pact—that is why I made the provision that the 3-percent guarantee not apply—they might be able to find some way of giving some element of relief. That is the reason that I developed the amendment this way, and the basis upon which I am proposing it is not with any thought that it would necessarily have to go this way, but with the thought that at least the conference would be seized of a situation which represents a very, very serious problem to an element of the country we are trying to encourage and help, to wit, the higher educational institutions of the country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a point of information?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand it, the Senator is suggesting that we add $300 million for 3 years to the $300 million per year for 2 years now provided?

Mr. JAVITS. No, it is 2 years now because the Participation Sales Act skipped 1966 and made it 1967 and 1968.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New York is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I am making it for 1966, 1967, and 1968, but at standard terms rather than special terms.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Roughly, it would be 4½ percent?

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct. But it is still better than many of these State dormitory authorities, which are charging as high as 6 percent because of the tightness of money.

Again I say, as the Senator knows, we are all in the same problem, people like myself; we are preoccupied with dozens of things, and hence we have got to expect that all we can accomplish with an amendment like this is at least to seize the conferees of the problem. I am sure they are just as interested in solving it as I am.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it is an excellent idea, but I should like to know, how would the Senator suggest that we discriminate with the 3-percent money that is available now, and then the 4.5-percent money that is to be made available?

Mr. JAVITS. The 3-percent money has run out. It is a question of choice by the individual university. The money has run out. In other words, what they will do is to grant all the applications they can on a reasonable ground rule—perhaps time of filing, or perhaps whether the money will be acceptable at a higher interest rate, or whether a particular institution can afford to pay a higher interest rate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator suggests a first come, first served basis?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not see how we can help it. The money has run out. Because we are incapable of finding a way out of this kind of a dilemma, shall we hold up these educational institutions for years? I think that is the question we face.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is a major amendment the Senator suggests.

Mr. JAVITS. Oh, yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it is desirable that we discuss it at length later.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order with respect to convening at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow be rescinded, and that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be permitted to meet tomorrow until the hour of 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, that presents something of a problem to me, because I am a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is marking up a very important bill, and it is my amendment that is pending.

I do not want to stand in the way of progress. If the Senator will assure me that I will be protected until 12 o'clock by allowing some other amendment or action to intervene, I will be perfectly happy.

Mr. MUSKIE. That will be satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 12, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 11, 1966:

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Crawford Young, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved 1 March 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661), vice Col. Robert E. Mathe, Corps of Engineers, reassigned.

Lt. Col. Frank C. Boerger, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved 1 March 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661), vice Col. Robert E. Mathe, Corps of Engineers, reassigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 11, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Paul A. Miller, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 11, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Randall M. Falk, the Temple, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

It hath been told thee, O man, what is good, and what the Lord doth require of thee: Only to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.—Micah 6: 8.

In a world of crisis and confusion, draw us ever closer unto Thee, eternal and ever-living God, that we may heed the challenge of Thy prophet, serving as coworkers in the building of Thy kingdom on earth.

Make us sensitive to the needs of all Thy children who yearn for insight into life's holy purpose, in an ordered universe founded on the moral law which undergirds our aspirations for freedom and for peace.

Bless the President and the elected representatives of this great Nation; sustain the leaders of all the peoples of the world, with integrity for their appointed tasks, with courage to pursue righteousness, and with the vision of a more hopeful universe which has embraced the power of Thy creative energy for the enoblement of man and of mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on August 8, 1966, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12031. An act to authorize the appointment of Col. William W. Watkin, Jr., professor of the U.S. Military Academy, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10284. An act to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Forth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947; and

H.J. Res. 810. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 8th day of September 1966 as "International Literacy Day."

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

H.R. 14921. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14921) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL OF GEORGIA, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous censent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today. I have been advised that the request has been cleared with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUNDRY INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, CORPORATIONS, AGENCIES, OFFICES, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, 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 Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, GIAIMO, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, RHODES of Arizona, and BOW.

CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH THE EL PASO COUNTY WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1, TEXAS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11671) to approve a contract negotiated with the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Texas, to authorize the execution, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "and" and insert "for".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 2056 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATING TO THE EFFECT OF DISCLAIMERS ON THE ALLOWANCE OF THE MARITAL DEDUCTION FOR ESTATE TAX PURPOSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 483) to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowance of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of H.R. 483 is to allow an interest in property which a surviving spouse receives as a result of a disclaimer by a beneficiary under a will to qualify for the estate tax marital deduction, where certain conditions are met. Under present law, the marital deduction, in general, permits the deduction of up to half of the adjusted gross estate for property passing to a surviving spouse. For an interest in property which has been disclaimed to be eligible for the marital deduction under this bill, the beneficiary involved must disclaim all bequests and devises to him under the will. Also, the disclaimer must be made within 6 months after the decedent's will is admitted to probate and before the beneficiary accepts any bequest or devise under the will. The amount which may qualify as a marital deduction as the result of a disclaimer—when added to other amounts received by the surviving spouse—is limited to the greater of, first, the marital deductions which would be allowable without regard to the disclaimer if the spouse elected to take against the will under State law; second, one-third of the decedent's adjusted gross estate.

The bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable A. S. HERLONG, JR., would apply to estates of decedents for which the date prescribed for the filing of the estate tax return occurs on or after January 1, 1965—that is, decedents dying on or after October 1, 1963.

The committee is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of H.R. 483, which was reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee. This bill makes needed changes in our estate tax laws to remove discriminatory consequences that presently result when property passes to a surviving spouse through disclaimer of a beneficiary rather than under the terms of the decedent's will.

Under the estate tax law, a marital deduction is provided for property passing to the surviving spouse, either by the terms of a will or under the State law of descent and distribution. However, the deduction cannot exceed 50 percent of the gross estate. If property passes directly to a surviving spouse under the decedent's will, the amount will qualify for the marital deduction. If the surviving spouse elects to receive his or her share under the intestacy laws rather than under the will, the marital deduction applies to the amount passing to the wife pursuant to the election. However, if the property passes to a beneficiary who disclaims the property in favor of the wife, the marital deduction is inapplicable.

The committee's bill attempts to partly equalize the tax rules applicable in these various situations. In order to insure that the benefits will apply to a genuine disclaimer, the committee's bill imposes three conditions:

First. The disclaimer must be made before any of the property is accepted.

Second. The disclaimer must be made within 6 months from the date the will is admitted to probate.

Third. The disclaimer must be with respect to all bequests and devises to the beneficiary under the law.

The amount of the marital deduction available as a result of the disclaimer is patterned after the amount a spouse is generally permitted to elect against the will.

In any of these cases, the property is available to the wife for her use and support, and the tax laws should address themselves to the substance rather than the form of the transaction. This bill will more nearly equalize for estate tax purposes the effect of a specific bequest to a surviving spouse, or a taking by law or intestacy, and a taking by disclaimer.

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

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

H.R. 483

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2056(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to disclaimers and allowances of marital deduction for estate tax purposes) is amended by striking out "not to the surviving spouse, but to the person who made the disclaimer" and inserting in lieu thereof "from the decedent to his surviving spouse".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to estates of decedents dying after January 1, 1964.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That (a) section 2056(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the treatment of disclaimers in computing the marital deduction for estate tax purposes) is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) BY ANY OTHER PERSON.—If under this section an interest would, in the absence of a disclaimer by any person other than the surviving spouse, be considered as passing from the decedent to such person, and if a disclaimer of such interest is made by such person and as a result of such disclaimer the surviving spouse is entitled to receive such interest, then—

"'(A) Except to the extent that subparagraph (B) applies, such interest shall, for purposes of this section, be considered as passing, not to the surviving spouse, but to the person who made the disclaimer, in the same manner as if the disclaimer had not been made.

"'(B) If the interest disclaimed was bequeathed or devised to such person, and before the expiration of 6 months after the admission of the decedent's will to probate such person disclaimed all bequests and devises in his favor under such will and did not accept any property under any such bequest or devise before making the disclaimer, such interest passing to the surviving spouse by reason of such disclaimer shall, for purposes of this section, be considered as passing from the decedent to such spouse. The amount of the deductions allowable under this section by reason of this subparagraph, when added to the amount of the deductions allowable under this section without regard to this subparagraph, shall not exceed the greater of (i) the amount of the deductions which would be allowable under this section without regard to such disclaimer if the surviving spouse elected to take against the will, or (ii) an amount equal to one-third of the adjusted gross estate (within the meaning of subsection (c)(2)).'

"(b) The amendment made by this Act shall be applicable to estates of decedents for which the date prescribed for the filing of the estate tax return (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing) occurs on or after January 1, 1965."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MRS. EDWARD EUGENE COX

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad responsibility to report to the House of Representatives the death of the widow of one of the great Members of this body.

Mrs. Edward Eugene Cox, whose husband represented the Second District of Georgia for 27 years, died Tuesday, August 9, 1966, in Davenport, Iowa, while visiting her daughter, Mrs. Roland B. Anderson, whose husband is commanding general of the Army Weapons Command at Rock Island, Ill.

Mrs. Cox was a grand and gracious lady. Many of our senior Members, including the distinguished Speaker—I might say, especially including the distinguished Speaker—have enjoyed reminiscing with me of other days and speaking fondly of the inimitable Gene Cox and his charming wife.

I had the highest regard for "Miss Grace." This is an old southern way of speaking, Mr. Speaker, that carries with it great respect and affection. You might say we apply it as a title. Everyone who knew her felt the same devotion.

This gracious lady was especially kind to me prior to and after my election to this body. I know my colleagues who were fortunate to know her receive this news as you and I do, Mr. Speaker; that is, with heavy hearts.

In addition to Mrs. Anderson, she is survived by another daughter, Mrs. Elliott Dunwoody, of Macon, Ga.; a sister, Mrs. Ruby Smith, of Sylvester, Ga.; and a brother, Douglas Pitts, of Greer, S.C.

Funeral services will be held in Camilla, Ga., tomorrow, August 12.

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

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I, too, wish to express my deep sorrow on the death of "Miss Grace." I knew her well. She was a beloved individual.

It was my privilege to serve with her distinguished husband, the Honorable Eugene Cox, who represented the Second Georgia District so long and so ably.

I grew up in southwest Georgia and "Miss Grace" lived in Sylvester, the same town that I did. Her sister still resides there. I have known the family intimately and well all these years and I have been privileged and honored to share their friendship.

