar evidence. I do believe, however, that I cannot close this statement without printing in the RECORD the following letter, received from the Post Office Department, concerning the loss in the mail of 2,754 mailings of Philadelphia Mint proof sets, containing 38,169 sets of 1964 coins. I submit this story for the consideration of the House:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1965.

Hon. DONALD RUMSFELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in response to your letter of July 27, concerning the loss of proof coins mailed to Mr. Thomas G. Goss of Wilmette, Ill.

The Philadelphia Mint mailed 3,949,235 sets of 1964 proof coins through July 26, 1965. From 1 to 75 sets were included in the 549,387 insured mailings, and 3,754 such mailings containing 38,169 sets were claimed as not received.

Each set of proof coins consists of five coins (one each of 50 cents, 25 cents, 10 cents, 5 cents, and 1 cent pieces) with a face value of 91 cents. The mint charges $2.10 per set. Claims are settled on the basis of $2.10 per set. Duplicate shipments were furnished to addresses in about 55 percent of the cases involving 1964 proof claims and refunds were made to the remainder of claimants.

We have been aware that reported losses of coins in the mail were on the increase. Some months ago we arranged to give intensified attention to the handling of coin packages including those mailed by the mint. Investigation and observation of mint mailings were made on numerous dates. We also provided for coordination of investigations covering depredations involving coins to get the best practical results.

Proof sets of coins were mailed by the mint as third- or fourth-class insured matter, depending on the weight. Slightly more than 50 percent of the parcels for which claims were paid were mailed as minimum fee insured mail. No record is made of this type of mail while in transit or upon delivery. The remaining such parcels, which contained the major part of the lost sets, were numbered insured parcels, and while again no transit record is made a receipt is obtained upon delivery.

Our records show that 45 postal employees were arrested for theft of mail containing coins in calendar year 1964, and 43 such arrests were made in January 1 through July 30, 1965. A number of these cases directly involved proof sets of coins mailed by the mint. A number of factors aside from thefts by postal employees must be considered in relation to proof set losses. For example, on May 20, five mail handlers (nonpostal) employed at a large railroad terminal were apprehended for theft of coin and other parcels from the mail. Although no proof sets were directly involved, they had had access to a number of such parcels in transit through their terminal which were not received by addressees in Midwestern and Western States. In three other instances, employees (nonpostal) of star route contractors were apprehended for coin mail thefts. Also, there is likelihood of some proof coin mailings, particularly smaller ones, containing one to four sets, being lost or stolen after delivery into individual mail receptacles of the addressees. In this connection, postal inspectors made 12,790 arrests during fiscal year 1965 which included 7,850 apprehensions in cases involving theft, rifling or other mistreatment of mail or mail receptacles.

In addition to depredations, other factors such as damage also contribute to the loss of numismatic coins. As an example, a railroad mail storage car caught fire in May 1965 and a postal inspector found loose coins totaling $54.13 in the debris. All but 16 coins bore 1964 mint dates and 21 were Kennedy 50-cent pieces. The coins no longer had numismatic value, however, as they were seared and blackened.

When coins having unusual value are found loose in the mail they are sent to the postmaster at New York, N.Y., for disposition after awaiting possible claims by the owners. Sets of U.S. proof coins are considered in this category, and when ownership cannot be established, they are sold with other unusual coins at auction. No record is maintained of the type of coins sold but we do know that $3,956.87 was realized from such sales in 1964, and proof coins were included among those sold.

The Philadelphia Mint has discontinued the manufacture and sale of proof coins in order to devote entire production capacity to the manufacture of coins for circulation. You may be sure that if such manufacture and sale resumes we will be in touch with Treasury officials beforehand to arrange the most secure method of mailing and handling. Meanwhile, we will continue to give intensive attention to the security of the mail and particularly that which is most susceptible to depredation.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

H. B. MONTAGUE,
Chief Inspector.

I do not know the answer to these problems. I do know, however, that I cannot simply join one of my constituents who ended his letter of complaint and frustration by saying:

Sound like a chronic complainer? A person can take just so much and when invited to comment will do so. If you had not inquired, I would have silently borne the burden of many others and said—Oh, well, at least we got it.

From the letters in my file and the numerous complaints which I have heard at meetings and from visitors to my office, he would seem to be one of the lucky ones.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no problem which does not have a solution. There are problems of varying complexity—and this one is unquestionably one of the

more complex. Many factors are undoubtedly involved in the breakdown in service, and the 13th Congressional District has been extremely vocal in pointing out a number of these.

Recently I took occasion to speak on the floor in connection with the civil service and postal pay increase bill which I supported. In part, I discussed one of the problems involved as follows:

> What may be a fair wage in one part of this country may not be a fair wage in another part of the country. The 13th District of Illinois, and the area around Chicago, is an area that has a very high cost of living. There is no question that the postal employees in our area do not make enough at the present time to have a reasonable standard of living. They just do not make enough money. The wages are inadequate. * * * Why has not (a proposal) come before the Congress * * * that takes into account the clear, well-known, and well-publicized differences in the cost of living in the various portions of this country?

I have heard from residents of our district that some postal employees, to augment inadequate incomes, have entered into "house-watching" agreements, whereby they take time from their delivery schedule at each particular house where so requested, and, for a fee, they will enter the house, check the heat and the pets and do other incidental tasks—a pleasant enough service if you are away from the city, but not so pleasant for the family at the end of the route which does not receive its mail until 4:30 in the afternoon, if enough people are out of town that day.

I would take occasion here, too, to object to that time-honored institution—the politically appointed "acting postmaster." Apparently, the proper administration of the postal service is more complicated and more demanding than one might at first be led to believe. The Civil Service Commission was established to prevent deterioration of Government services by appointment of unqualified or inadequately prepared personnel—and yet our postal service is being, in many cases, hastened in its deterioration by this very same type of political appointment.

The appointment of a postmaster lies in the hands of the administration's party—and in more cases than not, the appointment goes to a devoted party worker who—all too often knows little or nothing about the Post Office Department when he takes the job. We then have the convenience of appointing "acting postmasters" who serve indeterminate lengths of time until "postmasters" are finally appointed. Anyone can see that, whether originally qualified or not, if one does the job for 6 months or a year, he or she might very well know the ropes well enough at the end of that time to take the examination and at least end up on the register. And there is the third magic step—almost invariably, if the name of the acting postmaster appears on the register, no matter whether first, or second, or third, he wakes up to find himself postmaster.

I believe politics must leave the postal service. The spoils of political power almost wrecked the Government service until the Civil Service Commission was created. The rewards of faithful political service should not be unrelated positions of public trust. I cannot help but feel empathy for those dedicated, conscientious career employees of the Post Office Department as they watch while one after another takes over the top spot in their particular offices—one after another political appointees who, in many cases, had had little more to do with the post office than buy a stamp or send a package or accept delivery of mail.

In my testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I recommended that consideration be given to relieving Members of Congress of responsibilities involving postmasterships and rural letter carriers. I strongly believe that such a step would be in the best interest of the country and of the postal service, as well as of the Congress.

I would be remiss if I did not further point out the inadequacy of existing postal facilities in my district. In some areas studies and surveys and consideration have gone on for years, and the towns—such as Schaumburg, referred to earlier—with populations presently of 5,000 to 6,000 to 7,000 people, cannot even get themselves listed in the postal directory as post offices, branch offices, or stations. In March of 1964, in response to communications from my office and from the village involved, I received the following comments concerning one of our post offices:

> There are no present plans for any additional facilities in the community at this time, as it is anticipated that the culmination of plans above mentioned will solve existing difficulties.

Similar problems exist in other townships in northern Cook County.

Mr. Speaker, the plans have been carried through, and the service is worse than it has ever been. Certainly, in this country, we ought to be able to effectively meet the needs of rapidly growing areas—not 3 or 4 or 5 years after growth has taken place, but when it is taking place, or at least immediately thereafter. The continued lag between growth and service is destructive of efficient mail service.

A review of the amounts of money appropriated for the operations of the Post Office Department over recent fiscal years shows the following: fiscal year 1963, $4,648,924,300; fiscal year 1964, $4,925,500,000; fiscal year 1965, $5,202 million; fiscal year 1966, $5,324,400,000—with more to be appropriated. The steady increase is requested and justified year after year on the premise that it is necessary in order to modernize operations and improve service. And still we appropriate more and hope for the best.

And so it goes on. The population increases. The rates increase. The cost of living rises. Facilities do not increase in relation to the population. Service does not increase in relation to rates. Employees do not spend their lives in positions where they do not earn a reasonable wage, and where the incentive to reach the top is taken away before they even start to climb.

Mr. Speaker, if the telephone communications system of this country were operating in this manner, there would be such a public outcry that A.T. & T. would become a Government agency. Thank heaven, and private enterprise, this is not the case. It is not a branch of the Federal Government, and it is making money, expanding operations, reducing rates, and providing efficient modern service. There must be a lesson here someplace.

The recently appointed Postmaster General, Mr. O'Brien, is a skilled politician and able public servant—which I admire. Let us hope that he will be an equally skilled Postmaster General and be successful in putting the Department back on the track of efficiency and reliability.

DRAFT YOUNG TOUGHS, PUNKS, AND HOODLUMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Selective Service Act to provide for the drafting of young persons now considered morally defective or deficient because of criminal records which include juvenile offenses, drunkenness, narcotic addiction, and serious moving traffic infractions. Such persons will receive training and serve in special combat units in the Armed Forces.

In the light of the crisis in Vietnam, I think it is absurd that the Army does not draft our Nation's oversize group of punks and hoods. I am not saying that most of them will be any great shakes as soldiers, but they can at least be of some use as extra manpower.

The Army presently refuses young men with records of juvenile, narcotics, drunkenness, and criminal offenses because it believes they are not morally qualified for the privilege of Army service. This is ridiculous in light of the Vietnam situation. The sooner the Army starts making use of America's large contingent of punks and young toughs, the better off we will be. Drafted punks will be good substitutes for persons who can make a greater contribution in other ways, and I personally feel that Army discipline and Army life may have something to offer to the punks and young hoods who now clutter up our streets. No doubt the Army can offer some training that will help rehabilitate young punks and teach the unemployable ones a trade.

I do not believe we can afford to continue drafting only those who satisfy high draft standards because this policy is self-defeating. It drafts those who could make a more valuable contribution elsewhere, and allows those who can make no other contribution and who might profit from service to escape it as morally deficient. The career soldier's

concept of the military services as units in which membership is a privilege is inappropriate during wartime or during a period like the Vietnamese crisis. Besides, a unit like the Foreign Legion which took criminals and misfits without question enjoys a reputation as high as most of the best American units.

Nevertheless, I do not believe that punks and criminals who might be drafted under my proposal should be indiscriminately mixed with other soldiers. Most ought to go in special units, and it seems fitting to me that they be combat trained. Individuals with narcotics records particularly ought to be kept apart from other troops. I would suggest special "junkie battalions" for them.

This certainly should cut down our ever-increasing crime rate and make our streets and parks safe again.

PUBLIC REACTION TO RUMP ANTICS ON BANK MERGER BILLS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a handful of members of the House Banking and Currency Committee made a mockery of the rules of the House by sneaking into the committee room under false pretenses to hold a rump session.

This was a sad performance which hurts the reputation of the entire Congress. The session, of course, was totally illegal. That point has been firmly established.

The rump session did show plainly the desperation behind the move to bail out Manufacturers-Hanover Trust Co., the Nation's fourth largest bank, and the other big banks under prosecution for antitrust law violations. That frantic so-called meeting lays bare the massive pressures behind the bank merger bills.

Rice Odell, business editor for the Washington Daily News, tells about this session in today's editions. I place Mr. Odell's column in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 20, 1965]

DARK PLOTS EMERGE ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Rice Odell)

A pint-sized melodrama, with farcical overtones, was acted out at the Capitol yesterday.

The main plot centered on a bitterly disputed bill before the 33-member House Banking and Currency Committee which would provide retroactive antitrust exemption for three bank mergers, and would also soften merger guidelines to be used by the Justice Department and the courts in the future.

Leading characters in support of the bill are Representatives THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Democrat, of Ohio, and WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, backed by Republicans and several other Democrats. In violent opposition is committee chairman, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, and other Democrats. The play begins.

ACT I

The morning before, Mr. Patman has abruptly adjourned a meeting of the committee before a quorum arrived, thereby apparently sounding the death knell of the bill this session. An angry Representative ASHLEY goes into a huddle with Mr. MOORHEAD and one or two others. They plot darkly.

It is a few minutes before 10 a.m. yesterday, and the handsome Mr. MOORHEAD strolls casually through the committee's office toward the hearing room. He is challenged by a member of the staff.

Just going in to pick up some papers I left there, Mr. MOORHEAD is said to have replied.

He enters the cavernous Rayburn Building meeting room, goes to the main door, unlocks it and lets in a dozen or so of his colleagues waiting in the hall. They start to hold a meeting.

Chairman PATMAN has not called it. He doesn't even know about it. In fact he is at the hospital visiting his wife. Mr. ASHLEY, as ranking majority member present, presides. A staff man reported that the lights were all out at the beginning.

Shortly, an opponent of the bill, Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, arrives and, with his seniority, claims the chair. He rules immediately that the meeting is illegal.

Aha, says the Ashley-Moorhead group—rule 1 of the committee provides for regular meetings every first and third Tuesday of the month, unless canceled by the chairman. And this he didn't do.

Yes, he did, Mr. REUSS says, and a paper is produced to support the claim. But Mr. REUSS is outvoted and the group continues its meeting, voting favorably on the bank merger bill and to report it to the House.

ACT II

Mr. PATMAN returns, finding what he later calls a "rump session," illegal because he did cancel the regular meeting and also because there was no quorum present.

The Ashley-Moorhead forces issue a press release emphasizing that there was no cancellation, and that there was, indeed, a quorum present. Complete disagreement continues throughout.

Mr. ASHLEY, after the disputed meeting, goes to the House and obtains consent to file the report voted on. Mr. PATMAN says it's not a legal report.

Mr. REUSS calls a press conference to propose a compromise bill which, he says, its so important Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach should be called to testify.

He said he thinks he can get his proposal to the House "about as fast as that piece of paper that was acted on this morning."

Mr. PATMAN promises to fight the Ashley bill "by all means possible" anyway.

Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Democrat, of Texas, says it must be the "silly season * * * we're acting like a bunch of State legislators."

Another well-known business writer, Lyle Denniston of the Washington Evening Star, also writes a very significant piece for today's editions. As you will note, the headline sums up the reasons behind the rush for this legislation and the obvious reasons for yesterday's rump session. The headline reads: "Merger Survival Chances Up for Manufacturers, Hanover."

I quote these paragraphs from Mr. Denniston's story:

Chances are gaining that the biggest bank merger ever—the one that joined New York City's Manufacturers Trust Co. and Hanover Bank—will be left undisturbed.

A plan to break up the merged institution is scheduled for filing in a New York Federal court on November 1—less than 2 weeks from now.

But a confusing round of contradictory action in Congress yesterday may lead to a postponement of the court filing. Such a postponement almost surely will mean that the merger will be saved, even though it was once ruled unlawful by a Federal judge.

Are we, the Congress, to allow an illegal act of a rump session help to overturn a court decision?

I do not believe this is the wish of the majority of the Congress. This would be shameful if true.

As the press has reported, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative MOOREHEAD, of Pittsburgh, is the Member who sneaked into the Banking and Currency Committee room in the dark, and unlocked the doors. Mr. MOORHEAD has made little secret of his interest in this legislation. Last week, the New York Times carried this significant quote:

Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said the lack of action on the legislation was particularly troublesome for banks, notably the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., in New York, the First National Bank of Lexington, Ky., and the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago, which are under court orders to dissolve mergers.

"Courts may take into account the fact that the legislation is almost through Congress," Mr. MOORHEAD said, "but of course this is not certain."

These desperate acts of a handful of Members are putting the whole Congress on trial before the jury of public opinion. I predict that the reaction to yesterday's rump session will be heard for many months to come. I am convinced that the people of the United States do not want their affairs conducted in secret, lawless sessions in darkened committee rooms. The people will speak louder about yesterday's actions than anyone.

AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise today to call to your attention a most unusual group of young people, the first group of this size, visiting the Nation's Capital today. These are some 40 American Samoan youngsters, with a number of their teachers and chaperones.

American Samoa joined the family of the United States at the turn of the century. Since that time it has been an unorganized territory of the United States and the people are nationals of the United States. Many of them have become citizens of the United States. They represent the only community under American sovereignty below the equator, and they are situated in the beautiful South Pacific midway between Hawaii, Tahiti, and Australia. These are the romantic islands of the South

Seas about which Robert Louis Stevenson, Margaret Mead, James Mitchener, and Somerset Maugham wrote so enthusiastically.

It is an American community that has largely continued to govern itself in terms of its own Polynesian culture. Some time ago a popular magazine, the Reader's Digest, referred to it as "America's shame in the South Pacific," which it attributed to a "half century of neglect." Now the Reader's Digest is featuring American Samoa again in its forthcoming November issue. It will report that an economic and social revolution has happened in American Samoa, and it is now America's showcase in the southwest Pacific.

Indeed American Samoa has combined the new with the old so splendidly that the World's Fair sought this group to represent all of Polynesia at the New York World's Fair. These bright, handsome, and charming people have been the feature attraction at the Polynesian Village for 2 years now, and they have brought credit to America in the image they have created for the hundreds of thousands of our citizens and foreign visitors who have been to the fair.

The youngsters are leaving tonight for Samoa. Chairman ASPINALL of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee asked me to inform the House that we are so concerned on our committee that the political transition now going on in Samoa be carried out under the best auspices, that a very substantial number of Members of the House and of the other body will be going to American Samoa in early December to consult with them about their political future. So, until that day, I want to say to these fine people of our American community, Tofa Soifua.

MISUSE OF THE FBI BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department is misusing and desecrating the good name of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Efforts are being made to give the impression that the FBI thinks Francis X. Morrissey is a fit and proper candidate for Federal judge, and that the FBI thinks that Morrissey has been truthful on matters of his residency when in fact reports in the Boston Globe and other newspapers indicate the accounts given by Morrissey as to his residency were contradictory. He could not be a bona fide resident of Georgia for the purpose of being admitted to the bar of that State during the same period he was a bona fide resident of Massachusetts for purposes of running for political office.

The blame for this misuse of the FBI's good name must fall upon Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach whose office directs and limits the extent of the FBI investigations on these nominations to Federal judgeships and on other matters. The present pattern of misuses of the FBI has brought the Justice Department to its lowest point since the Harding administration and the reign of Harry M. Daugherty as Attorney General.

It was Katzenbach who gave us an absurd interpretation of the FBI report on Morrissey that led him to conclude "that there is no basis whatsoever to question either Judge Morrissey's credibility or his recollection of events surrounding his studies in Georgia."

This was a desperate last-minute move to give the public and Congress the impression that the FBI is endorsing Francis X. Morrissey. This is the worst type of deception for political purposes for it degrades the FBI—a great investigative organization that can do a magnificent job if not handcuffed by a politically motivated Attorney General.

The Justice Department submitted an incomplete FBI report on the David G. Bress nomination prior to the first hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee. That report made no reference to the fabrication of the phony stock certificates by the law firm of Newmyer & Bress that were secretly slipped into the Melvin A. Viner estate.

Even the second report submitted by the Justice Department was inadequate in its scope and did not call the attention of the Judiciary Committee to the full evidence and the full implications of the fabrication of the phony stock certificates in this estate. In fact, the Justice Department press office told the Washington Post that there was nothing illegal or improper in the actions of the Newmyer & Bress law firm fabricating the new stock certificates 2 weeks after the death of Melvin A. Viner and secretly slipping them into the estate without notice to the widow or to the children.

Attorney General Katzenbach has the responsibility for the inadequate and misleading reports to the Judiciary Committee, and for the limitations on the investigation that resulted in an inadequate investigation.

Mr. Katzenbach had the responsibility for the whitewash report on the Walter Jenkins matter a year ago when an effort was made to use the FBI for a clever coverup.

Mr. Katzenbach had the responsibility for the investigation, the reports, and the letters that were sent to the Senate Rules Committee in an effort to smear and discredit Don B. Reynolds and to protect Bobby Baker and some of his high-powered political associates.

Not since Attorney General Harry Daugherty have we had such a low standard of Justice Department operation.

Mr. Speaker, as a continuation of my remarks, I insert in the RECORD at this point an excellent article by Mr. Max Lerner in the Washington Evening Star of October 19, 1965, and another article by Mr. Julian Morrison of the Washington Daily News of the same date:

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS FLAW OPENS

(By Max Lerner)

A civilization, like the fabled dike, shows its vulnerability not by any massive breakdown but by a seemingly slight flaw through which the floodwaters will, in time, course. Just such a flaw has opened up in the system of Federal judicial appointments, with the choice of Francis J. Morrissey of Boston for the Federal district court.

By one of those ironic twists in the ways of politicians, it has come about that what the hubris of the Kennedy family was unable to achieve while one of its sons was in the White House—the elevation of a legal cipher and a judicial nobody to the Federal court system—has now been all but achieved under the ready political largesse as well as the hubris of President Johnson.

To the credit of the American Bar Association, it has bitterly opposed the nomination through the testimony of the chairman of its important committee on the Federal judiciary.

What he dug up was an almost unbelievable record: That, after failing the Massachusetts bar exam, Morrissey went to Georgia, got a law degree after 3 months from a diploma mill there, and was admitted to the Georgia bar; that he had failed to report this diploma-mill episode to the ABA committee; that he had failed the Massachusetts bar a second time; that after being admitted to the bar after a third try he had never tried a court case as a lawyer; that after he became a municipal judge he had never tried a jury case nor an equity case.

If the American legal profession accepts a man with such qualifications on the prized Federal bench, it will accept anyone.

Morrissey, to do him justice, has many virtues. He slips in and out of the detailed biography of Joseph P. Kennedy, "The Founding Father," by Richard Whalen, as the worshipful friend and faithful retainer of that patriarchal figure, who arranged to get him his municipal judgeship. He was Jack Kennedy's political mentor when he started his career, and then his office manager. He watched over the political debut of TEDDY KENNEDY as well.

He is doubtless—as a number of witnesses testified before the Senate committee, including Representative MCCORMACK and Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts—a faithful and loyal friend and a fine family man. He is a fluent orator in the grand Boston tradition and a man of commanding charm.

He has all those qualities. But alas, the qualities he almost wholly lacks are exactly those he needs for the Federal court: Knowledge and training in the law and mastery of its traditions and procedures.

Some might say: Why raise so much fuss over a single appointment, especially when he is such a fine fellow?

They forget how complex, exacting, and crucial are the cases coming before the Federal judiciary and what stakes of fortune and fate are involved in them, not only for giant corporations but for ordinary unimportant men.

They forget also the dreams of young law students and lawyers, giving the fire of their excellence in brain and spirit in the hope that ascent up the judicial ladder will go to merit—or at least that it will not be bestowed on a nullity of merit. Break this hope and you kill the dream.

Another case has hit the news at the same time—one in which Judge Edward Weinfeld, a Federal district judge who is recognized as one of the sharpest and deepest judicial minds of the Nation, has been denied the appointment to the U.S. Court of Appeals, for which the best men in the legal pro-

fession recommended him, while a far less distinguished judge—with political weight behind him—got the post.

Thus in one case the exactly wrong man gets a judgeship for which he has no qualifications, while in another the exactly right one is denied the judgeship which he would grace. I don't know what jokester, in Washington or wherever, shakes the dice that turned up so madly.

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 19, 1965]

AFFIDAVIT ON STOCK IS CIRCULATED—BRESS NOMINATION DEBATED TODAY

(By Julian Morrison)

An affidavit stating that stock certificates handled by the law firm of David G. Bress were not even in existence on the dates they bear has been shown to key members of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The Senate is expected to debate today Mr. Bress' controversial nomination as U.S. attorney for the District.

The affidavit bears the signature of an official of the Goes Lithographing Co. of Chicago, which printed the blank stock certificates used by the Arcade-Sunshine Laundry Co. of Washington.

Mr. Bress was secretary of and attorney for, the company during a bitter estate suit that followed the death in 1955 of one of three brothers who owned the laundry.

WIDOW DISAGREES

The surviving brothers, Robert and Leonard Viner, claimed their brother Melvin's stock must be sold back to the company at half its book value under an agreement signed in 1949. Melvin Viner's widow disagreed, and the suit followed.

A key point in the suit was the existence of stock certificates that bore the date of December 26, 1950.

In his affidavit, obtained by the widow's lawyer, Goes Lithographing Vice President Charles B. Goes III states that the certificates were first printed by his company in March 1953.

In depositions on file in U.S. district court here, Robert and Leonard Viner at first stated the certificates were signed on the date they bear.

AMENDED ANSWERS

Later they were allowed to amend their answers in ink on the depositions stating that the certificates were actually signed about the middle of January 1955, several weeks after their brother's death.

The brothers said in their revised depositions that the new stock certificates were issued as replacements for ones that had been lost but which, in fact, had been issued on the dates they bore. In the meantime, however, the suit had been settled out of court.

Mrs. Viner's attorney, Bruce Sundlun, said yesterday he obtained the settlement after presenting the Goes affidavit to Albert Philipson of the Bress firm.

The Goes affidavit also states that Mr. Philipson, on March 10, 1955, wrote the lithographing company to determine when the stock certificates that were made out 2 months earlier, but dated as of 1950, had first been manufactured.

The Philipson letter said, in part:

"Enclosed is a stock certificate blank which I have purchased from a local stationery store. I have been using this particular form for several years.

"I would like to know the year in which you first manufactured and sold in the Washington area this particular form GOES 509 in its present appearance. (If there has ever been any change in appearance).

"In addition, I would like to know if possible the date when this particular blank which is enclosed herewith was manufactured and sold in the Washington area."

The Chicago company replied that "we do not find that the design has been changed in any shape or form" since originally printed in 1927.

The Goes affidavit states, however, that a later examination of the certificates in question shows that they were part of an issue whose design varied in several particulars from the original stock certificates which had been used by the laundry company for a number of years.

Those original certificates made no mention of the agreement binding the brothers and their heirs to resell the stock only to the laundry and not to outsiders.

The new certificates, which the surviving brothers said were replacements of lost certificates, bear the restrictive clause.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. BONNER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, due to the deplorable conditions in the merchant marine, I have, today, introduced a bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to create the Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to establish a new independent agency to be known as the Federal Maritime Administration. It will not be under any other department, agency or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government or under the authority of any such department, agency or instrumentality.

When Congress enacted the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, it determined that our maritime policy could best be implemented and administered by an independent agency. It did so after a brief and unsatisfactory experience in attempting to carry out the promotion of the American merchant marine within the Department of Commerce in the early 1930's. During its period as an independent agency, the original Maritime Commission revitalized the merchant marine and produced a miracle of ship construction and operation which contributed so heavily to our victory in World War II. Following the war, criticisms of the activities of the then existing membership of the Commission brought about the adoption of a proposal to again place the maritime functions, both promotional and regulatory, within the Department of Commerce, but with a very high degree of autonomy.

I will not attempt in this brief statement to detail the effectiveness of the agency during the next period from 1951 to 1961, except to say that the results were spotty at best. And, as brought out in the investigations by committees of the House and Senate in the years 1958 through 1960, the regulatory functions were disclosed to be most inadequately handled.

So again we had a reorganization under plan No. 7 of 1961, which provided for granting completely independent status for the handling of the regulatory functions under the newly created Federal Maritime Commission. The promotional functions were left in the Department of Commerce.

At the time this plan was proposed, I was not entirely happy about it. I urged that, if it were adopted, the promotional functions of the Federal Maritime Administration, even though under the overall policy direction of the Secretary of Commerce, be administered as independently and autonomously as possible. I was assured that this would be the case even though the Maritime Subsidy Board would not be composed of Presidentially appointed and congressionally approved members. I felt at the time that the plan deserved a chance and, therefore, I supported its approval in the House.

Now, after 4 years of experience under Reorganization Plan No. 7, I must confess regrets over my support of that plan. I feel that our maritime policy must be implemented and administered by an independent agency composed of qualified people appointed by the President and approved in the customary manner with the advice and consent of the Senate and vested with responsibility and authority to carry out the policies and laws laid down by Congress. This does not seem to be possible under a subordinated bureau buried deep in a large department having many other various responsibilities in its jurisdiction.

Our merchant marine is too important a part of our national posture to be allowed to continue to drift in a sea of inaction as it has for the past 4 years.

I intend as soon as possible in the next session to hold hearings on this legislation with the hope that by giving everyone a full opportunity to express themselves we will be able to get our merchant marine policy back on course.

I include a letter published in the Washington Post of October 20, 1965:

SEA POWER AND SHIPPING

Your editorials "Purloined Wisdom" (Oct. 4) and "Subsidies and Benefits" (Oct. 11) displayed an amazing lack of understanding of the basic concepts of seapower. The objective of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was not "an efficient, economically competitive merchant marine," but to provide the maritime industrial support required by our Navy. Without this support, our mighty Navy may provide the uninformed with the comforting illusion of seapower, but that is all it would be, an illusion.

The logic of these editorials might have been quite persuasive had you not mistaken the means for the end.

C. H. MEAD,
Captain, USN (retired).

CHEVY CHASE.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the chairman of my committee, Mr. BONNER, of North Carolina, in endorsing his remarks today concerning our sinking maritime policy.

I have had the opportunity of serving with Mr. BONNER on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for 3 years. Mr. BONNER has always been a source of inspiration to every member of this committee and to me in particular. I have found his judgment, experience, and knowledge of the affairs of our Merchant Marine to be without peer in this country. Leading representatives of the maritime industry have on many occasions voiced these very same sentiments, and I know that they not only have admiration for his professional knowledge, but also they express a deep gratitude for his personal opinions.

Chairman BONNER has stated that the Maritime Administration in the past year and one-half has been making proposals and moving in a direction that is contrary to the best interests of the U.S.-flag vessels.

The veiled proposals which have been placed in the trade winds of American maritime policy have alarmed the American merchant marine industry and caused hesitancy and uncertainty in the continuance of American policy which was so forcefully stated in the 1936 act.

Last Friday in a speech in Hershey, Pa., I stated that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries would undoubtedly take up in great detail the reports requested and submitted to the Maritime Administrator in the special task force. This last report seems to be another probe into the economics of worldwide shipping whose thrust does not appear to be in the best interests of the U.S.-flag policy. It has always been my opinion that our regulatory agencies and the executive leadership in this country should function in the best interests not only of the United States, but within the agency for the best interests of the American indusry which they regulate.

I do not feel, and I am certain the industry does not feel, that the latest task-force proposal does anything in favor of the merchant marine, but in effect would destroy it. We have seen proposal after proposal with no firm policy emanating from these studies.

Accordingly, I am happy to cosponsor with Mr. BONNER, a bill to create the Federal Maritime Administration which will have at its head a Federal Maritime Board. The Board under my proposal shall be composed of five members.

Mr. MAILLIARD, of California, the ranking minority member of the committee and a member since 1953, whose judgment is always valued by members of the committee, made a statement on September 30 in agreement with those expressed by Chairman BONNER and myself. At that time, he submitted H.R. 11355.

AMBASSADOR FOSTER'S STATEMENT ON DISARMAMENT AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address by Ambassador Foster on disarmament at the United Nations.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and the American public generally will be interested, I know, in having available the full text of the important and powerful statement before Committee 1 of the General Assembly of the United Nations by Ambassador William C. Foster, of the U.S. delegation to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

"The United States remains committed to the objective of general and complete disarmament," Ambassador Foster said, stressing that the highest priority is given to the question of nonproliferation—the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons. He remarked that the United States, while recognizing the difficulties, does not take a pessimistic view.

Ambassador Foster's statement follows:

As we resume our discussion of disarmament questions—some 4 months after the meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and 1 month after the recent session of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament—some of us may be tempted to ask, as did one of our colleagues at our first organizational meeting: Has any progress been achieved? Has any solution been arrived at? Must we start again from scratch?

Without in any way minimizing the difficulties that lie ahead, the United States does not take a pessimistic view. Progress depends to a great extent on the political will for agreement. For its part, the United States has that will. We hope that in the course of our discussions others will manifest an equally strong and equally sincere will to work for the concrete results that all of our peoples desire and look to us to achieve.

The United States remains fully committed to the objective of general and complete disarmament, and we continue to work toward that end. But there is one problem that is of such pressing urgency today and so vital to maintenance of the peace in the future and, indeed, to holding open the doors to progress toward general disarmament, that my Government—and, I am happy to say, almost all the governments represented in this room today—attach the highest priority to it. That question is nonproliferation—the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons.

On June 15, 1956, the United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted by an overwhelming majority Resolution DC/225, in which it recommended that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament "accord special priority to the consideration of the question of a treaty or convention to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, giving close attention to the various suggestions that agreement could be facilitated by adopting a program of certain related measures." Nonproliferation received major attention in the deliberations of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament when it reconvened in July, as you will note from the Committee's report which is before us.

In his message to the opening session of the ENDC on July 27, President Johnson stated that the very first objective he had assigned the U.S. delegation was "to seek agreements that will limit the perilous spread of nuclear weapons, and make it possible for all countries to refrain without fear from entering the nuclear arms race." The President also said: "No difference among any of us, on any other issue, can be allowed to bar agreement in this critical area."

That spirit motivated the U.S. delegation on August 17, 1965, when I had the honor of presenting to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament the U.S. draft treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Our draft treaty embodies important contributions from Canada, Italy, and the United Kingdom. The text of the U.S. draft treaty may be found annexed to the report of the ENDC, which has been distributed as General Assembly Document A/5986 dated September 22, 1965.

Also annexed to the report is a joint memorandum on nonproliferation submitted by eight members of the ENDC—Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden, and the United Arab Republic. We welcomed their memorandum as a useful contribution to the ENDC's discussions. In their memorandum, the eight expressed their deep concern with the problem of nonproliferation. Referring to the draft treaty which the United States tabled at Geneva, the eight countries expressed regret "that it has not yet been possible to reconcile the various approaches for an appropriate or adequate treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons." We fully share their regret.

Also submitted to the Eighteen-Nation Committee and appended to its report is a draft unilateral declaration of nonacquisition of nuclear weapons, submitted by the Italian Government at the initiative of its distinguished Foreign Minister and now President of the General Assembly.

If we recall the long record of United Nations efforts to encourage a nonproliferation treaty, I am sure that all must agree that the offering of the U.S. draft treaty for negotiation at Geneva on August 17, 1965, was a very significant step. It marked the first time that an actual treaty text had been put on the table to implement the General Assembly's unanimous call 4 years ago in Resolution 1665 (XVI) for an international agreement to bar the spread of nuclear weapons. The U.S. draft treaty is our effort to respond to the renewed wish of the United Nations embodied in the June 1965 resolution of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

In tabling the U.S. draft treaty in Geneva, I made perfectly clear that it was offered "for discussion and negotiation." We were prepared and eager to begin negotiation for a nonproliferation agreement at Geneva. We remain so today.

Let me now say a few brief words about the United States draft treaty. We sought to make it as simple and straightforward as possible. It would prohibit nuclear powers from transferring nuclear weapons into the national control of any country not having nuclear weapons, either directly, or indirectly through a military alliance. Nonnuclear states would have a corresponding obligation not to receive the transfer of nuclear weapons. The nonnuclear states would also be prohibited from manufacturing nuclear weapons and the nuclear states could not help them. Both the nuclear and the nonnuclear states could take no other action to increase the number of independent nuclear entities in the world, whether a state or some other kind of organization. Control over nu-

clear weapons, that is, power to use them, now rests only in national hands.

We believe it important that all parties undertake in a nonproliferation treaty to cooperate in facilitating the application to their peaceful nuclear activities of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards or their equivalent. We recommend as strong a provision on this subject as is possible in the light of the views of all those interested in acceding. Many countries are increasingly accepting IAEA safeguards on their peaceful nuclear activities, and we welcome this trend. My own country has placed one of its large nuclear power reactors under IAEA safeguards, and the United Kingdom has done likewise.

In terms of a nonproliferation treaty, however, the application of international safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities should not be viewed as of interest to the nuclear powers alone. On the contrary international safeguards should be of special interest to the nonnuclear states as a means of assuring them that their neighbors and others are in fact complying with the treaty.

Our discussions at Geneva were most useful in clarifying points of view and in highlighting the major issues which must be resolved on the way to agreement on a treaty. Unfortunately, those discussions could not progress further toward agreement because the Soviet Union sought to impose certain prior conditions which are unnecessary and unreasonable. In doing so, the Soviet Union appeared to maintain its preoccupation with the achievement of certain of its political objectives in Europe, a preoccupation which unfortunately it has so far permitted to have priority over the worldwide danger of nuclear proliferation. Once more today, the Soviet representative has given priority to that preoccupation.

As I made clear at Geneva, the United States is opposed to any form of dissemination of nuclear weapons, direct or indirect. We seek no nuclear sharing arrangement in NATO which could involve such dissemination. The treaty we have suggested would bar such dissemination since it would prevent the creation of any additional entity, whether a state or organization, having an independent power to use nuclear weapons.

If the Soviet Government is as determined and prepared to prevent proliferation as its representative would have us believe today, then I think it would be highly preferable that we address ourselves objectively and dispassionately to the problem. Sterile polemics about the Federal Republic of Germany will not help us to achieve agreement, and to continue on this plan would not augur well for the future of our discussions.

The Soviet representative also sought to make us believe that his government is and has been second to none in its determination and readiness to act and prevent proliferation. The facts do not bear this out as regards the past. Judging by actions, rather than words, Soviet interest in halting proliferation is belated. But, if they say their interest today is deep and genuine, we do not question it.

I can only note with regret that the Soviet Union did not appear to be moved by the same sense of urgency as the United States in Geneva. However, the fact that the Soviet Union has now offered a draft treaty of its own for discussion may indicate that there is basis for hope that the urgency of countering proliferation is coming to be recognized. In its present form the Soviet draft continues to focus narrowly on Soviet preoccupations with NATO and does so in a manner which we cannot accept. Yet we are encouraged by the fact that perhaps the Soviet Union is now prepared to negotiate. If the possibility of real negotiation now finally exists, we can view this as a sign of progress. I propose that we return to Geneva as soon as possible with the firm resolve to seek to agree on a treaty text we can all support.

An important trend of recent discussions, whether in the United Nations Disarmament Commission or the 18-Nation Committee, has been to view the problem of nonproliferation in the context of a broad group of related measures of which a nonproliferation treaty would be the central measure. It has been suggested by some, however, that these related measures should be a necessary step on the part of the nuclear powers to accompany the foreswearing of nuclear weapons by states not possessing them. It seems to us that to pose the problem in this fashion obscures the essential fact that the spread of nuclear weapons is at least as much—and in some instances more—of a threat to the security of the present nonnuclear states of the world that it is to the nuclear powers. The probability of nuclear weapons being used will almost certainly increase as the number of fingers on the trigger increases. And so it is imperative to make progress where we can, when we can, remembering that agreement in one area can often be the catalyst to precipitate in another area agreement that may have long eluded us.

This does not mean that the United States does not attach equal importance to efforts to make progress as quickly as we can on other measures related to nonproliferation. We have, in fact, introduced new elements of flexibility into our positions to increase the possibilities of agreement.

The measure related to nonproliferation efforts that is foremost in the minds of most is a comprehensive test ban. I need not stress the great importance which we continue to attach to the limited test ban treaty, to which over 100 countries have subscribed. We continue to hope and to urge that it will be universally accepted. President Johnson stated only last week: "The nuclear test ban treaty of 1963 represents real progress and we are continuously trying to move forward to a comprehensive and lasting ban on the testing of nuclear weapons."

At Geneva my delegation indicated that we are ready to take current scientific capabilities fully into account in discussing the numbers and modalities of on-site inspections for verification of a comprehensive test ban. Representatives from many members of the United Nations attended the inauguration of our large aperture seismic array in Montana last week, which is one important phase of our research effort to improve our capabilities for monitoring a comprehensive test ban. President Johnson has announced that in following U.S. policy that our peaceful technological advances be shared with other nations, he has directed that data from this new installation be made fully available to all countries of the world. We support the suggestion made at Geneva by eight ENDC members, in another joint memorandum annexed to the ENDC report calling for an exchange of scientific and other information among the nuclear powers in an effort to facilitate agrrement on a comprehensive test ban.

The Soviet Union, which a few years ago was prepared to consider some on-site inspections, is now opposed to any on-site inspection whatsoever. We say to the Soviet Union once again—let us sit down together and compare our scientific data. Let us explore every opportunity to determine whether some accommodation can be found.

We will have more to say on this general subject when the agenda item specifically devoted to the test ban comes under discussion. I should like to note only at this stage that a moratorium on underground testing, either alone or combined with a ban on underground tests above a certain seismic threshold, is not a sound solution and is therefore not acceptable.

As we seek to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, we cannot forget the vehicles for delivery of these weapons of mass destruction. The United States has therefore proposed exploring a verified freeze of the numbers and characteristics of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles. As Ambassador Goldberg announced on September 23, if progress could be made on the freeze the United States would be willing to explore the possibility of significant reductions—I repeat, significant reductions—in the number of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles. Here is a measure that would give graphic assurance to the nonnuclear states of the willingness of the nuclear states themselves to halt and to turn back the nuclear arms race.

In working toward the effective limitation of nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems, we have also sought agreement to halt and reduce mounting stockpiles of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. I refer in this connection to our proposal for a verified cutoff in the production of fissionable materials for weapons use and for the transfer to peaceful uses of agreed sizable quantities of such materials. As illustrative figures we have proposed that the United States transfer 60,000 kilograms of U^{235} and the Soviet Union 40,000 kilograms to peaceful uses.

I should like to call particular attention to Ambassador Goldberg's announcement to the General Assembly on September 23 of the new U.S. proposal for the actual destruction of nuclear weapons. We propose the demonstrated destruction by the United States and the Soviet Union of nuclear weapons from their respective stocks to obtain the 60,000 kilograms of U^{235} to be transferred to peaceful uses by the United States and the 40,000 kilograms to be transferred by the Soviet Union. We are prepared also to include the plutonium from these weapons, if the Soviet Union would do likewise.

When the United States had earlier proposed a cutoff of fissionable material production and transfer to peaceful uses of these illustrative amounts of 60,000 kilograms and 40,000 kilograms, respectively, of U^{235}, the Soviet Union replied that this was not disarmament, but rather control without disarmament. We cannot agree with this Soviet contention. A cutoff in the production of fissionable material for weapons would, even by itself, be a very important step in halting and turning back the nuclear arms race. But if there were earlier misgivings on the part of the Soviet Union, unfounded though they may have been, everyone will agree that the new proposal made by the United States most assuredly is disarmament, for we are proposing that fissionable material be removed from actual weapons, that the weapons—the casing and all internal mechanisms—be destroyed, and that the fissionable material be transferred for exclusively peaceful purposes. I repeat, this is disarmament. The number of weapons to be destroyed would be very substantial, and I shall have more to say about this weapons destruction proposal later in our discussion.

Before concluding my remarks, I should like to touch on one or two other points relating to nonproliferation. The first is the problem of assuring the security of nations that forswear the manufacture of nuclear weapons. It has been suggested that

nonnuclear states should have some assurance that their security will not be weakened by their forswearing of nuclear weapons. United States policy was stated last October by President Johnson: "The nations that do not seek national nuclear weapons can be sure that, if they need our strong support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it." As Ambassador Goldberg has indicated, action by the General Assembly could be a useful part of such assurances and I wish to reaffirm today my Government's readiness to work to this end.

Nuclear free zones in appropriate regions of the world could also contribute significantly to the nonproliferation objectives we seek. While I shall wish to speak at greater length on this subject at a later time, it is pertinent to our present discussion to recall that several times in the past my Government has made clear its support for the creation under appropriate circumstances of nuclear free zones in such regions as Africa and Latin America.