It is a sad occasion to realize that she has left us. My sympathy and that of my family is extended to all the family.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I am glad to yield to my distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was very sorry—exceedingly sorry—as was Mrs. McCormack, when we learned of the death of Mrs. Cox.

Gene Cox and Mrs. Cox were close and valued friends of Mrs. McCormack and of myself for many years.

Gene Cox was one of the outstanding Members of the Congress, and served with great distinction in this body for many years. He was one of the most remarkable men I have ever met. Mrs. Cox was one of the sweetest and also one of the most remarkable ladies Mrs. McCormack and I have ever met.

When I was elected majority leader years ago in the Democratic caucus it was my dear friend Gene Cox from Georgia who led my fight on the floor of the caucus.

There has been a friendship between us which has been intense, deep, and lasting. The memory both of Gene Cox and of Mrs. Cox will always remain in my mind as long as I live.

I extend to her loved ones left behind my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I thank the distinguished Speaker for this contribution.

AHEPA, A GREAT ORGANIZATION

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, I welcome the opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a very fine and outstanding organization, the Order of Ahepa, on the occasion of its 44th Supreme Convention on August 14 to 20, being held in Washington, D.C.

It can be accurately stated that a part of America's greatness is the composite of many national origins blending successfully together toward the advancement of common goals. In the scope of national responsibility, the Order of Ahepa stands as an object lesson in successful cooperation.

I am particularly familiar with the effectiveness and altruism of the Ahepa because of the large Greek community in my area. It would be a vain attempt on my part to list the numerous achievements and charitable causes which this

organization has so generously and vigorously supported, but it would be less than proper of me not to express to Ahepa my appreciation and that of my State.

This country is very proud of its citizens of Greek descent who have contributed so greatly to the tenets on which this country was founded and who, because of their heritage, have always shared in our aspirations for freedom and independence.

ENACTMENT OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, "GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND EMPLOYEES," CODIFYING THE GENERAL AND PERMANENT LAWS RELATING TO THE ORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND TO ITS CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10104) to enact title 5, United States Code, "Government Organization and Employees," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and to its civilian officers and employees, 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 1, in the table following line 10, after item 7, insert:

"9. EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION ..... 901"

Page 6, line 9, strike out "1641(b)(2), 1884, and 1891–1902" and insert "1884, 1891–1902, and former section 1641(b)(2),".

Page 10, line 17, strike out "hearing examiner" and insert "employee".

Page 10, lines 21 and 22, strike out "a hearing examiner" and insert "such an employee".

Page 17, line 24, strike out "States" and insert "States,".

Page 20, lines 26 and 27, strike out "1641(b)(2), 1884, and 1891–1902" and insert "1884, 1891–1902, and former section 1641(b)(2),".

Page 22, after line 17, insert:

"CHAPTER 9—EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

"Sec.
"901. Purpose.
"902. Definitions.
"903. Reorganization plans.
"904. Additional contents of reorganization plans.
"905. Limitations on powers.
"906. Effective date and publication of reorganization plans.
"907. Effect on other laws, pending legal proceedings, and unexpended appropriations.
"908. Rules of Senate and House of Representatives on reorganization plans.
"909. Terms of resolution.
"910. Reference of resolution to committee.
"911. Discharge of committee considering resolution.
"912. Procedure after report or discharge of committee; debate.
"913. Decisions without debate on motion to postpone or proceed.

"§ 901. Purpose

"(a) The President shall from time to time examine the organization of all agencies and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

"(1) to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

"(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

"(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

"(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

"(b) Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes of subsection (a) of this section and that the purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under this chapter, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"§ 902. Definitions

"For the purpose of this chapter—

"(1) 'agency' means—

"(A) an Executive agency or part thereof;

"(B) an office or officer in the civil service or uniformed services in or under an Executive agency; and

"(C) the government of the District of Columbia or part thereof, except the courts; but does not include the General Accounting Office or the Comptroller General of the United States; and

"(2) 'reorganization' means a transfer, consolidation, coordination, authorization, or abolition, referred to in section 903 of this title.

"§ 903. Reorganization plans

"(a) When the President, after investigation, finds that—

"(1) the transfer of the whole or a part of an agency, or of the whole or a part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of another agency;

"(2) the abolition of all or a part of the functions of an agency;

"(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or a part of an agency, or of the whole or a part of the functions thereof, with the whole or a part of another agency or the functions thereof;

"(4) the consolidation or coordination of a part of an agency or the functions thereof with another part of the same agency or the functions thereof;

"(5) the authorization of an officer in the civil service or uniformed services to delegate any of his functions; or

"(6) the abolition of the whole or a part of an agency which agency or part does not have, or on the taking effect of the reorganization plan will not have, any functions;

is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 901(a) of this title, he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit the plan (bearing an identification number) to Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that the reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 901(a) of this title.

"(b) The President shall have a reorganization plan delivered to both Houses on the same day and to each House while it is in session. In his message transmitting a reorganization plan, the President shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of the function and the reduction of expenditures (itemized so far as practicable) that it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the plan.

"§ 904.—Additional contents of reorganization plans

"A reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 903 of this title—

"(1) may change, in such cases as the President considers necessary, the name of an agency affected by a reorganization and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of an agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

"(2) may provide for the appointment and pay of the head and one or more officers of an agency (including an agency resulting from a consolidation or other type of reorganization) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of a reorganization made by the plan the provisions are necessary. The head so provided may be an individual or may be a commission or board with more than one member. In case of such an appointment, the term of office may not be fixed at more than 4 years, the pay may not be at a rate in excess of that found by the President to be applicable to comparable officers in the executive branch, and, if the appointment is not to a position in the competitive service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that, in the case of an officer of the government of the District of Columbia, it may be by the Board of Commissioners or other body or officer of that government designated in the plan;

"(3) shall provide for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by a reorganization;

"(4) shall provide for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations, and of other funds, available for use in connection with a function or agency affected by a reorganization, as the President considers necessary by reason of the reorganization for use in connection with the functions affected by the reorganization, or for the use of the agency which shall have the functions after the reorganization plan is effective. However, the unexpended balances so transferred may be used only for the purposes for which the appropriation was originally made; and

"(5) shall provide for terminating the affairs of an agency abolished.

"§ 905. Limitations on powers

"(a) A reorganization plan may not provide for, and a reorganization under this chapter may not have the effect of—

"(1) creating a new Executive department, abolishing or transferring an Executive department or all the functions thereof, or consolidating two or more Executive departments or all the functions thereof:

"(2) continuing an agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made;

"(3) continuing a function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made;

"(4) authorizing an agency to exercise a function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to Congress;

"(5) increasing the term of an office beyond that provided by law for the office; or

"(6) transferring to or consolidating with another agency the government of the District of Columbus or all the functions thereof which are subject to this chapter, or abol-

ishing that government or all those functions.

"(b) A provision contained in a reorganization plan may take effect only if the plan is transmitted to Congress before December 31, 1968.

"§ 906. Effective date and publication of reorganization plans

"(a) Except as otherwise provided under subsection (c) of this section, a reorganization plan is effective at the end of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of Congress after the date on which the plan is transmitted to it unless, between the date of transmittal and the end of the 60-day period, either House passes a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the reorganization plan.

"(b) For the purpose of subsection (a) of this section—

"(1) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die; and

(2) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the sixty-day period.

"(c) Under provisions contained in a reorganization plan, a provision of the plan may be effective at a time later than the date on which the plan otherwise is effective.

"(d) A reorganization plan which is effective shall be printed (1) in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws and (2) in the Federal Register.

"§ 907. Effect on other laws, pending legal proceedings, and unexpended appropriations

"(a) A statute enacted, and a regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed in respect of or by an agency or function affected by a reorganization under this chapter, before the effective date of the reorganization, has, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law or by the abolition of a function, the same effect as if the reorganization had not been made. However, if the statute, regulation, or other action has vested the functions in the agency from which it is removed under the reorganization plan, the function, insofar as it is to be exercised after the plan becomes effective, shall be deemed as vested in the agency under which the function is placed by the plan.

"(b) For the purpose of subsection (a) of this section, 'regulation or other action' means a regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

"(c) A suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of an agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, does not abate by reason of the taking effect of a reorganization plan under this chapter. On motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after the reorganization plan takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of the suit, action or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, the court may allow the suit, action, or other proceeding to be maintained by or against the successor of the head or officer under the reorganization effected by the plan or, if there is no successor, against such agency or officer as the President designates.

"(d) The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this chapter may not be used for any purpose, but shall revert to the Treasury.

"§ 908. Rules of Senate and House of Representatives on reorganization plans

"Sections 909–913 of this title are enacted by Congress—

"(1) as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of resolutions described by section 909 of this title; and they supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

"§ 909. Terms of resolution

"For the purpose of sections 908–913 of this title, 'resolution' means only a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the —— does not favor the reorganization plan numbered —— transmitted to Congress by the President on ——, 19—.', the first blank space therein being filled with the name of the resolving House and the other blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; but does not include a resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

"§ 910. Reference of resolution to committee

"A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"§ 911. Discharge of committee considering resolution

"(a) If the committee to which a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has been referred has not reported it at the end of 10 calendar days after its introduction, it is in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to the reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

"(b) A motion to discharge may be made only by an individual favoring the resolution, is highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not more than one hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, the motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

"§ 912. Procedure after report or discharge of committee; debate

"(a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. The motion is highly privileged and is not debatable. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not more than ten hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate is not debatable. An amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"§ 913. Decisions without debate on motion to postpone or proceed

"(a) Motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(b) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate."

Page 22, line 32, strike out "predecessor," and insert "predecessor".

Page 24, line 14, strike out "the budget estimates" and insert "requests for appropriations".

Page 25, line 5, strike out "revision and submission of budget estimates" and insert "submission of requests for appropriations".

Page 35, line 9, strike out "mean" and insert "means".

Page 36, line 34, strike out "or".

Page 36, line 35, after "section;" insert "or".

Page 36, after line 35, insert:

"(E) the head of a Government controlled corporation;".

Page 39, line 19, strike out ", without the special warrant of the President therefor".

Page 40, line 12, after "agency" insert ", or the Secretary of a military department with respect to an employee of his department,".

Page 40, line 35, after "agency" insert ", the Secretary of a military department with respect to an employee of his department,".