To sum up, we now have the opportunity really to come to grips with concrete issues in our efforts to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. We cannot let pass the present opportunity to press forward until agreement on a nonprolifieration treaty is reached, for that opportunity may not present itself again under such favorable conditions as today, if ever. At the same time the United States wishes to move forward as rapidly as possible toward a comprehensive test ban; a freeze and then a reduction in strategic nuclear delivery vehicles; and a cutoff of production and transfer of fissionable materials to peaceful purposes, involving the demonstrated destruction of nuclear weapons. These involve complex and difficult negotiations. In the opinion of the members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at the end of its last session, as is stated in the Committee's report before us, "Extensive discussions on major problems relative to certain collateral measures were particularly valuable in clarifying the respective points of view of member governments." The report adds: "The Committee believes that these discussions and exchanges of view may facilitate agreement in the further work of the Committee."

My Government looks to the discussions commencing today in this Committee to contribute further to the better understanding and the will to succeed that are essential if negotiations at Geneva are finally to bear fruit. We hope that the General Assembly will therefore urge that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament promptly reconvene upon completion of our discussions here and give renewed priority to the question of a nonproliferation treaty and related measures.

It is my Government's strong wish that the next report of the ENDC will contain an agreed nonproliferation treaty, acceptable to all governments which share our wish to act now to prevent proliferation.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] spoke on the floor of the House concerning conditions at the Salt Lake City, Utah, Veterans' Administration hospital.

I am deeply concerned about his derogatory statements. In order to be fair to all sides concerned, I would like to here enter in the RECORD a telegram from Dr. Charles Francis, the director of the Salt Lake VA hospital, giving his answers to the above statements.

I plan to look further into this whole matter when I return to Salt Lake City at the end of the session. Dr. Francis' telegram is as follows:

The following information is furnished as you request. In answer to certain allegations made Tuesday by Representative JOHN T. SAYLOR, Dr. Charles Francis, Hospital Director, stated: "In reference to Representative SAYLOR's inference that a conflict exists between the teaching and the service sections of the hospital, let me say that no such distinction exists.

"We make no distinction between teaching and service sections. Those who care for patients also teach. To teach medicine, one must first be an excellent doctor, and because this is a teaching hospital, treatment must be exemplary." Dr. Francis said that the VA hospital is a part of the University of Utah hospital complex and as such is intimately involved in patient care, research and teaching. "These three are inseparable in a good modern hospital" he said. "Veterans hospitals all over the country have had relationships of this kind for years and the great improvement in patient care dates from the time that our hospitals affiliated with medical schools back in 1946."

In answer to Representative SAYLOR's suggestion that a small but significant number of VA and non-VA ineligible patients have been seen in the VA hospital as outpatients, Dr. Francis said: "This is because, again, the VA hospital and clinics are an intergal part of the medical school complex and, as such, we have provided service for an occasional patient from the university hospital or the county hospital in the only facilities available for them in the combined VA medical school program. This has been on an outpatient basis and without any way interfering with the care of the veteran patients—either hospitalized or outpatient, the patients were seen as part of research projects in pulmonary diseases and gastroenterology in the pulmonary disease and gastroenterology clinics of the VA hospital, pending the establishment of these clinics in the new medical center. Their care otherwise would have been interrupted with potential danger to the patient. Funds supporting these programs come from VA funds and university funds, since patients from both benefit. Much of the equipment for our clinics were purchased from university funds. The checks in payment accepted by physicians were endorsed immediately and turned over to the university to be used for advancing research. Some of these funds in support of research were used to defray travel expenses to research meetings in various parts of the country. None of it went to enhance the personal income of any member of the VA staff or the medical school faculty. In regard to the allegation that we failed to do what accreditation demands, the hospital is fully accredited and the accreditation has never been challenged," Dr. Francis pointed out. "The functions of a tissue committee have been carried by another committee of this hospital; its functions have been entirely acceptable to the Joint Committee on Accreditation." The VA hospital director said "doctors' reports of cases are written following surgery." One resident got behind, but he very quickly dictated his operative reports when this matter was called to his attention by the chief of staff, Dr. A. C. Thurman. Weekly reports concerning dictation of operative reports also are sent to the chief of staff. Representative SAYLOR made reference to our sanitary and housekeeping facilities which he said were poor. Up to this point the Congressman's remarks have been based on the report of internal audit. In answer to the Congressman the report states: "A reasonably good state of housekeeping exists throughout the hospital despite the additional attention to cleaning required by major construction projects now underway at the station."

CHARLES FRANCIS, M.D.,
Hospital Director.

REPORT ON THE 89TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the first session of this 89th Congress marks the most productive session in my legislative experience. The working majority, provided by the elections of 1964, produced a Congress more responsive to the President and to the Nation. This Congress has kept faith with the American people. It has responded amply to President Johnson's call for a Great Society.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

During the course of this session of Congress, we have witnessed and we have supported increased participation in the struggle against communism in South Vietnam. The wisdom of President Johnson's decision has been sustained by the course of events. America has not turned its back on the plea for democracy and freedom on the Asiatic mainland. A firm foothold has been maintained for the establishment of a strong and free government, capable of resisting Communist infiltration and attack. The earlier fears that our participation would lead to a broadening of the conflict have been dispelled.

As men and materials strengthen America's position, lines of communication are being consolidated and the casualty losses are being reduced. The Johnson administration is committed to limiting the conflict to the retention of a secure beachhead for democracy in southeast Asia. This action serves notice upon our enemies and upon our friends that we intend to stand by our commitments to liberty. In the meanwhile, we are providing valuable time for a careful reappraisal of solutions to this costly and painful conflict.

UNITED NATIONS

The recent Pakistan-India conflict threatened the whole fabric of world society. President Johnson wisely referred this conflict to the United Nations organization, which promptly ordered a cease-fire. This United Nations success proved its capacity for keeping the peace when member nations are sincerely joined in the effort.

The untimely passing of our United Nations Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson, created a void which could only be filled by an American of outstanding stature. The appointment of Justice Arthur Goldberg was a symbol to the world of our determination to provide this instrumentality of peace with our finest talent.

DEFENSE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Our commitment in Vietnam has resulted in an increase in defense spending. Up to the present time this year, this conflict has involved a $3 billion expenditure by our Government. At the same time, our Defense Secretary McNamara has made every effort to reduce the defense budget which now exceeds $46 billion a year. In addition to this, approximately $2½ billion is spent for atomic energy research and development, while veterans services for past, present, and future wars total an expenditure of $5½ billion. To this must be added the foreign aid programs which are involved in our national security which involves approximately $3½ billion for military support and economic development of underdeveloped countries.

Of the defense appropriations, approximately $378 million was spent in the Greater Cleveland area for defense activities, the operation of the Lewis Flight Laboratory, the Coast Guard, the Navy Accounting Office, and the Veterans' Administration. Defense contracting has dropped in the Greater Cleveland area from $270 million in 1963 to $109 million in 1964. It is becoming more and more when member nations are sincerely incumbent upon Members of the congressional delegation to fight for a fair and proportionate share in defense spending for their communities. Of the foreign aid expenditures, approximately $5 million was spent for products produced in our factories, most of which are situated in the Greater Cleveland Area.

It is my sincere hope that world conditions will reduce the need for the defense spending which has become a tremendous burden upon our country. Over half of the Federal revenues are dissipated in this way. If world tensions should lessen and permit a contraction of our defense and security spending, ample revenues would be available without any added taxation to meet all of the contemplated needs of our country and provide the hope for future tax reduction.

STATE OF THE UNION

As a result of the legislative program and the policies of this administration, America is, today, approaching unprecedented levels of productivity and employment. The gross national product is nearing $670 billion in output. A total of 72 million Americans are fully employed. There are extensive and distressing areas of unemployment and underemployment, but they are being steadily reduced. The manpower retraining program and the antipoverty programs are beginning to touch the problem. In the Cleveland area, there still remain some 24,000 persons who have not yet found a suitable job: including unemployed young people, including dropouts who have not been trained for available employment and older workers whose jobs have been terminated by either automation or plant relocation. If the current productive wave continues it will soon call every available man and woman into the productive effort.

THE TAX CUT

The current wave of industrial activity was first stimulated by the reduction of income taxes last year. This permitted higher wages and higher profits at the same time and also increased spendable income without creating excessive pressure on price levels. The result has been most fortunate with gains registered throughout the entire spectrum of the American economy.

EXCISE TAX CUT

This year's excise tax cut of $4.6 billion eliminated the luxury taxes on jewelry, watches, toilet preparations, furs, handbags, refrigerators, radios, and TV sets, and provided for a schedule of reductions in the automobile excise taxes.

One of my objectives was to insure that these tax cut benefits would be passed on to the consumer, in accordance with the intention of Congress. In this effort, I directed national attention on those manufacturers and retailers who took the excise tax reductions as added profits. The fruit of these efforts is a matter of record. Up to the present time, the consumer is deriving most of the benefits he had a right to expect from the excise tax cuts. In the 1966 automobiles, the excise form of added safety devices, which are tax cut is substantially included in the now provided as standard equipment.

The excise tax cut had the additional effect of stimulating sales, productivity, and employment, continuing the economic uplift which began in 1961.

EDUCATION

The buildup of educational legislation is continued without restraint in the 89th Congress. The commitment of our President has been unprecedented. As a former teacher, he was well aware of the need for high-quality education and carried through his ideal in his congressional recommendations.

Cleveland institutions of higher education, including the new community college, are substantially provided for in the Federal-aid programs. The Cleveland school district and other school districts in the Cleveland area have been receiving substantial assistance. In addition, all of our institutions of higher education have been the recipients of educational grants for developing special educational projects under Government contract. Thousands of college students in the Cleveland area are attending college with scholarship loans provided through their respective colleges utilizing Federal college loan funds. Our educational programs are reaching more and more deserving people because of the impetus provided by Federal programs.

VOTING RIGHTS

The enactment of a voting rights bill by this Congress was another milestone in the preservation of human rights. This bill—the second major civil rights bill in 2 years—was directed at enforcing voting rights guaranteed by the 15th amendment. Under this law, Federal registrars and examiners are being sent to any State or locality where registration or voting participation is less than 50 percent of the voting-age population and that uses a literacy test or other devices to qualify voters.

It was my privilege to serve on the steering committee guiding this vital legislation through the House of Representatives.

SOCIAL SECURITY

As a result of extensive hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of which I am a member, we were able to report out for adoption the most far-reaching social security changes adopted since social security began in the mid-1930's. All social security recipients were granted a 7-percent increase in monthly awards with a minimum increase of $4. Those who exercised the option for earlier retirement, at age 62, received a slight reduction in this award of approximately 10 percent. In addition, Congress adopted the medicare program which provides every senior citizen with hospital care for a 90-day period. The patient pays only $40 of his hospital bill for the first 60 days and $10 daily for an additional 30 days of care. After 60 days out of the hospital, this eligibility is reinstated for another 90 days. The same program provides extended care in nursing homes after a hospital stay for 20 days and for $5 daily for an additional 80 days. Benefits under the hospital insurance begin July 1, 1966, while the extended nursing care program is effective January 1, 1967.

A second portion of this program pays up to 80 percent of the bills for physicians' and surgeons' services after a $50 deduction paid by the patient. In addition, the patient is entitled to 100 home health visits, under a plan approved by a doctor, diagnostic tests including X-rays, laboratory services, radium treatment, surgical dressings, casts, braces, artificial limbs, and the rental of medical equipment.

However, in order to be eligible for the medical or doctors insurance, every eligible person under social security must specially enroll for this program prior to March 31, 1966. This additional insurance coverage will cost each beneficiary $3 per month, which will be deducted from social security benefits. Application cards for enrollment will be mailed to those eligible directly by the Social Security Administration.

I urge every senior citizen in my community to enroll for the medical insurance coverage. This is an important program. The Federal Government is matching your $3 with an additional $3 paid out of the general revenue funds of the Government in order to create the necessary reserve for making these payments.

I would reliably estimate that the combination of benefits, including the 7-percent social security increase, the hospital insurance program with its extended care features, and the medical insurance benefits, the cost of which is being subsidized by a matching contribution of the Federal Government, will bring about total social security benefits equivalent to a 30-percent increase in social security benefits. Although this program does not provide total coverage and since it requires the payment of a $40 deduction

for the first day's hospitalization, and a $50 deduction on medical and surgical services, it nevertheless provides a system of medical coverage more complete than was ever anticipated before this session of the Congress.

It was a great privilege for me to fly to Independence, Mo., with the President when this bill was signed in the Truman Library, in the presence of former President Harry S. Truman, a longtime advocate of this program.

In order to insure Cleveland's readiness to participate in the medicare program, on October 8, 1965, I organized a Greater Cleveland Conference on Medicare in the Cleveland community. It was my purpose to alert the community to the need of providing the additional extended care facilities which will be needed—between 600 to 1,000 beds—and the added personnel required to staff these facilities—estimated at 3,000 new hospital and convalescent care workers. This program resulted in plans for developing orderly extended care facilities and the training of the additional workers. Hon. Wilbur Cohen, Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Commissioner Robert A. Ball, of the Social Security Administration, and other leaders in the hospital, medical, and nursing fields, participated in the conference. One of the shocking disclosures in the course of this conference was the lack of adequate, licensed nursing homes available in Ohio. The objectives of this conference were achieved in directing the specific problems for community action.

IMMIGRATION

On Sunday, October 3, it was my privilege to fly to Staten Island and witness President Johnson's signing of the immigration bill to abolish the prejudical "national origins" provision of the immigration law.

The new law does not increase immigration. It redistributes the quota allotments to all nations on a fair and equitable basis. Eligibility for immigration is based upon family reunification, preference being given to the immigration of wives, parents, and children of American citizens. Eligibility is also based upon the usefulness of the prospective immigrant to the United States in order to insure that there will be no displacement of the American worker from his job.

CLEVELAND'S WAR ON POVERTY

Although the antipoverty program was adopted a little over a year ago, Cleveland has already received over $14 million in Federal funds as its share in this confrontation with poverty in our midst.

This hastily organized program is neither perfect nor complete—but it is a beginning effort in an area long overlooked. This year hundreds of school dropouts were given a second chance at employment and at skill improvement. Children are returning to the schools under programs brilliantly developed under the leadership of School Superintendent Paul Briggs. Preschool training is preparing poverty area youngsters with a better start toward educational achievement. These programs are costly in the short term—but they are expected to be most productive as a long-term investment in human betterment.

MANPOWER RETRAINING

This Congress renewed and expanded the Federal job retraining programs which was recently adopted. This law seeks to help workers made jobless through automation or plant shutdown.

More than 320,000 persons have been accepted in this program. Thousands of Clevelanders have been trained and readjusted through this law. One of the outstanding examples of the importance of this program occurred in the training and readjustment of the 1,500 former employees of the National Castings Co.

My office has been working closely with Federal, State, and Cleveland school officials to insure a full utilization of this important tool against unemployment.

THE POLLUTION PROBLEM

After my long and extended requests, the Governor of Ohio requested a Federal Water Pollution Conference to probe the alarming deterioration of Lake Erie. On August 2, 1965, at the Cleveland conference, I pointed out the contrasting standards of industrial control of water pollution in Lake Erie as compared with the Ohio River watershed. Downstream users of Ohio River water would never permit what Cleveland industries and other Great Lakes industries pour wantonly into our lake. I also protested the dumping of materials dredged from our contaminated Cuyahoga River, by the Federal Government itself, into Lake Erie.

As a result of these efforts, reports and directives should begin next year toward a water cleanup. It is my hope, also, that Cleveland will apply for necessary funds to provide a retaining wall at the Burke Lakefront Airport to receive contaminated dredged materials now being dispersed in the Lake Erie dumping grounds.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 increased Federal grants for sewage treatment. Individual cities may apply for grants up to $1.2 million, while multicity projects may be qualified for Federal grants up to $4.8 million. Under this program, I hope that suburban cities, like Parma and Garfield Heights, will develop eligibility for Federal grants. Eventually, a massive attack must be made to solve the water pollution problem. The costs will rise to staggering billions and will require drastic programs by our city, State, and National Governments.

AIR POLLUTION

While this year may become the turning point in our struggle to save Lake Erie, the struggle against air pollution has hardly begun. The central city of Cleveland continues to be a messpot of foul and dirty air, which accounts for much of our respiratory ailments in addition to the property damage involved. As an observer of the Cleveland air pollution problem for almost 30 years, I would say that conditions are no better today than they were at any time in the past. Cleveland and the entire community is threatened to be bypassed by new and sophisticated industries which require clean air as they require clean water. Our community health and our community growth are definitely related to our respect for these vital resources.

Federal contributions currently provide a substantial portion of the funds spent in air pollution research and control. The primary task remains, however, a local matter, subject to local regulations and enforcement. Washington can help—but, the people of Cleveland must, themselves, insist on a cleaner city.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

One of the last bills to pass in the current session is designed to limit and restrict outdoor advertising and junkyards along the Federal-Aid Highway System. Under this beautification program, the Federal Government will contribute 75 percent of the costs of removing such highway distractions in States which are willing to cooperate.

It is regrettable that the provisions of this law are not extended to cities and urban communities. The yet-unopened Willow Freeway extension to downtown Cleveland is already littered with huge billboards which serve to detract and destroy the usefulness of the road before it is opened. Cities must assume a sense of responsibility and develop freeways into parkways through the city.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

This session of Congress adopted legislation providing a group life insurance program for all members of the military service who are on active duty. This coverage is for either $10,000 or $5,000, with premium rates at $2 a month for $10,000 or $1 a month for $5,000 of group insurance. It is extremely wise for every member of the armed service to take advantage of this insurance program which cannot be duplicated in any other form of insurance.

Legislation was also adopted increasing service-connected disability compensation by approximately 10 percent. Education and training allowance for war orphans was increased by approximately 30 percent.

It is my hope that the next session will produce a GI education bill for all servicemen.

URBAN AFFAIRS

The special problem of cities and urban areas was recognized by this Congress by the creation of a Cabinet position on urban affairs. Within the next few years, approximately 80 percent of our population will be residing in urban areas. This new office will be designed to meet the special problems of city life and facilitate Federal-city programs of vital concern to our community.

AFTER THE SESSION

When this first session of the 89th Congress has ended, I expect to return to my Cleveland office and attend to the hundreds of inquiries which have accumulated during this long and busy session. I will be available at my office in

room 506 of the Federal Building on Cleveland's public square.

When time permits, I will endeavor to tour the district, particularly those new areas added by the State legislature, including the city of Parma, Brooklyn Heights, and the Brooklyn sections of Cleveland. My next order of business will include visits to every Federal office and installation to observe the effect of existing programs and determine the need for future legislative action. The next session is just weeks ahead. Preparation must be made for the work ahead.

My success as your Representative depends upon your support and your advice. If you have an opinion or a recommendation on what I can do to better represent the 21st District of Ohio, please let me know. Your idea may very well result in a better law.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—A NEEDED TOOL FOR MORE EFFECTIVE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 15 years now, there have been some Members of the Congress seeking to establish a Joint Committee on the Budget. I am one of those Members who feels that for the Congress to most effectively perform its responsibilities we need such a tool.

Along with many of my distinguished colleagues, I propose to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for a Joint Committee on the Budget. The purpose of this proposal is to provide Congress with the means to make a more efficient evaluation of the authorization and expenditure requirements of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new proposal, it is not a new idea devoid of proper study and evaluation. Proposals, similar to mine, have been introduced in the Congress on a rather continuous basis for many years. The original bill was introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN on January 19, 1950. Bills providing for a Joint Committee on the Budget have been passed by the Senate in 1952, 1953, 1955, 1957, 1961, 1963, and 1965. On the last six occasions, they have passed the Senate without recorded dissent. Senate bill No. 2, passed by the Senate in this session of Congress, was introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN on January 6, this year, and cosponsored by 76 other Senators.

Unfortunately, all of the bills passed by the Senate and numerous bills introduced in the House have failed to receive favorable consideration by this body.

Let us take a brief look at the basic elements contained in the Joint Budget Committee proposal and the objectives it seeks to achieve.

The proposed Joint Committee on the Budget would be comprised of 14 members, 7 from the House and 7 from the Senate. The chairmanship would rotate between the House and the Senate, with the other legislative body holding the vice-chairmanship. There would be a staff director appointed by, and responsible to, the party of the chairman, and an associate staff director appointed by, and responsible to, the opposition party. In addition, the committee would have a staff of fiscal experts, technicians, and other personnel necessary for it to make continuing studies of the programs and expenditures proposed by the executive branch of the Government.

The committee would have these primary duties: First, to study and inform itself on all matters relating to the President's annual budget, including analyses of the details of individual programs and operations and of the actual administration of these activities, making sure that current practices conform with legislative authorizations; second, to provide the kind of information to the respective appropriations committees which they require for adequate consideration of items contained in the budget requests and justifications submitted in their support; third, to make reports and recommendations as to changes in existing laws which would result in greater efficiency and economy in Government; and fourth, compile cost estimates of all programs and projects authorized by Congress. Additionally, the joint committee proposal would authorize consideration for joint appropriation hearings and further provide more staff personnel for appropriations committee work.

Control over the Federal Government spending and revenue is a major function of Congress. This power of the purse is specifically reserved to the Congress under provisions of the Constitution. Therefore, we have not merely the option to determine the amount of Government spending, we have the inescapable responsibility. To accept and meet this responsibility, as the elected Representatives of the people, we must have the methods and tools to accomplish this job. If not, then we continue to abdicate our responsibility and leave more and more control of the financial policies of the Federal Government to the executive branch.

Today, the procedures used by the Congress in filling its vital responsibility of controlling public funds are much the same as they were 25 and 50 years ago. In 1940, our annual expenditures were $9 billion, now they are 11 times that much and continuing to increase. Fifty years ago, our annual expenditures were $746 million, now they are more than 130 times that much. We have not updated our methods to meet our increased responsibilities. Can you imagine us trying to serve the present-day needs of the American public with our transportation system or communication system of 1915? Needless to say, this would result in much waste and many unmet needs.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress is to take a positive approach to its vital function of control of public funds, it must have detailed and adequate technical information upon which to base its decisions. To do otherwise, we are only contributing to waste and inefficiency in Government, and assuring the neglect of other vital needs.

Our present appropriation system handles budget requests on a piecemeal basis. These segments are not considered in terms of the overall financial picture of the Government. This proposed amendment would provide for a study of the budget as a whole, estimated revenues, as well as proposed expenditures, and the joint committee's views on the total budgetary data would be disseminated to appropriation subcommittees prior to the time that they take action on the individual parts. Additionally, this information concerning proposed expenditures, and authorizations in relation to estimated revenues, could be furnished to all individual Members of the Congress. These data would reduce the dependence of Congress on information provided by the same agencies for which it is considering appropriations.

The joint committee, through its studies and reports, could help to coordinate the dual functions of authorizations and appropriations. Through its reports and recommendations, it is probable that a clearer and closer understanding could be developed between these two processes. Furthermore, the joint committee could facilitate cooperation and develop closer working relationships between the appropriation committees of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the Congress will come to grips with this issue when we meet again next January. A Joint Budget Committee is an essential tool for review and control if we are ever to secure efficient and coordinated management of Federal expenditures. And we must not forget that this authority over the budget remains our most vital constitutional function.

The Congress needs a coordinated system of budget review, a modern system to acquaint all Members with annual Government expenditures and insure maximum efficiency and control.

TERMINATION OF BRACERO LAW

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables and extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to comment one last time before adjournment on what I firmly believe is an historic turning point in American agricultural life.

In 1965, with the demise of Public Law 78, the Nation made a first, significant step toward bringing the agricultural industry into the mainstream of our economic life.

Public Law 78—the so-called bracero law—was terminated last December 31. This was Congress wise decision, based on extensive experience and made only after thorough warning, to end the mass importation of foreign farmworkers.

For 14 years, this law, passed as a 2-year emergency measure during the Korean war and extended six times, has contributed to poverty, human indignity, and exploitation. This infamous program—perhaps necessary when adopted in 1951 but long since a menace to human decency—fed upon the poverty of neighboring Mexico and increased the plight of American agricultural workers by keeping wage levels low and working conditions at an intolerable state.

When this system of Government-guaranteed foreign labor ended, there were widespread grumbles. Farm employers and others cried that it was unfair, that Americans simply would not do "stoop labor," that crop losses would be astronomical, that prices of farm products would skyrocket, and that farmers would be forced to move outside the country to find labor.

And what has happened? These early fears have not materialized. These early arguments and vehement protests have largely been proved invalid, and often by self-admission.

As we prepare to adjourn this long and historic session of Congress, I feel we should set the record straight. I feel we should review the very substantial progress that has been made over the nine and a half months since termination of Public Law 78. For it is a heartening story of progress on many fronts.

Let us take a close look at some of the major developments in 1965.

FARM EMPLOYMENT

First, farm employment. Throughout the year, domestic farm employment has been up appreciably over 1964 and foreign employment has been down considerably. I will submit data to document this point. But in summary on August 15, for example, domestic employment, at 1,136,400 was up 86,200 over the same date in 1964. Foreign farmworkers, on the other hand, numbered a scant 1,200—contrasting sharply with the 68,700 working in the United States at the same time in 1964.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly at that point?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I have in my hand a little newspaper item which seems to be in some conflict with what the gentleman has said. It refers to 1,200 foreign workers. Perhaps it can be explained. But I note in California alone the number of wetbacks apprehended increased from a little over 5,000 in 1964, through September, to nearly 19,000 through September of this year. Those are only the wetbacks apprehended. Based on past experience—and I am sure the gentleman has had the same experience—I would venture to say there are many more in California.

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to have the gentleman contribute and I am glad to comment on this. I say again that the figures I cited were as of August 15. I intend to extrapolate those figures. I intend to submit in the RECORD a complete time series of data on wages, farm employment, farm production, and farm income. It will show distribution on the basis of foreign workers and domestic workers, and there will be a total for the entire work force, by State and by crop. I submit to the gentleman that this will support the argument I am making this afternoon.

I say to the gentleman, as a member of the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Post Office and Treasury, that I am very aware of the enforcement problem we have with wetbacks, and I am quite surprised the figure was not larger than it turned out to be.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. If the gentleman will yield further, briefly, I would estimate, based on my long life in California, that if 19,000 wetbacks or illegal entrants were apprehended there are probably twice that many wandering around California, working on the farms under conditions very much worse than those of the braceros.

Mr. COHELAN. I say to the gentleman that I am optimistic enough to feel, because of the gentleman's well-demonstrated fairness in the debates we have had on this subject, and recognizing the longstanding arguments and differences we have had, that I may be able to convince him before the afternoon is gone.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would doubt it.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. How does the gentleman account for the fact that it was necessary to import supplemental labor to West Virginia, which is supposed to be the most hard-core unemployment area in the country?

Mr. COHELAN. I will be glad to give some figures on West Virginia. The gentleman will be surprised to know they did import very few.

Mr. HAGEN of California. They imported some.

Mr. COHELAN. There are some structural labor problems, the distinguished gentleman, who is an authority on agricultural economics, knows very well.

But let me continue with my remarks which will amplify and document the statement I have begun.

Even on September 15, when nondomestic employment has been exceptionally high in the past, foreign employment was down substantially over a year ago. On this date in 1965, foreign workers numbered only 15,700—fully 77,000 fewer than the year before.

California, the major user of braceros in the past, showed on September 15 a rise of 5,400 domestic workers and a decrease of 52,000 foreign workers over the same date in 1964. Needless to say I am pleased with what this means for employment opportunities in my State. But the same advantages are shared by other States as well.

There is another bright sign in this improved employment picture and that is jobs for young people. For the end of the mass importation of foreign labor has meant more employment opportunities for American youths. And this came at a time when youth unemployment has been at a high peak across our country. By June 30, 1965, nearly 3,500 college men had been placed in farm jobs across the country. An additional 3,225 high school boys, members of "A-teams," had farm jobs this summer in a Federal-State program. And despite loud cries that these young people were not working out, these youths generally did a most creditable job performing hard but rewarding work. In Blythe, Calif., for example, 419 of 486 "A-team" boys completed their contract periods, drawing average wages of $1.85 per hour and enjoying good housing, living, and working conditions.

FARM WAGES

Second, let me turn to the matter of farm wages. One of the most encouraging lessons learned in this first year in the transition to the use of domestic farmworkers is that American workers are available if wages and working conditions are right. In many cases this year, they have been right and the results have been predictable.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, as a matter of fact, reports that in the second quarter of 1965 the U.S. average hourly farm wage rate, at $1.17, was up 16 percent over the third quarter of 1964, the last years of the mass importation of foreign agricultural workers.

This rise is quite apparent in comparing 1964 and 1965 wage rates, both piece and hourly, in crops that formerly used foreign labor. Let us look at some of the increases in 1965:

For lettuce in Arizona, piece rates, at 30 to 31 cents a carton, are up at least 6 cents a carton over 1964.

For melons in Arizona, piece rates, at 45 to 50 cents a crate, have doubled since 1964 and hourly rates range between $1.25 and $1.40 compared to $1 to $1.25 in 1964.

For celery in California, the hourly rate, at $1.40 is up 40 cents over that of 1964.

For tomatoes in California, the hourly rate, reportedly over $2, is up substantially over last year's rate of $1.35.

For oranges in Florida, the piece rate, at 25 cents a box, is 7 cents greater than a year ago.

These higher wages and the striking increase in domestic seasonal agricultural employment mean, among other things, that as much as $50 million may stay in the United States instead of leaving it as has been the case under the bracero program.

It means, too, that a large body of nonproductive, tax-consuming unemployed, living on welfare through no fault of their own, have at last had the opportunity to become taxpayers and more productive citizens. This is a significant though frequently unnoticed aspect of the progress made so far. And nobody, not even the strongest propo-

nent for importing foreign labor, has been able to argue against the merits of putting jobless Americans to work.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HAGEN of California. It is my recollection in your very area there were large pressure groups opposing the requirements that people on welfare participate in employment on the farm as a condition of retaining their welfare eligibility. I do not know what the gentleman's position was, but there were people up there in your district opposed to that.

Mr. COHELAN. That may be although the gentleman has drawn the issue much toc narrowly. I have no knowledge right at hand of the specific details. But I can say that there is much work to be done in the area of farm labor recruitment. As my colleagues know, from the very beginning I have made it very clear that I, as much as and maybe more than most people, recognize that a labor market in transition involves some very painful adjustments. I state here today and I have stated here before, and I am going to conclude with this in my statement today, that a number of positive and constructive steps must be taken. But we have made a very encouraging beginning and I have some very detailed tables which break this progress down by crop and price and labor.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California, Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. GUBSER. I think that the gentleman's figures are absolutely correct. Farm wages have gone up markedly. I think it is undoubtedly true, and I am certainly willing to accept his figures, that the number of farm employees has also gone up in the past year. However, I am wondering if the gentleman has any intention of placing in the RECORD figures as to the production of crops which normally have had labor problems. I am speaking in particular of tomatoes, pears, cling peaches, strawberries, and asparagus. I think since these are the principal crops which use bracero labor or which have used it in the past you will find that the production of these crops in the State of California at least is way down. So we then have the situation of needing more employees to harvest this lesser crop at a higher cost.

Mr. COHELAN. I cannot agree with the gentleman, because the data does not support what he is purporting to show. I must concede there were anomalies in relation to certain crops, but it was by no means in the proportions suggested by the gentleman. I do not want to get into all of this statistical data at this point because it will be covered in the tables which will accompany my statement.

But I want to say this to the gentleman and all those who have been kind enough to share this special order with me. All of us, even though we do not agree on everything on this particular subject, are gentlemen of good will and we all want to see that this matter is worked out satisfactorily in terms of price, in terms of production, and in terms of farm labor.

I honestly believe what I have just said, that you are going to find great progress has been made, and this will be reflected in the data which I will present.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman made the statement about the fine housing conditions for the youth who are harvesting over in Blythe. Did they build new housing for the youngsters that came there to work?

Mr. COHELAN. As the gentleman knows, housing conditions throughout the country in respect to farm labor were far from uniform. But to the best of my knowledge, on this specific example that I have cited, housing was adequate and I think the performance that was reflected in the actual harvest bears this out.

Mr. YOUNGER. They had the same housing that the braceros used, in all probability; is that right?

Mr. COHELAN. I am no more sure of that than is the gentleman. Housing conditions were by no means uniform from one grower to another.

I would suggest to the gentleman, however, that if we are going to solve this problem, housing is one of our key problems. Even if you expect to get a nice instant-package form of labor, where you have all male workers coming into dormitory-type accommodations, you are not going to solve the problem. We are going to have family housing if we are going to meet the needs and develop an adequate and stable supply of domestic farm workers. I have absolutely no doubt that we can and that we are going to develop this supply, but we are going to have to deal with our critical problems and these include housing.

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, but at the beginning of the gentleman's statement he made a generalized condemnation of housing in California. Now he says that it is not uniform, that there is some good housing as well, and I wanted to correct the record.

Mr. COHELAN. My good friend from California knows perfectly well that I would not get trapped in that kind of an argument. The gentleman knows that what I have said is that housing standards are by no means uniform. I have stood in the well of this House on two previous occasions this year and have pointed out to very distinguished Members who are involved, and quite properly so because of the interest of their districts in this subject, that about five of the large packers of California have not hired braceros for 5 years. One of the main reasons for this is that they provided attractive and adequate housing.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that if we continue to upgrade wages and working conditions, and if we provide the same safeguards and guarantees for farmworkers that have been available to industrial workers for years, we will eliminate the kind of problems that presently exist.

But let me again continue.

FOOD PRICES

Third, what about the prices of farm products? Despite cries of anguish from some quarters, the prices of fruits and vegetables on which foreign labor was used in the past are, on the whole, less than they were a year ago. While the cries of "wolf" have frequently been heard, the facts indicate, quite poignantly, that production is high and that field labor costs exert little, if any, pressure on the prices of produce.

For the week of October 11, 1965, for example, five crops that formerly used nondomestic labor were priced lower at wholesale than during the comparable week in 1964. Only three ex-foreign users were priced higher. Crops showing lower wholesale prices were grapes, lemons, California oranges, snapbeans, and Delicious apples. It is most significant to note, I think, that during this week grapes were at a 5-year low, oranges at a 4-year low, and snapbeans at a 3-year low.

The story has been pretty much the same in the wholesale price picture over the past few months. It has shown absolutely no connection between increased use of domestic farm labor and the prices of commodities.

Quite meaningfully, the average wholesale prices of fresh and dried vegetables declined this August some 14.2 percent over the same month a year ago. This meant that the average prices hit their lowest August level in 3 years. Furthermore, because of plentiful supplies from this year's crops, the average wholesale prices of canned fruits and vegetables were lower this August than for the same month in 1964.

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

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

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman is referring to Thompson's seedless grapes and that is the exception to the rule. Grapes generally are at an all-time high.

Mr. COHELAN. I would like to advise the gentleman that this data comes from the Employment Security Division of the U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. GUBSER. It is the Thompson seedless grapes which are on this morning's market selling at $2.50 to $3.50 per lug, and that is a lower price.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman would not deny that grapes in general as listed on the indexes—that grape prices are down; is that not correct?

Mr. GUBSER. No.

Mr. COHELAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. Thompson's are down, but that is all.

Mr. COHELAN. Thompson's represent fully 30 percent of the grape market. And my information states very clearly that grape prices are down because we have had a bumper crop. I am not attaching any degree of significance to grapes. Grapes are grapes and for statistical purposes that is the way

they are listed on all of the accepted indexes and data. But I say again, according to Bureau of Employment Security Statistics, that grapes are at a 5-year low, oranges are at a 4-year low and snapbeans are at a 3-year low.

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

Mr. COHELAN. Yes, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I believe I understand the point which the gentleman is trying to make, which I assume is that some of the predictions about the cost of living going up may be difficult to sustain, although figures can be cited which would support a different conclusion.

But I would also like to point out that this is pertinent: One reason the price of citrus is low, which is not necessarily a good situation as far as our farmers are concerned, is due to the delay in picking oranges and lemons. The quality of fresh fruit which has not reached the market is inferior to what you get in the average year.

Mr. COHELAN. May I say to the gentleman that I flatly deny that. I want the gentleman to take a look at the data which I will submit and which will substantiate my point. I happen to have a very high regard for the gentleman but I do not think he will find anything to support his statement. The price of lemons has had a very peculiar pattern of constancy, and while there have been highs and lows in the year 1965, the price of lemons has definitely gone down. In September 1965 they are are listed at $2.94 and $3.01, but in 1962, at the same time of year, they were at $4.27. In 1963 they were $3.46 and $4.40. And last year they were at $5.48 and $4.69.

How does the gentleman account for that at a time when you had all the bracero labor you wanted?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman. I had the impression he was making a point that the price of lemons and oranges is down, in contrast to the prediction we had made that they would be up; is this correct?

Mr. COHELAN. No, I am trying to make the point that as far as the labor component is concerned, it has not been a primary factor in terms of price fluctuations in any of these food commodities, including citrus.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. It is very much dependent on the weather.

Mr. COHELAN. Of course it is; weather is the primary reason, and we are going to show this later on when we get into costs.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Perhaps I do not make my point clear. What I was trying to point out is that the quality of citrus in the market this year is not as good as it has been in the last years, quite largely due to the fact of an unreliable harvest. We are not picking oranges and lemons at the time they should have been picked.

They have stayed on the trees, they have gotten too large, and were not the top quality fruit comparable to those which came in other years. That is attributable to the lack of labor.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman's argument is a qualitative argument, and I disagree with him. There are standards that are accepted for quality and size, and we are taking into consideration all of the factors the gentleman is trying to introduce.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I do not like to interrupt the gentleman so often, but I would point out, and I think he will concede this, almost half the lemons in the United States are grown in my congressional district, and a large percentage of the oranges. None is grown in the gentleman's district. I admire his sincerity, but I think I know more about the citrus business than the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. I am sure the gentleman in his specialized field is most knowledgeable. I will not yield, however, on the basic data, on the general topic of prices and production, and on the standard measures that are used to make judgments in this field.

If the gentleman will allow me to continue, when I finish you can fire all the shots you want.

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

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

Mr. GUBSER. I would like to inform the gentleman when I learned this morning he was taking this special order, I have taken one which will immediately follow him, and I will be just as generous in time with the gentleman as he has been with me.

On this question of prices related to the labor component, the gentleman is trying to determine the score of the ball game at the end of the third inning.

We have a situation where the tomato pack is down 216,000 tons. We have a situation where the raw product cost to the canner has gone up because of the labor problem, and nothing else, from $20 to $35 per ton. This, transposed into a can of tomatoes on the grocer's shelf, with all the commissions on commissions which are added, is going to raise the price of a 2.5 can of tomatoes exactly one nickel next year. But we have not yet distributed a single can of the 1965 pack. We are still working on the surplus of the 1964 pack. So, considering all of the added costs of the raw material due to labor will not result to the housewife until next year on tomatoes.

One more point: We have in California a 25-percent reduction in asparagus; 16,000 acres went out of production.

Mr. COHELAN. I disagree with that.

Mr. GUBSER. We have that impact on the price, and the increase is going to be tremendous.

Mr. COHELAN. I disagree with the gentleman categorically, and I will cite the reasons why before I conclude. But very quickly at this point, we need not have the problem next year that we have had in a few, limited areas this year if we have cooperation from the growers. I am just as concerned as the gentleman is in getting the facts of the situation and insuring that we have available a productive labor supply.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Perhaps I misunderstood what you are trying to prove. I gathered that you are trying to prove that the cost of living is down.

Mr. COHELAN. No. The gentleman knows better than that. What I am doing is making a general statement on the topic of farm labor, harvest, prices, and the general progress in all of these areas which is so important to an understanding of where we are going next year.

Mr. YOUNGER. Well if all prices of farm products and vegetables and fruits and so forth are down, then naturally the cost of living would be down; would that not be correct?

Mr. COHELAN. Insofar as those factors have an effect on the cost-of-living index, insofar as they are a component of it, the gentleman is quite correct. But this is only one of the factors in the cost-of-living index, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. YOUNGER. It is a big factor; is it not?

Mr. COHELAN. It is an important factor but not the controlling one. Earlier this year when prices fluctuated, by far the biggest factor was weather, although artificial marketing quotas also had their impact. And the data bears this out.

Mr. YOUNGER. Here recently the Congress just gave a 7-percent increase in social security benefits to take care of the increased cost of living. I think one must add those two things together.

Mr. COHELAN. I would suggest to the gentleman that we keep our eye on the ball. We are talking about agriculture labor today, but I would be glad to discuss the gentleman's point on some other occasion.

Now I was talking about prices.

Wholesale prices of crops that formerly employed foreign labor have experienced this year, as in previous years, normal week-to-week fluctuations. This clearly reveals that weather, plant disease, market conditions and other factors exert far greater influence on produce costs than does field labor.

If, in some cases, consumers have paid more this year for farm commodities, the reason clearly does not lie back at the farm. The cost of field labor is an extremely small percentage of the consumer cost. The cost of raising agricultural wages this year up to levels between $1.25 and $1.40 an hour is roughly equivalent to about 1 cent per unit of most vegetables and fruits. This increase is very small indeed for what it means in bringing agricultural workers closer to a living wage in what it means to bringing them into the mainstream of American life.

In those instances this year where unusual price increases have come about, the reason has been, with few exceptions, special weather conditions. In May and June, for example, lettuce prices soared to 49 cents in eastern grocery stores, or 20 cents above normal. Much attention and fanfare was given to this development. But one of the basic causes of this

increase was a temporary shortage of lettuce due to poor weather. Another was artificial marketing quotas. And within a very few weeks, the price dropped back to normal.

The fact, quite simply, is that too often this year American housewives have been denied the truth about the reasons they have paid more for some agricultural commodities. One of the tables that I will present at the close of my remarks will document this point further.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I wish to commend the gentleman in the well for presenting to the Congress such a comprehensive and most encouraging report. His report convinces me that I was right when I joined the gentleman in the well in the 88th Congress to fight against the extension of Public Law 78.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for his most generous comment and remarks and for his unceasing support and help in this very important area of American farm labor.

FARM INCOME AND PRODUCTION

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to discuss farm income and production. During this changeover to increased reliance on American workers, agricultural employers have not suffered the heavy losses many persons predicted would come.

For the second quarter of 1965, the annual rate of net farm income, at $14.6 billion, was $2.5 billion higher than the rate for the same quarter in 1964.

In addition, farm production, as the wholesale prices indicate, has been quite high this year. This is not to say that some crop losses have not been suffered. There have been crop losses in 1965 just as there have been losses in previous years. But crop losses have not been triggered, as some have charged, by labor shortages resulting from termination of Public Law 78. Weather and market factors have been the major culprits.

All told, this has been a good year for American agriculture.

Al Edinger of the California Tomato Growers Association said in a recent interview that the State's tomato growers "will never again ask for braceros." The growers, he noted, "had a pretty fair year despite our screaming" and will probably produce a crop close to last year's record.

As a matter of fact, the reports I have received from California indicate that total tomato production this year will exceed the anticipated 2.3-million-ton yield; that farmer's total profits will be up; and that the domestic work force will be up as well by some 12,000 over a year ago. At the same time the use of braceros is down substantially. On September 15, 1964, 63,860 braceros were used to harvest tomatoes in California. A year later—this year—the figure was down to 11,370. On September 30, 1964, 59,080 braceros were used. This year on the same date there were only 17,150. So it is evident that plentiful crops and good profits are not only possible but a practical reality without foreign farm workers. And it is also evident that the end of Public Law 78 has substantially aided American farm workers.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that we have learned, in these brief months of 1965, that the law of supply and demand for labor applies just as much to agricultural employment as it does to employment in other American industries. And this should not be surprising, despite being so long denied.

The death of Public Law 78 did not merely mark the end of the mass importation of foreign farm labor. More importantly, it signaled the beginning of a new era in American agricultural economics. To accept this historic challenge, the agricultural industry must be brought fully into the mainstream of the Nation's economic affairs. And this can be accomplished only—

If agricultural employers compete for workers just as employers in other industries have traditionally done; and

If dignity is restored to farm employment through decent living wages and working conditions comparable to those in other American industries.

This year represents just a start, albeit a most auspicious one, on the way to improving employment opportunities and conditions for our own citizens.

As we view the job that lies before us, I am reminded of what Samuel Johnson once wisely wrote:

> He who waits to do a great deal of good at once will never do anything.

America cannot wait any longer to better the lot of those who toil the land for a living. We have begun but we have much to do and we must continue.

As I have indicated previously, if the recruitment and the movement of domestic workers from their homes to areas of peak demand is a problem, as it is, let us see how this can be solved without degrading American workers by shrill cries for foreign labor. If legislation is needed to assist this movement, let us develop appropriate measures.

If housing is a limiting factor on the availability of domestic workers, which it is, let us embark upon a program to assist growers in this regard.

If the problem of migrant family care is a problem, as it is, let us come up with imaginative programs to help the workers maintain their families in some degree of dignity and comfort while they toil in the fields and orchards.

If the status of agricultural labor has been downgraded over the years, as it has, let us work together toward giving farmworkers equal status with industrial workers in such essential matters as minimum wage protection, unemployment insurance coverage, workmen's compensation, and collective bargaining.

These problems are certainly not insurmountable. They can be solved by reasonable and practical means. So let us get on with the task of building a stable, reliable, and efficient farm labor force which can harvest the crops where and when they are ready.

Let us recognize that the difficulties of these past months have been relatively minor.

Let us begin now to plan how they may be overcome and how our farmers and farmworkers can share mutually in the benefits of our abundance.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. I wish to commend the gentleman from California for the long period of time during which he has contributed so much in pinpointing the area of need not only insofar as legislation is concerned but also insofar as some of the work which yet needs to be done in some of our States is concerned.

I do not have knowledge, with exactness, of the statistics with respect to the California picture, but those of us who have lived in Texas have long been aware of a very pathetic situation. Our interest in this problem has been evidenced from the beginning of Public Law 78, in the early 1950's. I happen to have witnessed some of the conditions which were suffered and permitted to endure in the State of Texas.

The most significant thing in my State was that in 1962, when the minimum wage was raised from 50 cents to 70 cents, within a 6-month period the percentage of braceros used in Texas dropped by 76 percent. That resulted from a minimal increase from 50 to 70 cents, which immediately discouraged the great and overwhelming use of this labor. This proved that domestic labor in Texas was available, once the wage was put above the 50-cent figure.

Now the State of California has standards, and I am very happy for the gentleman that it does have. He comes from a great State which has championed and pioneered in labor standards and employment standards. You have a minimum wage in California. We do not in Texas. In the State of Texas, in the senate in 1957 I offered the first minimum wage act in the history of that body setting a minimum wage of 40 cents. I could not even get a committee hearing on it. To this day I am sorry to report that we do not have a minimum wage law in Texas. We have people who are earning as little as 22 to 25 cents an hour. It used to hurt me very much personally to see a native Texan toiling in the fields where foreign workers had been imported where the foreign workers were guaranteed by law and by international agreement at least 50 cents an hour whereas the native Texan had no guarantee whatever and would be paid whatever the traffic would bear. Even to this day there are workers who are earning less than 30 cents and even 25 cents an hour. This is purely a domestic State matter. I felt there was a national interest in this inasmuch as there was a national policy that led to these contractual agreements which resulted in the wholesale importation of foreign labor under contractual conditions which had been outlawed by Congress in the 1880's. For that reason I have long heard of the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], who has today rendered a service by bringing us up to

date on some of the current conditions particularly in his own home State.

I want to make it patently clear that some of us have heard of his eminent and distinguished contribution ever since the days before we were fortunate enough and privileged enough to serve in this body. I end as I began, by complimenting and thanking the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank the gentleman, and may I say I have enjoyed working with the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who is so knowledgeable in this field. In commenting on his excellent contribution to this discussion, I want to point out to some of the brethren from my own great State, where we do indeed have higher standards and a more advanced agriculture in some commodity areas, that the problem is not a State problem; it is a national problem and it has to be looked at in that manner.

Lastly may I say to the gentleman from Texas, in appropriate gratitude, that I hope he will examine the RECORD very carefully because table No. 4 which I am submitting is a complete record of employment of seasonally hired workers for 1964 and 1965. My source is the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security. This table lists every State in the Union, including Texas. He will find there a very interesting report on the distribution, first by expansion of domestic labor in his own State, and second, of the virtual elimination of the hiring of non-American labor.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I would like to round out the thought, which I never completed, that with the advanced legal and legislative conditions of standards in California some of the more deleterious effects of the wholesale importation of labor might be softened as compared to what it is in my native State. What I like about the gentleman's outlook and approach is that it has not been negative in just fighting a law and getting rid of a practice, but he has led the fight to offer constructive alternatives such as the introduction of the bill which I had the honor to join him in to provide a better approach on the part of our national authorities and our State governments in the recruitment of migratory labor so that we could make better use of the available labor that we have here among our native workers.

I wanted to say that before you rounded out your discussion, because I think in all fairness you should be recognized for this constructive and creative contribution. You have not only fought against a bad situation, but you have offered constructive and creative alternatives to help solve some aspects of this problem.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman wholeheartedly for his very fine contribution and very generous remarks.

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

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a creative situation for the gentleman from Texas. I do wish you Texans did not love Texas as much as you do. You stated, I believe, that there are still areas where you are paying only 20 or 30 cents an hour. We have sent recruiters down there to do their best to get workers, good Texas workers, to come to California where I will guarantee the gentleman that they can get $2 or $3 an hour. But we cannot get them to leave Texas. I wish they would come to California.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, a brief, although I think a somewhat hurried effort was made sometime last year in some sections of Texas, but strange as it may sound, the workers in my particular district and in the immediate surrounding area for some years now, dating from the large and intensive period of the use of braceros have sort of written off the west coast.

Traditionally and for many years the workers went to California, but the migratory farmworker has sort of written off California and we have found that he has been going mostly into the Midwest, as well as Oregon; and to Minnesota, portions of Colorado, Kansas, Iowa, and some sections of Michigan. I have visited most of these areas and have discovered that you could not persuade anybody just on a promise that he would find employment in California to go to California because apparently the word had gotten around over a period of years that they were preempted. I know that recruiters came from California last year and went mostly into the valley of Texas, but not into my district, where the growers there reported that their own domestics for some time had not been forced to migrate out of the valley area of Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is some merit in what the gentleman has had to say. The gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] has some more information on that and I hope that the gentleman will be able to encourage some of those people to give us in California another chance because we desperately need them and we will pay $2 or $3 an hour.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I can inform some people in certain sections in my district, which is a one-county district, where we have 13-percent unemployment—as I say, I will be delighted to disseminate that information, because I think that you can recruit some workers for California in that district.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I want to reiterate before concluding that the gentleman in the well wants to do everything he can to meet the legitimate and demonstrated needs of our great agricultural industry while protecting and materially advancing the welfare of our domestic farmworkers who have been too long ignored and deprived.

What I have tried to show is that in spite of the difficulties, we have had a good year. And I want to pledge myself once again at this time to cooperate with all who are interested and concerned with the problem to take whatever steps are necessary in developing an adequate, stable and efficient domestic farm labor force that can harvest the crops where and when they are ready.

I cannot resist the opportunity of stressing again what our good friend, Congressman GONZALEZ, has mentioned, that the recruitment and transportation problem is one of the most critical we face and that it demands our immediate attention.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I include several tables which make very clear both our current status and the progress we have made during this last year:

UNITED STATES

TABLE I.—*Estimated employment of domestic migratory agricultural workers, by State, Aug. 15, 1965 and change from Aug. 15, 1964*

[Thousands of workers]

State	Migrant employment, Aug. 15	
	1965	Change from 1964
United States	270.7	+41.4
California	45.5	+7.6
Michigan	42.5	+17.5
Texas	22.7	+5.9
Colorado	6.6	+2.5
Connecticut	4.2	+.8
All other States	149.0	+7.2

NOTE.—Because of rounding, figures may not add to total.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE II.—*Foreign workers in United States by States as of Sept. 23, 1965, and Sept. 15, 1964*

	1965	1964
National total	23,567	92,800
California	16,911	63,900
Florida	552	885
Maine	3,926	4,642
New Hampshire	215	103
Vermont	50	81
Massachusetts	339	910
Connecticut	401	1,370
Rhode Island	44	59
Virginia	669	672
West Virginia	200	
New York	250	350

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE III.—*Change in seasonal domestic farm employment 1964–65 in crops and States where foreign workers were concentrated in 1964*

JANUARY-JUNE

Crop	States	January		February		March		April		May		June	
		15	31	15	28	15	31	15	30	15	31	15	30
Asparagus	California	(1)	650	500	1,800	650	250	−1,100	−550	−590	370	2,400	−550
Beans	Florida	−360	−1,400	−1,170	670	−630	−1,260	70	1,240	2,400	−140	80	100
Celery	California and Florida	600	540	470	320	50	(2)	−120	−760	600	520	1,560	240
Citrus	do	5,400	6,700	8,700	9,600	10,600	5,500	7,900	7,800	7,200	9,200	7,900	5,900
Corn, sweet	Florida	1,400	550	520	600	910	910	1,890	1,570	2,200	1,450	1,420	510
Cotton	California, Arizona, Texas, and Arkansas	−2,590	−1,900	−630	280	690	500	(2)	−1,650	−2,300	−3,100	1,920	−580
Cucumbers	Texas	0	(2)	0	50	(2)	120	0	140	340	350	880	1,060
Dates	California	(2)	(2)	(2)	50	50	70	170	180	(2)	(2)	70	140
Grapes	do	1,400	2,400	3,800	3,400	1,400	400	470	−2,100	−650	450	2,200	−4,700
Hay and grain	Texas	580	440	440	470	240	670	2,200	750	590	−250	−1,640	1,160
Lettuce	California and Arizona	2,300	2,900	2,400	1,590	2,200	3,200	3,200	2,900	2,900	3,700	3,300	1,420
Melons	California, Arizona, and Texas	50	660	−290	−180	940	230	−780	−2,000	270	2,900	6,900	3,600
Onions	Arizona and Texas	160	620	80	440	640	100	−480	−400	590	1,660	390	560
Potatoes	Maine	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	−1,450	−880	−2,900	−2,900
Strawberries	California and Florida	790	1,280	1,000	1,640	830	400	320	1,390	2,400	3,100	3,400	3,600
Sugarcane	Florida	−290	1,630	580	670	100	−560	−1,570	−680	980	610	1,040	−380
Sugarbeets	California, Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.	−300	200	550	350	−100	850	−920	80	2,800	6,000	7,800	5,400
Tobacco	Connecticut and Massachusetts	860	720	680	560	640	750	1,590	2,300	1,260	1,490	1,090	1,590
Tomatoes	California, Florida, and Texas	200	(2)	−1,920	−1,620	−4,500	−3,000	1,040	110	−960	570	700	5,200
Total increase		8,200	15,600	15,700	19,400	14,700	9,200	14,100	10,300	18,500	28,000	38,300	21,200
Percent increase		8	16	17	20	14	8	11	7	10	13	17	9
Percent of 1964 foreign worker employment in above crops.		82	82	82	82	86	86	88	84	85	87	86	84

JULY-SEPTEMBER

Crop	States	July		August		September	
		15	31	15	31	15	30
Apples	Michigan, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia	−100	(2)	120	−580	−810	
Beans	California and Texas	−140	−280	−160	320	−300	
Celery	California and Florida	260	(2)	−410	−280	820	
Citrus	California, Florida, and Arizona	6,150	5,470	5,000	4,150	3,380	
Cotton	California, Texas, Arkansas, and New Mexico	−3,560	10,290	4,320	−3,890	−11,600	
Cucumbers	Michigan, California, Texas, Colorado, Indiana, and Wisconsin	480	8,220	13,060	11,860	4,190	
Grapes	California	600	−450	−50	8,650	4,000	
Hay and grain	Texas	(2)	1,190	4,340	2,530	1,990	
Lettuce	California, Arizona, and Colorado	1,800	2,050	2,830	2,850	3,960	
Melons	California and Texas	3,960	4,020	3,660	1,050	1,060	
Potatoes	Maine and New Jersey	−2,900	−3,450	−3,480	−3,080	7,210	
Strawberries	California	3,650	2,800	2,110	1,400	1,050	
Sugarbeets	California, Colorado, Nebraska, Montana, and Wyoming	3,000	1,710	−450	−100	−300	
Sugarcane	Florida	960	340	290	130	−420	
Tobacco	Massachusetts and Connecticut	1,830	1,910	1,340	940	2,520	
Tomatoes	California	1,450	−150	3,850	13,600	12,350	
Total increase		17,450	33,610	36,390	22,240	29,120	
Percent increase		8	16	19	10	14	
Percent of foreign worker employment in above crops		80	83	87	88	88	

[1] Crop not active.
[2] Less than 50 workers.

NOTE.—Due to rounding figures may not add to totals.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*

ARIZONA

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign	Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state				Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964							*1965*						
January	17,200	14,200	11,600	1,000	1,600	3,100	January	16,000	16,000	12,600	1,300	2,000	0
February	14,500	12,300	10,500	800	1,000	2,300	February	15,500	15,500	12,000	1,800	1,800	0
March	15,000	12,200	10,700	700	800	2,800	March	15,000	15,000	11,800	1,600	1,700	0
April	19,900	13,500	11,700	900	1,000	6,400	April	16,500	16,500	12,800	1,300	2,400	0
May	20,000	15,400	13,600	900	1,000	4,600	May	18,000	18,000	15,800	1,200	1,100	0
June	21,900	17,200	15,300	700	1,100	4,800	June	20,000	20,000	16,000	2,300	1,700	0
July	14,900	13,900	12,600	700	700	1,000	July	14,600	14,600	13,300	800	500	0
August	11,900	11,400	10,400	500	500	500	August	10,500	10,500	9,600	600	300	0
September	12,700	10,500	9,500	400	600	2,200	September	12,500	12,500	11,400	500	500	0
October	18,500	14,000	11,800	800	1,400	4,500							
November	23,700	16,500	13,800	900	1,900	7,200							
December	23,700	18,200	14,400	1,400	2,500	5,500							

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

ARIZONA—Continued

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964–65

Date	Lettuce cultivation		Lettuce harvest		Onion ph & h		Melon ph & h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
January	700	800	1,300	1,400	1,200	0	0	0
February	900	500	700	1,200	1,400	0	300	(1)
March	900	600	900	1,400	1,900	0	200	500
April	500	300	1,400	4,400	1,500	(1)	800	1,200
May	100	100	1,000	2,200	1,400	200	800	1,100
June	0	0	100	400	1,600	300	900	3,100
July	100	0	(1)	(1)	0	0	400	700
August	100	200	0	0	100	0	200	0
September	900	1,300	0	0	100	0	0	0
October	1,700	1,900	400	800	500	0	(1)	(1)
November	1,000	1,200	1,700	3,800	800	0	(1)	(1)
December	400	1,200	2,900	2,800	1,500	(1)	0	0
1965								
January	1,400	0	1,900	0	1,300	0	0	0
February	1,500	0	1,800	0	1,300	0	0	0
March	1,000	0	2,300	0	1,700	0	400	0
April	400	0	4,200	0	1,200	0	800	0
May	(1)	0	1,200	0	1,900	0	1,400	0
June	0	0	600	0	1,200	0	4,200	0
July	0	0	0	0	200	0	1,000	0
August	200	0	0	0	100	0	100	0
September	2,300	0	0	0	300	0	0	0

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964–65

Date	Citrus harvest		Cotton cultivation		Irrigation	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
January	600	400	0	0	1,700	300
February	600	(1)	0	0	2,100	300
March	700	100	0	0	2,500	200
April	700	100	300	(1)	2,500	500
May	500	100	3,100	300	2,600	500
June	200	100	4,200	300	2,900	300
July	100	0	4,500	100	3,200	200
August	0	0	3,700	100	3,100	200
September	100	400	1,000	100	2,600	400
October	200	1,000	(1)	0	1,800	500
November	800	1,400	0	0	2,100	400
December	1,100	700	0	0	2,200	400
1965						
January	1,000	0	0	0	2,400	0
February	800	0	0	0	2,600	0
March	1,000	0	0	0	2,900	0
April	1,400	0	0	0	2,800	0
May	1,400	0	2,700	0	3,200	0
June	1,400	0	2,700	0	3,300	0
July	500	0	2,900	0	3,600	0
August	200	0	2,600	0	3,100	0
September	300	0	700	0	3,100	0

[1] Less than 50 workers.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

ARKANSAS—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	13,200	12,800	8,200	2,700	2,000	400
June	41,700	37,800	37,000	300	500	3,900
July	34,400	30,700	30,100	300	300	3,700
August	9,000	8,800	8,700	100	100	100
September	31,700	31,400	31,000	200	200	300
October	42,000	40,600	39,900	100	500	1,400
November	24,700	24,000	23,600	0	400	700
1965						
May	10,800	10,800	7,200	1,900	1,700	0
June	37,600	37,600	37,100	300	300	0
July	34,800	34,800	34,100	400	300	0
August	8,200	8,200	8,100	100	(1)	0
September	18,500	18,500	18,500	0	0	0

[1] Less than 50.

CALIFORNIA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	98,000	87,600	69,100	13,600	4,900	10,300
February	85,200	74,500	59,300	11,000	4,200	10,600
March	76,500	65,200	53,000	8,100	4,200	11,200
April	97,100	78,000	61,400	10,600	6,000	19,000
May	150,200	120,400	93,500	17,900	9,000	29,800
June	165,600	127,800	94,100	21,000	12,700	37,800
July	156,600	122,600	87,800	23,900	10,900	33,900
August	161,300	124,600	86,700	25,400	12,500	36,700
September	225,200	161,200	110,000	33,600	17,700	63,900
October	175,900	124,400	93,000	20,900	10,400	51,600
November	89,000	70,000	55,700	8,500	5,800	19,000
December	93,400	80,700	64,800	11,000	4,800	12,700
1965						
January	90,200	89,300	70,100	13,900	5,300	900
February	83,000	83,000	63,800	13,700	5,500	0
March	73,800	73,200	55,800	12,000	5,400	600
April	84,800	84,600	63,000	14,700	7,000	100
May	140,200	139,400	100,200	25,500	13,600	800
June	166,200	162,800	114,700	30,400	17,800	3,400
July	142,000	141,300	96,400	26,900	18,000	700
August	146,100	145,500	100,000	29,200	16,300	600
September	178,000	166,600	113,100	34,600	18,900	11,400

CALIFORNIA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964–65

Date	Tomato ph and h		Asparagus ph and h		Strawberry ph and h		Melon ph and h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
January	400	200	0	0	300	0	0	0
February	0	0	0	0	200	0	200	200
March	0	0	1,800	0	400	600	300	400
April	1,000	0	4,500	3,500	2,000	2,800	800	0
May	2,600	1,000	4,300	3,700	2,900	8,500	2,400	100
June	1,800	1,200	1,400	4,200	2,100	10,400	3,200	200
July	6,600	3,200	0	0	2,000	6,200	1,100	3,200
August	5,800	11,200	0	0	1,200	4,500	1,200	2,800
September	6,400	38,000	0	0	800	3,600	500	1,600
October	4,600	26,600	0	0	400	2,200	0	0
November	1,600	1,600	0	0	500	0	0	0
December	1,000	1,000	0	0	100	0	0	0
1965								
January	800	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
February	400	0	500	0	400	0	0	0
March	400	0	2,400	0	100	0	700	0
April	0	0	3,400	0	3,000	0	0	0
May	2,000	100	3,700	400	5,400	300	1,800	0
June	3,200	0	3,800	1,000	5,500	2,200	2,800	0
July	8,000	0	0	0	5,900	200	4,400	0
August	9,600	400	0	0	3,300	0	4,400	0
September	18,700	10,800	0	0	1,800	400	1,400	0

Date	Grape ph and h		Lemon h		Orange h		Lettuce		Sugarbeets	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964										
January	16,700	200	600	2,800	4,200	400	1,400	2,000	300	700
February	11,000	0	1,000	3,400	3,600	1,000	1,200	1,800	800	600
March	1,800	0	1,000	3,800	3,300	1,200	2,200	1,500	3,300	400
April	100	0	1,000	4,600	2,600	1,200	2,000	2,000	6,300	800
May	5,400	200	800	4,500	3,800	1,200	1,800	3,300	4,500	1,400
June	7,300	400	600	3,600	600	2,200	1,700	4,200	1,600	2,000
July	1,300	900	400	2,000	800	3,000	1,800	3,700	2,100	2,500
August	12,500	0	200	900	600	3,000	1,600	3,500	1,400	900
September	51,200	1,200	200	1,000	600	2,700	800	4,600	800	0
October	32,600	2,500	200	1,100	200	1,400	1,400	6,400	1,200	2,100
November	3,400	100	200	900	0	0	700	3,900	2,400	2,600
December	6,200	0	400	2,000	7,200	100	1,000	2,200	1,200	1,000
1965										
January	18,100	0	1,500	0	3,700	0	2,400	100	0	0
February	14,800	0	3,600	0	5,500	0	2,000	0	1,300	0
March	3,200	0	4,100	600	5,400	0	2,800	0	3,200	0
April	600	0	4,000	0	3,700	0	2,400	0	5,400	0
May	4,800	0	3,600	0	4,000	0	4,600	0	5,200	0
June	9,600	0	3,800	0	5,300	0	4,500	200	2,500	0
July	3,600	0	3,600	0	2,800	0	3,900	0	3,000	0
August	12,400	0	2,500	0	3,000	0	3,700	0	1,200	0
September	55,200	0	1,200	0	2,700	0	3,000	0	600	0

Source: In-season farm labor reports as of midmonth.

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

COLORADO—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	8,700	6,200	3,300	500	2,400	2,500
June	15,900	9,900	4,800	700	4,400	6,000
July	14,100	11,400	6,600	800	4,100	2,600
August	13,900	10,400	6,200	1,000	3,200	3,500
September	13,200	10,400	5,400	1,400	3,600	2,900
October	9,300	8,400	4,900	1,100	2,400	800
November	1,200	1,200	1,000	100	100	(1)
1965						
May	8,000	8,000	3,400	300	4,200	0
June	14,100	14,100	5,000	600	8,400	0
July	12,800	12,800	6,100	900	5,800	0
August	12,300	12,300	5,600	1,200	5,400	0
September	12,900	12,900	5,800	1,400	5,800	0

[1] Less than 50.

CONNECTICUT—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	5,200	4,600	4,500	0	100	600
February	4,900	4,300	4,200	0	100	600
March	4,800	4,200	4,200	0	100	600
April	5,000	4,300	4,000	0	300	700
May	4,700	3,400	2,700	0	700	1,300
June	5,400	4,000	3,100	0	900	1,400
July	13,700	12,300	8,800	0	3,400	1,400
August	16,900	15,500	12,100	(1)	3,400	1,400
September	6,300	4,900	3,900	0	1,000	1,400
October	7,200	6,000	5,500	0	600	1,200
November	5,700	5,000	4,700	0	300	700
December	6,100	5,500	5,400	0	100	600
1965						
January	6,000	5,400	5,400	0	100	600
February	5,600	5,000	4,900	0	100	600
March	5,400	4,900	4,800	0	100	600
April	5,800	5,200	4,400	0	800	600
May	4,800	4,300	3,000	0	1,400	500
June	5,200	4,800	3,400	0	1,400	400
July	14,500	14,100	9,600	(1)	4,500	400
August	17,000	16,600	12,300	100	4,200	400
September	6,600	6,200	4,600	0	1,600	400

[1] Less than 50.

FLORIDA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	66,500	54,200	40,000	5,000	9,100	12,300
February	69,300	58,100	43,000	5,500	9,600	11,200
March	70,200	59,700	44,600	6,000	9,200	10,400
April	66,600	57,900	48,200	5,000	4,600	8,800
May	61,000	54,200	47,100	3,300	3,800	6,800
June	38,800	36,100	33,900	1,600	700	2,600
July	36,800	36,000	35,800	100	100	800
August	19,900	19,200	18,800	100	400	600
September	23,100	22,200	20,700	600	900	900
October	33,300	31,600	28,000	1,800	1,900	1,600
November	57,900	47,600	39,400	3,000	5,200	10,300
December	73,800	60,500	45,600	5,700	9,200	13,300
1965						
January	83,600	69,500	51,700	6,400	11,400	14,100
February	84,400	70,700	53,800	5,100	11,800	13,700
March	76,000	66,900	51,900	3,900	11,100	9,100
April	78,000	70,200	56,500	4,800	8,900	7,800
May	83,100	77,900	65,500	7,500	5,000	5,200
June	48,500	48,200	46,400	1,300	500	300
July	23,900	23,900	23,400	400	100	0
August	20,300	20,300	19,700	400	200	0
September	23,100	22,500	21,900	400	300	600

FLORIDA—SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITIES AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964–65

Date	Tomato ph and h		Celery ph and h		Strawberry ph and h		Citrus ph	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
January	10,900	600	1,800	600	1,000	300	7,700	0
February	11,700	700	2,400	600	1,500	300	8,000	0
March	13,300	1,000	2,500	600	2,100	1,300	9,900	0
April	8,000	900	3,000	600	1,700	1,300	9,500	0
May	8,200	400	2,700	600	400	(1)	8,300	0
June	2,600	0	1,300	100	0	0	9,500	0
July	400	0	500	0	0	0	10,700	0
August	700	0	700	0	0	0	10,300	0
September	1,400	0	900	0	200	0	9,600	0
October	3,100	0	1,100	0	500	0	9,300	0
November	5,900	0	1,300	300	900	0	8,700	0
December	9,100	100	1,800	500	1,800	100	8,600	0
1965								
January	10,400	200	2,300	500	2,000	400	7,800	0
February	9,400	200	2,500	500	2,400	400	7,600	0
March	8,500	200	2,200	500	3,300	700	8,900	0
April	10,100	0	2,300	500	1,000	1,000	9,300	0
May	8,200	0	2,600	500	400	0	9,500	0
June	1,500	0	2,200	0	(1)	0	10,800	0
July	300	0	500	0	(1)	0	11,200	0
August	600	0	600	0	(1)	0	10,600	0
September	1,400	0	1,100	0	(1)	0	9,800	0

Date	Citrus h		Sugarcane ph		Sugarcane h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
January	10,200	2,800	1,100	300	800	7,400
February	9,600	2,600	1,900	100	800	6,600
March	5,200	1,500	2,200	800	1,300	5,000
April	7,800	2,000	2,900	2,800	0	700
May	7,000	2,900	1,900	2,200	0	0
June	3,500	600	2,400	1,200	0	0
July	100	0	2,200	700	0	0
August	(1)	0	2,600	500	0	0
September	0	0	2,200	800	0	0
October	2,800	0	2,500	1,500	0	0
November	8,000	1,400	1,600	100	1,500	8,300
December	10,800	2,800	700	(1)	2,000	9,500
1965						
January	13,200	3,500	400	(1)	1,200	9,400
February	14,400	3,500	700	0	2,600	9,100
March	11,600	0	600	0	3,000	7,800
April	11,800	3,200	1,300	3,100	0	0
May	10,000	3,500	2,900	1,300	0	0
June	2,400	0	3,400	300	0	0
July	200	0	3,100	0	0	0
August	0	0	2,900	0	0	0
September	0	0	1,800	600	0	0

[1] Less than 50 workers.

IDAHO—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
April	3,900	3,900	2,800	100	1,000	0
May	7,200	7,200	4,300	200	2,700	0
June	15,300	15,300	5,900	400	9,000	0
July	15,000	15,000	6,900	700	7,400	0
August	9,800	9,800	5,500	400	4,000	0
September	9,100	9,100	4,600	600	3,900	0
October	17,500	17,500	10,500	1,500	5,400	0
November	1,500	1,500	1,300	100	100	0
1965						
April	4,900	4,900	3,500	200	1,200	0
May	9,400	9,400	5,100	300	5,900	0
June	15,000	15,000	6,200	600	8,200	0
July	11,200	11,200	6,600	500	4,100	0
August	10,600	10,600	6,400	600	3,700	0
September	9,800	9,800	5,000	600	4,100	0

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

ILLINOIS—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	5,200	5,200	2,000	100	3,000	0
June	7,500	7,500	3,000	200	4,400	0
July	6,100	6,100	3,600	100	2,400	0
August	7,200	7,200	2,600	100	4,600	0
September	7,800	7,800	2,400	100	5,300	0
October	1,800	1,800	1,100	0	700	0
1965						
May	4,300	4,300	1,200	0	3,100	0
June	7,600	7,600	2,500	(1)	5,000	0
July	5,400	5,400	2,500	300	2,600	0
August	7,500	7,500	2,100	200	5,300	0
September	7,700	7,700	2,200	(1)	5,500	0

[1] Less than 50.

INDIANA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
April	500	500	300	0	200	0
May	1,400	1,400	600	0	800	0
June	2,500	2,500	1,000	0	1,600	0
July	4,000	3,900	2,400	0	1,500	100
August	4,900	4,700	1,300	0	3,300	300
September	10,100	10,100	1,600	0	8,500	(1)
October	1,700	1,700	1,100	0	600	(1)
1965						
April	400	400	200	0	200	0
May	2,000	2,000	1,100	0	900	0
June	2,900	2,900	900	0	1,900	0
July	5,100	5,100	2,900	0	2,200	0
August	7,300	7,300	1,600	0	5,700	0
September	9,900	9,900	1,600	0	8,300	0

[1] Less than 50.

KANSAS—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	6,000	5,900	4,500	800	600	100
June	17,600	17,300	10,600	1,900	4,800	300
July	26,500	26,400	17,900	3,400	5,100	100
August	22,700	22,700	15,200	3,200	4,300	0
September	17,000	17,000	13,200	1,800	2,000	0
October	10,900	10,900	8,800	1,300	800	0
November	4,400	4,400	3,600	500	400	0
1965						
May	8,100	8,100	6,100	1,000	1,000	0
June	16,500	16,500	11,100	1,900	3,500	0
July	29,500	29,500	19,400	4,300	5,800	0
August	22,300	22,300	15,600	3,000	3,800	0
September	13,100	13,100	10,200	1,400	1,500	0

LOUISIANA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	2,900	2,900	2,400	300	300	0
February	1,400	1,400	1,400	0	0	0
March	1,400	1,400	1,400	0	0	0
April	9,500	9,500	5,400	1,600	2,500	0
May	11,400	11,400	9,900	900	700	0
June	16,900	16,900	16,900	0	0	0
July	6,400	6,400	6,400	0	0	0
August	3,600	3,600	3,600	0	0	0
September	17,600	17,600	17,300	200	200	0
October	18,400	18,400	16,500	1,300	600	100
November	16,600	16,400	13,400	2,100	900	300
December	11,400	11,100	8,000	2,200	1,000	300

LOUISIANA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965—Continued

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1965						
January	3,200	3,000	2,800	200	(1)	100
February	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0	0
March	1,700	1,700	1,700	0	0	0
April	9,000	9,000	5,400	1,600	2,000	0
May	8,300	8,300	6,700	1,600	100	0
June	13,500	13,500	13,509	0	100	0
July	9,300	9,300	9,300	0	0	0
August	4,700	4,700	4,700	0	0	0
September	12,200	12,200	11,800	200	100	0

[1] Less than 50.

MAINE—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	6,900	6,400	6,400	0	(1)	500
June	7,000	6,600	6,500	0	(1)	500
July	8,700	8,400	8,400	0	(1)	300
August	10,100	9,800	9,800	0	(1)	300
September	13,700	9,100	9,100	0	(1)	4,600
October	5,300	3,300	3,300	0	(1)	2,000
1965						
May	5,000	5,000	5,000	(1)	(1)	0
June	3,700	3,700	3,700	0	(1)	0
July	5,400	5,400	5,400	0	(1)	0
August	5,900	5,900	5,900	(1)	(1)	0
September	19,000	16,300	16,200	0	(1)	2,700

[1] Less than 50.

MASSACHUSETTS—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	100	0	0	0	0	100
February	100	0	0	0	0	100
March	100	0	0	0	0	100
April	400	200	200	0	(1)	100
May	5,600	5,200	4,600	0	600	300
June	7,300	6,900	5,900	0	900	400
July	14,000	13,500	11,800	0	1,700	500
August	14,600	14,200	12,300	(1)	1,900	500
September	10,500	9,500	8,500	(1)	1,100	900
October	9,700	9,000	8,300	0	800	700
November	3,700	3,500	3,100	100	200	300
December	1,200	1,100	1,100	0	0	100
1965						
January	100	(1)	(1)	0	0	100
February	100	(1)	(1)	0	0	100
March	100	(1)	(1)	0	0	100
April	1,300	1,100	900	0	200	200
May	5,700	5,600	4,700	0	900	100
June	7,400	7,300	5,900	0	1,300	100
July	13,800	13,700	11,600	0	2,100	100
August	15,100	15,000	12,700	(1)	2,300	100
September	11,900	11,600	10,000	100	1,500	300

[1] Less than 50.

MICHIGAN—SEASONAL HIRED WORKER EMPLOYMENT IN PICKLE HARVEST, JULY TO SEPTEMBER 1964-65

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
July 15	900	100
July 31	2,600	9,300
Aug. 15	3,400	12,800
Aug. 31	2,600	11,300
Sept. 15	500	2,000
1965		
July 15	900	0
July 31	8,300	0
Aug. 15	10,800	0
Aug. 31	11,600	0
Sept. 15	2,600	0

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

MICHIGAN—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
April	5,800	5,800	5,100	100	600	0
May	16,000	16,000	11,700	400	3,900	0
June	43,700	43,700	14,500	1,700	27,600	0
July	74,400	74,300	23,000	5,300	46,000	100
August	63,100	50,200	25,200	2,700	22,300	12,800
September	35,300	32,900	17,400	1,800	13,700	2,400
October	25,500	25,100	14,500	1,200	9,400	300
November	6,600	6,600	5,600	200	800	(1)
December	400	400	400	0	0	(1)
1965						
April	3,500	3,500	2,800	100	500	0
May	13,700	13,700	10,000	300	3,500	0
June	44,400	44,400	13,900	1,200	29,200	0
July	49,500	49,500	20,400	2,900	26,200	0
August	70,700	70,700	28,200	7,400	35,100	0
September	35,300	35,300	17,600	1,200	16,500	0

[1] Less than 50.

MISSOURI—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	6,200	6,200	6,000	0	200	0
June	15,700	15,700	14,400	300	1,000	0
July	8,100	8,100	8,100	0	0	0
August	200	200	200	0	0	0
September	16,300	16,300	15,700	200	500	0
October	19,300	19,300	18,300	300	800	0
November	5,100	5,100	5,000	0	200	0
December	500	500	500	0	0	0
1965						
January	200	200	200	0	0	0
June	16,800	16,800	15,300	800	600	0
July	13,300	13,300	12,800	200	300	0
August	1,000	1,000	800	0	200	0
September	8,900	8,900	8,600	100	100	0

MONTANA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
January	1,300	1,300	1,000	200	100	0
February	1,400	1,400	1,100	200	100	0
March	2,100	2,100	1,500	300	300	0
April	3,800	3,800	2,300	800	700	0
May	5,600	5,600	2,800	900	1,900	0
June	10,000	8,300	2,700	1,200	4,400	1,700
July	10,000	9,800	4,100	1,700	4,000	200
August	9,000	9,000	4,000	2,000	3,000	0
September	6,300	6,300	3,200	1,700	1,400	0
October	5,500	5,500	3,100	1,500	900	0
November	2,400	2,400	1,600	400	300	0
December	2,000	2,000	1,400	300	300	0
1965						
January	1,900	1,900	1,300	300	200	0
February	1,600	1,600	1,300	200	100	0
March	2,200	2,200	1,700	300	200	0
April	3,400	3,400	2,400	600	400	0
May	5,000	5,000	3,000	800	1,200	0
June	9,400	9,400	3,300	1,300	4,900	0
July	9,900	9,900	4,200	2,100	3,500	0
August	9,400	9,400	4,500	2,200	2,700	0
September	7,100	7,100	3,400	2,000	1,800	0

NEBRASKA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
May	1,100	1,000	300	0	700	100
June	5,600	4,200	2,200	100	1,900	1,300
July	6,600	6,400	4,300	300	1,800	200
August	2,900	2,900	2,400	200	300	0
September	1,900	1,900	1,700	(1)	100	0
October	2,800	2,800	2,500	(1)	200	0
1965						
June	6,300	6,300	2,400	(1)	3,800	0
July	5,300	5,300	3,600	200	1,500	0
August	4,000	4,000	3,400	200	400	0
September	2,000	2,000	1,800	100	100	0

[1] Less than 50.

NEW HAMPSHIRE—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
June	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	(1)	0
July	1,200	1,200	1,200	0	100	0
August	1,600	1,600	1,500	0	100	0
September	2,400	2,200	2,100	0	200	100
October	800	800	700	0	(1)	100
1965						
June	1,000	1,000	900	0	(1)	0
July	1,200	1,200	1,100	0	100	0
August	1,400	1,400	1,400	0	100	0
September	1,800	1,700	1,700	0	(1)	100

[1] Less than 50.

NEW JERSEY—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intrastate	Interstate	
1964						
April	2,000	2,000	1,200	0	800	0
May	10,900	10,900	3,400	0	7,500	0
June	18,100	18,100	6,500	100	11,500	0
July	24,000	24,000	13,400	100	10,600	0
August	24,900	24,900	11,300	100	13,500	0
September	16,900	16,900	8,100	100	8,700	(1)
October	11,100	10,300	5,800	(1)	4,500	800
November	2,200	2,000	1,100	(1)	800	200
1965						
April	1,900	1,900	1,000	0	900	0
May	10,800	10,800	3,500	0	7,300	0
June	17,400	17,400	5,700	100	11,600	0
July	23,600	23,600	12,500	100	11,000	0
August	24,600	24,600	12,100	100	12,400	0
September	16,100	16,100	7,200	100	8,800	0

[1] Less than 50.

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

NEW MEXICO—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	700	700	600	(1)	(1)	(1)
February	700	700	700	(1)	(1)	(1)
March	900	900	800	(1)	100	(1)
April	1,000	900	800	(1)	(1)	100
May	1,200	1,000	900	(1)	(1)	200
June	3,100	2,700	1,900	100	700	400
July	2,800	2,200	1,900	100	200	600
August	3,000	2,400	1,900	100	500	600
September	2,300	1,500	1,300	100	100	800
October	3,800	2,500	1,800	300	400	1,300
November	3,100	2,100	1,700	100	300	1,000
December	1,400	1,100	1,000	(1)	100	300
1965						
January	900	900	800	(1)	(1)	0
June	1,700	1,700	1,100	(1)	600	0
July	1,600	1,600	1,300	(1)	200	0
August	2,600	2,600	2,100	200	300	0
September	3,200	3,200	1,800	1,200	200	0

[1] Less than 50.

NEW YORK—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	7,100	7,100	4,600	200	2,200	0
June	12,700	12,700	7,200	600	4,900	0
July	24,900	24,900	12,300	1,000	11,600	0
August	25,600	25,600	10,500	1,200	13,900	0
September	31,700	31,400	9,800	1,200	20,400	400
October	31,200	30,800	10,500	800	19,500	400
November	400	200	(1)	(1)	200	200
1965						
May	7,100	7,100	4,800	300	1,900	0
June	12,100	12,100	6,900	400	4,800	0
July	23,000	23,000	12,400	900	9,700	0
August	25,200	25,200	11,400	1,000	12,800	0
September	30,500	30,300	10,800	1,200	18,200	200

[1] Less than 50.

NORTH CAROLINA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	12,700	12,700	12,600	100	100	0
February	19,600	19,600	19,400	100	100	0
March	23,800	23,800	23,600	100	100	0
April	33,800	33,800	33,200	400	200	0
May	85,500	85,500	83,600	1,300	600	0
June	113,300	113,300	106,900	1,500	4,900	0
July	229,900	229,900	217,700	4,900	7,300	0
August	249,800	249,800	236,300	7,000	6,500	0
September	118,900	118,900	110,800	3,800	4,300	0
October	158,300	158,300	153,500	2,100	2,600	0
November	86,200	86,200	84,100	1,000	1,100	0
December	24,900	24,900	24,800	100	100	0
1965						
January	17,700	17,700	17,700	0	0	0
February	22,000	22,000	21,900	100	100	0
March	25,800	25,800	25,600	100	100	0
April	42,000	42,000	41,700	200	200	0
May	82,100	82,100	81,000	400	700	0
June	117,700	117,700	112,800	1,000	3,900	0
July	192,300	192,300	181,500	4,100	6,700	0
August	260,900	260,900	248,000	6,900	6,000	0
September	141,600	141,600	136,800	1,700	3,200	0

OHIO—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	16,500	16,500	14,700	200	1,700	0
June	25,100	25,100	20,700	300	4,200	0
July	23,300	23,300	18,100	400	4,800	0
August	25,700	25,700	15,700	300	9,800	0
September	28,500	28,500	16,400	400	11,800	0
October	17,400	17,400	15,100	300	2,000	0
1965						
May	17,200	17,200	15,100	400	1,800	0
June	24,400	24,400	20,100	400	4,000	0
July	24,600	24,600	19,100	400	5,000	0
August	32,500	32,500	17,000	500	15,000	0
September	33,500	33,500	17,300	600	15,600	0

OREGON—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
March	700	700	500	0	200	0
April	3,400	3,400	2,700	100	700	0
May	7,700	7,700	4,100	200	3,400	0
June	31,600	31,600	25,000	800	5,800	0
July	57,600	57,600	42,400	2,100	13,100	0
August	61,200	61,200	45,600	2,600	13,000	0
September	20,900	20,700	13,400	1,000	6,300	200
October	9,900	9,900	6,800	800	2,300	0
November	2,600	2,600	2,500	100	100	0
1965						
March	2,400	2,400	1,600	400	400	0
April	4,200	4,200	3,400	200	600	0
May	8,700	8,700	5,000	300	3,400	0
June	59,200	59,200	46,500	2,300	10,500	0
July	33,200	33,200	23,300	2,400	7,500	0
August	63,400	63,400	48,000	2,000	13,400	0
September	17,600	17,600	10,100	1,100	6,400	0

PENNSYLVANIA—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	8,100	8,100	7,600	300	100	0
June	11,600	11,600	10,500	500	700	0
July	19,200	19,200	16,600	1,000	1,700	0
August	16,000	16,000	11,100	600	4,400	0
September	20,400	20,400	14,600	1,000	4,800	0
October	17,300	17,300	12,700	900	3,700	0
November	5,800	5,800	5,300	200	300	0
1965						
May	9,100	9,100	8,600	200	300	0
June	12,400	12,400	11,600	300	500	0
July	18,600	18,600	16,400	800	1,400	0
August	16,500	16,500	12,000	900	3,600	0
September	20,300	20,300	14,100	1,000	5,200	0

RHODE ISLAND—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
September	400	300	300	0	0	100
October	200	100	100	0	0	(1)
November	100	100	100	0	0	(1)
1965						
September	400	300	300	0	0	(1)

[1] Less than 50.

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

TEXAS—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	70,100	67,000	66,900	100	100	3,000
February	71,500	69,900	69,800	0	100	1,600
March	85,900	84,300	84,100	200	100	1,500
April	105,800	103,000	102,500	500	(1)	2,800
May	129,400	124,200	121,700	2,300	200	5,200
June	156,400	149,400	140,500	7,900	1,000	7,000
July	156,800	149,000	127,500	20,000	1,400	7,900
August	144,800	134,400	117,600	15,800	1,100	10,400
September	113,800	103,800	97,900	5,600	300	10,100
October	129,000	116,800	101,300	14,200	1,200	12,200
November	131,100	117,700	101,200	15,100	1,300	13,500
December	99,500	91,900	86,200	5,300	400	7,500
1965						
January	69,300	69,300	68,700	400	200	0
February	72,300	72,300	72,200	100	0	0
March	85,700	85,700	85,500	200	200	0
April	102,200	102,200	101,400	700	100	0
May	125,100	125,100	122,400	2,500	300	0
June	153,200	153,200	142,800	9,600	800	0
July	146,200	146,200	121,700	23,000	1,600	0
August	143,800	143,800	121,100	21,600	1,200	0
September	108,300	108,300	101,100	6,600	700	0

[1] Less than 50.