Page 42, in the second and third lines following line 28, strike out "; restrictions on voluntary service and service in excess of that authorized".

Page 42, lines 29 and 30, strike out "; restrictions on voluntary service and service in excess of that authorized".

Page 42, line 31, strike out "(a)".

Page 43, strike out lines 3 to 24, inclusive.

Page 52, line 33, strike out "A" and insert "On request of an appointing authority, a".

Page 52, line 34, strike out ", on request of an appointing authority,".

Page 54, strike out lines 22 to 31, inclusive, and insert:

"(a) An individual who reaches the retirement age prescribed for automatic separation applicable to him may not be continued in the civil service or in the government of the District of Columbia. An individual separated on account of age under a statute or regulation providing for retirement on account of age is not eligible for appointment in the civil service or in the government of the District of Columbia."

Page 54, line 37, strike out "An" and insert "Notwithstanding other statutes, an".

Page 55, line 1, strike out "A" and insert "Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, a".

Page 55, line 7, strike out "The" and insert "Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, the".

Page 58, strike out lines 26 to 33, inclusive, and insert: "(1) 'agency', 'employee', and 'international organization' have the meanings given them by section 3581 of this title; and".

Page 58, line 34, strike out "(4)" and insert "(2)".

Page 60, line 15, strike out "title," and insert "title".

Page 64, line 38, strike out "and".

Page 64, after line 38, insert:

"(B) a military department; and".

Page 64, line 39, strike out "(B)" and insert "(C)".

Page 69, line 17, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 73, lines 32 and 33, strike out ", and regulations prescribed under Executive Order 11012,".

Page 78, line 19, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 78, line 32, strike out "and" and insert "or".

Page 85, line 1, strike out ", Department of State," and insert "of the United States".

Page 85, line 12, strike out "Columbia," and insert "Columbia".

Page 85, line 21, strike out "Guard," and insert "Guard".

Page 98, line 11, strike out "402" and insert "407".

Page 104, line 19, strike out "5335" and insert "5335(a)".

Page 109, after line 35, insert:

"(72) Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

"(73) Chief of Protocol, Department of State.

"(74) Director, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State.

"(75) Director, Community Relations Service.

"(76) United States Attorney for the District of Columbia.

"(77) United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York."

Page 113, after line 34, insert:

"(100) Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, Department of Labor.

"(101) Assistant Director (Program Planning, Analysis and Research), Office of Economic Opportunity.

"(102) Assistant General Managers, Atomic Energy Commission (2).

"(103) Associate Director (Policy and Plans), United States Information Agency.

"(104) Chief Benefits Director, Veterans' Administration.

"(105) Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

"(106) Deputy Director, National Security Agency.

"(107) Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

"(108) Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

"(109) Director of International Scientific Affairs, Department of State.

"(110) General Counsel of the Veterans' Administration.

"(111) Members, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (4).

"(112) National Export Expansion Coordinator, Department of Commerce.

"(113) Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

"(114) Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights.

"(115) United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois.

"(116) United States Attorney for the Southern District of California."

Page 121, line 5, strike out "Quarters" and insert "Quarters,".

Page 122, line 22, strike out "employees" and insert "Employees".

Page 126, line 8, strike out "the executive branch" and insert "an Executive agency".

Page 128, line 11, after "or" where it appears the first time insert "resigns, or".

Page 128, line 11, strike out "ends" and insert "ends,".

Page 128, line 22, strike out "sections" and insert "section".

Page 129, line 4, after "Code." insert "For the purpose of this subsection, 'employee' has the meaning given it by section 1551c(z) of title 47, District of Columbia Code."

Page 135, line 29, strike out "prescribed" and insert "prescribe".

Page 139, line 35, strike out "wage boards" and insert "a wage board".

Page 142, line 15, strike out "the executive branch" and insert "an Executive agency".

Page 143, line 37, strike out "5" and insert "(5)".

Page 150, lines 40 and 41, strike out "in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940,".

Page 151, line 27, strike out "or".

Page 151, line 28, after "cooperatives;" insert "or".

Page 151, after line 28, insert:

"(iv) the Senate within the purview of section 36a of title 2;".

Page 155, line 21, strike out "a House of Congress" and insert "either House of Congress or of the two Houses".

Page 156, line 4, strike out "including actual expenses".

Page 156, line 20, strike out "An" and insert "Under regulations prescribed under section 5707 of this title, an".

Page 156, line 23, strike out all after "duty" down to and including "title" in line 24.

Page 156, line 36, strike out "covered" and insert "except to the extent provided".

Page 157, line 8, after "expenses" insert "under this subchapter".

Page 157, line 9, strike out "subchapter" and insert "section".

Page 158, line 31, after "regulations." insert "This section does not apply to the fixing or payment of a per diem allowance under section 5703(c) of this title."

Page 160, line 24, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 160, line 35, after "effects" insert "to the extent authorized by section 5724 of this title".

Page 161, line 2, strike out "in accordance with section 5724(f)" and insert "to the extent authorized by section 5724(f) of this title".

Page 162, lines 36 and 37, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 163, line 32, strike out "under section 5722" and insert "and a student trainee to the extent authorized by sections 5722 and 5723".

Page 164, line 12, strike out "under section 5722" and insert "and a student trainee to the extent authorized by sections 5722 and 5723".

Page 164, line 40, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 165, line 6, strike out "the" where it appears the second time.

Page 165, line 11, strike out "agreement" and insert "agreed".

Page 165, line 17, strike out "the" where it appears the second time.

Page 165, line 23, after "completed" insert "each".

Page 165, line 28, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 165, line 34, strike out "to pay".

Page 166, line 13, strike out ", Department of State" and insert "of the United States".

Page 167, line 26, after "and" insert ", except as otherwise provided by law, may pay".

Page 167, lines 27 and 28, strike out "engaged, may pay—" and insert "engaged—".

Page 172, line 6, strike out "other".

Page 178, lines 27 and 28, strike out "the executive branch" and insert "an Executive agency".

Page 178, line 32, strike out "wage boards" and insert "a wage board".

Page 179, line 20, strike out "section" and insert "subsection".

Page 180, in the sixth line following line 17, strike out "foreign service leave" and insert "leave for Chiefs of Missions".

Page 181, lines 11 and 12, strike out "the Senate or House of Representatives" and insert "either House of Congress or of the two Houses".

Page 185, line 11, strike out "foreign-service leave" and insert "leave for Chiefs of Missions".

Page 199, line 9, after "program" insert "under section 941(b)(1) of title 33".

Page 199, line 10, strike out all after "agency" down to and including "section" in line 13.

Page 216, line 33, strike out "compensation," and insert: "compensation".

Page 217, line 18, after "is" insert "a".

Page 223, line 37, strike out "interests" and insert "interest".

Page 223, line 39, strike out "is" where it appears the second time and insert "shall be".

Page 224, line 3, strike out "is" and insert "shall be".

Page 226, line 5, strike out "is" and insert "shall be".

Page 226, line 7, strike out all after "Columbia." down to and including "purpose" in line 9.

Page 226, line 36, strike out "member" and insert "or deceased individual".

Page 230, line 6, strike out "42," and insert "42".

Page 230, line 21, strike out "the" where it appears the second time and insert "The".

Pake 244, line 25, strike out "reapportionment" and insert "reappointment".

Page 247, line 6, strike out "section" and insert "sections".

Page 255, line 27, strike out "separted" and insert "separated".

Page 273, line 26, strike out "States," and insert "States or".

Page 273, lines 28 and 29, strike out "a Federal land bank, a Federal intermediate credit bank, and a bank for cooperatives,".

Page 274, line 2, strike out "foreign service" and insert "Foreign Service".

Page 274, line 35, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 5, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 8, strike out "and".

Page 275, line 10, strike out "Rico." and insert "Rico; and".

Page 275, after line 10, insert:

"(7) 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, means the States."

Page 275, line 14, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 24, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 27, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 35, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 37, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 275, line 40, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 3, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 8, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 20, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 22, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 25, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 276, line 40, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 277, line 1, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 277, line 4, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 277, line 11, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 277, line 39, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 279, line 20, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 279, line 22, strike out "States," and insert "States and each".

Page 279, lines 23 and 24, strike out ", Federal land bank, Federal intermediate credit bank, and bank for cooperatives'.

Page 280, line 6, strike out "statute" and insert "law".

Page 282, strike out lines 38 and 39.

Page 282, line 40, strike out "(2)" and insert "(1)".

Page 283, line 1, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)".

Page 283, strike out lines 3 to 16, inclusive.

Page 283, line 29, strike out "commissioner" and insert "Commissioner".

Page 293, line 30, strike out "commissioner" and insert "Commissioner".

Page 305, strike out all between lines 28 and 29 and insert:

"'1916. Unauthorized employment and disposition of lapsed appropriations.
"'1917. Interference with civil service examinations.
"'1918. Disloyalty and asserting the right to strike against the Government.
"'1919. False statement to obtain unemployment compensation for Federal service.
"'1920. False statement to obtain Federal employees' compensation.
"'1921. Receiving Federal employees' compensation after marriage.
"'1922. False or withheld report concerning Federal employees' compensation.
"'1923. Fraudulent receipt of payments of missing persons.'"

Page 305, strike out all after line 30 over to and including line 5 on page 306.

Page 306, line 6, strike out "1917" and insert "1916".

Page 306, line 19, strike out "1918" and insert "1917".

Page 307, line 1, strike out "1919" and insert "1918".

Page 307, line 20, strike out "1920" and insert "1919".

Page 307, line 28, strike out "1921" and insert "1920".

Page 307, line 35, strike out "1922" and insert "1921".

Page 308, line 4, strike out "1923" and insert "1922".

Page 308, line 17, strike out "1924" and insert "1923".

Page 310, line 16, after "appoint" insert "in the Department of Justice".

Page 310, line 17, strike out "in the Department of Justice" and insert ", learned in the law,".

Page 315, in the tenth line following line 24, strike out "Membership in International Criminal Police Organization; expenses" and insert "Expenses".

Page 317, strike out lines 15 to 27, inclusive, and insert:

"'§ 537. Expenses of unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character

"'Appropriations for the Federal Bureau of Investigation are available for expenses of unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, when so specified in the appropriation concerned, to be spent under the direction of the Attorney General. The Attorney General shall certify the amount spent that he considers advisable not to specify, and his certification is a sufficient voucher for the amount therein expressed to have been spent.'"