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS, BY MAJOR CROP ACTIVITY AND TYPE OF WORKER, 1964-65

Date	Cucumber		Cotton ph		Cotton h	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
January	200	0	10,600	500	3,000	1,200
February	200	0	14,400	600	(1)	(1)
March	400	0	19,800	700	0	0
April	600	0	30,300	1,800	0	0
May	900	300	42,600	2,200	0	0
June	700	100	54,300	2,900	0	0
July	800	600	52,400	4,600	11,000	0
August	1,300	2,700	28,000	5,000	37,800	0
September	700	2,100	8,500	3,200	31,000	1,800
October	500	100	3,400	200	42,500	8,500
November	600	(1)	3,200	0	42,300	10,700
December	200	0	5,700	0	27,700	6,300
1965						
January	200	0	10,400	0	2,000	0
February	200	0	14,500	0	(1)	0
March	400	0	20,400	0	0	0
April	600	0	30,600	0	0	0
May	1,300	0	43,800	0	0	0
June	1,500	0	54,800	0	0	0
July	1,100	0	53,600	0	6,800	0
August	3,200	0	32,000	0	36,300	0
September	2,000	0	13,200	0	25,500	0

[1] Less than 50 workers.

UTAH—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	1,900	1,900	1,700	(1)	100	(1)
June	6,200	6,000	3,700	200	2,000	200
July	10,400	9,900	7,700	100	2,100	500
August	7,200	6,900	5,100	100	1,700	300
September	6,900	6,400	4,700	100	1,700	400
October	6,700	6,400	5,200	100	1,200	200
November	700	700	600	(1)	(1)	0
December						
1965						
May	2,500	2,500	1,300	(1)	1,200	0
June	4,200	4,200	2,800	100	1,200	0
July	5,100	5,100	3,300	300	1,400	0
August	7,000	7,000	5,300	200	1,600	0
September	4,800	4,800	3,300	200	1,300	0

[1] Less than 50.

VERMONT—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
June	500	500	500		(1)	0
July	700	700	600	0	100	0
August	500	500	500	0	100	0
September	1,500	1,400	1,300	0	200	100
October	1,100	1,100	1,000	0	200	0
1965						
June	500	500	400		(1)	0
July	600	600	600	0	(1)	0
August	500	500	500	0	(1)	0
September	1,200	1,200	1,100	0	100	0

[1] Less than 50.

WISCONSIN—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	1,400	1,400	1,000	0	500	0
June	2,500	2,500	1,400	0	1,100	0
July	10,500	10,400	4,900	300	5,300	100
August	10,500	9,800	2,700	100	7,000	700
September	5,600	5,200	3,300	(1)	1,800	400
October	3,300	3,300	2,100	100	1,100	(1)
1965						
May	1,400	1,400	1,000	0	400	0
June	2,600	2,600	1,800	0	800	0
July	7,900	7,900	4,400	(1)	3,500	0
August	9,500	9,500	2,500	200	6,900	0
September	5,300	5,300	3,300	100	1,900	0

[1] Less than 50.

WASHINGTON—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
January	1,700	1,700	1,700	0	(1)	0
February	4,100	4,100	3,800	100	200	0
March	9,900	9,900	8,200	400	1,300	0
April	11,600	11,600	8,100	900	2,500	0
May	22,100	22,100	12,600	1,300	8,200	0
June	25,400	25,400	14,800	1,900	8,800	0
July	78,200	78,200	62,400	4,600	11,200	0
August	40,300	40,300	33,700	2,500	4,100	0
September	27,200	27,200	18,200	2,600	6,300	0
October	29,300	29,300	14,600	4,400	10,300	0
November	3,000	3,000	22,000	200	600	0
December	14,000	14,000	1,300	(1)	(1)	0
1965						
January	1,300	1,300	1,300	0	0	0
February	4,200	4,200	4,000	100	200	0
March	9,200	9,200	7,400	600	1,100	0
April	12,500	12,500	8,500	800	3,200	0
May	19,900	19,900	11,700	1,400	6,800	0
June	34,300	34,400	22,900	3,300	8,100	0
July	56,100	56,100	43,000	4,600	8,400	0
August	32,400	32,400	26,000	2,600	3,800	0
September	28,500	28,500	16,700	2,800	9,000	0

[1] Less than 50.

WYOMING—NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS, BY ORIGIN, 1964 AND 1965

Date	Total	Domestic				Foreign
		Total	Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
1964						
May	2,600	2,600	2,000	(1)	600	0
June	5,200	3,800	1,900	100	1,800	1,400
July	3,800	3,400	2,200	100	1,200	400
August	1,800	1,800	1,500	100	200	(1)
1965						
May	3,400	3,400	1,900	100	1,500	0
June	5,100	5,100	1,900	100	3,100	0
July	3,500	3,500	1,900	100	1,500	0
August	1,600	1,600	1,400	(1)	200	0

[1] Less than 50.

TABLE IV.—*Employment of seasonal hired workers, 1964 and 1965*—Continued

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED FARMWORKERS IN SUGARBEET CULTIVATION, SELECTED STATES, 1964-65

Date	Colorado		Montana		Nebraska	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
May	2,400	2,200	700	0	900	100
June	4,600	5,200	3,600	1,700	2,100	1,300
July	2,300	1,300	2,600	200	1,000	200
August	700	200	200	0	400	0
1965						
May	4,700	0	200	0	0	0
June	9,200	0	4,000	0	4,600	0
July	4,200	0	2,400	0	1,300	0
August	500	0	200	0	300	0

Date	Wyoming		Kansas		Utah	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
May	500	0	100	100	100	(1)
June	2,700	1,400	1,100	300	3,400	100
July	1,800	400	400	100	2,200	(1)
August	200	(1)	0	0	700	(1)
September	0	0	0	0	100	(1)
1965						
May	400	0	300	0	1,200	0
June	3,100	0	1,200	0	2,300	0
July	1,900	0	500	0	1,300	0
August	200	0	0	0	400	0

[1] Less than 50 workers.

Source: Inseason farm labor reports as of midmonth.

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS EMPLOYED IN APPLE HARVESTING, SELECTED STATES, 1964-65

Date	New York		Maine		Massachusetts		New Hampshire	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964								
Aug. 31	1,765	0	60	0	501	0	200	0
Sept. 15	5,872	350	245	81	1,643	408	1,097	103
Sept. 30	10,441	521	880	370	2,417	408	1,250	350
Oct. 15	9,375	356	262	187	1,262	314	454	46
Oct. 31	2,050	0	48	0	333	4	199	1
1965								
Aug. 31	1,575	0	73	0	0	0	200	0
Sept. 15	5,135	250	347	0	2,433	171	715	85

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS EMPLOYED IN APPLE HARVESTING, SELECTED STATES, 1964-65—Continued

Date	Rhode Island		Vermont		Virginia-West Virginia [1]	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964						
Aug. 31	0	0	10	0	92	0
Sept. 15	INA	19	1,159	81	1,594	672
Sept. 30	INA	19	1,124	76	1,824	1,178
Oct. 15	0	0	960	0	1,853	1,347
Oct. 31	0	0	120	0	1,799	1,283
1965						
Aug. 31	0	0	0	0	158	0
Sept. 15	INA	25	925	15	1,619	0

[1] Includes only Winchester, Va.-Martinsburg, W. Va., area.

NOTE.—60 percent of workers authorized used in New England minus New York.

Source: In-season farm labor reports.

NUMBER OF SEASONAL HIRED WORKERS IN TOBACCO ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTICUT AND MASSACHUSETTS, 1964-65

Date	Connecticut		Massachusetts	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
1964				
January	4,600	600	0	100
February	4,300	600	0	100
March	4,200	600	0	100
April	4,300	700	200	100
May	3,400	1,300	900	300
June	3,800	1,400	1,500	400
July	12,300	1,400	6,400	500
August	15,500	1,400	6,500	500
September	4,500	1,300	1,500	500
October	4,700	1,200	800	400
November	5,000	700	600	300
December	5,500	600	(1)	100
1965				
January	5,400	600	0	100
February	5,000	600	0	100
March	5,000	600	0	100
April	5,200	600	900	200
May	4,300	500	1,300	100
June	4,600	400	1,900	100
July	14,100	400	6,400	100
August	16,600	400	6,800	100
September	5,800	400	2,700	100

[1] Less than 50 workers.

TABLE V.—*Trends in employment of all seasonal hired workers, domestic workers, and foreign workers, January to June 1964 and 1965 United States*

Date	Employment (thousands)								
	Total seasonal			Domestic			Foreign		
	1964	1965	Change 64 to 65	1964	1965	Change 64 to 65	1964	1965	Change 64 to 65
Jan. 1	288.4	302.1	+13.7	255.4	285.8	+30.4	33.0	16.3	−16.7
Jan. 15	278.7	295.7	+17.0	249.3	279.8	+30.5	29.4	15.9	−13.6
Jan. 31	278.6	296.8	+18.2	250.8	282.1	+31.3	27.7	14.7	−13.0
Feb. 15	275.3	293.2	+17.9	248.8	278.8	+30.0	26.5	14.4	−12.1
Feb. 28	273.2	295.6	+22.4	248.0	281.8	+33.8	25.2	13.7	−11.5
Mar. 15	294.0	300.8	+6.8	267.3	290.4	+23.1	26.7	10.4	−16.3
Mar. 31	319.6	328.2	+8.6	289.5	319.8	+30.3	30.1	8.4	−21.7
Apr. 15	380.5	381.6	+1.1	342.5	372.9	+30.4	38.0	8.6	−29.3
Apr. 30	475.5	491.1	+15.5	434.0	484.8	+50.9	41.5	6.0	−35.5
May 15	748.0	733.1	−14.9	696.1	726.6	+30.3	51.9	6.7	−45.2
May 31	946.1	877.1	−69.0	879.1	871.3	−7.8	67.0	5.8	−61.2
June 15	1,068.6	1,084.7	+16.1	998.7	1,080.3	+81.6	69.9	4.4	−65.5
June 30	1,208.1	1,147.0	−61.1	1,142.9	1,144.9	+2.0	65.2	2.1	−63.1
July 15	1,290.9	1,149.3	−141.7	1,236.5	1,148.0	−88.5	54.4	1.3	−53.1
July 31	1,206.4	1,209.3	+2.9	1,147.6	1,208.0	+60.4	58.8	1.2	−57.6
Aug. 15	1,118.9	1,137.6	+18.7	1,050.2	1,136.4	+86.2	68.7	1.2	−67.5
Aug. 31	1,063.0	1,019.8	−43.2	977.8	1,018.7	+40.9	85.2	1.1	−84.1

NOTE.—Because of rounding, figures may not add to totals.

Source: In-Season Farm Labor Reports of the Bureau of Employment Security.

TABLE VI.—*Citrus production 1964–65, early-season [1] and end-of-season [2] estimates, United States, by State and crop*

[Million boxes]

State	Early-season estimate	End-of-season estimate	Yearly difference
ORANGES			
United States	113.2	121.5	+8.3
Arizona	2.1	2.4	+.3
California	28.5	32.0	+3.5
Florida	81.6	86.2	+4.6
Texas	1.0	.9	−.1
Louisiana	[3]	[3]	0
LEMONS			
United States	13.8	14.6	+.8
Arizona	1.3	1.1	−.2
California	12.5	13.5	+1.0
GRAPEFRUIT			
United States	40.6	40.7	+.1
Arizona	2.9	2.7	−.2
California	3.8	4.1	+.3
Florida	31.5	31.8	+.3
Texas	2.4	2.1	−.3

[1] Early season estimates refer to Dec. 1, 1964, when the first estimates were available for all varieties for the 1964–65 season.

[2] End-of-season estimates refer to July 1, 1965, and represent indicated production for the 1964–65 season.

[3] 10,000 boxes.

Sources: Crop Production—U.S. Crop Summary as of Dec. 1, 1965. July 1, 1965, Citrus Production Forecasts of SRS, USDA in Orlando, Fla.

TABLE VII.—*Wholesale prices selected fruits and vegetables for weeks June 28 through Sept. 27, 1965, and comparable weeks 1961–64*

	June 28	July 6	July 12	July 19	July 26	Aug. 2	Aug. 9	Aug. 16	Aug. 23	Aug. 30	Sept. 7	Sept. 13	Sept. 20	Sept. 27
Cantaloup (jumbo crate):														
1961	8.22	8.56	7.63	8.63	7.75	7.25	6.25	7.75	6.25	6.00	9.50	9.50	7.38	6.63
1962	5.63	5.56	5.42	5.25	6.38	6.25	7.13	6.00	6.75	6.00	6.13	6.50	6.06	5.75
1963	11.00	10.50	10.75	8.50	9.00	5.38	4.88	5.75	5.75	6.00	7.19	7.63	6.50	6.38
1964	9.40	8.58	8.19	8.75	7.63	6.00	5.75	5.63	5.75	7.50	7.63	8.25	6.63	5.00
1965	8.35	7.92	7.50	8.42	8.00	7.75	7.00	6.25	7.00	7.38	7.25	8.50	7.25	6.63
Carrots (48 1-pound bags):														
1961	4.75	5.13	5.00	4.87	4.50	4.25	3.69	3.28	4.13	3.54	3.67	4.13	3.71	3.83
1962	4.00	4.25	4.50	4.37	4.13	4.25	3.75	3.47	3.54	3.81	3.75	3.75	3.94	3.81
1963	4.25	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.13	3.75	3.55	3.33	3.42	3.36	3.28	3.31	3.41	3.48
1964	3.56	3.42	3.82	4.06	3.81	3.71	3.48	3.65	3.78	3.58	3.56	3.46	3.63	3.56
1965	5.10	5.21	5.25	5.41	5.44	3.65	3.69	3.60	3.68	3.39	3.02	3.33	3.15	3.25
Celery (crate):														
1961	3.96	3.42	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.50	4.25	4.13	4.25	4.29	4.63	3.84	3.63
1962	7.00	7.50	6.25	4.75	4.38	4.75	4.38	3.63	2.88	3.00	3.63	3.88	3.13	3.13
1963	4.13	5.19	5.00	3.75	3.38	2.63	2.75	3.63	3.38	3.56	3.87	3.88	4.13	4.13
1964	6.13	5.88	4.94	4.13	3.25	3.44	3.44	5.25	5.25	5.00	4.75	5.25	5.46	4.25
1965	5.16	4.83	5.25	5.13	4.00	3.83	4.17	4.29	4.50	4.25	4.13	5.25	4.31	3.94
Lettuce (24-head carton):														
1961	4.25	3.25	2.63	2.63	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.25	3.25	3.13	5.25	4.88	4.50	4.13
1962	3.13	3.50	3.38	3.38	3.25	3.38	2.38	2.88	3.25	3.88	5.75	4.63	4.25	4.88
1963	6.13	4.25	3.13	4.38	3.63	3.00	3.00	3.13	3.38	3.13	3.13	2.88	3.13	4.25
1964	3.50	3.38	4.38	3.75	3.63	3.63	3.25	4.13	4.50	4.13	4.75	4.00	4.38	3.38
1965	2.75	2.75	2.88	3.50	3.38	3.00	3.00	3.38	3.13	3.63	4.00	4.50	3.75	4.25
Tomatoes (40-pound carton):														
1961 [1]	[2]	4.80	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]	3.70	2.23	2.25	2.85	2.40	3.38	1.95	3.66
1962	6.72	3.61	2.55	2.05	1.83	2.40	3.20	1.74	2.72	1.89	2.12	2.12	2.59	2.45
1963	4.53	6.34	5.32	3.18	3.06	2.76	3.39	2.89	2.17	2.68	2.35	2.20	2.54	2.04
1964	4.73	6.49	4.03	2.89	4.43	3.88	4.15	2.72	1.99	2.53	[2]	3.43	3.51	2.18
1965	3.57	2.46	4.73	2.93	2.42	3.13	2.70	3.03	2.84	2.10	3.05	3.57	3.34	2.42
Strawberries (quarts):														
1961	.48	.65	.85	.75	.70	.65	.60	.65	.70	.75	.65	.63	.55	.63
1962	.60	.70	.75	.85	.90	.05	.65	.65	.65	.65	.58	.65	.70	.70
1963	.65	.90	.65	.80	.80	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75	.70	.75	.70	.75
1964	.78	.80	.75	.75	.75	.72	.75	.57	.62	.63	.90	.73	.64	.65
1965	.72	.85	.95	.85	.75	.80	.98	.75	.85	.85	.80	.70	.75	.85
Snapbeans (bushel hamper):														
1961	2.63	3.23	2.69	2.50	1.95	2.48	2.25	2.66	2.75	2.68	2.31	1.95	1.95	2.88
1962	3.13	2.71	2.63	3.63	2.94	3.38	3.00	2.46	2.85	2.63	3.40	2.35	2.41	2.23
1963	2.20	3.25	6.00	4.25	2.75	2.63	2.70	2.17	2.08	3.03	2.70	2.58	2.91	3.75
1964	4.62	3.25	3.08	3.00	2.75	2.25	2.29	4.56	3.16	3.06	2.70	2.75	3.33	3.25
1965	2.50	3.08	3.60	4.38	3.16	2.97	2.58	2.46	2.50	2.78	4.47	3.31	3.65	2.50
Oranges (California) (½-box carton):														
1961	3.32	4.36	4.28	4.68	4.58	5.06	4.77	5.02	4.29	4.10	4.18	4.18	4.23	4.26
1962	3.03	3.33	3.99	4.36	4.17	4.57	4.47	4.97	5.62	4.46	5.06	5.27	5.27	4.72
1963	4.00	4.44	3.66	4.30	3.99	3.77	3.55	3.37	3.48	4.12	4.41	4.43	4.03	4.63
1964	4.98	4.39	5.29	6.15	7.00	6.54	6.06	6.23	6.35	6.03	5.58	6.54	6.24	6.16
1965	3.18	2.83	2.82	2.91	3.19	3.98	5.46	3.07	4.60	3.38	3.66	3.98	3.50	3.21
Lemons (½-box carton):														
1961	3.31	3.18	3.17	2.93	3.44	3.20	3.49	3.54	3.60	3.30	3.97	4.38	3.88	2.97
1962	3.39	3.41	4.15	4.27	3.65	4.28	4.08	4.35	4.78	4.53	4.06	4.27	4.27	4.27
1963	4.67	5.11	3.83	3.36	3.27	4.14	4.22	3.49	3.22	3.00	2.77	3.05	3.46	4.40
1964	3.39	3.95	3.37	3.52	3.89	4.01	3.40	3.63	3.60	3.66	3.73	3.77	5.48	4.69
1965	4.24	4.09	4.34	3.67	4.24	3.85	3.74	3.59	4.36	4.28	4.24	3.44	2.94	3.01
Oranges (Florida) (bruce box):														
1961	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	3.33
1962	2.31	2.51	2.77	2.79	2.93	3.19	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	3.47
1963	4.93	4.43	4.15	5.51	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	3.29
1964	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
1965	3.74	3.72	3.84	3.95	4.22	3.96	3.84	4.41	4.58	5.51	4.97	[2]	[2]	[2]
Onions (50-pound sack):														
1961	2.44	2.71	2.94	2.75	2.25	2.92	3.06	2.90	2.13	2.04	1.95	2.28	2.12	2.48
1962	2.22	2.22	2.19	2.20	2.40	2.68	2.33	2.18	1.66	1.61	1.69	1.87	1.69	1.70
1963	3.12	2.98	3.20	3.50	3.35	3.18	3.13	3.04	2.59	2.88	2.75	2.58	2.58	2.26
1964	2.04	2.00	2.16	2.11	2.03	1.96	2.19	2.38	2.53	2.29	2.06	2.13	2.16	2.08
1965	3.88	3.55	3.29	3.22	2.88	3.30	3.15	2.77	2.50	2.31	2.16	2.15	2.04	1.86
Cabbage (50 pounds):														
1961	1.63	1.58	1.63	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.02	1.50	1.00	1.20	1.08	1.13	1.25	1.13
1962	.88	.88	.88	.75	.92	.92	1.00	.88	1.17	1.13	1.25	.97	1.30	1.09
1963	1.38	1.33	1.38	.92	.92	1.04	.95	1.08	.88	1.08	1.10	1.22	1.00	1.17
1964	1.29	1.38	1.38	1.25	1.63	1.75	1.92	1.94	1.94	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.88	1.50
1965	.92	.86	1.00	1.13	.88	1.00	.83	.85	1.00	.85	1.19	1.19	1.00	1.16
Corn (crate):														
1961	4.75	4.75	3.08	2.13	2.13	[2]	1.88	[2]	[2]	[2]	1.00	1.13	1.07	1.07
1962	2.41	2.50	1.29	1.75	1.59	2.63	1.69	2.13	2.00	2.00	1.88	1.75	1.63	1.56
1963	3.94	4.08	3.42	2.17	1.75	1.50	1.38	1.75	1.25	1.75	1.44	1.21	1.38	1.50
1964	3.50	3.17	2.83	2.79	1.88	2.19	2.75	2.38	3.00	1.79	1.69	2.13	2.13	2.00
1965	3.94	3.13	2.31	1.88	2.38	1.88	2.21	1.75	1.46	1.68	2.31	2.63	1.63	1.75

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE VII.—*Wholesale prices selected fruits and vegetables for weeks June 28 through Sept. 27, 1965, and comparable weeks 1961–64*—Con.

	June 28	July 6	July 12	July 19	July 26	Aug. 2	Aug. 9	Aug. 16	Aug. 23	Aug. 30	Sept. 7	Sept. 13	Sept. 20	Sept. 27
Potatoes, western—New York (100 pounds):														
1964	7.50	6.25	6.50	7.25	7.00	8.12	7.25	7.10	6.21	5.83	5.25	5.50	5.75	5.68
1965	9.75	10.19	10.75	11.00	8.25	8.83	7.50	6.17	5.63	5.43	5.25	5.18	5.15	5.15
Potatoes, western—Chicago (100 pounds):														
1964	5.88	4.70	6.23	6.09	5.70	4.63	5.16	4.58	4.58	4.58	3.88	3.88	4.85	4.58
1965	8.55	9.25	9.13	7.25	5.50	5.44	3.83	3.55	3.25	3.50	4.00	2.65	4.25	3.75
Potatoes, midwestern—Chicago market (100 pounds):														
1964	(2)	(2)	5.30	4.88	3.72	3.35	3.25	2.53	2.53	3.25	3.33	3.54	3.09	3.45
1965	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	5.94	5.68	5.00	2.75	2.70	2.34	2.43	2.90	3.00	3.06
Potatoes, western—Los Angeles (100 pounds):														
1964	5.63	4.75	5.25	5.29	5.13	4.98	4.68	4.33	4.20	3.92	4.03	4.38	4.56	4.53
1965	7.88	8.71	7.88	7.38	6.00	5.03	4.13	4.13	3.40	3.28	3.94	3.71	3.68	3.53
Sweetpotatoes, Chicago (50 pounds):														
1964		7.75	7.75	6.50	5.50	5.50	4.25	4.13	4.13	3.81	4.00	3.88	3.46	3.88
1965		6.29	5.75	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.25	3.50	3.63	3.63	3.41	3.75	3.63	3.31
Potatoes, eastern—New York (100 pounds):														
1964		5.28	5.64	5.39	4.58	4.18	4.05	4.21	3.94	4.20	4.05	4.05	3.77	3.55
1965		8.29	7.81	5.98	3.67	3.78	3.39	2.75	2.53	3.00	2.50	2.90	2.70	2.20
Sweetpotatoes, New York (50 pounds):														
1964		7.50	7.50	7.38	6.00	5.00	4.20	3.78	2.98	3.81	4.00	3.23	3.33	3.46
1965		6.53	6.16	5.00	4.96	5.19	3.66	3.66	3.34	3.16	3.31	2.93	3.04	2.91
Peaches:														
1961		(2)	2.75	2.54	2.75	2.50	3.00	(2)	2.45	2.80	2.05	2.08	(2)	(2)
1962		(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	3.75	2.95	(2)	(2)	(2)	3.38	(2)	(2)	(2)
1963		2.32	2.79	2.97	3.10	3.40	3.54	3.55	3.36	3.32	3.19	3.27	(2)	(2)
1964		(2)	4.13	3.98	4.00	3.23	3.07	2.91	2.72	2.54	3.04	2.83	(2)	(2)
1965		2.06	2.25	2.69	2.56	2.81	3.12	2.64	2.75	3.15	3.80	3.59	(2)	(2)
Grapes:														
1961						5.57	4.89	3.76	3.48	4.14	4.59	(2)	(2)	(2)
1962						4.92	4.03	2.80	3.90	3.45	4.02	3.59	3.33	3.42
1963						7.20	6.47	5.87	3.91	3.77	3.74	4.38	4.23	3.77
1964						4.22	4.06	4.63	4.09	4.12	4.58	5.04	3.96	3.21
1965						4.36	4.49	3.59	3.61	3.71	3.75	3.79	3.05	3.07
Pears:														
1961						7.01	6.93	6.30	5.85	6.17	5.70	5.95	6.34	6.
1962						4.78	4.76	5.27	5.67	5.43	5.16	5.24	6.37	5.36
1963						7.33	7.93	8.25	5.89	6.56	7.12	7.13	6.56	7.25
1964						4.50	5.66	5.53	6.32	6.13	4.79	5.36	5.29	5.88
1965						8.94	8.12	8.89	9.22	7.10	7.86	8.13	7.72	7.35
														37

[1] 1961 prices represent a conversion from prices for 60-pound containers to 40-pound containers, the price base for 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965.
[2] Not available.
[3] Not priced.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

NOTE.—These prices represent average wholesale prices for the product on the first marketing day of each week. They are compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics from material supplied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Marketing News Letter from New York and Chicago and the New York and Chicago Daily Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Reporters which are auction prices. With foreign agricultural employment in mid-September down nearly 70,000 over a year ago, these prices show that other factors—weather, markets, disease, etc.—exert far greater impact on the prices of commodities than farm labor.

Mr. COHELAN. With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who participated in this special order and I yield back the balance of my time.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCFALL). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, almost before the echo of the last vote which spelled the death of Public Law 78 had faded from this Chamber, I began to receive letters and communications and tables and charts from all sorts of groups, many of them leftwing extremist groups, which were designed to show how wrong those of us who favored Public Law 78 had been and how things we had predicted were not coming to pass.

I do not believe many of these communications have been accurate, nor do I believe some of them have been ethical.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see my colleague from California [Mr. COHELAN] engaging in what I call high-level constructive debate on this subject, and attempting through the use of statistics and figures to prove a point that so many others have tried to prove with inconclusive evidence.

But, Mr. Speaker, like all of his predecessors, I feel that my colleague from California has made a premature judgment based on incomplete evidence. The difference is that he has done so sincerely.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated during his remarks, you cannot determine the score of a ball game at the end of the third inning. As yet we do not have all the evidence.

For the purpose of setting the record straight I would like to give to the Members of the House a few facts which I have authenticated and which I believe paint a little different story than that painted by my esteemed colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a lot about this in the next few months in California, because whether we like it or not it is going to be a political issue. We have a very likable, fumbling, and bumbling Governor out there by the name of Pat Brown, who has been about as inconsistent in his policies concerning farm labor as an ice cube on a hot stove. As a result he is in political hot water.

I suspect, perhaps, that in the next few months you will be hearing facts and figures emanating from State departments, which attempt to justify that inconsistency, and its final result.

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

Mr. GUBSER I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I am going to have to leave at this time, but I do not want the gentleman to think I am withdrawing from the battle. I want to say to the gentleman I will be glad to stand by the record made here this afternoon, and I think I can anticipate some of the remarks he made and wants to make. As a distinguished colleague who has been familiar with some of the specialized problems I hope he will remember that this is a national problem and not a State problem. As to the remarks he made about our most distinguished Governor, I am willing to let the record speak for itself.

Mr. GUBSER. I do not think the fact that the gentleman is required to leave the Chamber at this time is in any sense a retreat from the battle. We have continued this battle for many, many years, and I have never known him to retreat in a single instance, though I think unfortunately the gentleman has been consistently wrong. I can assure the gentleman that the national implications of this problem do not escape me.

Let us take a look at the arguments that have been presented today. Perhaps in an oversimplification of them, I would say they can be summarized as follows: We have not suffered any severe crop losses in California, and there has been an ample supply of farm labor, and the price of farm produce has not been affected by labor considerations.

Let us look at the past year of history in California, and I think we can raise a very reasonable doubt that the conclusions drawn by my colleague are correct, and conclude they certainly are premature, and not properly supported.

Let us start back at the beginning of the crisis which has lasted all year when it was necessary in the Coachella Valley of southern California to hand pollinate dates. The fact is—and this is an indisputable fact—which the State Department of Agriculture will confirm—30 percent of the date crop did not get pollinated because there was an insufficient supply of labor. The 70 percent which did get pollinated was unfortunately the subject of a very poor job due to the fact it was done by inexperienced labor. So here is a record, here is a fact, that is not in the figures which the gentleman from California, [Mr. COHELAN] gave you. Thirty percent or more of the California dates will not be harvested because Mother Nature will not produce a date that is not pollinated.

Thus in a major industry in southern California, 30 percent of the crop to be picked this winter is gone before we start because of the abolition of Public Law 78.

Though they do not appear in the official crop records, and crop reports, I know personally of hundreds of acres of small, miscellaneous vegetables in the Watsonville, Salinas, Gilroy areas—crops like mustard greens, broccoli, endives, which were not harvested this season because there was no labor to pick them.

Strawberry production is one of the principal industries of central California. According to the Federal-State marketing news service—fresh strawberry production was down by 1,886 carlots during the just completed season—$7.9 million of strawberries which were not picked because there was no labor to pick them.

There were 5.7 million pounds of processing berries valued at $800,000 not processed because there was no labor to pick them.

The strawberry industry used 1,500 braceros. Even with these braceros, crops went to waste to the extent that I have just mentioned according to Federal-State marketing news service.

I understand that in the lemon and citrus harvest, the cost of harvesting has increased by approximately 25 percent. There was an argument earlier about whether this affected retail prices. ut if it did not and I assume it only for the purposes of argument, it certainly affected the profit margin of the producer of those lemons.

Consider the asparagus crop in California. There was a reduction in the pack of white asparagus of 1,200,000 cases for a 50-percent cutback from the year 1964. Ironically and unfortunately, most of that asparagus is shipped in export to West Germany. Certainly with the condition of our balance of payments and our balance of trade, such an export would have been in the best interest of the entire country.

There was a reduction of 2.6 million pounds of processed frozen asparagus. Frank Bennett of the State department of agriculture has estimated that cannery workers lost $1,200,000 in wages because of this reduction in the frozen asparagus pack and that the suppliers of cartons and labels and other items lost $1 million in sales.

The increase in the harvest cost of fresh asparagus is up 18 cents per pound. The authority for this is the California Asparagus Growers Association.

In addition, acreage was reduced last year by 10,000 acres. Another 5,000 acres of asparagus is being taken out of production this year which will leave 46,000 acres in California for the year 1966 as compared to a 61,000-acre normal. This is a 25-percent reduction in 2 years and a 16-percent reduction in 1 year. I ask you ladies and gentlemen of the House, if this does not presage and preordain the fact that asparagus prices will have to go up as the supply diminishes.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would like to commend the gentleman for his statement and to associate myself with him in what he is saying. But I, too, find it necessary to leave the Chamber, but I am sure the gentleman knows I am not retreating. As a matter of fact, the gentleman knows I have been on his side in this battle from the start but apparently our opponents are no longer here to do battle with us.

Mr. GUBSER. I certainly thank the gentleman. May I say before the gentleman leaves that as a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture, he has certainly contributed a great deal to the enlightenment of the American public on this subject. There is no more knowledgeable man on the subject in this House of Representatives. I wish the gentleman could remain, but I certainly understand the fact that he must leave because of a previous engagement.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, to conclude on the asparagus matter, a thousand braceros were used in the asparagus harvest. So an admission was made that supplemental labor was required. But even with it there has been a reduction of 25 percent in acreage.

Let us now talk about the tomato situation, California's largest crop, which uses supplemental foreign labor.

There are four things that have to be considered in talking about tomatoes.

You have to consider quality, you have to consider competition with Mexico, you have to consider what the total pack figures were this year as compared with last year, and you have to consider price.

Because of the abolition of Public Law 78, we have been forced to go to the use of tomato-picking machines, but these machines produce a quality of fruit—I might say a rather muddy quality of fruit which is suitable for catsup, puree, and hot sauce. It will not produce the type of quality pack which we refer to as whole peel and solid pack tomatoes. So processers must have handpicked tomatoes to get these quality packs.

I raise the question if they must go to Mexico to get this quality, will they not for economy's sake move their entire operation to Mexico?

The California Packing Corp., the Heinz Co., and Campbell's Soup already have tomato processing plants in Mexico. The Tri-Valley Packing Corp. is negotiating; so are several other companies negotiating for such a move.

With respect to the price of tomatoes, the price paid by the canners and the growers last year was $25 per ton for canning tomatoes. This year it is between $35 and $37. Without question—and Members might ask any canner they wish about this—it was because of grower resistance to the $25 price, and fear that he would not have the labor to pick his crop. So the abolition of Public Law 78 is directly responsible for the increase in the raw material to the canner from $25 to $35, or perhaps as high as $37. This, when translated into the finished product, means about $1 per case. When you consider that a canned product goes from broker to broker, and there is a retail price added to it and a retail profit, and always these commissions are commissions upon commissions, the effect of a raw material price increase mushrooms.

By this time next year—not now, because we are still consuming the 1964 pack—the price of canned tomatoes will have gone up considerably.

What is worse is that all of that increased cost will have to be borne by the solid pack and by the whole-peeled quality pack because the sauces, the purees, and the catsups have foreign competition. They must meet that competition and will not be able to add the increased raw material cost. So probably the nickel a can I have predicted will go even higher than I have predicted on quality pack tomatoes.

In 1964 there were 143,000 acres of tomatoes grown in California, and despite what the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] has said, there were only 116,000 acres grown in the year 1965. The tonnage and the acreage are down approximately 20 percent. Last year we harvested 3,083,000 tons of canning tomatoes. This year we will harvest and can 2.4 million tons.

On April 15, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] interviewed Secretary Wirtz on channel 2 in Oakland, Calif. By persistent questioning he drew from Secretary Wirtz a promise that supplemental labor would be furnished to California growers if they would plant the usual acreage of tomatoes. Up to that time the banks had refused to finance tomato growers. Upon hearing this assurance over television, they did turn loose financing for growers, who had then planted only half of what should have been planted. As a result we did come up to the 116,000 acres.

But then Mr. Wirtz gave evidence of reneging on the promise he had made April 15, and about the first of September it looked like we were not going to have enough braceros or enough supplemental labor to pick the tomato crop. So

after he had appointed a team of three college professors to determine how many were needed, and they had said we needed 8,000, Mr. Wirtz established criteria which the growers were required to comply with before they could get any of these braceros.

The criteria were absolutely impossible, because the growers were required to go to every State west of the Mississippi River and to recruit available domestic laborers and then transport them at a transportation fee plus a per diem all the way from States on the Mississippi River to California. This cost was prohibitive, and the growers decided that they would just as soon take their chances without complying with these criteria.

The canners, who had a great stake in this matter, began to be very concerned, so they met at the Hotel Fairmont in San Francisco, and they decided they would voluntarily assess themselves 25 cents per ton based upon their 1964 pack. This allowed them to gather a fund which amounted to some three-fourths of a million dollars. It would finance going into 17 States to recruit, as Secretary Wirtz insisted they must do. So they did.

A recruiting team was sent first into the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana and other States. These recruiting teams were composed of three people. One was furnished by Secretary Wirtz from the Bureau of Employment Security. One was furnished by the State department of employment. One represented the growers.

How many laborers do you think they got? They got 952. They got 109 from the State of Washington. Mind you, I repeat, a representative of Secretary Wirtz was a member of every recruiting team. They got 389 from the State of Louisiana. I might say in passing that at the same time Louisiana was importing labor to cut its sugarcane. They got 330 from the State of Oklahoma. They got 102 from the State of Texas, the State of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ]. They got 22 from the State of Missouri.

In frustration the canners realized that the 6,000 workers Secretary Wirtz had said were available were not and decided they must call upon Governor Brown.

Canners went to the Governor's mansion in Sacramento and sat down with Mr. Brown and said, "Look, we have done everything you have asked us to. They said that there were 6,000 workers ready to come to California. We have taken your man and Wirtz's man and done everything you asked, and we got 952 workers." So, with this Mr. Brown called Mr. Wirtz, or at least I presume he called him. It was at that point, this desperate point at the last minute, when they said, "All right, we will send 18,000 braceros to California." Prior to this, 20 million pounds or $2 million worth of tomatoes rotted in Merced County. Congressman SISK, of Fresno, and others were out there and saw it.

I would say that Mr. Wirtz and Governor Brown have played Russian roulette with the farmers' head at the end of the gun barrel. Now they are dreaming up a bunch of figures and averages which prove that they won this game of Russian roulette and they are getting ready to do it all over again.

Admittedly the losses were not as great as some predicted. They were not stupendous. But, let us consider some unusual facts which God Almighty had control of.

First of all, because of the lack of assurance early in the game that there would be labor available, the farmers planted late. The plantings were staggered. Instead of coming all at once, they were staggered over a long season. Fortunately, there was a long cool season, one of the coolest in California's history. Normally we have a terrific hot spell in September. There was none this year. Then there was a heavy rain in August, which is something that happens about every 75 years. As a result there were 200,000 tons of cling peaches which got a disease called brown rot. I am not making a pun on our good Governor. These 10 million canned cases of peaches representing 200,000 tons were not picked, so the people who would have picked them were moved to the tomato fields, thereby providing an unnatural and unusual situation which helped to alleviate a crisis.

The pear crop amounted to about 50 percent of what it normally does. Where we had 295,000 tons in 1964, we had 157,000 tons in 1965. This released additional labor, which was unusual.

Now let us figure in the 17,000 braceros which Mr. Wirtz finally released at the last minute.

Then, let us not forget the one factor which does not appear in anybody's official figures and which nobody wants to talk about—let us figure in the "wetbacks." According to the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations and the Assistant Director of the Bureau of Prisons, on page 90, part III, of the supplemental appropriation bill for 1966, which we passed last week, there were 19,174 wetbacks apprehended between January 1, 1964, and June 30, 1964. However, in the same 6-month period this year, 1965, there were 30,623.

The U. S. border patrol picked up 6,000 wetbacks in California in September alone. We all know that for every wetback you pick up there are five more that you do not get.

In these hearings that I referred to the Assistant Director of Prisons asked for and this House voted a supplemental appropriation of $180,000 for increased prison days for braceros who came here illegally, trying to get work because they would not come here legally under Public Law 78.

Let me quote Mr. Moeller, the Assistant Director of Prisons. He said:

> With the discontinuance of the bracero program in December and the elimination of the labor contracts, Mexican migrant labor continued to come into the country illegally and this placed new pressures on the three districts which we indicated in our submission. We had anticipated that this undoubtedly would result on the basis of past experience.

Then later on he said:

> The abolition of the Bracero Act has prevented their (the braceros) coming into the country legally, so they are coming in illegally.

Here is an additional fact that nobody is telling anybody about. Thirty thousand wetbacks in addition to 18,000 braceros, in addition to labor that came from peaches which were ruined by rain, in addition to the labor that came from the pear crop that did not exist. All of these were abnormal and the odds against them happening 2 years in a row are overwhelming.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman on a very fine and accurate statement of what happened in California and I associate myself with his remarks and the figures which he quoted. I am not a farmer as is the gentleman in the well, and I respect his views all the more. He has been and is now a farmer in California. He speaks not merely from statistics and not as a farmer of window boxes, but as a real farmer. So that his statement carries that much more conviction.

Mr. GUBSER. I certainly thank the gentleman for his kind words, but I want to offer one additional statement. I am a farmer who does not hire braceros and does not try to. I hire local employees.

So, Mr. Speaker, with reduced plantings, reduced acreage spread over a longer season, with unexpected labor from a peach crop ruined by brown rot, and because of a poor pear crop, with a long, abnormally cold harvest season, with 30,000 wetbacks, 276 brandnew tomato-picking machines, and 17,000 braceros, the California tomato harvest could not be completed except for those 17,000 braceros.

I say that Pat Brown and Willard Wirtz lucked out. Let us pray that they are men enough to admit it and do not press their luck by continuing the game of Russian roulette that they have played with the California farmer over the past year.

There was waste, and it can be documented. Admittedly the waste was less than expected. But let us look at the corollary to the argument that no crops were lost, and let us ask ourselves this question. Is it proper to place a major industry, and still California's largest industry, on such an unstable base that the whims of one man can make it or break it? Willard Wirtz nor any other Secretary of Labor, no matter who he may be, is entitled to become a czar of any industry. And that is what he is under present circumstances. This is wrong.

And a lucky and an unsual situation this year will not make it right for next year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us consider for just one moment the point which is repeatedly made that farm revenue is up.

Once again the people who want to justify their position before all the facts are in play fast and loose with averages. Averages are mighty funny things.

You might say that if you have one hand in a tub of boiling, scalding hot oil and the other one in a tub of ice water, on the average you ought to be reasonably comfortable. That is just about what they are doing with their figures here.

The increased farm revenue in the State of California is largely due to crops which are not involved in this labor problem. The grape crop is one of the largest in history, and with the exception of Thompson's seedless variety, the price is good. So, the dollar volume is good, but this crop is not one that has traditionally had labor problems.

The peach crop, due to brown rot, reached a point where, even with reduced production, the revenue was up because peaches skyrocketed to $69 a ton, an extremely high price.

The pear crop was down to 50 percent due to heavy and prolonged spring rains which spoiled the blossoms, but pears brought $125 per ton, almost double the average.

The lettuce crop, due to a combination of circumstances which the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] mentioned earlier this afternoon, and he was absolutely correct, was very high. It was a one-in-a-25-year market, something that every lettuce grower hopes and prays for and hopes will come along some day so he can get "well" from some of those $1.50 markets that broke him when he could not pay off his bank loan. Lettuce sold for $5 for a 2-dozen crate, an unbelievable price.

Mr. Speaker, these figures are not involved with the labor problem at all. Yet they are using them to tell you that farm revenue is up since we have not had Mexican braceros.

And, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget the corollary to the argument that farm revenue is up. Let us not forget that farm costs are also up.

Asparagus costs 18 cents a pound more to harvest, lemons cost 25 percent more to harvest, tomatoes cost $10 a ton more to harvest. Let us not forget these costs, when they have run the course of the marketing channels, will be paid by the consumer. They have not yet run this course, but they are going to.

Then think of the effect on our balance of payments with reference to the asparagus and other crops which we did not ship to West Germany and other countries.

Think of the effect on the laboring man, the cannery worker who did not help to process the frozen asparagus or can those thousands of tons of tomatoes, or process the crops which were not planted on those acres, thousands and thousands of acres, because of a possible labor shortage.

Think of these things and be reminded of what Pete Andrade, the secretary of the Cannery Workers Union of the Western Conference of the Teamsters said recently. I am not sure I am quoting him directly, but I certainly am paraphrasing him accurately. He said that "for every bracero not authorized means a Teamster lost his job."

Mr. Speaker, the full truth is not in as to the final effects of the abolition of Public Law 78. But one thing is certain today. We have a new commissar of California agriculture who holds the fate of that great industry singly in his hands. His name is Willard W. Wirtz. Putting such power in the hands of one man is not the American, democratic way.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 11588. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11588) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. HRUSKA to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, ROONEY of New York, FOGARTY, EVINS of Tennessee, BOW, JONAS, and LAIRD.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider the conference report on H.R. 11588 at any time after it is filed.

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

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may cancel my special order for this evening.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ARE THESE DEMONSTRATIONS REAL?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during the past weekend America experienced one of the most shameful episodes in the history of our Nation.

Since the time that our heroic forebears fought to establish independence for this land and its people almost two centuries ago, traitors have been a rarity. Until the past decade or so, for every American Judas there have been a hundred million loyal patriots.

As Godless communism began the incipient drive into the Western Hemisphere, betrayal of country was one of the tenets that came with it. Cells of disloyal citizens were formed in Washington and in other key cities. Spies began to operate as teams. Eventually the conspiracy was exposed. Some of the guilty fled into the accursed sanctuary of the Iron Curtain. A few were imprisoned. There were even executions. But, for the most part, members of the Communist Party sought to creep back into the dungeon of anonymity in anticipation of another opportunity to strike venom into the bloodstream of their country. Only a despised few have remained identifiable in the cloak of the hammer and sickle.

Ugly signs of treason again appeared during the Korean war, but the sin was largely confined to the weak of heart and body whose minds finally succumbed to the cruelty and torture of Communist captors.