Page 319, line 9, strike out "section 5317" and insert "sections 5315–5317".

Page 323, line 23, strike out "217(a)" and insert "217a".

Page 326, line 39, strike out "2101(e)" and insert "2101(f)".

Page 335, lines 7 and 8, strike out "in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940,".

Page 335, line 21, strike out "extent" and insert "extend".

Page 337, in the fifth column of the table immediately following line 3 strike out "3679 (b), (i) as applicable to subsection (b)) [added]".

Page 337, in the table headed "Statutes at Large", after the fourth line following "1874" which reads

"Do	328	3	18	109"

insert:

"Do	344	2–5	18	127"

Page 337, in the table headed "Statutes at Large", after the seventh line following "1874" strike out:

"Dec. 1	344	2–5	18	127"

Page 347, in the table after the thirteenth line following "1917" strike out:

"May 12	12	(3d proviso on p. 72).	40	72"

Page 352, in the table in the fourth line following "1930" strike out "June 4" and insert "June 6".

Page 359, in the table after the sixth line following "1949" which reads:

"June 10	194		63	170"

insert:

"June 20	226		63	203"

Page 360, in the table after the twenty-eighth line following "1950" strike out:

"Do	896	1211 (2d par., and 15th and 16th pars., as applicable to 2d par.).	64	765, 768"

Page 361, in the table after the first line following "1953" which reads:

"Feb. 7	2		67	4"

insert:

"Feb. 11	3		67	4"

Page 362, in the table after the fourth line following "1955" which reads:

"Mar. 2	9	2(a)	60	10"

insert:

"Mar. 25	16		69	14"

Page 362, in the table after the ninth line following "1956" strike out:

"June 27	452	101 (last 26 words of 4th par. on p. 345).	70	345"

Page 362, in the table in the eleventh line following "1956" strike out "Do__" and insert "June 27".

Page 363, in the table after the twelfth line following "1957" which reads:

"Aug. 29	85–217		71	491"

insert:

"Sept. 4	85–286		71	611"

Page 365, in the table in the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh lines following "1960" strike out ", (g) (as applicable to sections 1501(a) and 1507(a) of the Social Security Act)."

Page 365, in the table in the twenty-ninth line following "1960" after "542" insert "(b)–(d)".

Page 365, in the table after "1961" insert:

"Apr. 7	87–18		75	41"

Page 366, in the table after the fourth line following "1964" which reads:

"Mar. 26	88–290	("Sec. 306(b)")	78	170"

insert:

"July 2	88–351		78	240"

Page 366, in the table in the fifth line following "1964" strike out "July 2" and insert "Do__".

Page 366, in the table after "1965" insert:

"June 18	89–43		79	135"

Mr. TUCK (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Senate amendments be dispensed with, and that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—may I inquire of my distinguished colleague from Virginia whether any of the amendments made in the other body affect the substance of the title?

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the amendments do not affect the substance of the title. They are only clerical amendments, and do not make any change in substantive law.

The original bill passed this body unanimously. It passed the Senate unanimously. The amendments were adopted by the Senate unanimously.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, and withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND TITLE II OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. MADDEN (on behalf of Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 967, Rept. No. 1833), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 967

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11696) to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of

the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

JOSEPH McCAFFREY COMPLIMENTS DR. HANSEN

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, we very often hear on the news broadcasts matters that we disagree with and are concerned about, but I want to take the opportunity today to compliment the very well known TV commentator, Joseph McCaffrey, on a statement he made last night with reference to the District of Columbia schools. He paid a very high compliment to Dr. Hansen, head of the school system of the District of Columbia, and deplored some of the attacks that have been made upon him. He indicated in his statement that the years would prove that Dr. Hansen in all probability was right, and that his stature would go up as the years go by.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, deplore the attacks that have been made upon this very fine educator, who has instituted in the District of Columbia schools the track system which is used today in practically all progressive high schools throughout America.

And, Mr. Speaker, I deplore the fact that, unfortunately, sometimes people with their own petty ax to grind make attacks upon great men who are working and who are dedicated to the task of improving our educational system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. McCaffrey upon his statement and, particularly, I want to compliment Dr. Hansen upon the job that he has done, and express the hope that something might develop which will enable him to continue his fine service to this educational system.

OBSERVATION OF THE MOST MODERN TRUCKING TERMINAL IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KORNEGAY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was privileged to observe the most modern trucking terminal in the United States.

I flew down, late yesterday afternoon, to Burlington, N.C., to take part in the opening of the new, modern terminal erected alongside Interstate Highway 85. This terminal, constructed by Associated Transport, Inc., is the newest and largest facility operated by this progressive and forward-thinking carrier.

Not only is the terminal a beautiful new addition to the many modern new industrial facilities now lining the Interstate Highway System in Piedmont, N.C., it is a highly efficient and functional operation. The plant is equipped with the newest and most efficient materials handling equipment to be found in the trucking industry.

In short, the operation is a great credit to the industrial community it is located in, and I am very proud to have it and the fine people who operate it as a part of my congressional district. The management team of Associated Transport, headed by its president, Mr. J. K. Seymour, of New York City, is to be congratulated, not only for its decision to erect such a wonderful facility, but also for Associated's continuing contributions to the communities in which it operates.

I regret that my absence from this Chamber yesterday prevented my voting in favor of the military installation construction bill, but I am pleased with the new look in trucking transportation facilities I saw in Alamance County, N.C.

HIGH INTEREST, TIGHT MONEY

Mr. JONAS. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are suffering under the highest interest rates and the tightest money situation that has obtained in modern times. This presents a hardship to all of the business enterprises who seek money for expansion. It is a hardship on citizens who wish to build homes. It is becoming a hardship on the Government itself which is being victimized by its own folly in practicing unsound fiscal policies and its stubborn refusal to discontinue the fatal habit of deficit financing.

Mr. Speaker, this situation was highlighted yesterday when Fannie Mae—FNMA—announced the forthcoming sale of debentures to yield 5.91-percent interest. This follows on the heels of the recent sale of participation certificates by the same Government agency at discounts that will yield 5.75-percent interest on Government-guaranteed obligations.

Mr. Speaker, it is further highlighted by the announcement of the Treasury recently that it was refunding Government bonds to yield 5¼-percent interest, the highest interest rates paid on Government bonds in 45 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time for the Federal Government to put its fiscal house in order; to quit competing with private enterprise and individual citizens for available credit; to start living within its means, and stop borrowing money to pay current bills.

THE PRESIDENT'S CLUB AND POVERTY

Mr. GOODELL. 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. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, a new and suspicious situation has come to our attention involving President's Club contributions and a million-dollar contract in the poverty program.

Late in 1964, the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington was seeking a qualified engineering firm to provide guidance in the selection of Job Corps sites, and to furnish engineering services to Job Corps centers. Mr. E. Hunter Smith, Jr., Chief of the Job Corps Installation and Logistics Division, by memorandum of December 22, 1964, specified five major requirements for such a firm, including an "immediate capability" and "a Washington, D.C., area operational office." Mr. Smith recommended to Mr. Milton Fogelman, OEO contract officer, four firms "known to be experienced in these types of services who have expressed interest"—Lublin-McGaughy & Associates, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW.; Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall, 1725 I Street; H. D. Nottingham & Associates, Arlington, Va.; and Mills, Petticord & Mills, 3308 14th Street NW.

Two weeks later, the contract was granted to Consolidated American Services, Inc.—ConAm—a firm unmentioned and unrecommended in the Smith memorandum. It turned out that ConAm had a one-man office in Washington, D.C., and did not meet several important requirements outlined in the Smith memorandum.

The original contract was estimated at $500,000, and is now being phased out by OEO after expenditure of $1,350,000. The size and cost of the contract depended upon continuing task orders from OEO.

A subsequent audit reveals that "no evidence was found that other potential contractors were canvassed though several located in Washington, D.C., were known." It also found "matters which may not be in the Government's best interest."

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that it turns out that the senior vice president of ConAm was W. C. Hobbs. According to the records of the Clerk of the House, W. C. Hobbs, listing addresses of ConAm offices in California and Washington, contributed $1,000 to the President's Club on September 28, 1964; $1,000 to the Democratic National Committee on May 4, 1965; and $1,000 to the President's Club on March 11, 1966.

ConAm personnel informed our investigators that they had not done this type of work for the Government prior to the OEO contract. A new management and engineering services division of ConAm was established in November 1964, 2

months before the OEO contract. I understand that with the expiration of the OEO contract, the Washington management and engineering services division of ConAm is now being discontinued.

THE COST OF THE WASHINGTON POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. QUIE. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from New York [Mr. GOODELL] for bringing this information to our attention. In addition I have these comments.

The total cost of establishing and maintaining the Washington office of ConAm was charged to the OEO contract. Auditors have made the following comment:

> In our opinion the selection of a Washington, D.C., firm could have resulted in significant monetary savings of OEO, particularly as regards employee travel costs, relocation expenses, furniture and lease expenses, and other start-up costs. This appears to have been possible with little effect upon the immediate availability and know-how of technical manpower needed by OEO since ConAm found it necessary to recruit an almost entire staff.

Mr. Speaker, W. C. Hobbs joined ConAm in March 1964, and with the expiration of the poverty contract has now been separated from ConAm.

There are other discrepancies and problems in connection with the ConAm contract. The facts cited herein, however, require a full and immediate investigation:

How did Hobbs and ConAm get the inside track at OEO?

Why were four apparently qualified firms ignored and a fifth firm that failed to meet important specifications chosen?

What connection was there between the $1,000 contributions to the President's Club and the apparent arbitrary selection of ConAm for this contract?

A simple denial of any relationship is not enough. The taxpayers and the Congress of the United States deserve a full, detailed explanation of this unusual selection procedure that gave a million-dollar poverty contract to a one-man Washington office whose senior vice president was coincidentally a continuing member of the President's Club.

NATIONAL CEMETERY FOR ALABAMA

Mr. BUCHANAN. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, since 1953 it has been the policy of the Federal Government not to expand existing military cemeteries or add new ones. Under present policy, it seems that the Department of the Army has no plans to enlarge the national cemetery system by the establishment of new cemeteries at any location, by the enlargement of existing cemeteries, or by the transfer of existing burial grounds.