Today treason is again stalking the land, with the banner of betrayal arrogantly displayed by upstart youth who would impose their will in contradiction to a studied decision of the American President solidly supported by the Congress and by an overwhelming majority of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the disgraceful protests against our involvement in Vietnam are an insult to the flag and seditiously inspired. They are a source of solace to the bestial Communist compact that even now destroys American lives and menaces our entire civilization.

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach has announced that the Justice Department as begun an investigation into the nationwide demonstrations and has already uncovered some Communists and some persons very closely associated with Communists in at least one of the organizations behind the treasonous movement.

Mr. Speaker, I laud the Attorney General's action, though I must admit disappointment that the situation has been allowed to reach the proportions that now confront the country. I also applaud the arrest of the former college student who arrogantly destroyed his draft card to indicate his attitude on U.S. participation in the Vietnam hostilities. Last June 3, I inquired of the Selective Service System as to whether new legislation was required to deal with violators who deliberately tore up their

draft cards, but I was assured that adequate authority then existed for enforcement of compliance with the selective service law. While the new law signed by the President on August 30 is now being utilized to prosecute the latest offender, I feel that proper legal action against those who previously committed the offense would have dissuaded the latest incidents and would already have brought violators to justice.

I am convinced also that college authorities have been entirely too lax in giving demonstrators the run of the campus. Communist riots at the University of California were tolerated needlessly and served only to encourage outbreaks at other institutions of learning. Sit-ins took place early last May at Ohio State University. They were followed by heckling and sit-ins when Ambassador W. Averell Harriman appeared at Cornell University. About the same time hecklers were taking control at the University of Wisconsin when a Foreign Service officer attempted to speak. The demonstrations spread from campus to campus, and officials remained disinclined to interfere.

At this point I should like to insert in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence that appeared in the Washington Star last April 29 in warning of the Communist uprisings at colleges and universities:

RED'S CAMPUS INFLUENCE SEEN ON RISE

(By David Lawrence)

The Communist influence on the campus in American universities and colleges has increased so substantially in recent months that it now has become an important factor in the organizing of student demonstrations.

The Communists have actually profited by the "free speech" doctrine which, through Supreme Court decisions, has been given preference over the right of the American people to be protected against speeches on the campus inspired by members of alien organizations that are financed directly or indirectly by the Soviet Government or its agents in this country.

The most outspoken comment on the whole subject from the educational world has just come from Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., president of Howard University here, which is one of the leading Negro institutions in the country. He explicitly blamed on "external disruptive forces" the recent unrest at the Howard campus. He said in a statement:

"They are people who cloak themselves in the mantle of civil righters and plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship. They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be permitted to prevail."

At a news conference later, Nabrit said he was referring to an organization which had backed a campus demonstration. Nabrit stated that on one occasion he saw two known Communists in the student group's picket lines. He noted that the demonstrations thus far have been within university regulations, but he warned that he would not "sit idly by and see the university become a place of lawlessness and disorder."

It is surprising that the House Committee on Un-American Activities has not exposed Communist participation in various demonstrations. Maybe this is due to sensitivity about possible criticism that the committee was perhaps trying to discredit the movement for civil rights. Actually, it is fully understood that the Communists are by no means the originators of the civil rights controversy or of the use of street demonstrations of protest. Yet there have been instances in which these same demonstrations have been pushed to extremes through Communist influence. And it is this which can hurt the cause of civil rights, especially when idealistic students are brainwashed by Communist organizers.

The Communist Party in this country is beginning to work more and more out in the open. Originally its members were ordered to register with the Attorney General under the Internal Security Act of 1950, but court decisions during 1964 on some sections of the law were considered so favorable by the Communist Party that its leaders now feel there is a good possibility that all the provisions of this act will be nullified. For this reason, the Communists are optimistic of the future of their party and are beginning to speak out with the same defiance that was characteristic of them in the past.

Although the Communist Party has for years been trying to hide its connection with the Soviet Union, it nevertheless announced that it would send a delegation this year to Moscow to participate in an editorial conference there on the international Communist movement.

Leading members of the Communist Party are encouraged by the vast number of invitations they are receiving to speak at universities and colleges throughout the country. These give them the opportunity to spread the party line, obtain recruits and promote their claim that the Communist Party is just another political party on the American scene. The Communist leaders say they are receiving from colleges more requests to speak than they can possibly fulfill.

Congress can, of course, revise the existing statute and make it more specific, as certainly a legal distincton can be drawn between political parties which operate solely within this country without aid from abroad and those which have a direct connection with a foreign government.

Leaders of Negro organizations have repeatedly said that, while there may be Communist groups active in the racial controversy, they are not in any way influential. But information reaching Government sources here indicates that the tactics and techniques of the Communists are not always apparent even to Negro leaders, and that the real purpose of the Communists is to force the demonstrations into extremes so as either to provoke violence or to plunge the whole racial question into more and more bitter controversy.

More than a year ago, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, warned college presidents throughout the country of "an organized attempt by foreign money to disrupt the universities of America." He also has said that many colleges have provided some avowed Communists with "a platform from which to espouse their godless ideology of chicanery, deceit and treachery."

Perhaps campus officials will now attempt to retrieve their authority, but rather than wait for such action I would suggest that the Federal Government begin to examine its policies on aid to higher education to determine whether it is not possible under the law to withhold assistance to any student who absents himself from classes for the purpose of joining demonstrations against the Government of the United States. While it is unfortunate that a stronger limitation against financial help cannot be invoked against disloyal recipients, nonetheless every avenue of reprisal should be explored in an attempt to cut off money made available by loyal taxpayers that is going for sponsors and participants of insurgent meetings. If unwarranted absenteeism is the only answer, then let us resort to it. To reward disloyalty is to encourage disloyalty.

On the subject of Federal aid to students, Mr. Speaker, is it not alarming that State governments which support their own universities have not undertaken a determined campaign to rid those schools of the rebellious beatniks who are identified with the Communist movement against our Vietnam position?

Obviously there is a new need for classes at all levels of education that instill in our youth the meaning of love of country, dedication, and patriotism. It is time that our students are given to understand the true meaning of American democracy and to understand the responsibilities invested by the electorate in the Presidency and in Congress. By the same token every person in this country should come to realize and accept his own responsibility in our society.

I recall an article that appeared in the Christian Herald some years ago. It deplored the fact that some of our people have forgotten the spirit not only of our religion but of our patriotic faith. It proposed that we attempt to reinvigorate ourselves with the great truths and the great values which have made this Nation the envy of all the peoples on earth. Maybe it is time that our school systems, from the first grade through college, give special emphasis to a course of this nature. In this regard I believe that two editorials, one from the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat of June 28, 1965, entitled, "The Flag Is Passing—So What!" and the other, "On Flag Waving," from the Altoona Catholic Register of August 27, 1965, merit space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, you and I are appalled at the disrespect for the flag exhibited by the Vietnam draft dodgers. Consider the heavy hearts of the mothers and fathers of military personnel now engaged in combat in southeast Asia. What of our young boys and girls whose minds are perplexed at the strange antics of grown men who would dare to defy a Government policy that involves the life and death of our youth and of the Nation itself.

If the President or Attorney General should determine that new legislation is required to meet the challenge, then let us stand ready to act at once. I say that we are solidly behind our commander-in-chief and that we will gladly remain in Washington for another week or another month if he feels that we should stand by until a way is devised to clear our streets, our parks, and our campuses of the dupes, the dopes, and the addicted Communists who parade under the colors of the Kremlin and without reverence to our flag, our national reverence, or our national security.

[From the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat, June 28, 1965]

THE FLAG IS PASSING—SO WHAT!

(By Dr. Max Rafferty)

"Hats on, the flag is passing by."

Apparently this is to be the marching slogan of our brave new world, at least if one West Coast court has its way. Recently a decision was handed down that freed school children from the bothersome obligation to salute their country's flag and to repeat the Pledge of Allegiance.

In the parlance of the day, it figures.

At about the same time, some of the creepier, just-out-from-under-a-rock types who infest the Berkeley campus of the University of California held a kind of beatnik version of the black mass in front of their local selective service headquarters, the ritual consisting of a public tearing-up of their draft cards. I must confess to a gentle glow of relief at the thought that these exalted exponents of existentialism would not be charged after all with the onerous responsibility of hemispheric defense. But I began to wonder just where it is all going to end.

Certainly if my son can now decline to salute the colors merely because he decides he doesn't want to, he can also refuse to do certain other things for the same reason—things like bearing arms in his country's defense, paying his taxes to support policies he disapproves of or, for that matter, keeping his mouth shut in school so that the teacher can get the lesson taught.

The learned judge has opened a veritable Pandora's box with this little juridical gem, much as old Justice Taney opened a humdinger of a hornet's nest a little more than a century ago when he decided that Dred Scott was forever a mere thing and chattel of his owner, wherever he might roam. Postscript: The American people decided differently. The court was overruled. As Lincoln remarked, "a judge is as apt to be right as any ordinary man, and no more so."

For the logical implication of this flag-salute decision is that every man—indeed every child—now is to be the sole arbiter of his own conduct. He is to be ruled only by his own conscience in his relation to organized society and to his fellow man, regardless of the wishes of the majority and the laws of the land.

Such a doctrine, if upheld, spells chaos for the Nation and a death blow to the concept of responsible citizenship, harking back at least to Plato, which the schools are rightly charged with the duty of passing from one generation to the next.

People rise to salute you, your honor, whenever you enter your courtroom, and rightly so. Is it too much to ask that a little of the same respect be taught to children as they rise in their places every morning to greet their country?

[From the Catholic Register (Altoona, Pa.), Aug. 27, 1965]

ON FLAG WAVING

New York has an ordinance requiring those who use its streets as a speaking platform to display conspicuously a large American flag. This ordinance is currently under court attack by one Nathan Weinstein, aided and abetted by the New York Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Weinstein, an organizer for the Socialist Workers' Party, was arrested at a street-corner meeting at which American policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic was being attacked. That was his excuse for not displaying the flag.

If the case goes to the higher reaches of the American judicial system, where theorists dwell in Olympian detachment, it is likely to be struck down. The majority of the Supreme Court, dominated by libertarians such as Warren, Douglas, and Brennan—now likely joined by Fortas—have almost unanimously upheld the freedom of the individual to do everything, rather than the right of society to compel the individual to do anything. This attitude almost certainly has contributed to the growing breakup of the American social fabric, illustrated recently by fire and blood in Los Angeles, and reflected in the latest, horrendous statistics of national crime.

Our interest here, however, is not to discuss further the philosophic and judicial implications of such decisions. Rather, it is to tell why the New York ordinance should be upheld—indeed, should be extended nationwide by State or Federal law.

The most democratic State—as we fancy ours, or at least wish it—can and must tolerate opposition and dissent. No State, however, no matter how democratic and freedom loving, must tolerate disloyal opposition. A house divided against itself cannot stand.

What Mr. Weinstein's regard for the fundamental principles of this country is we do not know. But this country surely has the right, if he is going to speak publicly to other citizens, especially if using as a forum facilities paid for by the taxes of all citizens, to demand that he make a show of loyalty.

This beloved country is owed a place on a platform where actions it is taking in its own defense or the defense of freedom anywhere are being challenged.

Let the flag speak out, where deceit or ignorance disregards the truth about America. Those who speak out of love for America can feel nothing but pride in showing that flag; those who speak out of hatred of this country deserve the flag's rebuke.

It is a new idea that an ingredient of liberty is the right to challenge anything—any truth, any historical fact, any authority. Dissent is no longer seen as brave opposition based on intellectual conviction—which it properly is—but as the authoritative badge of the superior thinker, which it is not. For a scholar to uphold the status quo, or tradition, or loyalty to country automatically damns him in academic circles.

THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, during several visits this past year in our congressional district, I was surprised by the number of protests I have received from constituents against current legislation introduced in the other body that would impose controls against the movement of firearms in interstate commerce. These protests first came to me by letter, then by phone as well as in personal conversations with citizens on the street. Finally a protest meeting was called which was attended by a substantial number of my constituents.

One evening I was asked to meet with the group of men who were members of gun clubs, collectors of antique firearms, gun dealers, gunsmiths, and sportsmen. After about an hour's discussion, I came out of that meeting as the benefited recipient of some thoughts which have caused me to conclude that the Congress should take a very careful and deliberate look and perhaps a reappraisal of some of these proposals for legislation affecting the sale and use of firearms. In the interim, I have been able to locate some very interesting statistics which I think should be included within the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that it may be clear that it is not the gun alone that leads to crime but that when all is said and done it is the individual who is the criminal and who will find some way to commit a crime if he is intent upon it whether he uses a gun or not.

At the suggestion of some constituents including Mr. Neal Tait, of Raytown, Mo., Mr. Francis O. Blake, of Independence, Mo., Mr. Walter E. Carmack, of Kansas City, Mo., and James H. Curry, of Raytown, Mo., I turned to the FBI Uniform Crime Report for the year 1963, released July 20, 1964, as well as to subsequent reports. This is a statistical reporting of all criminal behavior. In the preface by J. Edgar Hoover, it is pointed out that the more the authorities of the law can categorize and identify criminal acts and criminal behavior the better these authorities are able to understand the crime problem and the means to control it.

The FBI report reached the following conclusions:

First. Cutting instruments, such as knives, together with blunt objects, were used in 68 percent of the 147,800 serious aggravated assaults committed in the United States in 1963. Separated into components, 44 percent of such 68 percent involved the use of knives or other cutting instruments, while the remaining 24 percent were blunt objects, for a total of 68 percent. Hands, fists, and feet accounted for 12.3 percent of the total. It is significant and most noteworthy that only 12.7 percent of the total number of aggravated assaults were committed with firearms. Poison, acids, and other means were involved in the remaining 7 percent among the total of all cases reported.

Second. Half of the States, numbering 25, have a per capita homicide rate less than the State of New York which has the unusual and unreasonably severe Sullivan law governing firearms.

Third. Commencing with the year 1930 and continuing through the year 1960, the FBI report revealed that homicide with firearms decreased 25 percent on a per capita basis while suicides involving firearms dropped 9 percent during this same period of time.

Fourth. The report in addition to the presentation of statistics reaches some conclusions which are quite interesting. It leaves the impression that there are numerous factors involved in the volume or extent of crime which are altogether unrelated to the use of firearms or for that matter the presence or absence of any other available instrument to be used in connection with an offense.

The report states:

Crime is a social problem and the concern of the entire community. The law enforcement effort is limited to the factors within its control. Some of the conditions which will affect the amount and type of crime that occurs from place to place include such things as density or size of the community population and the metropolitan area of which it is a part. In addition such things are involved as composition of the population with reference particularly to age, sex,

and race; economic status and mores of the population; relative stability of population including commuters, seasonal and other transient types, climate, including seasonable weather conditions; educational, recreational and religious characteristics; effective strength of the police force; policies of the prosecuting officials and the courts; attitude of the public to law enforcement problems; the administrative and investigative efficiency of the local law enforcement agency.

The foregoing list is rather lengthy. It should be fairly inclusive of all the factors that contribute to make crime a social problem. Yet if you go back carefully over the list you will find that nowhere is gun availability cited as the cause of crime.

There has been some publicity about a recent questionnaire that was sent out to all law-enforcement officers throughout the United States. Quite different interpretations have been put upon the answers from the respondents. Perhaps some light can be shed on such interpretations when one takes the time to look at the joint resolution entered into and signed not long ago by the National Shooting Sports Foundation and joined by the National Police Officers Association of America, stating:

We believe that an American citizen of voting age or a member of the Armed Forces of whatever age, should have the right to legally purchase without restriction, a handgun, rifle, air rifle, shotgun, or like item excepting fully automatic firearms.

Much of the recent deluge of firearm control legislation introduced in the 88th Congress and so far in the 89th Congress might be due to the great emotional impact caused by the assassination of our late President Kennedy. Because of the emotional situation created following November 22, 1963, it seems to me to be appropriate to go back to some words contained in a letter written in February of 1960 which was addressed to Guns magazine and authored by the then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and now Vice President of the United States, who had this to say at a time when the emotions of the people of our country had not been inflamed by an assassination. He stated:

Certainly one of the chief guarantees under any government no matter how popular or restricted is the right of citizens to keep and bear arms. This is not to say that firearms should not be carefully used, or that definite safety rules or precautions should not be taught and enforced. But the right of citizens to bear arms is just one more guarantee against arbitrary government, one more safeguard against a tyranny which now appears remote in America, but which historically has proven to be always possible.

It is my considered opinion that these words written by Vice President HUMPHREY in 1960 should be read and reread by the Members of both bodies of the Congress as they go ahead with hearings and perhaps later, debate, of the bills seeking control of firearms that has been introduced in this 89th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that if it is our objective to reduce crime and if the effort of the Congress is to be directed toward control and suppression of crime then our preventative legislation should be directed against the criminal and not against the tools used by perpetrators of crime. Directed to this kind of thinking is a resolution approved by the New Hampshire Legislature on April 17, 1965. The president of the New Hampshire Senate, Stewart Lamphrey, pointed out that present proposed legislation would have conflicting effects in that some of the current legislation would be restricting the recreational use of firearms which would only hurt the domestic economy without having any effect on the suppression of crime. The resolution of the New Hampshire Legislature stated quite forthrightly that if the proposed restrictions on firearms were enacted into law they "would only result in further loss of American liberty, add to the workload of our law enforcement and police officers and inconvenience and penalize law abiding citizens." The resolution demonstrated clear thinking when it emphasized that "easy accessibility of firearms does not contribute to the crime problem of the United States. The target for preventive legislation should be the criminal, not the tool used by the perpetrators of crime." The New Hampshire Legislature goes right to the heart of the problem when it blasts away at the proposed legislation by saying "such could seriously impair the recreational economy of the State and Nation, infringe on the constitutional rights of the U.S. citizens, damage essential wildlife programs, intrude further Federal authority on powers reserved to the States." In my opinion the New Hampshire Legislature put this entire matter of firearms control in proper perspective. Their analysis of the situation deserves more credit, closer attention and greater respect than it has received.

An interesting bit of information which may have been overlooked and perhaps altogether neglected in this discussion of firearms legislation is the fact that the Swiss people all have guns and as was recently explained by a representative of the Swiss delegation of New York City when questioned about the matter said:

For centuries the Swiss Constitution has provided that every mature male be issued a gun by the army reserve. Even though these guns are kept in every home, Switzerland has virtually no armed crime.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by complimenting the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce over in the Senate who, at the time he announced his intention to hold hearings on gun legislation, stated:

The solution must not be one conceived in hysteria, born of ignorance, intended to foster complacency, and destined to futility. It must be dictated by the voice of reason, not emotion. While it is right to prevent the use of firearms by the irresponsible, in so doing we should not unduly burden or inconvenience the responsible.

If I am to support any legislation involving guns, it will have to take into account, and proceed upon, the premise that the great majority of our people are law-abiding individuals. For my part I will support only such legislation as is reasonable and effective without unduly restricting the legitimate areas of freedom and action of the private citizens. I want it to be plain that for my part I cannot support any legislation which departs from or ignores the concepts and principles of personal rights and liberties expressed in our Constitution of the United States which states "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

AN EXPENSIVE CONGRESS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is undeniable that this Congress has accomplished a tremendous amount of work, for which it is being quite generally praised. It has also been the most expensive peacetime Congress in our history and it seems very much in order that this fact also be pointed out. It now appears that the total amount of money appropriated this year will run close to $120 billion. This fact is noted in a recent editorial which appeared in the Plymouth (N.H.) Record written by its able associate editor, Robert E. Wherland. He notes an earlier report of mine that, on a daily basis, this 1st session of the 89th Congress has appropriated in excess of $30 million each day.

It appears that the updated figure, on the basis of the session's total appropriations, is going to be in excess of $400 million a day. It should also be pointed out that, of the appropriations, the Congress is compelled to vote about $11.5 billion a year to pay the interest on the national debt. I commend Mr. Wherland and the Plymouth Record for bringing this side of the record of the 89th Congress to the attention of the public and offer the editorial at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Plymouth (N.H.) Record, Oct. 7, 1965]

AN EXPENSIVE CONGRESS

There's much to be said about the present Congress, but no one can accuse it of being stingy with the taxpayer's money.

Already it has appropriated over $100 billion, with modest estimates predicting the figure will reach $120 billion. Congressman JIM CLEVELAND states that this amounts to a congressional appropriation in excess of $300 million per day.

This would be the highest appropriation by a peacetime Congress in history, and only $30 billion below the 1942 outlay to meet the exorbitant costs of World War II.

At the same time, the 1965 lawmakers are certain to set a record low for cutting original budget requests. Estimates are that by the end of the session they will have trimmed authorizations by only about 2 percent.

The 1st session of the 89th Congress will not be finally judged by historians for many years. But auditors have already offered their opinion. Expensive.

THE POLITICS OF POVERTY

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker the heavy flavor of politics in the poverty program has become apparent throughout the country. It is undermining public confidence in the program and threatening the purposes for which it was created. The city of Berlin, N.H., had the unfortunate experience with one aspect of the program this summer. The public reaction is summed up well in an editorial by Mr. Brud Warner, able editor of the Berlin Reporter. Under unanimous consent, I offer the editorial for the RECORD. As Mr. Warner notes, it is hard to disagree with the purposes of the poverty program. It is, however, impossible to condone the manner in which so much of this program is being handled.

[From the Berlin (N.H.) Reporter, Oct. 13, 1965]

POVERTY'S POLITICS

It's hard to disagree with at least some of the principles of the war on poverty.

But it's becoming increasingly easy to disagree with the way a lot of it is being handled.

And that's probably because it is the biggest opportunity for political boondoggling since the days of F.D.R.

It's beginning to look as if the big political centers are the ones getting the funds and the rest can spend their time planning with nowhere to go.

Take this business of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. First there was a State project which was supposed to get rolling right after school let out. It was to give young people jobs, supposedly to help some of them, at least, to stay in school. But the program was delayed again and didn't start to get off of the ground until just before school opened this fall. Said principal Richard Bradley of BHS, who was one of many people who spent many hours in screening applicants, "I suppose the jobs can now be filled by encouraging young people to drop out of school."

Then there was Berlin's application for a Youth Corps to provide part-time jobs for 90 men and 90 young women who are still in school and for 100 young men who are out of school. It was a long process to compile job specifications and to determine the manner of selecting those who would get the jobs. Dozens of Berlin people put in a total of probably several hundred hours planning this program and writing up the application.

It was duly filed and the waiting period began. But Berlin people didn't know just how long that wait would be. It seems that funds ran out a month ago—and those who knew that fact were sworn to secrecy not to breathe a word of it.

There also have been some serious questions raised as to whether funds have been awarded on a first come basis and not on need. There has been much ballyhoo that the war on poverty is supposed to be just that—Federal taxpayers putting up their money to help those in need. Some of those close to proposed projects are expressing their doubts that it's working out that way.

Politics is playing a major role in this poverty business. When the board of directors of Community Act for Carroll, Coos, and Grafton Counties, Inc., was being expanded, members were getting lengthy phone calls morning and night from politicians pushing for their favorite party member.

Politics we can condone, if the politicians can come up with qualified people who can do a good job. But we would judge by past performances and present actions that some of the people within the war on poverty are there not because of their ability or knowledge but because they know the right people in the right political seats.

Perhaps that's why when Berlin was filling out its application for a Neighborhood Youth Corps the advice came down from higher places not to necessarily make the project fit the community's needs, but to make it big enough so that it would make an impression on those who had to review the application.

DU BOIS CLUBS NEED INVESTIGATION

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DEL CLAWSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, when J. Edgar Hoover, according to reports of his speech last night, charged that the W. E. B. du Bois Clubs of America are "standing in the forefront of the Communist campaign to confuse minds, distort the thinking, and win the support of our young people," he touched a sensitive nerve for Californians.

Earlier this year in discussion and by letter I contacted the Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS, our distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and expressed my growing concern over the operation of these clubs and their apparent progress on college campuses throughout the Nation. It is a matter of special apprehension to me that the unrest in several colleges in California, particularly the uprisings at the University of California in Berkeley, have been linked to the activities of Communist groups, and that the Du Bois clubs might be suspected to operate in the forefront of this dissension.

I am convinced that the demonstrations of the past week are representative of the thinking of only a misled, misguided, and misinformed minority of college-age youths, many of them brilliant and idealistic, with energies tragically unchanneled into constructive paths. The very fact that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State should be constrained to comment, and that our Government should need to explain these demonstrations because of their misleading effect upon world opinion, is reason enough for remedial action.

Therefore, it should be mentioned at this time that Chairman WILLIS in August informed me that he too is disturbed by the increase in Communist activity among youth and the particular operations of the W. E. B. du Bois Clubs on campuses, and that a preliminary investigation is underway so that the committee can hold hearings on the organization at the earliest appropriate time.

TOLL TRAPS ON THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 which launched our great highway construction program, the Secretary of Commerce was authorized to approve toll roads, bridges, or tunnels as part of the Interstate System upon a finding by him that such action would "promote the development of an integrated Interstate System." Pursuant to this act, the Secretary has designated a total of 2,332 miles of toll highways in 23 States as part of the Interstate System. In my opinion, the indiscriminate placing of toll traps on the Interstate System is not in the interest of the public or in keeping with the intent of Congress. This not only violates the concept of a toll-free Federal-Aid Highway System; it also makes road users pay twice—gas taxes and tolls—and adversely influences the planning and construction of needed highway improvements since highway officials try to avoid building highways which would compete with toll facilities.

Some years ago, it was felt by many persons that the building of toll roads in this country would end because of the construction of the 41,000 mile system of interstate highways. This, however, is not the case. Instead of ending, the building of toll roads is spreading. Some are under construction and a good many more are underway. The August 9, 1965, issue of U.S. News & World Report has an article on this subject and I quote a part of that article:

In Oklahoma, legislation for five new toll roads recently won approval.

In Kansas, the legislature has called for preliminary studies on three new toll road projects.

In Texas, bonds have just been issued for the State's second stretch of toll highway.

Other new projects are just finished, under construction or study in Florida, Louisiana, New Jersey, Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina and Pennsylvania * * *

If all the proposed turnpikes are built, more than a thousand miles will be added to the 3,772 miles of toll road already in operation in the United States.

To be candid, I must point out that so far as I know, none of these new toll facilities are being proposed as additions to the Interstate System. However, under the existing law, they could be added to the system. I do not believe that this would be in accord with the intent of the Congress but a change in the law is needed to preclude such a possibility.

Today, I am introducing a bill to correct this situation. I introduced legislation for the same purpose in the 87th Congress, the 88th Congress, and again early during this Congress. Basically, the previous bills would have required the States to agree not to construct toll facilities on the route of an interstate highway without the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce and that the Secretary of Commerce would be required to report to Congress any violation of this agreement. His report would include recommendations as to effective enforcement action to be taken, which action would be carried out unless within 60 days either the House or Senate passed a resolution disapproving his proposed action.

The Department of Commerce, by letter dated July 1, 1965—signed by the general counsel of the Department—commenting on my bill, H.R. 2958, stated that:

While this Department would have no objection to that portion of the bill which would require that all project agreements for projects on the Interstate System contain a clause prohibiting toll facility construction without concurrence therein by the Secretary, the remaining provisions of the bill would not be considered desirable.

In my opinion, H.R. 2958 contained effective desirable provisions which would go far toward correcting the possibility of additional toll traps on the Interstate System. Nevertheless, the chances of having the bill enacted over the objections of the Department of Commerce are remote. Accordingly, I am introducing a new bill which would delete the provisions objected to by the Department of Commerce and retain those parts to which the Department would have no objection. The text of the bill follows and I am hopeful that the Congress will take early and favorable action on the bill.

H.R. 11685

(A bill to amend section 129(b) of title 23, United States Code, relating to toll roads, bridges, and tunnels on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 129, United States Code, is amended by adding the following material after the last sentence of the subsection: "After the date of enactment of this Act, all agreements between the Secretary and a State highway department for the construction of projects on the Interstate System shall contain a clause providing that no toll road, bridge, or tunnel will be constructed on the interstate highway route involved without the official concurrence of the Secretary. The Secretary shall not concur in any such construction unless he shall affirmatively find that, under the particular circumstances existing, the construction of such road, bridge, or tunnel as a toll facility rather than a toll-free facility is in the public interest."

THE KENNEDY ROUND IS THE FOCUS FOR WORLD TRADE PROBLEMS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 13, our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] delivered a speech on the floor of the House entitled "Commercial Policy at the Crossroads: The Kennedy Round Is Focus for Solving Major Trade Problems." Although he outlined many of the problems facing successful trade negotiations at the Kennedy round, his conclusion, which I share, was that with tough bargaining many of our trade goals can be achieved through the Kennedy round.

In the course of his remarks, Congressman CURTIS made another contribution to our understanding of the tactics which must be used by our negotiators. He laid to rest the notion first raised by an article in the October 11 Washington Post, that the United States was tentatively beginning planning to bypass the European Economic Community in some new form of trade arrangement.

The significance of this speech did not go unnoticed in the financial press. Mr. Peter Greenough, financial editor of the Boston Globe, in commenting on the speech in his column of October 14, reiterated the two reasons why this suggested notion to bypass the EEC would be unsound. First, it conflicts directly with the most-favored-nation principle, that duties applied on goods from one country apply to goods from all countries. This cardinal principle of our trade policy cannot be abandoned. Secondly, the rumor ignores the fact that one aim of the Kennedy round is to knock down Common Market trade barriers.

Mr. Greenough continued by saying:

No such change has been made, and the authority for this is Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, the one Member of Congress who has kept a constant grasp on the Kennedy round's pulse.

CURTIS took to the House floor yesterday to knock down the notion anyone is trying to bypass Paris.

Greenough concluded that:

In any case, the thing now seems to sit in a bit of a vacuum. And we as a nation cannot afford it. TOM CURTIS is one of the few, all too few, in Congress who appreciate the big chips in this trade game.

I include the full text of the article from the Boston Globe of October 14 at this point:

VITAL IN TRADE TALKS—IGNORE FRANCE? NO EASY TASK

(By Peter B. Greenough)

Europe has been chewing on a hot rumor these last few days—that the United States may be contemplating an end-run around France in the Kennedy Round trade talks at Geneva.

The Washington Post started it. The idea, as the Post postulated things, is that we would go ahead and negotiate with other major trading nations and leave the door ajar for the European Economic Community (Common Market) countries to hop aboard later on, once their own internal scrapping had been settled.

Intriguing cocktail talk notion, except for a couple of practical realities.

First, in all our trade relationships there is a key item called the most-favored-nation clause. What it means is that the duties we apply on goods from one major exporting nation apply equally to imports from other sources.

By law, therefore, any two-tiered tariff arrangement would be illegal.

Then, too, the basic aim of the Kennedy Round is to knock down Common Market trade barriers. A strange way it would indeed be to let EEC's duties rise and others fall; the whole ball of wax might unravel.

Moreover, any such move—altogether too crass a piece of diplomatic pressure for any civilized nation—would also represent a major shift in U.S. trade strategy.

No such change has been made, and the authority for this is Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, the one Member of Congress who has kept a constant grasp on the Kennedy Round's pulse.

CURTIS took to the House floor yesterday to knock down the notion anyone is trying to bypass Paris.

To illustrate how ridiculous this notion is in the first place, consider a remark made to the Globe recently by Otmar Emminger, member of the governing board of West Germany's Central Bank.

In view of the fact that Germany, the United States, and other members of the so-called Group of Ten managed to establish a prop for the British pound without France's help, we asked Emminger if it might be carried further, to the point that a new international monetary setup could be arranged without France's presence?

Emminger vigorously denied it.

By like token, you can apply this same reasoning to the Kennedy round. Increasing of trade and provision for more liquidity (or funds to support trade, in this case) are like Mike 'n Ike. Nothing meaningful could possibly be achieved without France.

Representative CURTIS presently is less optimistic about the Kennedy round's successful outcome than he was last May while visiting Geneva. Nevertheless, he has not reached the degree of despair we have detected here and there.

The first order of business, he suggests, is for everyone to bend themselves toward a successful ending at Geneva. After that we should begin worrying about getting a new trade bill through Congress in 1967.

Conceivably the Congressman is pushing the wrong cart. The way Kennedy round talks drag, it looks as if authority for the United States to be a continuing part of them will be directly up to Congress in another year.

While trade promoters in Washington are about it, they also might start serious thinking on lumping all such efforts under one tent.

State Department (and the Executive) snatched away Congress' prerogative in connection with the Canadian auto parts pact.

Ambassador Christian Herter's office, created specifically to push the Kennedy round, seems to have lost some of its zip (conceivably due to Mr. Herter's ill health).

In any case, the thing now seems to sit in a bit of a vacuum. And we as a nation cannot afford it. TOM CURTIS is one of the few, all too few, in Congress who appreciate the big chips in this trade game.

VIETNAM DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, these past few days have been filled with comments about the anti-Vietnam demonstrators who have so blatantly used their democratic freedoms to create confusion with respect to the determination of the vast majority of the American people regarding our presence in South Vietnam. The real damage, Mr. Speaker, comes not from their meaningless parades and their defiance of Federal law because these acts and their repulsive connotations are decried by every thinking American. No, their real damage is to the morale of American troops in South Vietnam. Rather than giving attention to the small minority who have seen fit to abuse their freedoms, I would like to reconfirm my gratitude to our boys in Vietnam who are bravely defending the cause of freedom for their generation. Certainly these boys do not like the idea of being in the jungles of Vietnam, but realizing the needs of their country they have accepted orders and displayed courage and valor in what is a seemingly endless battle for the right of men to choose their own government.

It is understandable that there have been some complaints among these soldiers, but those of us who have visited South Vietnam and have had the opportunity to talk with our service people have found a near unanimity of opinion supporting U.S. objectives in this troubled area. These boys realize that we must remain in Vietnam because, as one young man told me, "I would rather fight them here than at home." These boys are risking their lives and dying for the cause of freedom and no amount of irresponsible demonstrating should detract our attention from the service they are rendering to the American people.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, over the past year we have seen the development of something new in the history of America. It began some months ago in a Midwestern university, when a teach-in was organized by a few members of the faculty and by some of the students, to parade their disagreement with our policies in the Vietnam war.

It has spread since then to a nationally televised teach-in, to a nationally televised debate on Vietnam, to a public burning of draft cards, and now to a threated march on Washington to protest our involvement in the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of these actions is one that has many faces.

There is a tradition in our Nation that says that freedom of speech is a sacred thing. Under this great doctrine, the people of America have debated every issue which has come before our Nation. But under it, too, there has grown an equally sacred tradition which says: "When the bullets start to fly, when our men are dying on the battlefield, the voice of America will be one voice that our enemies may hear clearly."

We are not speaking with one voice today. Our enemies are taking great consolation from a small divisive group among us. Daily the newspapers and radio stations behind the Iron Curtain report with glee the divisive influences in America. They are reporting them, not as the voice of a small minority of ill-comprehending youth and ill-advised professors, but as the voice of America—and they are deceiving themselves and their peoples in so reporting.

Out of this deceit may well come a prolongation of the war in Vietnam. Out of it may well come a new toll of death among our soldiers, our sailors, our marines, our airmen, who are fighting with bravery in one of the most difficult wars in the history of our Nation.

There is another tragedy to this which I must point out. It has long been true that trouble catches the headlines. So on the front pages of the papers of the Nation last Sunday there were headlines screaming about the parades and teach-ins protesting our involvement in Vietnam. It was not readily apparent from the reading of the headlines that the group involved was pitifully small. These headlines went to our men in Vietnam, the men who were marching out into the jungle or flying over North Vietnam in furtherance of our war effort; and as they marched out to possible death or torture, they could read their own noble commitments being denounced by fellow Americans.

It is difficult to speak in reasoned tones about these incidents. There is a swelling tide of anger in America over them, and I am one of those who has become angry.

It has been the tradition, not of America alone, but of the whole history of civilization that our teachers should lead the young into the paths of truth and righteousness. We have a tradition of teaching in America that has produced great minds, great souls, even noble souls. It is a monumental tragedy that a very small portion of our teachers in 1965 have lost sight of that tradition.

In the current Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists there is an article by Prof. Kenneth E. Boulding, who presided over the first teach-in at the University of Michigan. It is an article which is designed to show how splendidly and intelligently the teach-in was conducted, and how brilliantly it was geared to the Vietnamese war. But it is monumentally tragic that the essay on self praise spoke no one word about the vast problem of facing a Communist power in China which is pledged to dominate Asia, and eventually the world—through violence. There is no word about the thousands and thousands of murders committed by the Vietcong. There is no word about the ultimate question: Just what would happen to the people of South Vietnam if we did get out?

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for the teachers involved in these teach-in programs to look to themselves again. If they are looking for sensationalism, then I believe they are in the wrong profession. Teaching is supposed to be a quiet search for truth. I do not believe these teach-ins are pursuing eternal verities.

There are nearly 150,000 of our brave men presently committed to the fight to save the people of South Vietnam from Communist slavery. We have made a pledge to save them. We must keep it, in the name of all that is sacred to our own traditions, and in the name of basic human decency.

It is not possible for me to be with our troops in Vietnam to tell them that America stands beside them in their fight, in our fight. But I would consider myself remiss if I did not state this in the Halls of Congress, where the men and women who represent the Nation may speak.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the cruel stupidity of the teach-in may soon become evident to the foolish teachers and the misguided students who are engaging in this work to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

I hope also, Mr. Speaker, that the agents of our Federal Government will take swift and proper action against those people who are destroying their draft cards as their protest against our involvement in Vietnam.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a word about the proposed march on Washington. I have not bothered to note the date of this proposed march. I have no intention of noting the date. I merely wish to note that I shall not be in my office to meet any marchers coming to Washington. I hope none come from among the great patriots in my own 10th Congressional District, where my constituents know the meaning of this war, and know they must stand solidly with our fighting men. In any event, I have no desire to see any marchers, to discuss anything with any marchers. I shall make a conscious effort to be absent when they arrive. I have nothing to discuss with them. I would, however, suggest that if they really need conversation, they travel into the central highlands of Vietnam, to discuss their problems with our soldiers and marines in the jungles. That conversation should be profitable for them.

CRISIS IN OUR FISCAL POLICY

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we are facing this year something of a crisis

in our fiscal policy. We have voted the largest budget in the history of the Nation. No one can be unaware of the importance of saving wherever saving is possible. We have called upon the Departments of the Federal Government to exercise the wisest prudence in their expenditures. We have called upon them to do so in the past.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to report in this House that in the person of Mr. Frank C. Memmott, Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines, there is one man who is well aware of the need to save money and who is doing something about it today just as he did something about it yesterday. At my request, Mr. Memmott has made available to me certain documents and directives originating in the Bureau of Mines which are specifically aimed at saving as much money as possible. I am inserting those directives in the RECORD at this point for all of you to read:

APRIL 26, 1965.

To: Assistant directors.
From: Director.
Subject: Convention and foreign travel.

Travel to conventions and foreign countries to attend meetings of technical societies is worthwhile and the Bureau of Mines should be represented at the meetings where a definite benefit from such attendance is clearly demonstrable. However, the number of requests for convention and foreign travel being received for approval leads me to believe that insufficient thought is given by the persons involved to the need for the requested travel.

There has been and continues to be increased emphasis by the Congress on reduction of travel expenses of Government employees. Furthermore, it is the announced policy of President Johnson and Secretary Udall to utilize our manpower to the fullest extent in order to advance our technical programs as rapidly as possible with available funds. Personnel attending foreign sponsored meetings and conventions without good cause are not being utilized fully.

Supervisors at all levels of operation should carefully consider all applications for convention and foreign travel and forward only those which appear to fit the criteria for serious need for attendance. I am personally interested in making an all-out effort to reduce travel expenses to a minimum and owing to the comparatively large expense involved in both convention and foreign travel this naturally is an item which will bear close scrutiny.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT,
Director.

APRIL 20, 1965.

To: Director, through Assistant Director, Health and Safety.
From: Chief, Division of Coal Mine Inspection.
Subject: Reducing cost of travel.

On April 7, 1965, I attended a conference with officials of the Freeman Coal Mining Corp. and health and safety district D, Bureau of Mines, at the company's office, West Frankfort, Ill. When the conference was arranged, we anticipated that it would not be concluded until late in the afternoon which meant the only available return flight would be at 7:45 a.m., April 8, from Evansville, Ind.—a 2-hour drive from West Frankfort.

Inasmuch as we were able to complete the conference before 12 noon on April 7, I contacted the Eastern Air Lines office in Evansville and arranged to change my flight time from 7:45 a.m., April 8, to 3:30 p.m., April 7. My scheduled flight at 7:45 a.m. on April 8 returning from Evansville, Ind., was first class, the only available accommodation on that flight. Inasmuch as I was able to obtain tourist-class accommodations on the return flight on the afternoon of April 7, a saving of $10.70 in air fare and a saving of $8 per diem was realized.

I am giving you this statement to prove that we are quite sincere in our efforts to cut costs wherever possible.

H. F. WEAVER.

Control of travel

	Fiscal year 1964			Fiscal year 1965		
	Budget	Cost	Percent	Budget	Cost	Percent
Administration	$93,400	$65,694	70.3	$93,710	$62,573	66.7
Mineral resource development	271,700	221,375	81.4	279,090	183,787	65.8
Minerals research	402,500	356,491	88.5	389,500	325,525	83.5
Health and safety	336,900	355,054	105.3	366,800	308,575	84.1
Helium	61,300	53,676	87.5	85,900	62,755	73.0
Total	1,165,800	1,032,290	88.5	1,215,000	943,215	77.6

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1965.

To: Assistant directors.
From: Director.
Subject: Travel.

You are aware of my insistence that every Bureau of Mines official charged with the responsibility of approving travel exercise prudence and care in the expenditure of such funds. With your cooperation, in fiscal year 1965 we did a good job of restricting travel only to those trips we considered absolutely essential for conduct of the Bureau's business. During the 1966 fiscal year, I am again soliciting your help in exercising a tight control over the expenditures of the Bureau's travel funds. One way to accomplish our goal is for you to alert all members of your staff to review carefully their requirements and plans for travel.

With respect to travel by assistant directors, starting immediately I will expect an absence from the office notice (form 6–536) to be on my desk at least 5 days before a proposed trip. In certain emergencies where such notification is impossible, verbal notice should be given if practical. I will expect the absence form to be prepared in enough detail to provide me with full information regarding the purpose of the trip.

Similar procedures should be set up for the personnel under your direction.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT,
Acting Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1965.

To: Assistant Directors, Headquarters Division Chiefs, Area Directors, Research Center Directors.
From: Director.
Subject: Travel.

We are all well aware of our obligation to carefully and continuously monitor our travel commitments. In addition to our efforts in this direction and the concern expressed by the congressional committees, President Johnson and Secretary Udall, personally, have directed that travel be restricted to those instances that are clearly essential to the effective performance of the Government's most urgent programs.

The obligation to conform to this policy attaches to all persons to whom authority has been delegated to approve travel, as well as to their supervisors. The funds allotted to offices, laboratories, and projects are controlled by objects and we know that each supervisor establishes his work plans with the limitations on such objects as travel in mind.

Aside from the travel that is essential to the effective conduct and management of the Bureau's specifically authorized projects and programs, it is expected that our presence at certain public affairs, meetings and conventions is necessary to maintain appropriate Government, public, and industry relationships and to gain the scientific and commercial knowledge that is important to the planning and conduct of our work. But the fact remains that the total funds available for travel is fixed and we are expected to not only perform all of our obligations within that total but to implement controls that insure that expenditures are well below it.

This year a number of new national programs of particular significance, such as the wilderness investigations and the scrap studies, involves the need for extensive travel on the part of numerous people. Moreover, travel that is essential and clearly necessary to the conduct and management of our continuing research and investigative programs involves substantial expenditures. In approving travel for other purposes each of us recognizes that funds remaining for the conduct of our authorized work are reduced by a like amount. Therefore, in contemplating travel for any purpose, each of us must, in his own mind, be completely satisfied that his decision is correct.