Currently, there is a resolution pending before the House which would create a National Cemeteries Site Selection Advisory Board to give needed direction to the establishment of such facilities. I believe the enactment of such a proposal would be beneficial.

Nevertheless, I would call to your attention the acute problem which exists in the State of Alabama. As circumstances now exist, there is no place where Alabamians who have given that last full measure of devotion can be laid to rest. Recently, an Alabama soldier who was killed in Vietnam had to be buried in a national military cemetery in Georgia because the Mobile National Cemetery is filled, leaving Alabama as one of the few States without a national cemetery for its military men.

Knowing that Alabama has provided this Nation with courageous men who have distinguished themselves and defended their country on the battlefields of every war fought by these United States, and being advised that the necessary land is possibly available, for example, in Horseshoe Bend National Park near Dadeville, Ala., it is my privilege to introduce legislation providing for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Alabama by requesting the Secretary of the Army to acquire real property in the State of Alabama for the purpose of establishing a national cemetery on such real property.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, I am transmitting the annual report on the International Educational and Cultural Exchange Program for Fiscal Year 1965. Transmitted with this report is the United States Grantee Directory for Fiscal Year 1965.

The educational and cultural programs of our Government are conducted in a world so interdependent that it constitutes, in a sense, a single environment. In this global community, education must be international in focus if the cause of understanding and peace among peoples is to be served. Education for world responsibility is no longer an option. It is rather a necessity.

In addition to fostering an informed and responsible attitude toward the world among students, the program surveyed in this report has encouraged the flow of ideas among the leaders and thinkers of different nations and cultures.

But full heads and empty hearts breed disunity rather than unity. Therefore, the international educational and cultural exchange program, by bringing people of diverse nationalities together in common endeavors—of learning, teaching, truth seeking—has cultivated the humane virtues of sympathy, sensitivity, and tolerance.

In an age when men feel particularly threatened by impersonal forces and alienated from their fellows, this program unobtrusively reminds us that the mind and heart of man know no physical barriers.

I commend this report to the thoughtful scrutiny of the Congress.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August, 11, 1966.*

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO APPOINT A SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES OF CANDIDATES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 929 and ask for its immediate consideration.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make a 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. 214]

Anderson, Tenn.	Halleck	Pucinski
Andrews, George W.	Hawkins	Purcell
Ashley	Hébert	Rees
Baring	Irwin	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Jones, Mo.	Rivers, Alaska
Bolling	Karth	Roncalio
Brademas	King, N.Y.	Ryan
Brock	Kupferman	St Germain
Burton, Utah	Landrum	St. Onge
Cameron	Long, La.	Schmidhauser
Casey	McEwen	Scott
Celler	McMillan	Senner
Clark	Mackie	Skubitz
Conyers	Mailliard	Smith, Va.
Corman	Martin, Ala.	Sweeney
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Nebr.	Toll
Dawson	Mathias	Trimble
Diggs	Michel	Tupper
Edwards, La.	Moorhead	Tuten
Farnum	Morrison	Van Deerlin
Fisher	Morse	Walker, Miss.
Giaimo	Murray	Walker, N. Mex.
Grabowski	Nedzi	Weltner
Gubser	Nix	Willis
	Passman	
	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO APPOINT A SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES OF CANDIDATES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 929

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1967, with respect to the following matters:

(1) The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

(2) The amount subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving picture films, and automobile and any other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1966 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

(3) The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

(4) The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

(5) The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, chapter 120, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session, referred to as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

(6) Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1966, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which, in its opinion, will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

(7) The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-ninth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by supena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

(8) The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

(9) Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1967, as hereinabove provided.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has been familiarized with the language of this resolution. It sets up the Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures and, save for necessary changes in the language relating to the date, it is identical in all respects with resolutions that have been adopted in prior years. I believe perhaps many Members of this House are more familiar with this committee as the old "Davis committee," the committee chaired for many years by our former colleague from Tennessee, Clifford Davis.

One salutary effect, perhaps, of presenting this resolution at this time is to remind ourselves that even though the frost is not yet on the pumpkin, campaign time is approaching. Some of us dare express the hope that this House may be able to conduct its business in time for us to conduct the campaign, so that there will be something for the committee to look into.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last year this House considered the question of the seating of a number of our colleagues who had been nominated and elected in congressional districts where Negroes were systematically excluded from the democratic process. When the Mississippi challenge was dismissed, a number of those who opposed the challenge argued that, if the Voting Rights Act were successful, it would eliminate the need for such challenges in the future.

In its action on both the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the seating of the Mississippi delegation, this House affirmed that complaints of racial discrimination should be carefully scrutinized in the future.

The resolution before us would establish a committee with full power to investigate any charges of racial discrimination in the election of Members of Congress. In the words of the resolution, it is empowered to—

> Investigate and report to the House . . . with respect to . . . (6) Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1966, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be in the public interest, and which, in its opinion, will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

In short, the committee is empowered to make investigations in anticipation of a challenge similar to the objections which I raised to the seating of the Mississippi delegation on January 4, 1965, and investigations to determine the adequacy of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures has the opportunity to perform an invaluable service in the safeguarding of free, honest elections. It can make an enormous contribution to the success of the Voting Rights Act by making a thorough investigation of all charges of intimidation or discrimination or discrimination against prospective candidates and voters because of their race.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the committee to make full use of the power explicitly given to it by this resolution.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, for many years, throughout the country, I have defended the honor and the reputation of the Congress collectively and of its individual Members. I have defended the Congress as the people's own institution. I have defended Congress as the protector of the people's rights—as the individual citizen's most direct representative with their Federal Government.

It is not always easy to point out the facts about Congress and defend the dedication and devotion of its Members. There are those who are eager and willing to tear down this great democratic institution in order to remedy the wrongs of a few. Then, too, they may use the wrongs of a few to attack the vast majority and the institution itself.

There are Fascists and subversives in our country who seek every opportunity to reflect upon this great institution. Often, Mr. Speaker, the most self-righteous indignation comes from those unsympathetic to a strong legislative branch.

While defending Congress, however, I have not ignored the need, Mr. Speaker, for high ethical standards of our membership and of self-regulation by the Congress itself of its own membership.

Time and time again, I have introduced legislation which would prevent campaign contributions from crossing State lines to influence Federal elections. I believe and have always believed that congressional elections should represent the will of those citizens residing in the State or in that congressional district. No outside finances from faraway places, or from abroad, should be permitted to be used to influence those people who directly elect their representatives to the Federal Congress. Also, Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced legislation which would create a House Grievance Committee; which would be similar to the grievance committee of our bar associations. I know of no more effective committees than the grievance committees of the bar associations. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this is true of the bar association grievance committees in my congressional district. A similar committee for this House would be a step toward assuring the American people of our own good intentions, and our desire to improve the image of this august body.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House today would authorize the Speaker to appoint a bipartisan committee of five members to investigate and report to the next Congress concerning campaign expenditures and congressional candidate ethics in the elections this fall. This resolution creating this committee is timely and will reassure the American people of our good intentions. The mounting cost of congressional elections is a serious threat to representative government. The astronomical cost of congressional elections prevent many good men from offering and remaining in public office purely and simply by a lack of funds and an unwillingness to subvert themselves to those who would put up the money.

This committee, with its forthcoming report, will indeed "aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation."

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 929, 89th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, the following Members of the House: Mr. O'NEILL, of Massachusetts, chairman; Mr. SMITH, of Iowa; Mr. DAVIS, of Georgia; Mr. DEVINE, of Ohio; and Mr. GOODELL, of New York.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1966

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 936 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 936

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14359) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 936 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 14359, a bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes. The resolution also provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 authorized the development of a nationwide system of roads linking the major cities of the United States from coast to coast—a transportation network to be known as the Interstate Highway System.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 brought into being the greatest road construction program in the world's history. Also, it authorized the creation of the highway trust fund. But, in spite of the tremendous progress that has been made in our highway system, the rapid growth pace of our population and economy has outstripped our planning.

Prior to 1956, revenues from all Federal excise taxes on motor fuels, motor vehicles, and associated products were placed in the general fund of the U.S. Treasury. Also, prior to 1956, appropriations for Federal aid to the States for highway improvement were made from the Treasury general fund.

By the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, Congress substantially increased the size of the continuing Federal-aid program for improvement of main highways, secondary roads, and urban extensions included in the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems—the A–B–C program—and it also provided for accelerated completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. To pay for these programs Congress increased some of the existing highway-related excise taxes and levied some new ones. It earmarked the revenues of some of the highway-related excise taxes for transfer to the highway trust fund. This trust fund was made the sole source of money for the A–B–C and interstate programs during the years 1957–72. Thus the Federal-aid program was put on a wholly highway-user-financed, pay-as-you-build basis.

In changing the rates of some highway-related excise taxes and levying some new ones, both in 1956 and subsequently, and in dedicating them to the highway trust fund, the Congress sought both to assure the provision of enough money for the Federal-aid highway program in the years 1957–72 and to distribute its cost equitably among the different classes of highway users.

All of the revenues from the Federal taxes on motor fuel, rubber, new trucks, buses, and trailers, lubricating oils, truck and bus parts and accessories, and heavy vehicle use go into the trust fund and are used only for Federal aid for highways. The highway-related excise tax on new automobiles continues to be considered

as general revenue, in the same class as most other Federal excise taxes.

H.R. 14359 would extend for 1 year the authorization for the Federal Interstate Highway System and increase the total authorization for the program by $8,921,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 936 in order that H.R. 14359 may be considered.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has stated, House Resolution 936 will bring to the floor of the House for its consideration H.R. 14359, the Federal Highway Act of 1966. The rule is an open one, providing for 2 hours of general debate. The rule also provides that the committee substitute for the original bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purposes of amendment.

The primary purpose of the bill is to authorize an additional $8,921 million for the Interstate Highway System as construction funds, and to extend the construction completion target date for 1 year, to June 30, 1972. Testimony received by the Rules Committee indicated that even this additional money and time cannot ensure completion by the new target date.

Other Federal highway programs are also included in the bill. The primary and secondary systems are expanded into our urban centers and authorized for 2 years—fiscal 1968 and 1969—at $1 billion a year.

Various other road assistance programs, including forest highways, park roads, Indian reservation roads, and forest development roads are authorized for some $500 million in fiscal 1968 and 1969.