In weighing the merits of individual instances of travel, ultimate approval of foreign trips rests with the Secretary and, in other cases, with this office. We expect in these instances that appropriate judgment has been exercised by the originator of the request as well as the supervising offices. The fact that approval might rest elsewhere in no sense relieves the proposed traveler of his obligation to objectively determine what the cost means in terms of our total obligations and if it is clearly essential.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my own personal commendation to Mr. Memmott for his work in this direction. I hope that every Director in every section of the Federal Government will take note of his fine activities and will go and do likewise. It is certainly an effort that is well worth the commendation of this entire body.

THE WIZARD'S NEW ROBE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News has a very incisive editorial in their October 20 edition. It deals with the 5th amendment testimony of Imperial Wizard Robert M.

Shelton before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I heard his entire testimony—or possibly I should say his lack thereof—and it is quite a contrast compared to his previous invective and loud talk. Like most demagogs, he issued a pious and self-serving declaration afterwards that he was fighting for freedom and so forth. He is not fighting for freedom, Mr. Speaker. By his own admission he is fighting to prevent the Negro from attaining his constitutional rights and protections.

It is quite ironic that he should endeavor to use the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment in his declinations to respond to questions dealing with everything from his title to mismanagement of funds. He is dead set against the Negro achieving any rights through the equal protection clause but he certainly found it a safe sanctuary for the time being. I am hopeful that he will be cited for contempt of Congress. The Daily News editorial hits the nail right on the head, and it follows:

THE WIZARD'S NEW ROBE

The U.S. Constitution surely is one of the most wondrous protective garments ever conceived by man. It shields alike the innocent and the guilty, the sheep and the wolf, the accuser and the accused.

Now it gathers under its capacious skirts even the Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan.

This in itself is irony of high degree. For the Constitution and its amendments are repugnant to every tenet and every trapping of the Klan.

Yet Mr. Robert Shelton, who heads the United Klans of America, has found the Constitution a more comfortable garment in which to wrap himself than the robe and hood of his organization.

He invoked not only the 5th but also the 1st, 4th, and 14th amendments to avoid giving the House Un-American Activities Committee any information about the Klan. It was an interesting selection, to say the least.

The first amendment guarantees freedom of religion, of speech, of press, of assembly and of petition for redress of grievances. Do Klansmen believe in these freedoms for Negroes, for Catholics, for Jews, for anyone who opposes them?

The fourth amendment safeguards the right of people to be secure against search and seizure except under full color of the law. Do Klansmen wait for warrants before starting on midnight forays?

The fifth amendment does more than protect a person against self-incrimination. It further pledges that no one shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Do the noose and the whip, the torch and the gun comprise due process of law?

The 14th amendment's use in this instance is most ironic of all. It guarantees full citizenship to all persons born or naturalized in the United States—including Negroes—and forbids States to pass laws abridging this privilege. Was it not to thwart the purposes of this amendment that the Ku Klux Klan was born?

Mr. Shelton, of course, has the privilege of invoking these or any other constitutional provisions if he wishes. As a citizen, he is under the protection of the Constitution no matter what he may think of its application to others. So are his fellow Klansmen.

But the American people will form their own opinion of men who hide behind constitutional immunity as readily as they hide behind robes and hoods.

HOW THE UNITED STATES GOT INVOLVED IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a report published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions of the Fund for the Republic, Inc., entitled, "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam," by Robert Scheer. The author's background and qualifications were described thus:

Robert Scheer is coauthor with Maurice Zeitlin of the book, "Cuba: Tragedy in Our Hemisphere." A correspondent for Ramparts and the Realist, Mr. Scheer has recently returned from a trip to southeast Asia.

Later I received an appraisal of the report, plus a much more generous rundown on Mr. Scheer's background, from another recipient of the report, the Honorable RICHARD H. ICHORD, of Missouri, who is my colleague on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He made an excellent reply to the letter we both received.

Because it is virtually impossible for a congressional office to thoroughly digest all informative materials which it regularly receives, the following insertions should prove useful in evaluating the report, "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam":

LETTER OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD ICHORD

Recently I received from you a copy of "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam," by Robert Scheer, which you described as "the best short treatment of this subject I have ever seen." After a very thorough reading of the material, I must strongly disagree with your conclusion.

The publication is filled with half-truths, distortions, implications, innuendoes, and inferences which lead one to believe that Ho Chi Minh is the George Washington of Vietnam and any American who has had any part in our involvement is guilty of stopping a legitimate revolution. For example, in the section entitled "The Lobby," Mr. Scheer implies that our involvement in Vietnam was the result of a plot carried out by such distinguished Americans as John F. Kennedy, MAURINE NEUBERGER, EDNA KELLY, EMANUEL CELLER, and Cardinal Spellman. I would also point out to you that the Fund for the Republic, which allegedly sponsored the publication of the material, has been denounced by the very people who provided the money for its establishment.

I am equally confident that you were also unaware of Mr. Scheer's previous efforts in behalf of the Vietcong, Fidel Castro, and Mao Tse Tung.

I enclose a brief résumé of Mr. Scheer's activities which I am also sending to all Members of Congress for their information. I am sending this to them as I believe they should be informed of the kind of material being printed and distributed by an alleged education organization which enjoys a tax-exempt status. I, of course, am sending it only to the Members who received a copy from you.

With warmest personal regard, I am

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Member of Congress.

ENCLOSURE PREPARED BY REPRESENTATIVE ICHORD ON ROBERT SCHEER

(The following is a brief résumé of the previous activities of Mr. Robert Scheer, based on documented evidence held in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.)

1. Robert Scheer is a former executive committee member of the University of California at Berkeley chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

2. Robert Scheer has traveled to Vietnam. He appeared as an introductory speaker at a showing of the film entitled "War in Vietnam." The film was prepared by the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, "Vietcong," and was confiscated by Federal authorities in New York.

3. Robert Scheer was among the first students to violate the Cuban travel ban. An investigation of this travel by the House Committee on Un-American Activities indicated the trip was financed to a large degree by a foreign power. While in Cuba, the students cheered at a film showing American aircraft being shot down.

4. Robert Scheer's book "Cuba: Tragedy in Our Hemisphere," damns the U.S. policies and deifies Fidel Castro.

5. Robert Scheer was among those who signed a petition urging President Kennedy to adopt a fairer policy toward Cuba.

6. Robert Scheer is actively engaged in the programs of the Women's Strike for Peace and appears in their "demonstrations," including the massive march in Times Square, New York City, coinciding with the march on Washington.

7. The following are but a few of the many quotes attributed to Robert Scheer:

"We cannot expect Jack Kennedy to feel the necessity of political freedom—he has never been threatened by the state, never questioned by the secret police (FBI), never seen his parents arrested as political prisoners."

"You must talk about the economic development of Communist China and the role of profit in the perversion of the American consumer."

"As imperfect as they may be, Nasser, Mao, Toure, and Castro have liberated their people for the first time in modern history and we as a people oppose them."

8. Robert Scheer is an announced participant in the coming international days of protest on October 15 and 16 which are sponsored by the Vietnam day committee. This is the committee which attempted to halt the troop trains in California.

FENCING AND SPRAYING POSE DUAL THREAT TO ANTELOPE ON PUBLIC GRAZING LANDS

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the welfare of antelope herds on our federally owned public grazing lands in the West. I warned earlier that the erection of thousands of miles of fences on these public lands inhibited the movement of antelope herds which must range widely for the food and water they need to survive.

This concern prompted me on September 30, 1965, to introduce H.R. 11359, a bill to prohibit the erection of fences which impede the movement of wildlife on public lands used for grazing and other purposes.

On October 9, 1965, the Bureau of Land Management issued a position statement on its fencing policy on publicly owned lands in the West. I discussed this statement—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 14, 1965, pages 27052–27054—and reported that I was encouraged that the BLM was recommending a tightening of its fencing policy.

The threat to antelope posed by the network of fences on publicly owned grazing lands—over 6,100 miles of such fencing has been erected in Wyoming alone—is described in an excellent article in the October 15 issue of Conservation News, a publication of the National Wildlife Federation.

The article points out that the BLM and livestock operators have embarked on still another program that could cut down on the antelope population—aerial spraying to kill sagebrush. Cattle and sheep do not eat the hardy plant, but it is a staple in the antelope's diet.

Since an estimated two-thirds of our antelope live on public lands administered by the BLM, it follows that the Bureau's policy on management of this land will play an important role in determining the future of antelope herds.

Congress originally directed the BLM to manage these public lands for multiple uses, including livestock production, wildlife habitat, recreation and timber production.

The Conservation News article implies that this directive is not being followed by the BLM.

I include a copy of the article by Willard T. Johns, Assistant Chief of the Division of Conservation Education of the National Wildlife Federation:

WHERE THE LIVESTOCK, BUT NOT THE ANTELOPE, CAN PLAY

(By Will Johns)

The West, according to the popular ballad, is supposed to be the place where seldom is heard a discouraging word and the deer and the antelope play.

Not any more. At least not in Wyoming where the hottest controversy in years is boiling up among conservationists, sportsmen, ranchers, and the Bureau of Land Management. At stake is the future of the pronghorn antelope, America's only genuine and distinct mammal—a species which has no living relatives in any other part of the world.

The fleet-footed, graceful and colorful pronghorn antelope is a creature of the prairies and wide-open spaces. It once ranged over an area of 2 million square miles in the central part of the continent—north into Canada, south into Mexico, east to Iowa and west to Oregon, Washington, and some parts of California. Some estimates of its numbers in the early 1800's ran as high as 30 to 40 million animals. But less than 75 years later, a 2-year survey in 1922–24 by State and Federal conservation agenices revealed that only about 26,600 antelope were left in the 16 Western States. It looked like the end of the pronghorn as a game animal and almost all of the States moved quickly to close the seasons and give the antelope full legal protection. Within 30 years, however, the antelope came back. Between 1924 and 1957, Wyoming's antelope herd increased from less than 7,000 to 105,000; in Montana from about 3,000 to 59,000; in Arizona from about 650 to more than 9,000. Today, surveys indicate antelope herds on the remaining range may total over 300,000 animals.

Now, however, the fate of the antelope rests not so much with the hunter as it does with other users of its range, especially with Government agencies which control those uses. Today, it is not the hunting rifle that poses a threat to the welfare of these popular and important animals; rather, the doom of the antelope may well be determined by the erection of fences and the application of herbicides on its home on the range.

As with all wild birds and animals, habitat is the key to antelope abundance. But unlike many game animals, antelope habitat has but two simple characteristics—plenty of sagebrush and plenty of wide open space. Over most of its present range, these two simple requirements are also characteristics of federally owned land in the Western States—land still left in the public domain and administered by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management through its State directors and advisory boards. Indeed, two out of every three pronghorn antelope alive today are found on lands administered by this single Bureau.

Here is where the fate of the antelope hangs in the balance—a balance of uses for the public domain. Until fairly recently, there was little, if any, conflict but today new techniques and new materials spell the beginning of a rapid change. From pioneer days, the greatest single use of these lands has been (and still is) the grazing of sheep and cattle. It is a land use upon which a rich and powerful industry has been built and for years, many livestock operators have considered grazing to be the only use for which these lands are suited.

Fortunately for antelope, there has been no great problem in their sharing the range with cattle or sheep. Occasionally a feeling of resentment cropped up among some ranchers who felt the antelope were competing with their cattle or sheep for the available forage. Wildlife biologists, however, long since have proved that with proper stocking rates of domestic livestock and game there is little competition for specific food plants.

Still another ballad expressing the feeling of the old West contained the line, "Don't fence me in." And, until recent years, most of the people and all of the antelope felt that fences on the open range were too costly and really unnecessary. Where some control or watchfulness over flocks of sheep or herds of cattle was necessary, livestock operators used cowboys or sheepherders. Today, however, most of the cowboys and other "riders of the purple sage" are seen only on television, at dude ranches, or in rodeos. Control of grazing now is beginning to take the form of fences—wire fences strung mile after mile across the range in order to divide grazing units and keep sheep and cattle off the highways. These fences do keep livestock within well-defined areas, of course, and do eliminate the cost of hiring men to watch over them. But for the antelope, fences pose a serious problem. Unlike deer and other big game, antelope normally are not good high jumpers. Some pronghorns do have the ability to get across fences, even when running at full speed (up to 50 miles per hour) by projecting themselves through or under the strands of barbed wire. Most adults in time have learned how to jump over a 4-foot fence but many are still lost where fences corner during severe snowstorms. Young antelope, however, usually wind up entangled in the wire or are completely blocked from traditional migration routes.

Coupled with fencing is another, and equally serious, problem. In Wyoming, as in many other places, much of the public domain has been badly overgrazed. The better forage grasses are gone, the topsoil eroded away, and about the only plant that can survive is the tough sagebrush. Thus the Bureau of Land Management and the livestock operators are embarked on a major range rehabilitation program. Many techniques have been tried but currently the most popular, and least expensive, seems to be aerial spraying of the herbicide 2,4-D in an oil suspension. The objective is to kill out the sagebrush, then reseed the range in the hope that it will come back to grasses and other forage for livestock. The only hitch is that in many places the only topsoil left is the little bit held together under the sagebrush plants. When they are destroyed, wind or water erosion sweeps that soil away and no amount of reseeding will ever bring back suitable forage cover. One study in Montana, for example, showed that after a sagebrush spraying program had been completed, the grass cover increased only 1 percent.

With this background, it is not too difficult to understand the concern of Wyoming sportsmen, as well as that of conservationists everywhere, over current fencing and spraying programs in the "Equality State." In the Bench Coral area of Sublette County north of Big Piney, for example, the Bureau of Land Management has announced it plans to spray 2,4-D to kill out sagebrush on over half of the 64,000 acres in the next 8 years. Already, BLM has sprayed 5,000 acres and has scheduled application of the herbicide next year in the most important antelope fawning area on the Bench Corral. Three years ago, according to Wyoming Game Warden Dave Thomas, the antelope population on the Bench Corral totaled 530 animals. Last year BLM started, or permitted holders of grazing allotments to start, a fence building program as well as spraying to eradicate the sagebrush. The May 1965, spring census showed the antelope population had dropped to 437 and 5 weeks after the spraying of 5,000 acres, the count was 168 animals. Thomas points out that the spray doesn't actually kill the antelope, but it apparently does drive them out of the area and scatters them in small herds from which they don't seem to regroup.

Another "hot spot" in the controversy is located in the Rattlesnake Mountains on some 20,000 acres known as the Cabin Creek Allotment. This includes 18,240 acres of Federal land administered by BLM, 770 acres of State land, and 1,670 acres of deeded land. It was formerly operated by the Grieve family as the Diamond Ring Ranch, with cattle using the allotment. When the ranch was sold several years ago, the new owner applied to the Bureau of Land Management for permission to graze both cattle and sheep on the land, as well as permission to construct about 30 miles of sheep-tight fencing. Permission to graze sheep was granted. The Bureau, however, has an agreement of long standing with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department to consult with it before authorizing any fences on the public land. In this case, the department refused to give approval because the fencing would be detrimental to the antelope. Last summer, however, a survey of this area showed that the 30 miles of fence had been erected on the public domain without permission from BLM, the Wyoming department, or anyone else. To date, the fence is still up although affidavits have been filed against the Diamond Ring Ranch Company in the hope that the U.S. attorney will file a civil suit compelling the firm to tear it down.

To resolve a growing problem and insure the future of antelope in Wyoming, Tom Bell, president of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation, has called for a 10-point program, as follows:

1. An indefinite moratorium on sheep-tight fence on the public domain where antelope are involved.

2. Fencing on all important antelope ranges should be kept to a minimum. Where fences are absolutely necessary, they should

be no more than a four-strand wire fence, with the bottom wire no less than 16 inches above ground level.

3. A concentrated and intensive research effort to determine the effects on antelope of fences now in place.

4. A review of grazing fees, with the thought in mind that where minimum fences only are permitted, the fees would remain low; otherwise, where the public is subsidizing the building of fences, the fees would be scaled upward.

5. A modification of a number of fences lying on or across critical migration routes of antelope where these are known, the modification to be as above.

6. A posting of all roads on all lands in grazing districts where there is an interspersion of private and public lands. If the public allows grazing on its land, the private landowner should certainly allow access across theirs.

7. Immediate prosecution of any unauthorized fences and illegal signs.

8. Immediate installation of livestock "exclosures," 5 to 10 acres in size, on the public range in order to determine range rehabilitation through natural processes and then to compare results with present livestock allotments.

9. Immediate implementation of methods to obtain better control of livestock numbers on the public range. There is really no excuse for livestock owners receiving only a light slap on the wrist for consistently overstocking and overgrazing, and for willful trespass.

10. A concentrated and intensive research effort to determine the long-range effect of sagebrush spraying on all the ecological communities involved.

Echoes of the fight to save the antelope in the "Equality State" are now spreading across the Nation. They sounded through Pinedale in late August when the National Wildlife Federation's officers, staff and board of directors pledged support of the Wyoming Wildlife Federation's stand and carried the plea to save the pronghorn into the Washington offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

This conservation battle is far from over but it reached a new level of intensity on September 30 when Representative HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin, introduced a bill (H.R. 11359) in the 89th Congress. The REUSS bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to ban from the public lands any fence which impedes the movement of wildlife. If the Secretary finds a grazing licensee has built such a fence, he shall require it to be removed by the licensee, and shall see that it is removed at the licensee's expense if the licensee fails to remove it himself within 30 days. Any future illegal fencing shall be the cause for a revocation of the grazing license.

As storm clouds gather over the home on the range for antelope, livestock, fences and sprayed sagebrush, one point should be made clear. This is not a fight for a single use of the public domain, but rather a fight based on the principle of multiple use a—principle which by law and regulation is supposed to be applied to all of the 18 million acres in Wyoming and 176 million acres in the 11 Western States administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Sportsmen of the Equality State and conservationists throughout the Nation are asking that the antelope be given equal consideration, along with cattle, sheep, horses and other creatures, both wild and domesticated, which live where the buffalo once roamed and the skies are not cloudy all day.

THE SUGAR BILL

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, October 13 on the floor of the House we debated the sugar bill. I felt that the people in my district were entitled to information that would give them a true picture of what transpired and I therefore sent out on that day the following radio press release. I include it here for the benefit of my colleagues:

There has been a good deal of comment both in and out of Congress regarding the recently passed sugar bill. Most of this rhetoric has been by persons who are more interested in generating heat than they are in bringing light on this subject.

Heat in itself is not necessarily bad, because as President Truman is reported to have said, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

Unfortunately, however, numerous scurrilous and character defamation remarks were directed toward members of the Committee on Agriculture. This was uncalled for and was not worthy of the proper debate that should be observed in the House of Representatives.

It pleased me greatly to see a large number of Members from both sides of the aisle rise to the defense of members of this capable committee. In order to keep the record straight, I hope all who are interested in this debate will study carefully the entire text as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would be a grave mistake to rely only on the fragmentary and out-of-context reports that so readily abound.

This committee has worked long and hard on some excellent farm legislation. It would be tragic if we were to allow irresponsible comments to cloud the issue and detract from the work of these conscientious Members of Congress.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 11332

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I was honored to appear before our colleague's, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], Subcommittee on General Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in support of H.R. 11332, a bill introduced by my distinguished fellow Floridian, Mr. GIBBONS, and my bill, H.R. 11614. These bills are to create and provide for a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other purposes. This bill is commonly called the Elementary and Preschool Child Development Act.

In no way do I want to seem vain, but I would like to submit for the RECORD my testimony on this subject as I feel that this is one that should be called to the attention of all our colleagues and ask that unanimous support be given to this bill when it comes before this body for consideration, and a voice of thanks from every person should go out to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] for his work and forethought in this field of education.

Mr. Speaker, our country is today faced with the sad and frightening problems of our emotional and imbalanced children. Therefore, I now offer my statement at this point for the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I thank you very much for your kind words of invitation and introduction, Mr. Chairman. It is a great privilege for me to be here today to testify in behalf of H.R. 11322 introduced by my distinguished colleague, Mr. GIBBONS, and my companion bill H.R. 11614, which I have introduced to show my support of and my desire to help in any way I can in the progress of that very desirable and in my opinion very important legislation.

There are no more serious problems America faces today than those twin evils of delinquency and crime.

Not far behind taking their social toll are the tragic conditions of mental illness and other forms of emotionally debilitating and socially disruptive behavior.

There is not one American in this country who would not agree that these grave problems are threatening the survival of the very fabric of our democracy. Yet, what are we doing about these problems today?

The sad answer is, I believe, that we are now spending our resources simply to contain these problems once they have become rampant and done their damage. Crime costs us billions of dollars a year and our prisons are overflowing. And our mental institutions are also full—in this case of tragically afflicted human beings.

This is why I urgently support the bill which has been so ably introduced and sponsored by my distinguished colleague, Mr. GIBBONS, for the proposals in this act, instead of dealing with these problems at the end of the line, aim to strike at the hearts of these problems at a stage before they have a chance to become full blown—that is, when children are still very young.

This would be done by sponsoring a program that would place child development specialists in our elementary schools to help them to discover and work with young pupils who have these potentially disruptive forms of behavior. By working with such children in the early school grades, these disruptive forms of behavior could be prevented before they had an opportunity to develop into serious problems.

Before discussing the excellent provisions of H.R. 11322 and companion bills, I would like to say I have been vitally interested in this early preventive approach to dealing with the problems we are talking about for a very long time. And the Congress has for some time considered this approach. In 1945 when I was privileged to be chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education, we investigated, among other things, the educational and physical fitness needs of our country, at that time and, in the report which resulted from this inquiry, we clearly indicated our feeling that early preventive program of mental hygiene were

needed to solve some of our deep-rooted social problems.

Our report stated, and I quote directly, "From a longer range point of view, the establishment of child guidance clinics in all communities is urgently needed to prevent early social maladjustments. Such a step would pay tremendous dividends in decreased crime, delinquency, and costs of institutionalizing the mentally ill."

In line with this same thinking, even earlier, in 1939, I introduced in the other body a bill to offer Federal assistance for the promotion of kindergarten education. The report of the Committee on Education and Labor which accompanied this bill also made clear our belief that the answer to many of our social problems lay in acting in the early grades of school. It said, and again I quote directly:

"From information available to the committee, college presidents and other educators of note, penologists, and psychiatrists—furnish valid reasons for the contention that an increase in the number of kindergartens will mean a decrease in crime. The committee believes that by being given training in kindergarten and nursery schools, normal children will be better prepared to lead normal lives and that such training will prevent the development in children of dispositions toward unsocial acts."

The idea behind our present bill, H.R. 11322, and companion bills, is very similar to those motivating these earlier ones. But in the form of H.R. 11614, we have a much improved proposal for achieving the aims of early prevention of socially disruptive behavior in young pupils.

How then would H.R. 11322 and similar bills do this?

Basically, as I have said, it would attempt to accomplish this preventive action by initiating an original program that would help our elementary schools to identify and treat these problems as they become apparent in young pupils in our earliest grades.

The heart of this practical program would help to provide our elementary schools with the services of of child development specialists who would help elementary schools to carry out plans of preventive action. In addition to paying the salaries of such elementary school personnel, the program would also give assistance for training these needed child specialists in our institutions of higher learning.

These child development specialists would be persons who had successfully completed a postgraduate course of at least 2 years in an institution of higher learning, such course which would qualify them to help schools carry out a program of prevention.

These specialists would act in a number of valuable ways. First, they would help elementary school personnel with the individual learning or behavior problems of elementary school children, as well as with the educational progress of such children.

Second, they would assist school personnel to recognize elementary school children who have or who are developing serious emotional, learning, or behavior problems, and in making effective school related changes to help such children. And third, they would help teachers, parents, and school staff to become knowledgeable about community and other resources that might be used by such children and their families who required assistance in solving some of the problems of these schoolchildren.

By the terms of the proposal, the child development specialist would work only with children up until and through the third grade of elementary school. He would be assigned to serve no more than 350 children. And, he would perform duties appropriate only for child development specialists.

These specific limitations are extremely important—and extremely sensible. For, we feel that they will insure that the beneficial effects of the child development specialist's services will not be allowed to be dispersed ineffectively over too many grades and too many students, but will instead, be able to be focused on the primary aim of the program—to identify and treat incipiently disruptive behavior in some of its very earliest identifiable stages in very young schoolchildren.

These points cannot be stressed enough. For, we feel that if this program is to do any good, it must be strongly pinpointed on this one problem of early identification and treatment of young children before the fourth grade. Moreover, the persons who are to be the major leaders in this task—the child development specialists—must not be allowed to be diverted to other educational duties, no matter how important these may be. These limitations I have just described will help to assure that these fundamental purposes of the program will be accurately carried out. And, they will help to assure that the specialized knowledge of the child development specialists will really be appropriately used by the school for these purposes.

Those who have worked in this field believe that staffing our Nation's elementary schools with these highly trained child development specialists would be one of the most practical and effective ways of realistically helping elementary schools to identify and help troubled little children before their problems grow out of hand. Yet, the truth of the matter is, even if we wanted to put this program I have discussed into operation tomorrow, we would not be able to provide our elementary schools with these essential child development specialists for the simple reason that, at this time, we do not have sufficient personnel properly trained in this field.

This is why another very important part of H.R. 11322 provides assistance for training child development specialists in our institutions of higher education. Through a program of fellowships, to be awarded for not more than 2 years, we would help qualified persons pursue a program of graduate study that would appropriately prepare them to be child development specialists.

Although the act does not spell out all the details of the training a child development specialist would have, it does wisely set down some firm guidelines for such training. For instance, to qualify an individual as a child development specialist, the act specifies that, among other things, his training program shall make him competent in child growth and development, personality theories, behavior problems of children, learning disorders and their prevention and remediation, parent counseling, and the utilization of community resources.

The clear aim of the child development specialist's program is specified, however—it is to be to establish a high level of competence in these persons so that they can help school personnel to become more effective in the management and education of all children in the school, and especially so that they can be a major support and resource to the teacher and to the parent in the education of children with beginning, moderate, or serious learning, behavior, or emotional problems.

Another well planned part of the training provisions of H.R. 11322 and companion bills provides assistance for training and would make grants to State educational agencies so that they could sponsor in an institution of higher education programs that would provide special training for school and community personnel in the use of child development specialists. Since the idea of this program would be very new to many persons involved in running educational programs in the country, it would seem apparent that these courses would be extremely useful—if not indeed, essential.

Finally, H.R. 11322 and companion bills would establish an Advisory Council on Elementary School Child Development to review the administration and operation of the programs carried under this act and to advise and make recommendations to the Commissioner on the approval of programs authorized under the training provisions of the act.

It is, I think, clear that H.R. 11322 provides a carefully designed and comprehensive practical plan for helping our Nation's troubled children at the stage when they can be helped—in the early grades of elementary school. Its plan of providing child specialists for elementary school and the training to create them, and its provisions for training school personnel and the community as to the aims of the program, would all constructively contribute to providing this desperately needed help.

I urge every American concerned with finding a really effective solution to our national problems of crime, delinquency, mental illness, and other such social problems, to support H.R. 11322.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add on to this. I have been urging at the administrative level for some time that there be set up in each of the major cities of the country a Public Security Administration, or a public security director, or administrator, as I have called him, for lack of a better term. The purpose of that function would be to have someone of outstanding competence and responsibility who I hope would be paid something like $15,000 to $25,000 a year, and I prefer the latter figure, with the cost of that administration being divided between the Federal Government and under the recent anticrime bill that we passed and the local municipality.

I say the function of that overall administrator with a small staff but a comprehensive jurisdiction would be to recognize and to adequately deal with every facet of this multifaceted matter of what we call crime, the kind of maladjustment or antisocial behavior which we described as crime, and for a good long while I have been emphasizing and supporting this proposal, that one of the areas where such a person could serve advantageously is in working with the school authorities at these tender ages of children when criminals are being developed, when criminals are aborning, and when tragedy is also aborning in the life of the children who has that predisposition or predilection toward the kind of antisocial behavior that eventuates this crime. As it is now the school principal is one of the claimants for the public money that is available, and of course there are a lot of other claimants and he has to fight the battles from the point of view of the school man, but if the man I envisage was of the stature that he should be, he would have a hearing before civic clubs, before the press, the radio, and the TV media and before parent teachers associations, before community groups of influence and responsibility and concern to tell them, "listen, I am not fighting battles of education. I am trying to keep some of us from being killed. I am trying to keep someone, some woman or girl in your family from being attacked by some criminal youth or somebody who will manifest tendencies to commit crime."

If we don't work with these school authorities at these tender ages, when now it is that the psychiatrists tell us these antisocial predilections and predispositions are observable and maybe correctable, or at least perhaps to be ameliorated, why, eventually we are going to have to deal with a criminal and the tragedy again may be unspeakable or indescribable. Look at what has happened here in Washington. A teenage boy—

I think he was 17 years old—attacked a woman and killed her, murdered her. I am as sympathetic as anybody—I think I am—toward the problems of delinquency and toward judicial attitudes that take cognizance of those maladjustments in the mental and nervous derangements of those people but at any time when a local judge in Washington sentenced that boy only to incarceration until he got to be 21 years old and then made it possible for him to be turned loose on society without any psychiatric examination or any determination as to whether he has an inevitable compulsion to do the same thing, then I think it is a gross and a valid miscarriage of justice.

It might well have been that if that boy who performed that heinous act had had the kind of treatment that Mr. GIBBONS' bill would wisely contemplate and envisage, that boy might have been saved from criminality and for a useful life and that lady might have been spared her life from his later criminal attack.

Take just one further instance. Take slums. Well, it just happens that I know of some areas right here in Washington. There are some areas to my knowledge, and the police tell me, where a shocking amount of criminality comes out of those slum areas. There must be somebody in the District whose problem it is to try to eradicate slums, but every time he goes before the board which dispenses the money they have a problem and he has a problem: Is there enough money to go around?

But some man speaking for the community should even be enabled to go out to the community and tell the story. I am not talking about more housing projects. I don't personally care whether you get them or not, but I don't want to be killed by some criminal that comes out of these areas. I am trying to help you and me save our lives or protect our property or our families. I think this is one of the most meaningful approaches that could possibly be made, start at the tender age when what will later become the hardened tree is only a tender twig which can be prevented perhaps or at least saved from deformity when it comes to full maturity, so therefore I commend my distinguished colleague for some more excellent work and farsighted contribution to our country.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Mr. PERKINS. Any questions? Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. SCHEUER. No; I don't have any questions, except to say how pleased I am that our colleague, Mr. PEPPER, came before us. To me this is the greatest evidence and if I had had any lingering iota of doubt that this bill is right as rain, then Mr. PEPPER's appearance would have obliterated it.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you very much.

Mr. PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you very much and members of the committee.

Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you very much. It is an excellent presentation.

THE 7TH ARMY SAYS "THANK YOU"

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant pieces of legislation that this historic 89th Congress passed this summer was the pay increase for our Armed Forces. It has not received as much publicity, perhaps, as other legislation whose impact is measured largely in terms of our society here at home. But it was significant because it recognized the outstanding performance by a most important segment of our society, and attempted to nearer equate its pay with that of its contemporaries. Our dependence on that segment, our recognition of its daily, and often unsung, effort on behalf of us all can never be translated into any piece of legislation, even an increase in salary. Even our daily prayer of thanks and godspeed will never be enough to let the men of our Armed Forces know how we think of them and what we think of them.

Among the letters of appreciation that I have received from individual soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen, none has quite touched me as one I received this morning from the leader of one of the key units of our forces, Lt. Gen. William W. Quinn, commanding general of the 7th Army.

I do not know General Quinn, to my recollection have never met him, in fact. But any man who, amid the constant and considerable pressures of running one of the greatest teams in the history of our Army, can take the time to write such a thoughtful letter on behalf of the 170,000 men in his command, must be quite a commander. His military rank and assignment eloquently attest to his caliber as an officer and gentleman. His letter confirms this. He speaks for all of his men, and no group of men ever had a better spokesman. And, in order that all who read the record of our proceedings may know of the appreciation of those who daily stand on the eastern perimeter of the free world defending all Europe against the Communist threat, I include the text of General Quinn's letter at this point in the RECORD:

HQ, 7th ARMY, APO NEW YORK,
October 15, 1965.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RODINO: On behalf of the 170,000 officers and me, of the 7th Army in Europe, I would like to express to you our collective appreciation for your active support of the military pay raise and the more recent insurance program.

As commander of this field army, which is the world's most powerful, I share in the responsibility for the maintenance of its high morale. Hence, I can appreciate the impact that these recent actions by the Congress have had on the troops that comprise this fine organization.

Although the material benefits derived from these two bills were more than welcome, the psychological benefits gained through the realization that the Members of Congress, and hence the people, are thinking of and are concerned for them, is of unestimable value toward increased morale and the long term goal of high retainability.

From the 7th Army therefore, please accept our best wishes and sincere thanks.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM W. QUINN,
Lieutenant General, USA, Commanding.

COMPENSATION CLAIMS

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been brought to my attention, by letter from the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, Local 10, that a situation exists in the U.S. Bureau of Employees' Compensation, the 13th compensation district, which greatly hinders the prompt processing of compensation claims.

The problem lies not within the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, but is created by a lack of funds and personnel to adequately process claims.

If our compensation program is to be meaningful, we must have a prompt adjudication of claims. To hinder the proper functioning of the 13th compensation district at the hearing and conference levels is certainly unjustifiable and increases to a large extent the misery and suffering of those whose claims are not promptly processed.

I do not know the extent to which this difficulty exists in the other compensation districts. I would, however, urge the Bureau of the Budget to review the allotment of funds and personnel to these districts in light of existing backlogs and with the knowledge that these backlogs diminish the effectiveness and thwart the purpose for which our compensation laws were enacted.

LADY BIRD'S BILL

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Chronicle on Friday, October 15, 1965, printed an editorial entitled "Lady Bird's Bill."

This editorial commends the First Lady for the "good fight" in behalf of the highway beautification bill. We are fortunate to have Mrs. Johnson assume the important task of providing leadership to the program to retain our national beauty.

The full text of the editorial follows:

LADY BIRD'S BILL

The highway beautification bill establishing controls over junkyards and billboards along 266,000 miles of roads finally has emerged from Congress, a bit tattered and torn. We deplore the weakening of the controls originally proposed, which were so ably advocated by Lady Bird Johnson, but we do regard the compromise as at least a good start toward preserving or restoring America's heritage of natural beauty.

The President, with Lady Bird stanchly by his side—or was it vice versa?—obviously fought a good fight, else the whole measure would have been killed forthwith by billboard lobbyists. San Franciscans well know the strength of that lobby, since it succeeded to a great extent in emasculating the citys'

own billboard control ordinance only a few days ago.

Saved in the Federal bill were provisions which require States to control billboards along interstate and primary Federal-aid roads by January 1, 1968, or lose 10 percent of their Federal highway grants. Billboards will be banned within 660 feet of rights-of-way, except in areas zoned for industrial or commercial uses—and Federal officials will have an equal say as to what constitutes such areas. States must also agree, under the same penalty of curtailed aid, to remove or screen junkyards within 1,000 feet of the highway paving. Although the President had proposed these things be done by police powers of the States, the final version of the measure provides for compensating the billboard or junkyard or landowners involved. The bill also grants some extra funds to States to beautify all Federal-aid highways.

Regardless of the weakening amendments written in by Congress, the bill definitely is a forward step. Any measure that forces the slide-rule minds of Federal and State highway engineers to consider protecting instead of destroying natural beauty is well worthwhile.

PRESIDENTIAL "E" AWARD

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure as well as pride to put the remarks of S. L. Drumm into the RECORD. Mr. Drumm is the president of the West Penn Power Co. which serves my congressional district.

The remarks were made on the occasion of the presentation of the Presidential "E" Award by the Secretary of Commerce, John T. Connor, to the West Penn Power Co. for its contributions in the interest of export expansion.

This is the first time in history that this award has been awarded to an operating power company.

I join with my fellow Westmorelanders in congratulating Mr. Drumm and the West Penn family.

Mr. Drumm's remarks follow:

ACCEPTANCE OF "E" SERVICE AWARD FROM SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JOHN T. CONNOR

(By S. L. Drumm, president of West Penn Power Co., at National Export Expansion Council luncheon, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Oct. 18, 1965)

On behalf of West Penn Power Co. of the Allegheny Power System and my associates, we are most gratified to be the first electric utility in the Nation to receive the "E" Export Service Award for our contributions to the increase of U.S. trade abroad. It is a distinct honor to have had this presentation made at this luncheon with the many distinguished guests from both Government and business. To attach this importance to this award and its presentation attests not only to the importance of foreign trade promotion, but reaffirms the wisdom of our company's decision and subsequent action in this field. In addition, it provides a soundingboard on the essential nature of this activity for other utilities throughout the Nation, and emphasizes the vital importance of this undertaking in contributing to the national as well as local economic improvement.

Fred Foy has asked me if we could briefly describe our concept of the program, how it was put into operation, and how we feel it has worked. Many of these details are covered in an extensive brochure that has been put together for distribution to those in attendance at this meeting. Our area development manager, C. M. Fife, who incidentally is a member of the Pittsburgh Regional Council, is here today and will be glad to answer any questions concerning its contents.

I believe that the basis of our thinking and operation with respect to the program and its long-range advantages to us as a utility will be of some benefit in motivating others to undertake a foreign trade program. This program was undertaken more than 2 years ago as an integral part of our total concept of area development. Most important, the program was made a definite responsibility of our marketing function, with accountability for results. This was no casual approach, to be done as our personnel saw fit. If it had been, we would not have had the results, nor would we be on this platform today.

In most areas, the Regional Export Expansion Council has had to rely on the voluntary help of members, who are limited in number and whose time is already taken up with their own business, to do the grassroots selling with medium and small firms.

This is the key to our program. We use people that are already calling on these companies for other purposes to also promote foreign trade. There are about 50 men, and since it is made a part of calls for other purposes, can be done at very little incremental cost. They are Indians, not chiefs, and the same thing applied nationally to utilities would mean a sales force in the thousands.

Perhaps a few words of explanation of this total concept of area development will be helpful in telling why we embarked on such a venture. Utilities are fully aware that they can achieve growth in only two ways:

1. By expanding use of their present customers, and

2. By adding new customers.

An area development activity, to be total in concept, must contribute significantly to the attainment of both of these objectives—more use by present customers and adding new ones. Properly designed and implemented programs will do just that. The attraction of new commercial and industrial enterprises with attendant employment fills the need for new customers and, in turn, causes a general improvement in the economy. These changes then begin a chain reaction as they generate additional business for present service industries and trigger the establishment of new ones. Needs for schools, public services, and community facilities are also increased, providing greater sales opportunities in all the utility's markets—industrial, commercial, residential, farm, and municipal as well.

In addition to these growth benefits, however, other important values should accrue to a utility from an area development program that is broad in scope. Providing leadership and other help to community groups in programs directed toward economic development has an important by-product—it is one of the best possible ways to build a company image which reflects full acceptance of corporate citizenship responsibilities.

Finally, a comprehensive area development program should also help to foster our American way of life and the competitive enterprise system.

You can readily see where the foreign trade program fits in, naturally and logically. It also serves a patriotic purpose and fills an obligation that we have in helping to improve the national balance-of-payments picture. As a service activity for our area, it helps us as a corporate citizen to assist our customers and generate confidence in West Penn Power as a utility interested in general improvement rather than just selling kilowatt-hours of electricity.

But even more important from the factual basis of business decisionmaking, it is only enlightened economic self-interest that motivates us to undertake, refine, expand, and improve our foreign trade promotion program. There are jobs created by the export business. One estimate has it that 135,000 jobs are created by a billion dollars in exports.

The Pennsylvania county where our general headquarters is located is Westmoreland County. There is no city larger than 25,000 in this county, which is on the fringe of the Pittsburgh metropolitan area and includes both industrial and rural areas in its breadth. Westmoreland County exceeds $25 million yearly in exports by only 16 percent of its manufacturers, and this provides 3,200 jobs in the county. Products shipped abroad range all the way from books and clothing to amusement park locomotives and church steeples.

It would be belaboring an obvious point to say much about this significance to our company, with expanded industries and additional jobs in the area in which we provide electric service. That is one good solid reason why it is sound long-range thinking for a utility to undertake an aggressive foreign trade program, because among its results if properly carried out is an indisputable direct economic benefit.

When our decision to innovate such a program was made, the first step was a major meeting and workshop announcing our interest and desire in cooperating with and asking the encouragement and support of the local field representatives of the Department of Commerce, as well as executives of banks and industries already involved, to capitalize on their experience and counsel. Employees to whom this work was being assigned were given training courses. Reference material that would provide background, encouragement, and answers was provided.

This was later supplemented by local workshops, staged in cooperation with chambers of commerce and other interested groups. Our methods of determining contacts for initial and primary emphasis were developed and sophisticated as experience in the program helped.

We not only continued to publicize various foreign trade opportunities and events as they arose, but also encouraged present and prospective exporters to expand their business by this route.

Contact reports with customers are required of our personnel assigned to the activity, with provision for followup to provide any help or encouragement necessary to obtain action. Advice on opportunities, particularly those in the standard industrial classification of the products they are already making, are promulgated.

These are but a few of the various tools and elements of our aggressive and continuing program. One other point that may have some significance is that West Penn Power Co. does not serve a port city or coastal area, although it is on the inland waterway.

It is difficult as yet to fully assess the results of our program. It is a long-range effort, and has only been underway since 1963. On the other hand, there are many evidences of increased interest and effort, and some examples that it is beginning to produce tangible results in getting companies to export that never had, and those that did to increase this phase of their business.

We have found there is a surprising variety of businesses that have export possibilities in our area, and that the promotion and support provided by our program has been most

helpful in stimulating and motivating by raising the sights of even some very small companies which had previously given only passing thought to export profit possibilities. Here is, indeed, a fertile field for a well-executed program. After 2 years, we are learning new ways to accelerate the future results of this ongoing effort, and will adopt them as appropriate.

Our gratitude is expressed to Judge Roy Morgan and the Department of Commerce field services staff, and particularly to Newton Heston of the Pittsburgh field office, for their invaluable and enthusiastic support and cooperation. We are grateful to Fred Foy and his associates on the national council, and the Pittsburgh Regional Export Expansion Council headed by Bill Boyd, and are most appreciative of the honor and recognition you have so generously paid us here today.

Let me assure you that our program will be continually improved and refined so that it will be even more productive in all of our best interests in the future. A program such as this, with its manifold benefits to the Nation and its value to our service area clearly mandates our most dedicated continuing efforts.

Thank you.

ROOSEVELT LIBRARY ADDITION WOULD HONOR ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution today to authorize an appropriation of $625,000 to pay half the cost of construction of an Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Addition to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N.Y.

This memorial addition will consist of two wings on the library, to house the papers and personal effects of Mrs. Roosevelt, whose warmth, understanding, and compassion made her known as the "First Lady of the World." The Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation will pay the other half of the cost of the addition, which would become the property of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library was a source of great interest and pride to President Roosevelt during his life, and it became Mrs. Roosevelt's first interest after his death. It is significant that President Roosevelt was the first American President to see the great value of preserving Presidential papers in a place accessible to scholars and historians, and to all interested Americans. President Roosevelt established a precedent, and libraries have been built to house the papers of Presidents Hoover, Truman, and Eisenhower. Libraries will be built for the papers of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and, I am sure, for all our Presidents in the future.

I believe it is fitting and proper for the American people to recognize the debt the Nation owes to the strength and greatness of President Roosevelt, and the greatness and warmth of his wife, Eleanor, by helping to provide a fitting place for Mrs. Roosevelt's valuable papers and memorabilia at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park.

WE HONOR EXCELLENCE

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of participating in the presentation by the Administrative Management Society of Federal Government Paperwork Management Awards. Twenty-two officers of the Federal Government were honored for producing savings in Federal paperwork amounting to $100 million since the administration's war on waste began. The Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, made the principal remarks at the presentation ceremony, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Macy's important message be brought to everyone's attention by making it a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In recognition of their professional excellence, I should like to include also the name, agency, and hometown of those who received top honors and the other award recipients.

Chairman Macy's remarks and the award winners follow:

WE HONOR EXCELLENCE

Congressman OLSEN, Mr. Poole, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very great pleasure for me to be with you here this evening and to share in this wonderful occasion.

President Johnson has asked me to convey to you his high interest in the honors that are being granted tonight and to express his regrets that he could not be here personally. He has also asked that I extend his warm congratulations to each of the award winners for their exceptional achievements that will help to reduce the cost of paperwork in Government.