All these programs, Mr. Speaker, are necessary—all of us support them. However, the bill also includes funds to be used for highway beautification under the act passed last session. The bill authorizes $160 million in 1968 and 1969 for billboard control, $48 million for junkyard control, and $285 million for landscaping and scenic enhancement. These funds are to come out of the highway trust fund after it has had additional funds pumped into it to cover these expenditures.

These additional funds will represent an amount equal to 1 percent of the current excise tax on motor vehicles, plus any additional amounts needed, which will be taken out of the general fund.

I do not support the use of the highway trust fund in this manner. Why must we put money into the fund which was not originally earmarked for it to accomplish a purpose for which the fund was not intended? Why cannot the administration use straightforward bookkeeping methods?

Why must the administration use the trust fund for purposes it was never designed to handle?

Why cannot the beautification program authorizations stand on their own feet instead of borrowing the respect of the trust fund to protect it?

Mr. Speaker, I do not want these comments to be misunderstood. I support this bill. It is necessary. We must push toward the completion of the Interstate System as rapidly as possible. We must improve our primary and secondary road systems.

The Interstate System, begun by the Eisenhower administration, is already proving its great worth to the Nation, as I am sure the many visitors to Washington can testify. It moves people and goods faster and more safely than any other highway system in the world.

I know of no opposition to the rule, Mr. Speaker; I urge its adoption.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14359) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14359 with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, 10 years ago I had the honor of bringing to the floor of the House the legislation which became the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, providing, for the first time, a sound program for the construction of a comprehensive and coordinated national system of expressways, designed to meet the economic and defense requirements of our Nation, the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The 1956 act brought into being the greatest road construction program in the world's history.

Today, 10 years later, more than half of the Interstate System is open to traffic and State highway departments are proceeding steadily toward the completion of the system.

Since the 1956 act was passed, it has been amended several times as the need for changes in the program became apparent. I am personally very proud of the fact that the House Committee on Public Works has always approached highway legislation with a nonpartisan point of view. Both the majority members and minority members have made great contributions to the development of sound legislation.

We have before us today H.R. 14359, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966. It has been developed in a nonpartisan fashion and represents the views of the committee concerning the future course of the Federal-aid highway program and the programs for the various categories of highways which are in the Federal domain.

With reference to the interstate program, the committee was confronted not only with the fact that the 1965 cost estimate submitted by the Secretary of Commerce indicates that an additional $4.9 billion in authorizations is required to cover the cost of completing the Interstate System but also with the fact that the 1965 cost estimate is now obsolete. In order to obtain the most accurate picture possible of the total cost, the committee asked the Federal Highway Administrator to make further estimates, taking into account the cost of certain improvements in highway design and the upward trend in construction costs as shown by contractors bid prices. In this way, the committee has determined that additional authorizations of $8.921 billion are needed to cover the Federal share of the cost of completing the Interstate System. The total cost of Interstate System construction from July 1, 1956, through the completion of the system is $51.223 billion. Of this, the Federal share is $46.021 billion and the State's share is $5.202 billion.

The Interstate System authorizations provided in H.R. 14359 reflect this realistic view of the cost. It should be understood that the Interstate System program is financed entirely from the highway trust fund and that appropriations to support authorizations cannot be made beyond the capability of the highway trust fund. The enactment of H.R. 14359 will place the financial problem of the highway trust fund in sharp focus, but will not create a deficit.

The legislation also provides authorizations from the highway trust fund for the continuation of the A–B–C highway program for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. The A–B–C highways include the Federal-aid primary system, exclusive of interstate highways, and the Federal-aid secondary system, together with the urban extensions of the primary and secondary systems. These highways, extending approximately 850,000 miles, reach into every section of every State, serving both rural and urban areas. The reported bill continues A–B–C authorizations for 2 years at the existing level of $1 billion annually. These funds are matched by the States on a 50–50 basis.

The bill authorizes $243 million for fiscal year 1968 and $250 million for fiscal year 1969 to carry out the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. Certain amendments in the Highway Beautification Act are proposed which will have the effect of making the act more workable. In drafting this legislation, the committee has reaffirmed its conviction that funds earmarked for highway construction should not be diverted to the highway beautification program. Safeguards are provided to prevent such diversions.

A total of $541 million is authorized from the general fund of the Treasury

for the several categories of public domain roads for the 2 fiscal years 1968 and 1969. This includes $66 million for forest highways, $14 million for public lands highways, $340 million for forest development roads and trails, $5 million for public lands development roads and trails, $55 million for park roads and trails, $20 million for national parkways, and $41 million for Indian reservation roads and bridges.

One of the major problems in the construction of urban highways is that of relocating and reestablishing the families and business organizations displaced by construction projects. H.R. 14359 would authorize the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with Federal and State agencies, to make a comprehensive study of this problem and to submit his findings no later than next January.

The provisions of H.R. 14359 which I have just described are the major points of the bill. It is constructive and forward looking legislation and its enactment will expedite continued progress in the development of our national highway system.

The modernization of the highway system, including the timely completion of the interstate program, is a matter of vital importance. The continued economic growth of the Nation depends on the efficiency and vitality of its transportation system. Modern highways prevent economic waste by providing for the fast and economic movement of people and goods. And the provision of highways of the interstate type results in the saving of many lives which would otherwise be lost in traffic accidents.

These are among the reasons that Congress should take action to provide for the on-schedule completion of the Interstate System.

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

Mr. FALLON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman or the members of the committee give me any idea as to how many cities of 70,000 population or more have no interstate connections or no approved program for an interstate connection in the near future? How many such cities are there in the United States?

Mr. FALLON. How many do not have an interstate program?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could get the information later.

I would like to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we are deeply involved in a war and a terribly costly war, many thousands of miles from this country, does the gentleman not think that we might well have dispensed for the time being with the beautification program and thereby save some $250 million a year?

Mr. FALLON. What we are doing is carrying out the judgment of the Congress of 1965 in providing what was asked for by the Congress in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. But I would hope the Congress, even though it authorized the program 2 years, ago—or a year ago—could change its mind under the circumstances and hold back at least until we can see some daylight insofar as financing the war is concerned, as well as the deficit spending and inflation that plagues the country.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman, what the committee did in my judgment was imcumbent upon them to do and that was to carry out the legislation that was passed by this Congress in 1965.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland has consumed 11 minutes.

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

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14359 as reported authorizes appropriations for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the Federal-aid highway systems—interstate, primary, and secondary—and for the public domain roads, highway beautification, and certain needed related studies.

The 41,000-mile Interstate System is now half complete. In January 1965 the Secretary of Commerce, as required by law, submitted to the Congress the 1965 estimate of cost to complete the Interstate System. The 1965 estimate reported a cost increase of $5.8 billion over the 1961 estimate.

Three billion, six hundred thousand dollars of the 1965 cost increase resulted from additions and adjustments to the system, all attributable to requirements of increased traffic demands and to lengthening the serviceable life of the system. Nearly $2 billion of the increase resulted from right-of-way, engineering, and construction cost increases.

Last year the committee withheld approval of the 1965 cost estimate, approving instead a joint resolution which authorized $3 billion only for the fiscal year 1967.

It was the committee's position then, as it is now, that while the 1965 estimate was sound as far as it went, it did not include all the known and foreseeable factors that will make up the total cost of the Interstate System.

Testimony before the committee in April of this year disclosed that the 1965 estimate was based on 1963 construction costs. Since 1963 there has been a consistent 2½-percent increase in construction costs, and the committee is convinced that unless there is a substantial change in the general economic condition of the Nation, these costs will continue to increase at about the same rate. The Bureau of Public Roads estimates that this price trend increase will add an additional $3.39 billion to the Federal cost of completing the Interstate System.

It also became obvious during the hearings that certain additional design features, including four-lane construction throughout, would have to be included in the system. The Bureau estimated that these changes would add another $630 million to the Federal cost. The next cost estimate required by law is not due to be submitted until January 1968. There is no reason to believe that the policy which based the 1965 estimate on 2-year-old cost figures, and precluded inclusion of reasonably foreseeable price increases, will be any different in 1968 than it was in 1965.

The committee believes that we should act on an accurate and up-to-date estimate for actual completion of the system. The authorizations contained in the reported bill represent the most realistic estimate that can be provided. The committee has therefore approved an extra year of authorization for the Interstate System and increased the authorizations for the year 1968 through 1972 to cover this new estimated cost. That total cost is now $51.223 billion, of which the Federal share is $46.021 billion. Actual construction on this schedule, would be completed in 1973 instead of 1972.

It has been suggested that these increased authorizations are inflationary, or contribute to an unbalanced budget, or to increasing the national debt. None of these statements is true. We are committed to completion of the Interstate System at the earliest possible date, Everyone—the Congress, the States, the construction industry, and the people of the Nation—should know what it will involve. Under present law, the appropriations from the highway trust fund cannot exceed revenues in the trust fund. Therefore, if the revenues are not sufficient to permit appropriation of the full authorization, obviously the full authorization cannot be apportioned to the States. If the revenues going into the trust fund are not increased, we will be faced with a $6 billion shortage of funds to complete the Interstate System by 1973, and the system would then not be completed until 1975 or later. That fact, however, does not relieve us of the obligation to be accurate about what the system is going to cost.

The reported bill continues the present $1 billion annual authorization for the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems, from the highway trust fund.

It also provides, from the general fund, authorizations for the public domain roads for 1968 and 1969. The committee has approved the administration's recommended authorizations for all public domain roads except those for forest development roads and trails, which it has increased to $170 million a year.

Our national forests are one of our most valuable national assets. National forest timber contributes $1 out of every $70 of the gross national product. In addition, the forests serve extensive recreation, water, mineral, and forage uses. I am sure you have all noted the recent publicity regarding crowded conditions in our national parks. Without adequate roads, the same situation will soon exist in the national forests. The forest road system must be a multiple-use system. The 10-year program approved by the Congress for development of this road system is already $168 million behind schedule. If it is not put back on schedule, we will be jeopardizing the health and even the existence of our national forests; we will be jeopardizing the economies of the many businesses and communities dependent upon them; we will be receiving reduced prices for our national timber; we will be paying the timber purchasers to build inadequate roads, and then paying again for the same roads when we have to rebuild them for multiple use. The situation is therefore reduced to a simple question of profit and

loss, and the committee believes that inadequate appropriations which result in the Federal Government's losing money on its basic resources is neither sound management nor a contribution to a balanced budget.

Sections 7 and 8 of the reported bill make it clear that beautification funds must come from the general fund, not from the highway trust fund, and contain authorizations for 1968 and 1969 of $80 million for billboard control, $48 million for junkyard control, and $285 million for landscape and scenic enhancement.

These authorizations for highway beautification are the authorizations requested by the administration. At this point no one is able to say with any accuracy what billboard and junkyard control will cost, so these are, at best, estimates. The authorization for landscaping and scenic enhancement, however, is the 3 percent of Federal-aid funds specifically spelled out in the Highway Beautification Act, and it is not, therefore, subject to change without amending that statute.

Section 9 of the reported bill is identical with H.R. 6790, passed unanimously by the House last year, providing for an increase in the existing emergency fund authorization from $30 million annually to $50 million annually, and for a 3-year period of availability for expending the annual emergency fund authorization, thereby making the period of availability similar to that provided for regular Federal-aid highway authorizations. The committee feels that this authority in the use of emergency funds is essential to assist the States in the prompt and economic repair or reconstruction of highways seriously damaged or destroyed by disaster. These standby provisions will also lessen the need for special authorizing legislation to meet disaster situations as they arise.

Advance acquisition of rights-of-way before land is developed can result in large savings to the public. It can also lessen the inconvenience and hardships suffered by persons and businesses whose relocation is made necessary by future highway construction. The obstacle facing most States in effective advance acquisition is financing. Section 10 of the reported bill calls for a study to develop comprehensive information and guidance on all possible methods by which advance acquisition can be undertaken and financed. The report on this study is to be submitted in January 1967.

Section 11 of the bill spells out the congressional intent that when needed, and subject to requirements prescribed by the Secretary, State highway departments may continue to use private engineering firms to assist in the development of our highways. This puts into law, and thus eliminates administrative difficulties, what has in fact been the practice for many years.

For a number of years the committee has been increasingly aware of the problems in taking care of relocation of people, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced by highway construction. The problem continues to grow more acute as we move to construct the roads needed to relieve transportation difficulties in our cities. Section 12 of the reported bill therefore requires a full study to determine what action can and should be taken to relieve this problem, with the report on the study to be submitted to the Congress in January 1967.

Section 12 requires that the Secretary, in cooperation with the governments of Guam and the Virgin Islands, make a study of the need for, and estimates and planning, relating to, highway construction programs for these two valuable and important territorial possessions of the United States. Development of both territories requires an adequate and safe highway system. No Federal agency presently has authority to assist them with such a program, nor does either receive direct Federal appropriations for this purpose. This report, also, is to be submitted in January 1967.

The Public Works Committee believes this is a sound, realistic, and forward-looking highway authorization bill, and that enactment of anything less would be misleading, inadequate to meet our needs, and poor fiscal policy.

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

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I should like to express to the gentleman my appreciation for his very comprehensive statement on this important legislation.

There is considerable interest, in numerous sections of the country, relative to the possibility of adding additional mileage to the Interstate System and possibly to other Federal systems.

Can the gentleman tell us what, if anything, is underway in that regard? Are studies being made? If so, by whom are they being made? When does the gentleman anticipate the studies will be completed and reported to the Congress?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1965 the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads were directed to report to the Congress by January 1968 on what the future highway needs of the Nation will be beyond the present program. This report will then be made every second year thereafter.

This study will be carried out by the Bureau of Public Roads in conjunction with the highway departments of the 50 States.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As I understand it, the first report under this directive will be made January of 1968.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Any recommendations that might be made and accepted by the Congress would, under the present law, be secondary to the current system; that is, they would take effect and begin with the conclusion of construction of the current system. Is that right?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think it is important to point out, however, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi, that there appears to be some reluctance on the part of the Bureau of Public Roads to include in that study specific State recommendations, let alone Federal recommendations, concerning increased mileage on the Interstate System. For some time we had difficulty in even getting the Bureau to agree to request that the States make such recommendations to the Bureau. We overcame that hurdle. However, it is my opinion that unless considerable effort is exerted by the Congress, the report that comes up may not contain specific recommendations for later specific increased mileage. I think that would be wrong and we should do everything in our power to make certain it does include such recommendations.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You mean the recommendations from the State highway departments?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. Not only that recommendations should be obtained from the State highway departments, but that those recommendations be included in any report made to the Congress by the Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this bill contains substantial authorization——

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me briefly on the subject we just discussed a moment ago?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am not sure I understand the answer to my question regarding the Federal Interstate System and additions to such. As I understand it, a report is supposed to be made in January of 1968 including information and recommendations from the States and the Bureau of Public Roads relative to expanding the Interstate and Federal highway systems. Is that right?

Mr. CRAMER. As one of the drafters of that specific amendment, it was the intention of this Member that that be a required item.

Mr. ABERNETHY. One other question and I will not trespass further on the gentleman's time. If there is a recommendation to expand the Interstate System and should it be approved and written into the law by the Congress, in order for any portion of that to be put under construction concurrently with the present authorized Interstate System, there would have to be additional financing from some source, would there not?

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. There will not be enough money in the trust fund to do the job presently authorized unless additional revenues are obtained.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Can the gentleman tell us what he thinks the prospects of such are now, that is, expanding the system in the next few years?

Mr. CRAMER. I do not think there is any question but what there will be considerable demand for increased mileage where there are obvious missing links.

I can point to Florida as an example. The Tampa-St. Petersburg-Miami proposed Interstate extension has not been included in the existing system. It is an obvious missing link with dead end interstate routes I–4 and I–75 running into the Tampa-St. Petersburg area. That is but one example. We are going to need the increased mileages to complete these missing links on the system.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does not the gentleman feel those missing links are of such prominence and importance that they would demand concurrent additional financing so that they might be put under construction with no delay?

Mr. CRAMER. There would have to be additional money which would have to be provided for its completion.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course, I realize that. And I thank the gentleman from Florida and also the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CRAMER. Or the presently authorized highway-user taxes would have to be made available to the trust fund after 1973.

As this is going at the present time, Congress will have to act upon it in 1968, because it takes about 4 years to tool up the program.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me before he commences his general statement?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, because I was on my feet attempting to get the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], but I failed to do so before the gentleman sat down.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed in the preliminary remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], that he told us that the Interstate System was, roughly, one-half complete. And, the report also indicates that work has either been completed or is underway on some 94 percent, or 41,000 miles of the Interstate System.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these kinds of figures are impressive, and they have always impressed me; but I cannot ignore the fact that we have made a part of such progress, and a rather substantial part of it, by virtue of the fact that some of the more progressive States—including my State of New York, and that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], and I believe the gentleman from Florida as well—constructed mileage prior to the beginning of the Interstate System which was later incorporated into the system and has therefore been contributed to the system by these various States.

Mr. Chairman, this represents a substantial part of the progress which has been made under this program, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida if there is any intention on the part of the subcommittee, or on the part of the full committee, at some time in the future to consider this unresolved question of reimbursement to the various States for the mileage they have contributed to the Interstate System?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from New York that a report has been made on that to the Congress and this question will be dealt with and treated in the January 1968 report to the Congress as well. The decision can be made then by Congress relating it to the bill then pending before it.

Mr. Chairman, it was my position, and that position has been substantiated since, that we have got to build the roads first before we start talking about reimbursements for existing highways. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] probably takes a different position and the gentleman might want to comment upon the question of reimbursements on toll roads.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I believe the gentleman from Florida is correct with reference to the question of reimbursement and that the question of reimbursements be held in abeyance until we complete the Interstate Highway System.

However, I would hope that we could have reimbursement by the target date for completing the system—1972 or 1973.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. I am glad to hear that statement, because I hope we do not lose sight of the fact that somewhere along the way New York State did contribute $799.1 million worth of mileage to the Interstate Highway System and I hope that some day we will be considered as eligible for reimbursement for that amount.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from New York that after the 1972 or 1973 program New York State will receive a fair and equal break inasmuch as toll roads will not be involved in that situation.

Mr. ROBISON. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains the total authorization completion date of the 1973 programs and other programs including some $11,955,150,000. That figure includes the $8.9 billion for Interstate completion; $493 million for 1968 and 1969 relating to beautification; highway study, Guam and the Virgin Islands, $150,000; and emergency relief, $50 million per year. The Alaskan system is not included in this bill, but it is included in the Senate bill. Furthermore, the A–B–C authorization is for $2 billion for the 2-year extension. Of course, public-donated roads and others total another $541 million.

Mr. Chairman, this is indeed a substantial authorization bill; however, it is a bill which, of course, Congress must act upon and must act upon in the immediate future.

Mr. Chairman, allocations for fiscal year 1968 are supposed to be made in the month of August of this year.

They are made about a year and one-half in advance so that the States can properly tool up for the actual letting of contracts in the fiscal year in which funds are made available. Therefore, allocations are made traditionally a year and one-half in advance. That is why this bill is before you now in order that funds and programing funds can first be assured starting in fiscal year 1968. In addition, planning and programing can go ahead now in anticipation of spending in 1968 and the years thereafter.

That is why this bill is here. It has to be here for the purpose of authorizing the Interstate System for those years, the primary system for those years, the public lands and parks and trails authorizations, plus the other necessary authorizations contained in it.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this bill for the acquisition of bankrupt toll roads or skyways; is there?

Mr. CRAMER. I say to the gentleman that we have discussed that subject once before here today. There is nothing in the bill concerning such acquisitions. As far as I am concerned, I hope there never is any such provision in a Federal-aid highway bill. I say that Congress is constantly under appeals to bail out those projects.

Mr. DERWINSKI. But there is nothing concerning that in this bill specifically?

Mr. CRAMER. Not in this particular bill. They did bail one out in the State of West Virginia by making it a part of the interstate highway mileage allowance to that State. But I personally am hoping that it will never happen again.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman for providing the information.

Mr. CRAMER. There is nothing in this bill to provide authority to do that.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to duplicate the remarks made previously, but there are a couple of points I think are of interest and they should be discussed.

I think it is important for every Member of this House to know the trouble this Interstate System is in relating to financing. As it is proposed in this bill and by the administration, this program could not be completed until 1973. When it was initially started in 1956, the highway user who was paying for it was told by the authorities that it would be completed in 1970 with 41,000 miles of Interstate Highway System. Because of increased cost estimates, it has gone up now to a $51 billion estimate as of our 1965 estimates which are in excess of a $10 billion increase. With the other increased cost factors, the system will not be completed until 1973 and only then if there is provided to be paid into the trust fund approximately $6 billion more.