These outstanding accomplishments need to be identified and held up as examples that will inspire and encourage the efforts of others toward additional improvements and progress in paperwork management. We are very pleased with the Administrative Management Society's contribution to this objective and their initiation of this ceremony.

As I reflected on my remarks for this event, I kept thinking of the old statement, "Everybody talks about the weather, but no one does anything about it." It is a statement often attributed to Mark Twain, but actually it originated in an editorial in the Hartford, Conn., "Courant" in 1890. In any event, the statement was certainly true at the time it was made. Weather—hot or cold—wet or dry—was something people accepted as a fact. Sometimes it was helpful, sometimes burdensome, but the individual had to make his own personal adjustment to it.

Today, however, the statement is no longer true. We still talk about the weather, but we are also doing a lot about it.

First of all, we have learned to make more and more accurate predictions of what it will be. Second, with the advent of air conditioning, we have won a real battle over one aspect of the weather. Many people now step from an air-conditioned home, into an air-conditioned car, and ride to an air-conditioned office. They have to read the newspaper to find out that a new heat record was set for the day. Now, in Houston, Tex., we have an air-conditioned sports stadium. I understand that the city of Boston is next on the list for one of these exotic buildings of our age of progress. Before long, we may have air-conditioned domes over our city streets, and city children may grow up without really knowing the old-fashioned weather could be hot or cold or wet or dry.

Why do I call this current phenomenon to your attention? My purpose is to draw a comparison with paperwork management in the Government.

For years and years it could be said of Government paperwork that "Everybody talks about it, but no one does anything about it." I am told that John Paul Jones, one of the founders of our Navy, complained that paperwork interfered with the working of his ships. We didn't go back any further with our research, but I'll bet that Napoleon had trouble with paperwork—and Julius Caesar and—well you can go back as far as you like.

If you go back far enough, you will find at least one bright spot. Our ancestors did not have problems with making 10 extra carbon copies when they wrote their letters on stone tablets. But, on the other hand, I suppose they did have some of our current problems, such as: Trouble in carrying the stone tablets from office to office to get the clearance initials; long delays in the mail, and lack of file cabinets large enough to hold the tablets.

To get back to my theme, everybody talked about Government paperwork for years and suffered with it until the first and second Hoover Commissions came along. The Hoover Commission reports described the problem in a way that made some influential people decide it was time to do less talking and convert some of that energy to fighting the paperwork colossus.

We are still in the early stages of the war on paperwork but a great deal of progress has been made. The National Archives and Records Service of GSA has laid out strategy and tactics for this war, trained cadres of troops, and put weapons in their hands.

My friend Congressman OLSEN, through his series of hearings, has done a tremendous job in scouting the paperwork enemy, describing the fortifications, and marking the maps for the campaigns.

Our troops have been in battle and we have been winning some victories. Tonight the people on the home front, in the form of the Administrative Management Society, are going to honor some of the heroes of the past campaigns.

I am delighted to be with you, to join in this salute to our heroes, and to applaud them as they receive their decorations.

Let there be no lack of clarity about the excellence of these outstanding people we honor tonight. They have demonstrated great ingenuity and imagination in preparing their campaign plans against paperwork.

They have trained and inspired their troops and fellow campaigners. They have shown high courage and skill in leading the charges. They can wear their medals proudly.

I also want to express the appreciation of all the Government service to the Administrative Management Society for doing a great deal of work to identify the war heroes we honor tonight and for pursuing with conspicuous gallantry all of the problems of administration of the fine tribute and ceremony we are enjoying here. It is most appropriate that a respected national professional society, representing many years of experience and judgment in paperwork management be the sponsor of this award. We

will be grateful for their continuing interest.

As we look toward the future, we know the war must go on. We have many campaigns ahead of us. We are right in the middle of the campaign for the computers. Some of them are firing paperwork at us with 1,000-line-per-minute, high-speed printers, but we've infiltrated their forces and already have won over many of them to our side. We have discovered that current paperwork systems should not be converted directly to computer operations. We have found that redesign of systems for computer use often shortcuts and makes unnecessary some of our current paperwork routines and even some of our reports.

We are making good headway on the record-filing and preservation front and expect an early victory there. The turning point occurred a few months ago when the enemy was cut off from its supply of new filing cabinets.

There are still many battles and campaigns ahead of us on the "creation of records" front.

Congressman OLSEN's report tells us that Federal agencies receive 1 billion reports per year. In looking over his report, I find my own agency—the Civil Service Commission—listed among the 10 largest paperwork agencies, and receiving 4,408,280 report responses annually. That's a lot of reports and I want to say to the Congressman that we have been working steadily in this paperwork area and we are making headway. We are very proud of the standardized statistical sampling process we developed within the last few years which gives us a base for accurately estimating various Federal statistics without asking for agency data on each and every personnel transaction.

We are also proud of the progress we are making with the establishment of ADP which is helping to reduce our paperwork requirements. In receiving statistical data from the agencies, we are striving for systems compatability. This means that a magnetic tape coming off one computer can be fed into another. Already, some agencies just mail us their computer tape and we feed it into our machine for processing. In the next step, agencies will send the computer information over the telephone lines and in the jargon of the trade "one computer will talk to the other." At that point—presto—the paperwork disappears. This won't happen tomorrow, but along with the other agencies in the ADP field, we are looking toward this development in the future.

Now in relation to the war on paperwork, I am particularly interested in the campaign against gobbledygook.

As some of you may recall, this campaign was opened by President Johnson at a Cabinet meeting in February. The President expressed his concern about the responsiveness of Government employees to public inquiries and requests for services. He asked me to survey the policies and practices of agencies in their relationships with the public and to report findings and recommendations.

There is no mistaking the President's active and personal interest. He wants improvement in our communications with the public. This means improvement of service to the public, whether we communicate by mail or by telephone or in person. When we achieve these improvements we will also have advanced our war on paperwork. Better communications—the first time—means less prospective correspondence to originate, to file, to dispose of. Better service to the public means fewer complaints and, if you have ever handled complaints, you know how much paperwork they can involve.

Our surveys show that a great deal of good work has been started on improving communications.

In Agriculture, Joe Robertson is waging his own one-man campaign to improve correspondence. His memos and bulletins are in line with the 4–S letterwriting principles—short, simple, strong, sincere. Everyone gets the message and the files are not cluttered up with pages and pages of obscure prose. Thirty thousand agriculture employees are getting training in how to write better letters.

Small Business Administration has been taking vigorous steps to upgrade the writing and the public contact work of its staff. Their program includes a review of their whole correspondence system and emphasis on employee ability to meet and deal when they consider their people for promotions.

Interior is reviving its training in plain-letter writing.

Post Office has an effective customer-relations program to monitor and improve service to its clients.

HHFA has centralized its facilities for handling requests for general information on its wide variety of housing and urban redevelopment programs.

VA has a time-tested, one-step contact service that is being studied by other agencies. It provides for continuing inspection and feedback on the effectiveness and conduct of its public employees. Also, a regular spot-check survey of its visitors to ascertain whether or not the customers feel that they were treated effectively and with courtesy.

Commerce has been engaged in a systematic review of its publications to improve content, appearance, and readability.

These are just a few samples of steps being taken in the campaign against gobbledygook. All of these actions also help in the war on paperwork. They are aimed at better communications and service to the public, but as they reduce correspondence there will be fewer records.

Many of you here tonight are leaders in the paperwork management field. I call on all of you to enlist in the President's war on gobbledygook. Don't wait to be drafted. Many of you have special skills in improving communications and service to the public. Your President is asking that your skills be used to the utmost. If you have uncompleted projects that will help fight the war on gobbledygook—simplification of form letters, training programs, informational leaflets, etc., this is the time to go to work with renewed energy—with a new flood of enthusiasm. If you have useful projects that are stalled, now is the time to get them in motion.

Many of you have responsibility for internal directives. Now is the time to put into effect the improvements you've been thinking about—improvements in readability, appearance, content. Your own employees, your own staff, are a primary public and your communications to them must be clear and effective. They are a main channel of communications to other publics. Every study that we've conducted shows that a positive or negative attitude by the public toward the Government is significantly promoted by the attitude of our own employees with whom they come in contact. Improve your communications with your own employees so they will not need to use gobbledygook in talking about your agency's mission and operations. Their knowledge and attitude can have a make-or-break impact on the opinions of the public they contact.

I have received a number of constructive suggestions from officials of various agencies on steps that need to be taken in the war against gobbledygook. Some have already been put into practice. We are working on others. You can help with many of these:

The first suggestion was that one top-level person in each agency be assigned the responsibility of improving that agency's communications and service to the public. This is a logical starting point and this step has already been taken in many agencies.

Second was a suggestion for setting up one-stop information centers in major cities so a citizen does not have to wander around among a series of buildings and offices to find the answers to his problem with the Federal Government. A capital idea that will be very well received by the public, and we are working on it. We need your support.

Third is the idea that we need some special evening and Saturday office hours to serve the public. If the department stores can stay open all day on Saturday and several evenings a week, why shouldn't the Federal information offices be open one evening a week and a half day on Saturday? This idea raised a lot of eyebrows when it was first mentioned—but after a little thought the eyebrows were lowered—and now there are some people rolling up their sleeves and wrinkling their forehead to work out plans for special hours. I'm proud to say that the Civil Service Commission's central and regional information offices are now open for 4 hours on Saturday morning and the Washington office is also open until 8 p.m., on Thursday evening. I hope to see other agencies follow the Commission's example with similar pilot projects in the near future.

Other suggestions covered items like improved selection of employees for their communications and public contact skills, additional training for employees in this work, special emphasis on awards for excellence in communications, and an interagency exchange of ideas on improving communications with the public.

Let me reemphasize the last point—we are looking for additional practical and useful ideas that will help fight our war on gobbledygook. In this audience there is a vast amount of brainpower and experience. I would be glad to have any specific suggestions you believe will be helpful.

In closing, I would like to bring your attention back to our 22 heroes of the battle of paperwork that we are honoring tonight and the six among them who are to receive the special honors.

Tonight is the night of glory for their achievements. We have a temporary lull in the battle to express our high appreciation for their great skill, their imagination, and their courage in overcoming the many obstacles we face.

And tomorrow—refreshed by this magnificent interval—let us take up our weapons again for the battles against paperwork and gobbledygook. Let the bugles sound "Charge" and we will go forth to further victories.

TOP HONOR WINNERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT SOCIETY PAPERWORK SAVINGS AWARDS

Sam C. Beckley, Director, Paperwork Management Service, Veterans' Administration, New Castle, Ky.

Edwin G. Callahan, Assistant Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Arlington, Va.

Marden D. Kimball, Director, Administrative Services Division, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Phoenix, Ariz.

Thomas J. Pugliese, Chief, Records Management Branch, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Corona, N.Y.

Edward Rosse, supervisory management analyst, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Baltimore, Md., Baltimore, Md.

Donald J. Simon, Chief, Division of Records Management, Department of State, Springfield, Va.

ADDITIONAL AWARD RECIPIENTS

Neil C. Tulloch, management analyst, Selective Service System, Arlington, Va.

Leonard W. Johnson, Chief, Management Analysis Section, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Hastings, Nebr.

Thomas J. Stratton, Chief, Management Engineering Division, National Security Agency, Fort George G. Meade, Md., Philadelphia, Pa.

Linné Ahlberg, Chief, Budget Division, Southwest Region, Federal Aviation Agency, Fort Worth, Tex., Fort Worth, Tex.

Capt. Edward R. Joshua, commanding officer, U.S. Naval Supply Depot, Yokosuka, Japan, Youngstown, Ohio.

William J. Hopkins, executive clerk of the White House Office, the White House, Netawake, Kans.

John S. Peters, Director, Rate and Routing Service Division, Transportation and Communication Service, General Services Administration, Monroe, Ga.

Thomas E. Murphy, Director, Statistical Operations and Analysis Staff, Business and Defense Services Administration, Department of Commerce, Hollis, Long Island, N.Y.

Mrs. Ruth C. Smith, supervisor, Files and Docket Section, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Arlington, Va.

Mrs. Agatha L. Mergenovich, Chief, Paperwork Management Branch, Interstate Commerce Commission, Fairmont, W. Va.

Miss Mary Hamilton, records administrator, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Army, Worcester, Mass.

Mrs. Velma DeBusk, paperwork management officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex., La Porte, Tex.

Maj. Robert B. Weathers, Director, Administrative Services, Defense Subsistence Supply Center, Defense Supply Agency, Chicago, Ill., Vincennes, Ind.

John J. Shurman, Chief, Communications and Records Management Branch, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.

Hugo Duhn, records officer, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, Clinton, Iowa.

Maj. Floyd H. Russell, personnel systems analyst, Department of the Air Force, Bentonville, Ark.

DEDUCTIONS FOR MINING TAXPAYERS

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 9 I introduced H.R. 4665 to allow mining taxpayers to elect to deduct all exploration expenditures as they are incurred. The Committee on Ways and Means considered H.R. 4665 in its executive sessions last week and ordered the bill favorably reported with certain amendments. Due to the press of time it is not anticipated that the report on the bill will be prepared so that the committee can formally report it to the House until the beginning of the next session in January. Today, I am introducing for the information of the Members and the interested public a bill that embodies the changes made by the Committee on Ways and Means in my original bill, H.R. 4665. I am reintroducing the bill in this form so copies of it will be publicly available for study before the formal report is filed by the committee.

I believe this bill will go a long way toward revitalizing the domestic mining industry—a goal shared by many of us, particularly including my good friend and colleague from the State of Idaho [Mr. WHITE], who also introduced the bill in its original form, as well as Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, and 18 cosponsors in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, present tax laws discourage the search for additional sources of domestic ores by prohibiting, except to a limited extent, the current deduction of amounts expended in the search for such minerals. A taxpayer may deduct the cost of exploratory work to the extent of $100,000 per year, with a lifetime limitation of $400,000. Most mining companies have made expenditures in excess of these limitations and must now capitalize exploration costs, which they may not recover for many years. This discourages exploratory projects and stifles the development of a sound and healthy mining industry.

My bill would allow mining taxpayers to elect to deduct all exploration expenditures as they are incurred, and not require them to wait to recover them through depletion deductions or, if the ventures are not successful, through eventual abandonment losses. As you know, approximately 9 out of every 10 mining ventures are unsuccessful in finding commercial quantities of ores and minerals. The risk of failure is high. Consequently, it is important that we do away with the tax barriers imposed against investments in mineral exploration. My bill would do just this.

The bill covers the entire mining industry with the exception of oil and gas and coal. The latter industry is omitted because we were advised that most coal companies have not utilized to the fullest extent possible the provisions of the present law and desire to be excluded.

Under my bill, where the exploratory project is successful and the mine reaches the producing stage, the mining company will have either to restore to income, or reduce their depletion deduction by, the amount of the exploration expenditures previously deducted. With respect to exploration expenditures that are unsuccessful, the mining company would not have to wait until abandonment of the project to obtain its deduction. What my bill does is to accelerate deductibility of exploration expenditures that are incurred. The bill has been limited to domestic mining to encourage the production of minerals in the United States and to better enable the mining industry to meet the needs of our domestic industry. The bill not only limits the current deductibility of exploration expenditures to domestic deposits but also repeals the application of section 615 to foreign operations. Under the bill the only mineral that will be covered by section 615 is coal.

While the bill will defer receipt of revenue by the Government, I want to emphasize that the recapture provision protects the Treasury from any absolute loss of revenue, and that the revenue that will be deferred temporarily by acceleration of these deductions will be more than made up by increased activity in searching for new mineral deposits within the United States.

In summary, I believe the present limited deduction under section 615 is inadequate in light of present-day exploration costs, and particularly so since most taxpayers doing mine exploration have reached the maximum limitation of $400,000. They may obtain a tax deduction for their expenditures on an unsuccessful project only by abandoning the project, frequently a number of years after the expenditures were made. Current deduction in full will encourage mineral exploration by reducing the immediate after-tax cost of exploration and increasing cash flow. Thus it will increase discovery of mineral resources, including metals in short supply, and income of taxpayers from new discoveries, thus increasing revenues in the long run.

JOB "WELL DONE"

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, all of us recognize that without great effort there can be no great accomplishment. When Congress goes home, it will have a well-deserved rest, and the rest will seem all the more sweet now that we are hearing accolades for the achievements of this session.

As chosen Representatives of the people, we hear about problems and trivial worrisome details. You might say that dealing with problems is our business.

Yet, from the problems we have arrived at answers and solutions, until the Congress now is being called the Fabulous 89th. President Johnson praised the work of this Congress by saying that:

> Your people will revere you and reward you, and the Nation will honor you long after you are gone.

In this vein, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a tribute to this Congress which appeared recently in the New York Times. Because I think they would like to see this editorial on the Congress that "broke the mold," I offer it for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 18, 1965]

CONGRESS MEETS THE TEST

The 89th Congress, nearing the end of its first session, has been the best Congress since World War II.

For two decades Congress has been the object of severe but justified public criticism for its failure to face up to the needs of a highly urbanized national society undergoing swift economic and technological change, strained by the challenge of educating, housing and transporting a rapidly growing population, and beset by the complexities of admitting its Negro minority to full citizenship.

The country's needs called for imagination, flexibility, compassion; for vastly increased

Federal spending for schools, hospitals, low-income housing and special programs for the most impoverished and disadvantaged. But Congress, stalemated by a conservative bipartisan coalition drawing its strength from rural and smalltown constituencies and looking backward to a different America, was long unresponsive. Its fussy rules and rigid seniority system helped inhibit action.

The Congress elected a year ago broke the mold. A new majority coalition of Democrats and liberal Republicans has emerged. The seniority system remained, but the House rules were modified in a modest way that helped ease the flow of legislation to the floor. Rather than making a virtue out of sulky obstinacy, this Congress has cooperated with the executive branch to shape a constructive program.

The great measures were approved relatively early in the session. The lawmaking, the right to vote, effectively for southern Negroes, the law bringing Federal financial aid to the elementary and secondary schools, and the law adding the protection of medicare to the scoial security system were historic gains.

But Congress did much more. It submitted to the States a constitutional amendment providing for an orderly succession to the Presidency. It passed—by the narrowest of margins—a program of rent subsidies that may provide a useful approach to the stubborn problem of good housing for low-income families. A Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development was finally established.

The war on poverty, still in its early stages, received a vote of confidence in the form of an increased appropriation. In addition to medicare, much was accomplished for the Nation's health, including the establishment of regional medical centers, funds for staffing community mental-health centers and training more teachers for the mentally retarded. Congress approved a pilot project to rejuvenate railroad passenger service. The reform of the immigration law and a pioneering program of Federal aid for the arts were other high points.

The Congress had a few black marks on its record such as the defeat in the House of the home rule bill for the District of Columbia and the weakening of the bill to regulate highway billboards. The proposal to regulate the shocking trade in guns made little progress. Many conservative measures are needed; and control of water pollution, for example, is going to require a more aggressive and much more amply financed program despite the passage of this year's bill.

Yet these failings and unfinished tasks do not destroy the general excellence and comprehensiveness of this sessions record. At last the decks have been cleared of numerous old problems and old quarrels. At last the Nation has had the benefit of the work of a modern-minded Congress that addressed itself to the needs of a complicated industrial society entering the last third of the 20th century.

RENDER TO CAESAR AND TO GOD

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, last month, on September 3, I inserted a column of David Lawrence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which concerned a sermon delivered by the Reverend Dr. Robert B. Watts, Reactor of St. James-by-the-Sea Episcopal Church, La Jolla, Calif.

Since that time, I have received a copy of Dr. Watts' sermon and find that, in its entirety, it is the most provocative assessment of the teachings of Christ on rights and duties that I have ever read.

Dr. and Mrs. Robert B. Watts reside at 7949 Princess Street, La Jolla, Calif. He was graduated from Bates College in Lewiston, Maine, and from the Yale Law School. Here he was a Phi Beta Kappa, and editor of the Yale Law Journal.

His illustrious career included being chief assistant U.S. attorney in New York City for several years and included repeated appointments as a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. He was National Labor Relations Board general counsel and argued many of its cases in the Supreme Court. For many years he practiced law in Chicago and New York. He was a director of General Dynamics Corp.

Father Watts was ordained in 1958 in the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles.

His sermon of August 15, 1965, "Render to Caesar and to God" follows:

Last night I laid aside the sermon which I had prepared for today, because of an irresistible feeling that I must offer certain suggestions and conclusions concerning the Christian response and reaction to the holocaust of riots through which we are passing—highlighted by the bloody events in Los Angeles.

Since this may well be regarded as a controversial sermon, I wish to make perfectly clear that it represents my own views as a lawyer and as a priest. None of my colleagues in this parish is aware of what I am about to say. My notes have not been reviewed by anyone.

My views are presented by the authority which was conferred upon me at my ordination and, I believe, follow the guidance and impulse of the Holy Spirit. Incidentally, no individual priest or bishop can rightfully claim to speak for the whole church under ordinary circumstances, and I make no claim to be doing so now.

There is no need for me to recount the horrors of the riots which have been occurring, particularly in Los Angeles, during this past week. We have all followed the unspeakable events which have been and still are taking place there as well as in Chicago and in Springfield, and we all must have clearly in mind the earlier riots in our Southern States.

I speak today because I believe that many Christians are desperately confused about what their position should be in respect to these events.

That they are confused is readily understandable when one looks about and reads and listens.

No later than last Friday evening, the bishop of California is reported in our press as having in San Diego criticized the stand of the Episcopal Church on civil rights. He is quoted as saying that "If people are kept busy making things for the ladies' bazaar they feel holy and good even though they may deny persons' rights to be persons." And he is quoted further as saying, "The secularist is just a nasty fellow when he demonstrates for civil rights."

You will note that the Right Reverend Sir leaves quite a blank—at least in his published remarks—what constitutes demonstrating for civil rights. He thereby leaves the readers of his quoted remarks under the unhappy conclusion that any demonstration involving civil disobedience is all right and should be supported and accepted by Christians.

Would he say that the wild and lawless demonstrations in Los Angeles are all right? Or if not, where would he draw the line? We simply don't know—and hence we are confused at what position a Christian should take.

But let us look at another ecclesiastical aberration, with which I desire to register complete opposition.

There has been advanced by various philosophical followers of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., one of the most extraordinary suggestions ever made in Anglo-Saxon or American legal annals. As a mixture of sophistry and softheadedness, brewed by nonlegal or corroded legal minds, I assert that this suggestion has spawned the present wave of destruction now sweeping the country.

In brief, this proposed doctrine is that if any individual citizen or group of citizens, after meditation, come to the conclusion that any law is unjust, and further conclude that if apprehended he or they are willing to accept the penalty imposed for violation of the law—then it becomes morally justifiable to break the law openly and notoriously.

Of course the worst thing about this doctrine is that there are no dividing lines in it. If it is valid for a small violation, it applies equally to a more serious one. Once you start this approach there is no stopping. It is like a rollercoaster which nears the top of the track. Once you push it over a little bit, it plunges down all the way.

The amazing thing is that many clergy of this church, including both priests and bishops, have openly and officially accepted this doctrine. Episcopal clergymen have received written expressions of this doctrine for their guidance. And large numbers of clergy of this and other communions have been sent, or have gone on their own volition, to southern areas for the sole purpose of expressing racial concerns by open law defiance pursuant to this new assertion of moral right.

Finally, as sorely distressed Christians we see instance after instance of reluctance on the part of elected officials to meet lawlessness quickly and firmly lest there be an adverse effect upon their personal political careers at the ballot box. Thank God, not all our officials are of this character, but too many are.

All these things we see and hear and read. We are furthermore frequently assailed with bits and pieces of Scripture, with quotations which seek to justify a Christian "do nothing" attitude.

And the result is all too often complete confusion and deep concern over what is right for us to do as loyal Americans and good churchmen. We are morally disarmed and brainwashed. We are reluctant to act in defense of our liberties and our country. We are afraid to speak out and let our voices be heard in demanding a return to law observance by all citizens—white, yellow, black, red, priest, bishop or missionary.

What shall we do? What may we do as Christians?

In offering an answer, I do so humbly and with complete recognition of the right of others to reach the opposite conclusions which I have described, and with which I emphatically disagree. Moreover, what I offer does not assert to be the only answer. It is, however, an answer to which the Holy Spirit has given me guidance, and one which I believe to be valid both in law and in Scripture. And I shall be ready to defend it in any forum, whether ecclesiastical or otherwise.

Let us start with the basic legal fact that we live in a country where all ultimate power resides in the people.

By their representatives in constitutional convention, large areas of this power have been given over to the Federal Government, with other areas reserved to the several States.

Furthermore, certain individual rights and protections have been reserved for the people themselves, as set out in the Bill of Rights. Without naming them all, we are quite familiar with the fact that under our Constitution we are assured the protection of life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness (but with no guarantee that we shall be successful in that pursuit), freedom of speech and freedom of religion.

But we should be equally familiar with the fact that none of these rights is absolute. Every one of them is held subject to equal rights in others. Thus, if we kill or commit grave felonies we may lose our liberty and perhaps our life. If we enter business to make a fortune, our ineptitude may result in our becoming bankrupt. If, in a public place such as this large church or a theater, we falsely cry "fire" we have gone beyond the permissive limit of our right of free speech. And even though we feel deeply about our religion, we have no right to attempt to force others to believe or act as we do.

In brief, all of our rights are balanced by the protection of similar rights in others.

One final point requires mention. Since ultimate power is in the people they have the right, if a majority so desire, to overthrow their existing form of government and substitute another in its place. And if a majority have no such desire, they have the right to use all necessary power to suppress an insurrection or rebellion against them.

With these fundamental legal rules clearly in mind, we may proceed to evaluate for ourselves the legal and constitutional status of deliberate rioting, burning, looting, killing, and general destruction of the public peace—all in the name of civil rights demonstrations.

It should be perfectly clear that no asserted individual right can justify, under our system of government, the destruction of rights in others. It should be equally clear that neither you, nor I, nor any other persons—however exalted he may be or regard himself—has the right to say that what was wrong before becomes morally right if the acting party is willing to be punished if caught.

Should any such warped thinking protect me if I were caught setting fire to a hospital? Should any such claptrap justify me in hurling Molotov cocktails at innocent travelers on the public highways? Should any such reasoning morally justify me in stopping the whole process of law enforcement in a great city?

The answer is, I submit, that which not too long ago propelled a somewhat obscure New Englander into the Vice-Presidency—from which he succeded to the Presidency. Paraphrased only as to one word, his answer was, "There is no right to demonstrate against the public safety." And with that, Calvin Coolidge crushed a strike by the police in the city of Boston.

That ringing declaration electrified the country. It stopped short a vicious new idea. It was correct under our form of government.

Now we are face to face with a whirlwind largely fostered and encouraged by our vacillation, our attempt at appeasement and the participation of some us in this new theory of morally justifiable lawlessness.

As our own Governor says, we now face insurrection—an attack upon the very existence of our own government. When that point is reached, we must first use overwhelming force to crush and destroy every vestige of danger; and then destroy this sickness of mind which has led so many to defy law and order.

But what about the theological problem? Can we, dare we, protect our way of government and our individual rights and still call ourselves Christians? Here I part with many of my ecclesiastical colleagues and give you a ringing "Yes."

And what is my authority? The only ultimate authority which our church recognizes—the Holy Scriptures. Read for yourselves verses 13 through 17 of chapter 12 of the Gospel of St. Mark. You all know the story.

It is the one in which the Pharisees sought to trap Jesus in an inescapable dilemma by inquiring of Him whether they should obey the civil law of Rome or the law of God. It was believed that either answer which might be given would destroy Him.

You remember how Jesus then called for a Roman coin and asked whose face appeared on the coin. The answer was "Caesar's." And then came the divine response, just as valid today as then. "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God the things that are God's."

Jesus didn't tell them to decide whether they liked the Roman taxes, or whether the tax collectors were brutal and unjust—and, if so, to start a turmoil and demonstration by breaking the Roman law. He told them to obey the laws, and not to forget to carry out God's law as well.

Is that reconciliation of rights and duties impossible for us to follow? Is the formula unworkable today? Can we, as Christians, use that resolution of our confusions?

I say we can and should; and I offer these three concrete suggestions as to how we can do it:

First, we should stand solidly in support of the Constitution and laws of our Government, resorting to the courts and not the barricades if we feel grievances. We must once and for all reject the doctrine of a morally justified civil disobedience.

Second, we should counteract the pressure which already has tremendous effect with some of our political leaders—to temporize and compromise with lawlessness if only it be tagged "civil rights"—by exerting every ounce of our personal influence to encourage equal and courageous law enforcement.

Then third, having done these things, we should—as Christians—seek by all lawful and proper means to help our neighbors to achieve civic equality of treatment and betterment of opportunity for self-improvement. We should do as our young people of this parish are doing for 2 weeks, going to underprivileged people (in this case Indians) and helping them build schools and hospitals and other needed things. We should come to this and to other churches as powerhouses where we can worship God, be refilled with His power, and then go out into the world to teach His ways.

God's power is limitless. With it we can change the world, and if we are faithful it will surely prevail.

PANAMA CANAL SITUATION: GRAVE DANGERS INVOLVED

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my work in the Congress on interoceanic canal problems, I have had significant correspondence with officials of the Executive Branch of our Government, including the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of State, and the President. Some of this has been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It long ago became apparent that successive Presidents of the United States in recent years have been badly advised as regards the Canal Zone and Panama Canal situation. In a series of surrenders to radical demands and following communistic revolutionary patterns, we have now reached the point where we have lost our bargaining power.

The most sensational of these yieldings were given away in 1955 of the terminal passenger stations and freight yards of the Panama Railroad, thus leaving the main line without its long established terminal facilities; the formal display in 1960 of one Panama flag in the Canal Zone as visual evidence of Panamanian titular sovereignty over the zone, followed by a widespread display of such flags; and, after the January 1964 Red-led Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone, the hiring of alien Panamanians as members of the zone police force. The design has been one of piecemeal erosion of our treaty-based rights, powers, and authority over the Panama Canal enterprise to the point where we have seriously compromised our indispensable authority with respect to it and have become the laughing stock of the world.

As regards the replies to my various letters to executive officials, the least adequate were those from the Department of State. These were not only unresponsive but also definitely evasive. Moreover, they reflected the viewpoint that the United States is a great and powerful nation that can afford to be generous with Panama and a desire to appease the implacable by concession after concession. The January 1964 mob assaults were a direct consequence of this anti-U.S. policy.

In defending the lives of our citizens in the Canal Zone and the canal itself against the bloody mob assaults, our country was fortunate in having a capable and fearless commander in chief of the southern command on the scene to restore law and order. His effective measures showed that our Armed Forces when faced with a severe crisis would rise to the occasion regardless of appeasement-minded policymakers in the Department of State.

In this connection, it may be pointed out that if the 1903 Treaty with Panama is abrogated and a new one substituted therefor, the latter, under Panamanian interpretation, may be abrogated at any time that Panama desires regardless of the indemnities and benefits paid and accorded by the United States.

As our Government permitted Nasser to take over the Suez Canal before he had any legal right to do so, Panama will very likely cite this as a precedent. Hence, the negotiation of new treaties with Panama in substitution for the 1903 Treaty amounts to nothing so far as Panama is concerned.

The surrender of all our authority over the Canal Zone as provided for in the new treaties will undoubtedly be followed up by Panamanian demands for complete control of the canal and its abandonment by the United States. This would be inevitable as it is in line with inexorable communistic revolutionary policy. Also, if a new canal is

built in Panama, this country will feel free to abrogate the treaty therefor although billions of the taxpayers' money may be used for building it. The State Department may consider any such loss to our taxpayers as of no consequence but I believe that the taxpayers will feel otherwise. Certainly, the proposed giveaway of the Canal Zone territory to Panama and the loss of the entire investment to our Nation in the canal enterprise, all paid for by our taxpayers, is complete evidence of the State Department's indifference in the premises.

To acquaint the Joint Chiefs of Staff with vital facts in the overall canal situation, I have written a series of letters to the Chief of Naval Operations summarizing key points and supplying documentation; also a letter to Hon. Robert B. Anderson, chairman of the United States-Panama Treaty negotiating team and of the recently appointed body to consider a so-called sea-level canal. The last letter of the Chief of Naval Operations and my reply of October 14, 1965, also the August 30 letter to Chairman Anderson will be quoted as parts of my remarks along with a copy of my September 27 press release.

In addition, I shall include an October 7, 1965, statement by Thurman Sensing of the Southern States Industrial Council on the subject of the proposed giveaway. This statement is specific evidence that the people of the United States are beginning to understand what is involved in the proposed abject surrender of our rights at Panama now proposed by the State Department, which has been practicing a policy of concealment of facts from the people of our country.

The indicated documents follow:

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
October 1, 1965.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Thank you for your informative letter of September 9. The documents and bibliographic references forwarded to me on this and on previous occasions, have proven most useful. It goes without saying that the Navy is deeply interested in the present Panama Canal negotiations.

As you know, the President has now publicly announced U.S. agreement with Panama to abolish the 1903 Treaty and complete a new pact to "effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty" over the Canal Zone. Working within the confines of this Presidential commitment, the Navy and the JCS have advocated that the new treaties should in no way restrict or inhibit the effective discharge of our responsibilities for canal defense and hemispheric security. Adequate provisions for the defense and protection of the existing canal, as well as for any new canal, should be the paramount consideration in all treaty negotiations with Panama.

I wish to express my personal appreciation for your continued interest in the Navy. You may rest assured that we will do all within our scope of authority to achieve an acceptable solution to the Panama Canal problem.

Sincerely,

DAVID L. MCDONALD.

OCTOBER 14, 1965.

HON. DAVID L. MCDONALD,
Chief of Naval Operations,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL MCDONALD: Your letter of October 1, 1965, especially its statement that "the Navy and the JCS have advocated that the new treaties (with Panama) should in no way restrict or inhibit the effective discharge of our responsibilities for canal defense and hemispheric security," raises some very pertinent questions that must be faced by our Government in realistic manner.

Among such points are the following:

1. Where can the line be drawn between the actual needs for the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal and "adequate provisions for the defense and protection of the existing waterway described by you as the "paramount consideration in all treaty negotiations with Panama"? Experience has clearly demonstrated that the canal could not have been constructed nor efficiently maintained, operated, sanitated, and protected except with the scope of authority granted under the 1903 Treaty. Hence, the treaties now proposed will render it impossible for our Government to achieve these ends for the further operation of the canal.

2. Precisely where could you separate the Canal Zone from the canal? All major activities in the Zone exist for only one purpose—to serve the canal, the personnel involved in its maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection, and vessels in transit or visiting the terminal ports. To separate the Canal Zone from the canal would be about as practicable as to separating the heart from the human body and expecting it to function.

3. How can our Government meet the "obligations" of the 1902 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty with Great Britain as regards the management of an interoceanic canal on terms of equality for all nations, if we "effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty" over the Canal Zone? Panama's chief aim in securing new canal treaties will be to derive pecuniary benefits from the canal, but without bearing any responsibilities to the world at large as are imposed by other treaties on the United States. Would not Panama have to negotiate its own treaty with Great Britain to correspond with the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty?

4. Would not "effective recognition" of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone be in violation of the Thomson-Urritia Treaty (1914–22) with Colombia, which recognizes the title to the Panama Canal and Railroad as "vested entirely and absolutely in the United States of America, without any encumbrances * * * whatsoever"? Such recognition would mean that the United States would have to indemnify Colombia for the renunciation of her rights touching this matter.

5. Would not such recognition conflict with the rights of Colombia under this Treaty? It is clear that it would and the right of Colombia as stated in its provisions are considerable.

6. Where there are such grave responsibilities imposed on the United States by existing treaties how can such obligations be met without adequate authority? Certainly, the lessons of experience furnish the answer. Two masters cannot successfully operate and maintain the canal.

7. How could our Government under the proposed treaties with Panama prevent all significant positions in the canal enterprise from becoming political plums for Panamanian politicians? Realistic facts negate the idea of making the canal a political pawn of Panama.

8. Do you and other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff not know that the movement for the elimination of every civil activity of our Government on the isthmus is already underway? The erosions of our sovereign rights, power, and authority begun a few years ago have accelerated with ever-increasing velocity and the proposed treaties are merely the culmination of all that has recently preceded. Unless our policies are reversed, the worst is yet to come.

9. Are you and other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff familiar with the record of lawlessness and disorder on the isthmus since the ratification of the general treaty with new Granada in 1848, at times requiring the use of our Armed Forces in this area of endless bloody revolution? A study of this subject will prove illuminating to those directly responsible for the formulation of military policies, especially those of naval character, and is commended. See my addresses: "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 4, pages 5498–5505 and supplementary remarks on the same subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 5, pages 6152–6157. The latter gives a partial list of incidents of violence both before and after U.S. occupation of the Canal Zone.

While I would like to have your views on these matters if you care to give them after you have read and considered this letter, my main purpose in writing it is to give you and other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff vital facts and what I believe to be the inevitable outcome involved in the proposed complete reversal of our historic and successful policies as regards the Panama Canal.

The President has been grossly misled by his advisers in these matters and I cannot believe that our military and naval authorities have been adequately consulted. Therefore, I am unable to avoid the conclusion that before the proposed treaties are spelled into life these authorities should be consulted and their views considered. Why should we not prevent the surrender of the Panama Canal and all its protective benefits to ourselves and other nations of the Western Hemisphere and why should we not save the President himself from the consummation of one of the most tragic blunders in our national history? Would a Matthew C. Perry, Farragut, Dewey, or Ernest J. King hesitate thus to act when the world is on fire and the fate of Western civilization is everywhere at stake?

A copy of my press release of September 27, 1965, and tear sheets of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 30 and October 1, 1965, are attached inviting special attention to the marked statements of Representatives LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, WILLIAM H. HARSHA, and H. R. GROSS.

Be assured that I take no pleasure in opposing the indicated proposals, which have undoubtedly originated in the State Department, but the situation presented is so grave and the contemplated action is so destructive of the best interests of our Nation and, indeed, of the Western Hemisphere that I conceive it to be my duty to oppose them.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

AUGUST 30, 1965.

HON. ROBERT B. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: Because you are now engaged in diplomatic negotiations with the Republic of Panama and serving as chairman of the five-man agency appointed by the President pursuant to Public Law 88–609, 88th Congress, approved September 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990), to make a full and complete investigation as to a new canal across of so-called sea-level design, I address you in regard to some key elements in the situation. For emphasis, some of these points will be presented, following a statement of facts, in the way of questions.

FACTS

1. The Spooner Act of 1902, under the authority of which the 1903 treaty with

Panama was negotiated and the Canal Zone acquired, calls for the United States to perpetually maintain, operate, and protect the Panama Canal and Railroad.

2. The 1903 treaty reflects the perpetuity feature of the law, which originated with a 1902 recommendation of the Isthmian Canal Commission. (S. Doc. No. 123, 57th Cong., p. 9.)

3. In addition to the grant of sovereignty over the Canal Zone in the 1903 treaty, the United States obtained absolute title and ownership of all land and land under water in the zone from individual owners at generous prices.

4. The Canal Zone is our most costly territorial acquisition, estimated in 1964 at a total of $144 million exclusive of canal construction costs.

5. In 1912, pursuant to provisions in the Panama Canal Act, President Taft, by Executive Order, stated that all areas in the Canal Zone are needed for the operation, maintenance, sanitation, and defense of the canal.

6. Indispensable in the planning of any canal project wherever located are adequate terminal anchorages and port facilities.

7. As long as the sovereignty and perpetuity clauses in the 1903 treaty exist, the presence on the isthmus of the United States will assure the independence of the Republic of Panama.

QUESTIONS

1. Where on the Atlantic side of the Central American Isthmus can be found an arrival anchorage comparable to that in Limon Bay already protected by breakwaters?

2. Where could port facilities be constructed on the Atlantic side better than those now existing at Cristobal?

3. Where on the Pacific side of the isthmus could be found an arrival anchorage better than that in Panama Bay at the Pacific entrance of the canal?

4. Where on the Pacific side could port facilities be established better than those now obtaining at Balboa?

5. Does not the perpetuity clause in the 1903 Treaty bind the United States as well as Panama with equal force and effect?

6. Where there is responsibility for the efficient maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal must there not be adequate authority?

7. How can this treaty obligation (Hay-Pauncefote) be discharged satisfactorily in this area of endless bloody revolution with less than full sovereignty granted under the 1903 Treaty?

8. In view of the increased dangers of subversive infiltration, the needs for increased protection in this modern atomic age, and the necessity for safeguarding the water supply of the Panama Canal, why does not our Government demand the widening of the Canal Zone territory to include the entire watershed of the Chagres River, as was once recommended in 1915–17 by Gen. Clarence R. Edwards when he was in command of the U.S. Army in the Canal Zone?

9. Will not weakening our authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal inevitably weaken our Government in any condition of peril with corresponding increase of communistic or other anti-American influence not only on the isthmus but also throughout Latin America?

10. Will not nullification of the basic sovereignty and perpetuity clauses in the 1903 Treaty impair the independence of Panama for without the presence of the United States the Republic of Panama would, in all probability, disappear with Red control similar to that in Cuba?

11. Why should the United States acquiesce to Panamanian political blackmail by surrendering any of the Canal Zone territory or otherwise weaken our rights, powers and authority inherent in the grant of sovereignty and ownership of this key artery of transportation?

Mr. Ambassador, I trust that you and your fellow negotiators and members of the canal study group will ponder these questions, and many others could be added, all of which affect the canal and the entire Western Hemisphere.

I enclose for your perusal copies of my April 1 and July 29 addresses which deal with subjects involved in more detail, inviting special attention to their documentation.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, concerning the proposed treaties with the Republic of Panama, released the following statement today from his Washington office:

"The President's announcement on September 24, 1964, about the status of current treaty negotiations with the Republic of Panama, fully justify my fears for the security of our position on the isthmus and confirms my predictions on this subject.

"It means a complete and abject surrender to Panama of our indispensable sovereignty and authority with respect to the Panama Canal in favor of a so-called dual governmental and managerial setup for it in an area of endless bloody revolution and political instability. This can only lead to unending conflicts and recriminations that always accompany extraterritorial jurisdictions where two masters are involved.

"The Canal Zone is a territorial possession of the United States with sovereignty granted by treaty in perpetuity and ownership of all land in the zone obtained by private purchase at a total cost of some $144 million. Our investment in the canal enterprise and defense installations is in billions of dollars furnished by the American taxpayers but in the indicated agreements not a dollar is to be repaid to us.

"Under existing treaty, the United States is obligated to Panama for the perpetual operation and maintenance of the canal. The issues involved in the agreements under negotiations are so grave that candor is required. Panama gets everything it desires and the United States nothing but losses and ignominy.

"The Panamanian negotiators have written out what they demanded and our negotiators, figuratively speaking, have merely signed on the dotted line. We certainly should not have agreed to Panamanian sovereignty but, on the other hand, should have demanded the extension of the Canal Zone to include the watershed of the Chagres River.

"The grant of complete jurisdiction of Panama over the Canal Zone, means that all laws made by the U.S. Congress for the government of the zone and the operation and maintenace of the canal may be scrapped at any time by Panama, and superceded by Panamanian law. Also, all civil activities in the zone—courts, police, and fire departments, schools, roads, and public utilities—will be taken over by Panama.

"All this means, sooner or later, the elimination of the U.S. citizen employees in the canal enterprise with substitutions by Panamanians. It will be inevitable that all these positions will become political plums eagerly sought by Panamanian politicians with gross confusion and embarrassment. Yet, our negotiators were unable or unwilling to deal with the situation realistically and have agreed to leave our Government with responsibility without any adequate authority. Think what this means in time of war or other grave emergency? Even as to the matter of land in the zone, which may be required for canal purposes, we should have to buy back at exorbitant prices areas we already own by actual purchases from the owners. What a ridiculous situation.

"Panama, having secured such outstanding results in its claims, will, inevitably, demand all control over the canal enterprise with withdrawal by the United States. If such abandonment occurs, Panama and all of Latin America will go down the Communist drain.

"For our officials to proclaim that Panama, which since 1955 has not been able to collect its own garbage from the streets of Panama City and Colon, as a partner of this great interoceanic public utility, is, to say the least, unrealistic and really astounding; and it will evoke serious reactions from maritime countries as regards the fixing of tolls.

"The President's announcement, indeed, marks a sad day for the United States although it may bring rejoicing at Peiping and Moscow. He has completely yielded to the counsel of his advisers, sappers, and appeasers, who must be made to bear basic responsibility for what has occurred. Moreover, I predict that the expressed willingness to surrender control over the Panama Canal will be taken as a signal for accelerated activity among communistic revolutionary elements all over Latin America and the Caribbean.

"There should be only one flag flown over the Panama Canal and zone—the flag of the United States—and the proposed treaties should be defeated."

PANAMA CANAL SURRENDERS

(By Thurman Sensing, executive vice president, Southern States Industrial Council)

President Lyndon B. Johnson's decision to abolish the 1903 Panama Canal Treaty and to complete a new pact that will "effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty" over the Canal Zone is almost certain to do irreparable harm to U.S. strategic interests in this hemisphere. It can only lead to serious trouble for the people of the United States.

The Presidential action should be compared with the willingness of the British Government to allow Dictator Nasser of the United Arab Republic to take over the Suez Canal. In the case of the Panama Canal announcement, Fidel Castro of Cuba must be rejoicing. The Presidential decision plays right into the hands of Castro's Cuba.

Anti-American riots in the Canal Zone in January 1964 underlined the role of Communist elements in stirring trouble in Panama. It is not as though Panama were a stable country that could be counted on to act responsibly with its great hemispheric partner to the north. On the contrary, Panama is riddled with graft, corruption, Castroite communism, and a variety of social and political maladies. It is one of the most unstable countries in the Western Hemisphere. To entrust the Canal Zone to Panama is to ask for a series of irresponsible governmental acts calculated to injure the United States.

Panama is one of the Latin countries where Castroite communism can work most easily. Indeed, it is not out of the question that in time Panama may become in effect a Cuban satellite in Central America. It is small and disordered in its political life, thus presenting ideal conditions for the machinations of the Castro regime in Havana.

The U.S. Government knows full well that all the branches of communism—Castroite, Soviet, and Chinese—are zeroing in on Latin America as a prime target area. Only a few weeks ago, the Chinese Communist defense minister cited Latin America as one of the areas where his government expects to provoke revolutionary disorders.

Clearly, in the years ahead the United States may be called on to do considerable

policing of its hemispheric backyard. It may be frequently required to move fleet units from the Pacific to the Atlantic, or the other way around. It will need the defense base represented by the Canal Zone. But Mr. Johnson's decision to hand over the Canal Zone to the Panamanians will rob the United States of its security position on the Panamanian Isthmus.

Consider the experience of Suez. Dictator Nasser closes the Suez Canal to nations that he dislikes. And the British, since losing Cyprus, have been enormously handicapped in policing the troubled Middle East region which—from the security standpoint—bears such a resemblance to Central America.

Mr. Johnson should know better than to turn the Canal Zone over to the Panamanians. It represents appeasement of the mob element in Panama, and appeasing mobs always is foolish. You cannot do it, for the mob always cries for more.

In surrendering the Panama Canal Zone, Mr. Johnson is surrendering a precious national asset—created at tremendous cost—in order to improve opinion in Latin America. It is a waste of time to court something so illusory as Latin opinion. What is needed is retention of the strategic advantages that we possess, chiefly the Panama Canal.

The public can only hope that the decision will be reversed through the pressure of an outraged Congress. Certainly, the abandonment of the Panama Canal is a very solid issue for Mr. Johnson's political opposition. If this issue of appeasement in the Caribbean is not brought before the voters in the 1966 congressional elections, a great mistake will be made. Appeasement of Panama could be even more costly than was appeasement of Castro's Cuba. Whereas the United States still retains the Guantanamo Naval Base on Cuba and has other bases in the Caribbean, the Canal Zone is the only U.S. position in Central America.

The United States cannot hope to win the cold war if it continues to do the enemy's work for him. Giving up our most precious strategic zone in this hemisphere certainly comes under the heading of making things easy for the enemy. Mr. Johnson is ill advised to take such a step in order to get a better image.

PANAMA'S SWEEPING DEMANDS REVEALED

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a close student of isthmian history and problems over many years, I have been able to evaluate information and to make predictions that some have thought amazing. In no important development have I been surprised, for coming events cast their shadows.

The National Assembly of Panama is now in session and engaged in extensive discussions of the three recently proposed treaties with the United States, with Diogenes de la Rosa and his fellow negotiator, Dr. Roberto Aleman, appearing before the assembly.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may be alert to what is transpiring, I quote two highly significant news stories from a leading isthmian newspaper:

[From the Panama (R.P.) Star & Herald, Oct. 7, 1965]

YEAR 1903 TREATY UNTENABLE TODAY, DE LA ROSA TELLS R.P. ASSEMBLY

The 1903 Panama Canal Treaty, a remnant from the expansionist era of the United States, has become a historical anachronism that is untenable in the universal movement of submerged peoples to attain their own national personality, treaty negotiator Diogenes de la Rosa told the national assembly yesterday.

With the numerical and spiritual growth of the Panamanian people, De la Rosa declared, the national conscience has expanded through succeeding generations and now aspires to a Panamanian canal on Panamanian soil and under the Panamanian flag.

De la Rosa and another member of the Panamanian negotiating team, Dr. Roberto Aleman, appeared yesterday at the invitation of the assembly to answer questions on the Robles-Johnson statement of September 24 announcing areas of general agreement in the current negotiations.

Since the assembly began its current session, the opposition has been pressing for a full-dress debate on the negotiations. The government bench blocked an attempt to have opposition political leaders come into the assembly to participate in the debate on the negotiations and, instead, voted through a motion to have negotiators De la Rosa and Aleman to appear before the assembly.

Opposition deputies who had walked out of the assembly hall late Tuesday night protesting the majority's action attended yesterday's session and sat through De la Rosa's 5-hour dissertation on the historical background of the negotiations.

The majority bench voted at 10 p.m. to suspend the session until this afternoon, when De la Rosa will resume his presentation.

De la Rosa said he was saddened by the spectacle of a nation torn by politics over the issue of the negotiations.

He termed the canal the "national issue" by excellence and pointed out that Panamanians of every generation since 1904 have fought for correcting the injustices of the 1903 treaty. Hence, he declared, no one can claim exclusive credit for the body of doctrines that Panama has accumulated in the course of time to uphold its position.

De la Rosa recalled that in his youth he was one of the leaders against ratification of the 1926 treaty with the United States, which was rejected by the National Assembly. He said he had called the Panamanian negotiators of that instrument "traitors" and "turncoats" and had since come to realize that he had been unfair.

In all the negotiations with the United States, he declared, each team of Panamanian negotiators has given its best within the limitations of time and place, to carry on the nation's cause. And with each generation, as Panamanians have strengthened their nationality, the nation's demands with respect to the canal issue have grown, he added.

The current negotiations, De la Rosa declared, actually began in July 1961, not in January 1964, as some have said. The first contact was between personal representatives of the then Presidents Roberto P. Chiari and John F. Kennedy at a meeting of ministers of finance in Tegucigalpa, Honduras. Chiari sent word to Kennedy that Panama wanted to reopen the 1903 treaty question.

Two months later, in September 1961, De la Rosa recalled, Chiari sent a letter to Kennedy reiterating the request. The Panamanian chief executive warned that the 1903 treaty was the source of friction between Panama and the United States which, if not removed, could lead to regrettable situations.

In April 1962, Kennedy replied. His answer acknowledged there were grounds for complaint by Panama, but said the sea-level canal had become the vital question. Chiari answered that Panama's fundamental interest lay in a revision of the 1903 treaty. Eventually, De la Rosa declared a joint commission was appointed, but no results were attained.

Then came the crisis of January 1964, marked by clashes between Panamanian and United States troops along the Canal Zone boundary.

The "historical mission" of the January events, De la Rosa said was to "reactivate" Panama's aspirations.

In connection with the 1964 events, De la Rosa said there were those who participated out of pure idealism and those who participated to exploit and take advantage of the idealists. He promised to elaborate on this later.

The negotiations, De la Rosa declared, caught Panama psychologically and historically unprepared. Psychologically he said, the country is going through the period of impatience, expectation, uncertainty, and doubt that marks the universal movements of nationalism. This situation offers fertile ground for all sorts of theories, promises, and incitements. In addition he said, Panama, for reasons of spiritual necessity has made the issue of sovereignty the paramount one and thus has failed to grasp other vital questions connected with the canal issue.

Historically, he went on, Panama failed to heed warnings that the advent of the atomic bomb portended the end of the present canal. Thus, when the United States raised the issue of a sea-level canal, Panama was unprepared to evaluate the impact that this new question has on its life.

De la Rosa had just begun to discuss the start of the current negotiations when the Assembly voted to suspend the session until this afternoon.

[From the Panama (R.P.) Star & Herald, Oct. 8, 1965]

RP'S SWEEPING TREATY AGENDA REVEALED—1903 TREATY SETTLEMENT IS PARAMOUNT

Panama is insisting in the current negotiations with the United States that the solution of longstanding problems stemming from the 1903 Panama Canal treaty is the paramount issue and has priority over any discussion of a sea level canal, Panamanian negotiator Diogenes de la Rosa told the National Assembly yesterday.

Within that "tactical framework," De la Rosa reported, Panama submitted on January 25, 1965, a sweeping agenda which so far has been the basis of discussions between the negotiating teams.

De la Rosa and his fellow negotiator, Dr. Roberto Aleman, appeared before the Assembly yesterday for the second successive day to report on the treaty negotiations. They will resume their presentation at today's session, which starts at 9 a.m.

As far as is known, De la Rosa's disclosure of the detailed Panamanian agenda was the first revelation of the actual demands that Panama has presented in the negotiations.

The agenda is as follows:

I—MATTERS RELATIVE TO THE PRACTICES AND MODALITIES APPLIED BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE CANAL ZONE

1. Abolition of the existing regime in the Canal Zone, which has been clothed with the characteristics of a colonial enclave in the center of the Republic of Panama.

2. Legislation and the administration of justice in the Canal Zone will be Panamanian. For special matters connected with

the canal, a juridical system will be jointly agreed to by both countries.

3. The agencies of the U.S. Government will not exercise commercial, agricultural or industrial activities in the Canal Zone. Services will be provided exclusively under Panamanian authority, excepting those inherent to the transit of ships through the canal which will be furnished under joint administration.

4. The Canal Zone postal system will use exclusively Panamanian stamps. The Canal Zone will have no representation before international postal organizations, which representation will be exercised exclusively by Panama.

5. Spanish will be the official language in the Canal Zone.

II—QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO SOVEREIGNTY IN THE CANAL ZONE

1. It will be clearly established that the sovereignty of the Republic of Panama in the territory of the Canal Zone will not be affected by the rights, power, or authority granted to the United States with respect to the canal in Panamanian territory.

2. The Panamanian flag will be flown aboard ships transiting the canal and in the areas of the Canal Zone.

3. Panama's tax system will be enforced in the Canal Zone, in the same manner as in the rest of the Panamanian territory.

III—QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO THE RIGHTS, JURISDICTION, AND AUTHORITY EXERCISED AT PRESENT BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE CANAL ZONE

1. The authority necessary for the purposes of the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal will be exercised jointly by Panama and the United States. Insofar as this authority is not directly related with such purposes, only the Republic of Panama will exercise such authority.

2. Return to Panama of lands, islands, waters, drydocks, ports airports, piers, and installations which are not strictly necessary for the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal.

3. It will be expressly established that such lands and waters will include those necessary to maintain the continuity of the exclusive Panamanian authority over the two portions of the national territory bisected by the canal.

IV—QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO ECONOMIC AND COMMERCIAL BENEFITS THAT THE CANAL SHOULD PROVIDE FOR PANAMA BECAUSE OF ITS GEOGRAPHICAL POSITION

1. The United States will cooperate in order that Panama will benefit from the advantages inherent to its geographical position.

2. Panama will receive an adequate participation in the benefits derived from the operation of the canal and compensation in proportion to the benefits derived by the United States from the existence of the canal in Panamanian territory.

3. Joint formulation and application of employment standards, including salary scales.

4. Equal access for Panamanians and U.S. citizens to security positions.

5. The Canal Zone will constitute, primarily, a source of employment for Panamanians in all categories.

6. Equality of services for all employees.

7. Short- and long-range training of Panamanians in all occupations.

8. Establishment of a joint claims commission to adopt measures for the effective equality of treatment for Panamanians and U.S. citizens.

9. Panama should receive special treatment in the U.S. market with respect to the importation of goods produced in Panama.

10. The territory of the Canal Zone will be opened to the development of agriculture, livestock raising, commerce, and industry, and to all kinds of activities of goods and services, according to the laws of the Republic of Panama exclusively.

11. The United States will provide the cities of Panama and Colon of ports, piers, and auxiliary installations.

12. Construction, at U.S. expense, of a bridge across the canal on the Atlantic side.

V—QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO PANAMA'S PARTICIPATION IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CANAL

1. The administration of the canal will be carried out jointly by the two governments.

VI—DURATION OF GRANTS MADE BY PANAMA TO THE UNITED STATES IN THE 1903 TREATY

1. A term will be fixed for the canal concession.

VII—MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS

1. Adequate solution to problems related with the furnishing of water (to Panama).

With respect to the sea-level canal question, repeatedly raised by U.S. negotiators, Panama has agreed to discuss it simultaneously but separately with the understanding, De la Rosa said, that the settlement of the problems resulting from the 1903 treaty will come first.

De la Rosa made no mention of specific counterproposals made by the United States. He said that since the presentation of Panama's agenda, the two negotiating teams have concentrated their discussions on the question of joint administration of the waterway.

The discussions on that point had advanced sufficiently that the Panamanian delegation felt that it could issue a declaration on the progress of the negotiations. After the Panamanian negotiators contacted the U.S. delegation on this possibility, the final result was the joint declaration issued by Presidents Robles and Johnson on September 24, dealing with areas of general agreement between the two countries.

In the final part of his presentation, De la Rosa said the people of Panama have been misled into believing that Panama will get everything that it has demanded. The people, he admonished, have not been told clearly that Panama and the United States are negotiating—that there are points on which Panama will have to yield in order to gain others.

The mere abrogation of the 1903 treaty, for example, De la Rosa declared, will not of itself solve Panama's problems. Panama's maximum aspiration, he repeated, is a Panamanian canal in Panamanian territory under the Panamanian flag, but the problem lies in how far that aspiration can be carried in the light of the present structure.

"We must avoid illusions which can be suicidal," the negotiator declared.

In that connection, he pointed out, one inescapable reality is the dependence of Panama's economy on the canal. In 1964, he said, total income derived by Panama from the Canal Zone amounted to $115.4 million which, in turn, generated activities totaling $233 million. This was 39 percent—"a fearful figure," De la Rosa termed it—of the gross national product of $578.8 million.

Treaty negotiator Aleman had just taken the floor to discuss the Robles-Johnson declaration in the light of Panama's demands when the session was suspended for resumption at 9 today.

THE NEW ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, last night the Administrator of the newly created Environmental Science Services Administration, Dr. Robert M. White, visited Norfolk. This agency formed in July through the consolidation of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau has offices in Norfolk. I am confident that the program in Norfolk under Capt. John C. Bull, commanding officer of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, Atlantic Marine Center, is going to contribute immeasurably to our study of the interrelation of the atmosphere and the ocean in weather formation.

Dr. White was interviewed by members of the press in Norfolk. I ask permission to insert at this point in the RECORD the news account from the Ledger-Star of October 19, of this interview including Dr. White's comments concerning this important new agency.

[From the Ledger-Star, Oct. 19, 1965]

FIELD OFFICE PLANNED ALSO—ESSA HYDROGRAPHIC CENTER IN NORFOLK

(By Donald Moore)

NORFOLK.—The port of Norfolk is to be a focal point for hydrographic work by the newly formed Environment Science Services Administration, Dr. Robert M. White, ESSA's head, said here today.

White, here for talks with ESSA personnel at the Norfolk base of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, known as the Atlantic Marine Center, added that a field office of CGS land surveys will also be based here.

No change is planned in the Weather Bureau facility at Norfolk Municipal Airport. CGS and Weather Bureau facilities simply become ESSA facilities, White said:

ESSA was formed in July, a consolidation of the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with the addition of the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory at Boulder, Colo. White is the former chief of the Weather Bureau.

He said here that present air and water pollution in the United States is serious and will get worse unless something is done about it. He thinks something is being done.

"Congress is extremely interested," he said, noting passage of the Clean Air Act as an example.

White said the formation of ESSA will permit a unified effort to study the interrelation of the atmosphere and the oceans in weather formation.

He predicted increased efforts at both meteorology and oceanography in efforts to understand man's environments.

White ncted that the United States has sent up 10 Tiros weather satellites—3 are currently functioning—and a Nimbus satellite in an effort to unlock further secrets of the atmosphere. ESSA, he thinks, will increase this program.

Concerning air pollution, he said the Weather Bureau is gathering information and issues bulletins on critical conditions, not to the public but to concerned agencies.

White said there will be an exchange of personnel within ESSA and the new agency will have a uniformed branch, such as the CGS has now. Thus some Weather Bureau personnel will be uniformed.

He noted that the CGS had a highly mobile function while the Weather Bureau operates

from fixed stations. This will be taken into account in the consolidation.

White said ESSA is under the Department of Commerce and he will issue his reports to the Secretary of Commerce.

ESSA, he noted, will collect and evaluate information on environment, but will not enforce air and water pollution, but would instead supply data to Federal agencies concerned, such as the U.S. Public Health Service.

While here White discussed ESSA operation with personnel from stations along the Atlantic coast. Tomorrow he flies to New York for the same purpose.

A 35-HOUR WORKWEEK

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to establish a 35-hour workweek in the agencies operated by the Federal Government. While the lateness of this session will not permit committee action before we conclude, I am hopeful that the appropriate committee will give thorough attention to the measure when the 89th Congress reconvenes in January.

The 35-hour week is not a new phenomenom. Since the 1930's, various industries have maintained work schedules of less than 40 hours a week, notably ladies' garment, printing, coal mining, and construction. The practice has grown to a point where 8 million nonagricultural workers are estimated to be assigned to full-time workweeks shorter than 40 hours.

One recent survey by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 82 metropolitan areas involving almost 14 million employees reveals that approximately 2 million are on less than 40-hour work schedules.

In 1962, Congress established the principle of "comparability" between pay and related conditions for Federal and postal employees and those in private firms. The President in his messages to this body has affirmed his endorsement of this rule.

In my view, "comparability" should not be based on conditions prevailing in private industry among substandard or average employers. Those who accept careers in public service by working for the Federal Government are entitled to salaries and benefits consistent with those adopted by progressive employers in the private economy.

Actually, the Federal Government can exert a beneficial influence on lifting the standards of workers generally by acting as the enlightened employer in some areas. Adoption of a 35-hour workweek for Federal employees would indicate the Government's willingness to accept the practice of many forward-looking employers and would set an example for many other employers to emulate.

Through firm steps taken by this administration, significant progress has been made in recent months in reducing the worrisome rate of unemployment in our country. However, the problem of creating employment opportunities for our youth remains. Unless we take action now to solve the problem, it will continue to grow as the number of young people entering the labor market increases by leaps and bounds.

Enactment of legislation to establish a 35-hour week for Federal agencies will provide additional opportunities for qualified young men and women to enter public service. In the decades ahead, we will need more highly skilled young people at all levels of Federal employment. The bill I have introduced affords an excellent opportunity for Congress to add to the attractiveness of a career in Federal Service.

SPEAKER McCORMACK LEADS 89TH CONGRESS TO HISTORIC RECORD

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 89th Congress, now approaching adjournment, has been one of the most productive in the history of the Nation. The scope of legislation beneficial to the Amercan people is unprecedented and unparalleled. This has been a historic Congress.

President Johnson, who is wise, experienced, and knowledgeable in the workings and traditions of the Congress, has called this the greatest Congress.

I submit that the 89th Congress has indeed made history for the lasting benefit of the American people.

The volume of work accomplished has been tremendous. The House has been in session 154 days. There have been 13,031 measures introduced and 199 new laws created.

These new laws are more important, however, for what they will accomplish than for the sheer volume of number. These new laws reflect a willingness to face the problems that face this Nation at home and abroad. They represent a willingness and a determination to wage war on ignorance, disease, poverty, rural and city slums, on the effects of automation, the economic lag that retards huge sections of our Nation, unemployment, and all the other basic problems that harass our Nation despite its prosperous and vigorous economy.

And the leader of this body to whom we must give a lion's share of credit for the remarkable record of this session is Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Speaker MCCORMACK burns with the fire of patriotism and the love of his country. He wants to help build a better America—an America where all sections and all sectors will share in the good life.

He is dedicated to this ideal. But coupled with this idealism is an unexcelled knowledge and consciousness of what it takes to achieve this ideal. He understands the basic steps that must be taken—and he leads us up those steps by his example and by his great leadership.

Speaker MCCORMACK has had an illustrious and distinguished career. He was first elected to the 70th Congress in 1928. He became Democratic whip and in the 81st Congress, he became majority leader, a position he held longer than any man in either party in the history of Congress.

Because of his dedicated and brilliant leadership, he was the logical choice to succeed the late Sam Rayburn—the great Texan who served his nation so ably and so well—as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Speaker MCCORMACK is eminently fair. Power rests easily in his hands. He does not misuse it. Power in his hands is an instrument for the people and for America.

He is loved by his colleagues. I have the highest personal affection for Speaker MCCORMACK. He has been my friend through the years. He has been a tower of strength in the Congress and a source of counsel and inspiration.

Under his guidance and leadership this Congress has enacted a legislative record which has been described as incredible, surpassing all records of previous Congresses.

This record includes medicare and other social security amendments, assistance to elementary and secondary education, reduction in taxes, a broadened housing program, and establishment of the Cabinet-level position of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, a great public works and economic development program, the voting rights bill, Appalachian Regional Development Act, continuation of the war on poverty, a number of health measures, water resources development, highway beautification, and many other enactments vital to our Nation.

And in addition, the Congress authorized nearly $1.8 billion for military construction and $15 billion for new aircraft, missiles, ships, and for research and development. The Congress has supported the President's position on Vietnam.

Speaker MCCORMACK has ably drawn parallels between our present world situation and the situation prior to World War II. Prior to World War II, he has emphasized, the appeasement of Hitler fed the fires of aggression.

This lesson of history, Speaker MCCORMACK emphasizes, underlines the importance of our battle in Vietnam for freedom and for the right of a smaller nation to self-determination.

Speaker MCCORMACK has been a champion of freedom—a champion of liberty—a champion of America. He believes that to be strong abroad America must be strong at home, that America internally must be strong to maintain its strength and influence around the world.

Time magazine in commenting upon the work of Congress said:

This is an outstanding record of accomplishment.

I agree with that assessment.

I would add, however, that the great role played by our distinguished and beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, has been one of the major factors in the building of this great record of this historic Congress.

Congress and the Nation are indebted to Speaker MCCORMACK.

The free world can look to the Speaker of the House of Representatives for liberty and freedom and progress.

CHAIRMAN MAHON: DEDICATED TO MAINTAINING A MIGHTY AMERICA

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the great leaders in the Congress is our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman of the important Committee on Appropriations.

I have known and worked with Chairman MAHON for many years. His progressive and practical leadership has been an inspiration to me and to other members of the committee—and, I am sure, to all Members of Congress.

With the completion of the several appropriations bills passed during this session, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has finished work on another milestone in his career. The appropriations bills breathe life into important legislation Congress has adopted.

They also provide the means with which to keep our Nation strong, to maintain a powerful defense posture. Chairman MAHON is dedicated to a strong America and the appropriations measures relating to defense bear out his dedication. We have the strongest defense establishment in the history of mankind, Mr. Speaker, and it is in great part a tribute to the foresight of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The Appropriations Committee also breathes life into our vital domestic programs—assistance to education, the war on poverty, our housing programs, our agriculture programs, our efforts to build a stronger rural and smalltown America—all the programs needed to make America strong and productive and prosperous.

Chairman MAHON has an appreciation of the problems of America. While he diligently represents the people of Texas, he also has a national perspective.

He protects the taxpayer. Like President Johnson he believes that the taxpayer should receive a dollar's value for a dollar spent and he carefully examines each and every proposal for appropriation with care and penetrating study. You can, therefore, rest assured that the monies appropriated under the scrutiny of Chairman MAHON constitute the best figures that can be arrived at after a careful analysis of programs and proposals.

Chairman MAHON is prudent, conservative and progressive.

He is a great American.

He is a great champion of the people.

He is a man of vision and understanding—but a man of realism and practicality.

This magnificent combination of qualities projects the chairman from Texas to the fore as we review the work of this Congress. I am sure Chairman MAHON will be recorded in congressional history as a leader who played a crucial role in building a mighty America to safeguard the American way of life and to assure smaller nations their right to choose their own destiny.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES, 89TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud and feel privileged to have had the honor of serving the Seventh Congressional District, Queens County, N.Y. I am forever thankful to the people of my district for having given me the privilege to represent them and for their overwhelming vote of confidence in my reelection of last year.

I believe, from the record of this 1st session, that the 89th Congress is one of the most outstanding Congresses on record and that it has accurately reflected the mood and mandate of our citizens and has been responsive to the needs and wishes of our people in both domestic and foreign affairs.

At the end of each session, since I came to Congress almost 5 years ago, I have summarized the year's activities, reprinted them at my expense, and mailed them to my constituents. Each session has been a lengthy one, and my only regret has been that the lengthy sessions reduced the time I would have spent in my district personally discussing and obtaining the views and attending to the needs of my constituents. While I cannot possibly include every bill, I do try to include those of widespread interest or importance in my district. The rules under which the House of Representatives operates were changed enough at the beginning of the session so that some bills which had been blocked by parliamentary maneuvers in previous years came to a vote this year. Of course, there was also some change in the membership as a result of the election last November. As a result of these and other factors, the volume of general legislation passed was greater than it has ever been in any previous year in history.

MEDICAL AND HEALTH

Public Law 89–97 provides, first, a basic hospitalization program under social security for persons 65 and over effective July 1, 1966, under which they can go to any accredited hospital of their own choice instead of the county hospital; second, an optional medical care insurance program at $3 a month matched by the Federal Government to cover physicians' fees and various other services; third, a 7-percent increase in social security cash benefits; and fourth, expands and increases payments under Federal assistance programs for dependent children, blind and disabled. It will be financed partly by an increase in social security taxes and partly from the general fund.

Public Law 89–105 authorizes grants to community mental health centers for professional and technical personnel, and to train teachers, construct facilities, and perform research for handicapped and retarded children.

Public Law 89–74 regulates the production, purchase, and sale of depressant and stimulant drugs.

Public Law 89–115 is a 3-year extension of a matching grant program for construction of health research facilities with an authorization of $280 million.

Public Law 89–239 establishes regional medical research centers and clinics to fight heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.

Public Law 89– — extends program for construction of facilities and loans to students to increase the number of physicians, dentists, osteopaths, optometrists, pharmacists, and nurses.

EDUCATION

The record of this session in passing seven major bills pertaining to the education of our youth is unprecedented in the history of this or any other nation. In the future years, millions of American children from the elementary grades to high school and college can, if qualified, secure a finished education regardless of the handicap of short funds or the financial condition of their parents. Any youth with industry and desire for educational advancement can take advantage of legislation passed by this Congress and signed by President Johnson. This great educational expansion gives opportunity to American youth who wish to become doctors, nurses, or participate in scientific education in this atomic age of scientific progress. Time and space do not permit me to give all the details of the wide scope and complex provisions contained in the seven educational bills passed by this Congress.

Public Law 89– — increases grants to colleges to pay part of the cost of new classrooms and expands student loan program.

Public Law 89–10 authorizes Federal aid to local school districts mainly for special education courses to be distributed on basis of number of children from low-income families.

Public Law 89–209 provides the first real attempt to recognize the importance of general education programs in an era which has previously had a heavy emphasis upon space and atomic science.

VOTING RIGHTS

On August 6, 1965, President Johnson signed a bill aimed at enforcing voting rights guaranteed by the 15th constitutional amendment. It was the second

major civil rights law enacted in 2 years.

Federal registrars, or examiners, can be—and are being—sent to any State or political subdivision that on November 4, 1964, had a registration or voter participation of less than 5 percent of the voting age population, and that used a literacy test or other device in qualifying voters.

LABOR

Public Law 89–212 amends the Railroad Retirement Act by eliminating the provision which produced annuities of spouses of retired employees who were eligible for social security.

Public Law 89–216 provides that a bond fully protecting union funds against loss due to fraud and dishonesty is sufficient and eliminates requirement of Landrum-Griffin Act for excessive coverage which was requiring unnecessary premium payments.

Public Law 89–15 extends the manpower development training program 3 years to June 30, 1969. This program provides training for the unemployed and partially employed persons whose jobs are in jeopardy due to automation.

IMMIGRATION

The recently passed immigration legislation, Public Law 89–236, would abolish the 41-year-old national origins provisions of our immigration laws. This new bill will equitably distribute immigration quotas to all nations without relationship as to nationality, race, or religion. After World War I, an isolation-minded Congress enacted immigration regulations wherein a few countries in northern Europe were extended superliberal immigration quotas, while other Nations less favored were restricted with unreasonable limited quotas.

Our migrant population will not be increased by the passage of this bill. But we provide for a fair and equitable distribution of the quota allotments to all nations. The bill places a limit of annual immigration at 170,000, inclusive of 10,200 refugees. A maximum of 20,000 will be allotted to any one country. To this number may be added the wives, children, and parents of the U.S. citizens. In that latter category there were about 35,000 last year. This bill prevents the permanent separation of families. In many cases the families have remained divided for indefinite periods during these 41 years that we have had the national-origins theory of immigration.

The State, Labor, and Justice Departments are authorized to exercise rigid control over immigrant applications under this new bill. No one can be admitted for citizenship unless the Secretary of Labor issues an individual certificate that there will be no displacement of an American worker from his job. There will be no adverse effect on working conditions, or American labor in general.

TAXES

Public Law 89–44, Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965. Although the President asked for a reduction of $3.5 billion excise taxes to help spur the economy, Congress sent him—and he signed on June 21—a measure reducing them by $4.6 billion. Most of these taxes were enacted and levied in World War II and the Korean war. Here is the partial schedule of reductions: jewelry, watches, furs, cosmetics, toilet preparations, luggage, handbags, business machines, sporting goods, phonographs, records, musical instruments, cameras, film, radios, televisions, pens, mechanical pencils, refrigerators, coin-operated amusement devices, bowling alleys, general admissions—theaters, athletic events—and cabaret bills.

SMALL BUSINESS

Public Law 89–78 increases SBA's loan funds for small business investment companies and State and local development companies.

HIGHWAYS

Public Law 89–139 provides for a $100 million increase in the amount authorized for the Interstate Highway System. It is hoped that with the increase, presently planned interstate mileage can be completed in 5 years.

Public Law 89– — provides that States will lose considerable Federal highway funds unless they eliminate most billboards on primary roads.

DEFENSE

Public Law 89–171 authorized funds for foreign economic and military aid for 1966. Amount slightly less than last year.

Public Law 89–27 authorized $30 million annually for 1966–68 for arms control and disarmament research and negotiations.

Public Law 89–214 provides free life insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones.

Appropriations for defense hardware and to pay for past wars continue to be about 80 percent of the budget. Although equipment is more complicated each year and costs more per unit, the cost reduction program is holding the overall cost of defense about the same.

VETERANS

Public Law 89–222 increases the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans educational assistance program.

Public Law 89–137 provides cost-of-living increases in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training and to the dependents of deceased or permanently and totally disabled veterans pursuing a program of education under the war orphans educational assistance program.

Public Law 89–138 extends the time limitation for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training for totally disabled veterans.

CIVIL SERVICE

Public Law 89–205 provides cost-of-living increases based on the Consumer Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

At this date, a bill providing salary increases for Federal classified and postal field service employees has passed the House of Representatives and has been reported in the Senate. It has not been enacted into law, but there is little doubt that a raise will be approved together with some other fringe benefits such as a provision for severance pay for Federal employees not entitled to immediate annuities who are victims of base closure, and so forth, such as we have experienced in New York.

MISCELLANEOUS

Public Law 89–134 authorized $115 million for the Peace Corps for 1966.

Public Law 89–174 establishes a Cabinet-level department to merge and assume the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administration and several constituent agencies.

Public Law 89–141 makes it a Federal crime to assassinate, kidnap, or assault the President, President-elect, Vice President, Vice-President-elect, and other officers next in order of succession.

Senate Joint Resolution 1 cleared for State approval a constitutional amendment permitting the Vice President to become Acting President if the President is disabled and provides for filling vacancies in the office of Vice President.

Public Law 89–73 establishes an Administration on Aging to provide information and services to the States relative to developing programs for the aged.

NATIONAL SOLVENCY

Critics continue to talk about the size of our national debt. They fail to mention in their pessimistic propaganda that our economy—or gross national product—has been advancing and improving over the last 20 years. In 1946 our gross national product was approximately $202 billion. Today, in 1965, our gross national product at the termination of this year will be approximately $660 billion. They also fail to mention that our national debt in 1946 was $270 billion and today, in 1965, it is approximately $318 billion. In other words, our national debt in 20 years has increased $48 billion while our gross national product, or our economy generally, has increased approximately $460 billion. This increase of gross national product means billions more in taxes coming into the Federal, State, and local treasuries. So when your neighbor talks about our Nation's fiscal policy "going to the dogs" you might quote figures of our great business, industrial, and employment expansion during the last 20 years.

Congress still spends most of its time working through money requests, and since I am one of the Appropriations Committee members, I spend a large share of my time helping decide which requests to approve. Sometimes we add a few items, but it is usually a matter of either approving, eliminating, or changing requests. The appropriations recap—or maximum that can be spent—for the fiscal year 1966 is as follows:

Total budget requests	$103, 083, 378, 055
Total authorized by Congress	101, 522, 219, 794
Total reduction by Congress	1, 561, 158, 261

Appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess.

Title	Budget requests	Amount as passed (House)	Amount as passed (Senate)	Amount enacted
Agriculture, 1965 supplemental	$1,742,209,000	$1,600,000,000	$1,600,000,000	$1,600,000,000
District of Columbia	389,346,800	356,300,500	364,350,347	360,228,500
Interior	1,270,129,500	1,200,090,300	1,246,752,770	1,212,739,070
Treasury [1]	1,219,400,000	1,272,252,000	1,304,014,000	1,291,239,000
Post Office	5,383,000,000	5,313,400,000	5,340,850,000	5,324,400,000
Executive Office of the President	15,805,000	15,752,000	15,805,000	15,805,000
Independent agencies	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
2d supplemental, 1965	2,226,456,933	2,118,033,083	2,257,869,415	2,227,563,977
Defense supplemental, 1965	700,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000
Labor	588,144,000	537,460,000	557,607,500	547,607,000
Related agencies	36,867,000	36,825,000	36,825,000	36,825,000
Health, Education, and Welfare	7,652,014,000	7,323,020,000	7,411,940,000	7,410,170,000
Independent offices	14,566,023,000	14,109,908,000	14,253,364,000	14,246,167,800
Agriculture	5,815,134,000	5,717,832,000	6,711,908,800	621,000,000
State	404,210,000	388,202,000	390,125,000	[2] 389,602,000
USIA	173,249,100	171,871,000	171,617,000	171,617,000
Justice	373,834,000	370,819,000	370,919,000	370,869,000
Judiciary	76,616,500	81,111,900	80,693,900	80,693,900
Commerce	937,030,000	889,522,000	851,122,900	856,851,250
Related agencies [3]	191,547,000	184,164,000	187,734,000	184,814,000
Legislative [4]	204,872,222	150,589,107	190,840,167	189,993,297
Defense	46,948,844,000	46,888,244,000	46,877,063,000	46,887,163,000
Public works [5]	4,373,805,000	4,241,636,500	4,327,589,000	4,292,866,500
Military construction	2,049,000,000	1,755,495,000	1,759,504,000	1,756,635,000
Labor-HEW supplemental, 1966 [6]	1,553,918,000	1,223,181,500	1,407,181,500	1,223,181,500
Foreign aid	4,188,923,000	4,001,453,000	3,857,188,000	3,932,188,000
Total [7]	103,083,378,055	100,650,161,890	102,275,864,299	101,522,219,794

[1] Does not include permanent appropriations for debt service, tax refunds, trust fund payments, etc.
[2] Estimated and includes several hundred million dollars for CCC that will not be spent this year.
[3] Includes Small Business Administration, Civil Rights Commission, Maritime Commission, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Tariff Commission, and U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
[4] Includes funds for Architect of the Capitol, Library of Congress, Government Printing Office, Botanic Gardens, joint committees, in addition to the House of Representatives. Appropriations for the Senate added there.
[5] Includes funds for Atomic Energy Commission, Army Engineers' projects for navigation improvements and flood control, Tennessee Valley Authority, Bureau of Reclamation and power agencies of the Interior Department, Panama Canal, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and Delaware River Basin Commission.
[6] Includes funds to finance elementary and secondary school programs, medical centers for heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and manpower development program.
[7] Does not include last minute supplementals for the newly passed education and other bills.

LOCAL ISSUES

When we think of local problems in the Seventh Congressional District of New York, we immediately think of noise from airplanes, especially jets, flying low over our homes as they land and depart John F. Kennedy International Airport. As in the past, I have been in constant touch with the Federal Aviation Agency, the Port of New York Authority, and our congressional committees having jurisdiction in this field. I shall continue to pursue every avenue which holds even a glimmer of hope for a solution to this problem. In this age of space travel, I am confident that research can eventually solve the problem of engine noise. Until the "breakthrough" in research, I shall continue to work for landing and takeoff patterns that are safe and bring the least amount of noise to those of us who live and work in the vicinity of large airports.

One item of major interest to our district which is included in the 1965 omnibus rivers and harbors bill is the authorization to proceed with hurricane protection in Jamaica Bay. The work authorized to be done will be under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers. Not only does this promise great relief from flooding for those communities bordering on Jamaica Bay but it also promises much for business in the area with the attendant recreation possibilities.

CONGRESSIONAL OFFICES

It has been—and continues to be—my desire to be readily available to any constituent who wishes to talk with me. Whenever time permits, I attend district civic, veterans, and fraternal organization meetings. For the convenience of my constituents, I maintain a full-time district office, and my office in Washington is always open. For those who may not have had occasion to contact me during 1965, I call attention to the change in office addresses: District office, 96–11 101st Avenue, Ozone Park, 11417; Washington office, 1727 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., 20515.

This has been a fruitful session, and I look forward to an active 2d session of the 89th Congress. Through personal contact and mail, I hope to continue to work and reflect the needs of our community and the Nation.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FARNUM, for October 21–25, 1965, on account of official business in the district.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, and the balance of week, 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. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, tomorrow; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GUBSER, for 1 hour, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GRAY, for 30 minutes, on October 22; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS, for 25 minutes, tomorrow, October 21, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BOW, for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. REDLIN), today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER (at the request of Mr. REDLIN), for 30 minutes, October 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BARRETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SECREST.

Mr. EVERETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. BROOKS).

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REDLIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. MCGRATH.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa.

Mr. SWEENEY in two instances.

Mr. MORRISON.

Mr. RONCALIO.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 337. An act for the relief of F. F. Hintz;

S. 343. An act for the relief of Paride Marchesan;

S. 374. An act for the relief of Dr. Castrillo (Fernandez);

S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, and that such Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966;

S. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth;

S. 1735. An act relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes; and

S. 2039. An act for the relief of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa).

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. 1218. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co., and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 4088. An act for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.;

H.R. 9545. An act providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy;

H.R. 10369. An act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity;

H.R. 11303. An act to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended;

H.R. 11420. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 19, 1965 present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Joseph J. McDevitt;

H.R. 1319. An act for the relief of Joseph Durante;

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hann;

H.R. 1644. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann, and others;

H.R. 1836. An act for the relief of Constantinos Agganis;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg;

H.R. 2285. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi Carson;

H.R. 2557. An act for the relief of Frank Simms;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Maria Alexandros Siagris;

H.R. 2853. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged;

H.R. 3288. An act for the relief of Hwang Tai Shik;

H.R. 3515. An act for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann;

H.R. 3669. An act for the relief of Emilia Majka;

H.R. 3770. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.;

H.R. 4078. An act for the relief of William L. Minton;

H.R. 4137. An act for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Angelica Anagnostopoulos;

H.R. 4203. An act for the relief of Alton G. Edwards;

H.R. 4464. An act for the relief of Michael Harjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas and Paniote Hadjichristofas;

H.R. 5167. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9526. An act for the relief of Raffaella Achilli.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 21, 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:

1687. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1966, for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1688. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting report of amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of September 1965 pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965 and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1689. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of procurement of fault locating indicators for the Nike-Hercules guided missile, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1690. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report of unauthorized expenditures for the repair and reconstruction of a section of the Inter-American Highway in the Republic of Costa Rica, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1691. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements for the Southwestern Power System and related activities, fiscal year 1964, Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior and Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1692. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting reports of negotiated contracts for disposal of materials during the period January 1 through June 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 87-889 (76 Stat. 587); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1693. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting report of tort claims paid during fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 79-601 (28 U.S.C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1694. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1695. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 605. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 1180). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MACDONALD: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A report on world newsprint supply-demand; without amendment (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11664. A bill to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 1182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1098. An act to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 613. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct certain studies and investigations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee of Conference. S. 2118. An act to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920 (Rept. No. 1185). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of Conference. H.R. 8370. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1186). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 11681. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist States and communities in meeting the initial cost of establishment and operation of programs for the care of patients with kidney diseases and to train professional personnel needed to conduct such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 11682. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to make discrimination in em-

ployment because of age an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 11683. 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.

H.R. 11684. A bill to provide that individuals entitled to disability insurance benefits (or child's benefits based on disability) under title II of the Social Security Act, and individuals entitled to permanent disability annuities (or child's annuities based on disability) under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11685. A bill to amend section 129(b) of title 23, United States Code, relating to toll roads, bridges, and tunnels on the National Systems of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 11686. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11687. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act so as to provide for the induction into the Armed Forces of persons who would otherwise be deferred from such service because of being morally deficient or defective; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 11688. A bill to aid in the development of a coordinated system of passenger transportation for the northeastern corridor; to create a Northeastern Corridor Transportation Commission; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 11689. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the amortization of reorganization expenditures of railroad corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 11690. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 11691. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 11692. A bill to provide that the fee increases prescribed by Public Law 89–83 shall not be effective in any case wherein the application was filed prior to the effective date of that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 11693. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national historic site in or near South Pass, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 11694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 11695. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Sonoran Desert National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 11696. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11697. A bill to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 11698. A bill to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 11699. A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 11700. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1958 to authorize the appropriation of $8 million for the repair and modification of certain structures along the Illinois and Mississippi Canal in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 11701. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 11702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 11703. A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11704. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 11705. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.J. Res. 777. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.J. Res. 778. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the reprinting of Consumers All, the Yearbook of Agriculture 1965; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.J. Res. 779. Joint resolution providing for Federal participation in the construction of an addition to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library as a memorial to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 525. Concurrent resolution condemning some tactics currently employed in certain demonstrations against official U.S. policy in Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 613. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct certain studies and investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 614. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; tot he Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 11706. A bill for the relief of Grace M. Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11707. A bill for the relief of Romeo de la Torre Sanano and his sister, Julieta de la Torre Sanano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11708. A bill for the relief of Stella Dourou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11709. A bill for the relief of Branislav, Liljana, and Milan Stankovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARNSLEY:

H.R. 11710. A bill for the relief of Enrique C. Chico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christine Pui-See Sottiurai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11712. A bill for the relief of Angela Elosegui-Cortadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 11713. A bill for the relief of Marcelo P. Antolin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11714. A bill for the relief of Julian S. Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11715. A bill for the relief of Miriam Agatha Benn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11716. A bill for the relief of Maria Aida Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11717. A bill for the relief of Theofanis Koystiaftis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 11718. A bill for the relief of Jack L. Philippot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 11719. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Gilmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 11720. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Noble and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (by request):

H.R. 11721. A bill for the relief of Elena Affo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.