Mr. Chairman, the trust fund is unfortunately $6 billion short of doing a 41,000-mile job even by 1973.

Mr. Chairman, I hope everyone understands this problem. This authorization provides the vehicle to finish it by 1973, as it relates to authorizations, but the Committee on Public Works does not have the authority to provide the money. It belongs to the Committee on Ways and Means to put enough taxes into the trust fund to do the job or in the alternative to provide it through appropriation processes from the general fund.

Mr. Chairman, as of today with the Byrd amendment in existence, the money, other than the beautification and safety features, has to come out of the trust fund. The trust fund is $6 billion short.

We hear all about the money that is needed for the antipoverty program and these other boondoggling programs that have not been proven on the basis of merit, but there seems to be little leadership to get enough money into this trust fund to do this job even by 1973, which, in my opinion, will do more to fight poverty, to help the economy of this Nation, and to keep faith with the motorists by finishing it at least by 1973 than any poverty program. If this $6 billion is not put in the trust fund what is going to happen is that the program will have to be stretched out at least until 1975 or perhaps over 1976. I am hoping that the leadership will come from the administration on this critical and important program, which is a proven one, to provide adequate funds to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, that leadership clearly does not exist today. Nothing in my opinion is going to be done this year by the administration to put more money into the trust fund. Then the question is, Will it be done next year? Every year we miss, we are stretching it out that much further.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If the Johnson galloping inflation is not stopped, the situation will become even more desperate; is that not correct?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes; that is obviously true. The increased cost is now going up about 2.5 to 2.7 percent a year. If the cost of living and cost of construction continue to go up, the cost of the program could be greater than even that contained in the authorization.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and I appreciate his remarks as well as those of the chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee.

My question pertains to section 11 on page 17 of the bill under "State highway departments." Would this same inflationary spiral, the decreased purchasing value of the dollar, the slippage, the increased cost of construction and the deficit funding be responsible for the complaints that we as Members get from the various State highway departments that the matching funds are slipping further and further behind; first one quarter, then two quarters, and even in some instances and, paradoxically enough, in the instances of the States that have contributed the most and that are further along with the interstate program, receiving their matching funds so that they can fulfill their contracts that are being let on time? I have many complaints from State highway departments about the Federal matching funds slipping further and further behind, by quarters. Is the explanation which the gentleman has given to this general slippage and an extenuation of the program to 1973 and even to 1975 also responsible for that?

Mr. CRAMER. It has been my opinion that the administration has, for a period of time, withheld allocations for future construction inordinately and unnecessarily, whereas if they had been let from the States that are accustomed to expect them, there would not have been the slowdown. In my opinion it was done for the purpose of cutting back Federal expenditures, supposedly to try to fight inflation. But this is not an area in which the cuts ought to come.

Mr. HALL. I certainly agree with the gentleman. It is very embarrassing to the good State highway commissions, and it is certainly another example of deficit financing on the part of the Government so they can spend elsewhere.

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. It is also important to point out one or two other aspects of this bill. The administration sent up a proposal that highway beautification should be paid out of the trust fund. They also said as an aside something like, "We would like to have 1 percent of the automobile excise taxes transferred to the trust funds to take care of that cost plus the cost of safety." They asked the Congress in effect to authorize the payment of the beautification program out of the trust fund without any assurance whatsoever that the cost of that program would be paid for by transfer of the 1 percent excise taxes.

I am proud to say that our committee refused to do so, either relating to safety or to beauty. This bill specifically states that safety and beauty money must not come out of the trust fund unless there is transferred to the trust fund the 1-percent highway excise tax and, of course, that is just transferring money from one pocket to the other.

In any event, it prevents highway construction money from being used, as could be done under the administration's proposal for beautification and safety which is a substantial sum as this bill itself indicates. So we accomplished that objective, and that is now tied down without any question.

In addition, we have provided for what I think are necessary studies relating to relocation assistance and to the advance acquisition of rights-of-way. For a number of years we have had on the books the Cramer amendment, which provides for 7-year advance acquisition of rights-of-way. The States do not use it, and we want to know why.

It is essential that the people along the future acquisition routes are treated with some equity.

Unfortunately, they sit around for 20 years, knowing their property is going to be taken, with no relief.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important provisions of this bill, H.R. 14359, is the increased authorizations for completion of the Interstate System. As you know, the Secretary of Commerce submitted the 1965 Interstate Cost Estimate to the Congress on January 11, 1965. This estimate showed that the 41,000-mile Interstate System will cost $46.8 billion to complete, which is $5.8 billion more than the 1961 cost estimate. Of this $5.8 billion increase, the Federal share is $5 billion, making the total Federal cost $42 billion.

The House Committee on Public Works held hearings on the 1965 estimate last year and concluded that, although the estimate appeared to be sound on the bases upon which it was made, it did not reflect the full actual cost of completing the system. The committee withheld final action on the estimate, and Congress merely approved the estimate for the purpose of apportioning interstate funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1967. The 1967 authorization was increased by $100 million, leaving unauthorized $4.9 billion of the $5 billion increase contained in the estimate.

Extensive hearings were held this year on the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System. The testimony disclosed that the 1965 cost estimate was based upon 1963 calendar year construction prices, and that unit prices have consistently increased at the average rate of 2½ percent per year since 1963. It further appeared from the testimony that unless there is a substantial change in the general economic condition of the Nation, construction costs will continue to increase at about the same rate during the foreseeable future. The Bureau of Public Roads, in response to a request by the committee, has estimated that this price trend increase will add an additional $3.391 billion to the Federal cost of the Interstate System over the remaining period of its construction.

It also became obvious during the hearings that additional design features would have to be included in the Interstate System before its completion to maintain the high standards we have come to demand of the system. With the passage of time, from one estimate to another, conditions change, forecast traffic volumes increase, and technology and design concepts advance, all of which result in constant upgrading of standards. There will be additional costs to provide for such things as full widths of shoulders across long bridges where traffic volumes require, more traffic lanes, additional interchanges, and depressed sections in urban areas.

There are continuing pressures to add ramps to simple grade separation structures, to convert them into interchanges so as to meet the needs of increasing traffic and growing communities. For example, the 1965 estimate provides for 754

more interchanges than were included in the 1961 estimate, and undoubtedly the next cost estimate will include still additional interchanges. The average distance between interchanges on the Interstate System, included in the 1965 estimate, is 1.1 miles in urban areas and 4.4 miles in rural areas. As communities grow and urban limits expand, more interchanges are needed. The bill also requires, in the interest of safety, that the entire Interstate System be constructed with a minimum of four traffic lanes. This will necessitate some 1,426 miles of highways, now planned or constructed as two-lane facilities, to be increased to four lanes, at an estimated cost of $265 million. The Bureau of Public Roads has estimated that these design changes, including four-laning of the system, will add another $630 million to the Federal cost of completing the system.

The administration has recommended that additional authorizations for the Interstate System be limited to the $4.9 billion increase contained in the 1965 cost estimate and that any additional increase await submission of the next cost estimate. Under existing law, as interpreted by the Bureau of Public Roads, the Interstate System is to be completed by September 30, 1972, and only two additional cost estimates are to be submitted, the next one in 1968 and the last one in 1969.

The committee is of the opinion that it is unrealistic to ignore known increased costs which have occurred since 1963 and future increases in cost which appear certain to occur. If funds for these additional costs are not authorized until the next cost estimate is submitted to the Congress in 1968, large additional sums will have to be compressed into 2 or 3 years of authorizations, commencing with authorizations for fiscal year 1970, or a substantial stretchout of construction and delay in completion of the Interstate System will result. The system should be completed as nearly on schedule as possible in the interest of highway safety, the national economy, and national defense. It is estimated that completion of the Interstate System alone will save 8,000 lives annually. Furthermore, if future cost estimates are based upon prices and conditions as they exist on a cutoff date a year before the estimate is submitted to the Congress, as has been the practice in the past, and do not take into consideration additional costs that have occurred or are reasonably anticipated in the future, completion of the system would be dragged out interminably if authorizations never exceeded the cost estimates.

By authorizing funds now for known and reasonably anticipated increased costs, the additional authorizations can be spread over the maximum number of years remaining for completion of the system and thereby avoid peaks and valleys in the construction program, which is costly and places severe strain upon State highway departments and the construction industry.

After thorough deliberation, the committee decided that the $4.021 billion increase in cost contributable to rising prices and design changes, as well as the $4.9 billion increase contained in the 1965 estimate, should be authorized at this time. Thus, H.R. 14359 increases the authorizations for the Interstate System by $8.921 billion. The administration's proposal for a $4.9 billion increase added 1 additional year of authorizations, for fiscal year 1972. The bill approved by the committee retains this limit on the period of authorizations and distributes the additional $8.921 billion over the fiscal years 1968 through 1972, for completion of the Interstate System in 1973.

Based upon testimony presented at the hearings, the committee has determined that the best estimate of the cost of completing the system is $51.223 billion, of which the Federal share is $46.021 billion and the States share is $5.202 billion.

The committee also continued the $1 billion annual authorization level for the A–B–C program for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, and provided necessary authorizations for Federal domain roads.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND REVENUES

Providing necessary authorizations for appropriations to complete the Interstate System solves only half of the problem, however, for additional revenues must be provided to finance part of the increased authorizations. The estimated receipts of the highway trust fund, under existing law, will exceed estimated expenditures for the Federal-aid highway program—assuming continuation of the A–B–C program at its present level—including the existing authorizations for the Interstate System, by $2.939 billion. Thus, the additional authorizations of $8.921 for the Interstate System will result in a trust fund deficiency, under present tax laws, of approximately $6 billion.

There are several financing methods available to the Committee on Ways and Means to provide this additional $6 billion, including the following: First, imposition of new or increased highway user taxes; second, transferring to the trust fund all or a portion of the 7-percent automobile excise taxes that now go into the general fund of the Treasury; third, extending the present October 1, 1972, termination date of the highway trust fund and continuing the fund's present revenues, and fourth, repealing or suspending provisions of section 209(g) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956—the Byrd amendment—to permit appropriations to the trust fund of advances from the general fund to be repaid with interest from later revenues to the trust fund.

It is hoped that the Committee on Ways and Means will take early action to finance the additional authorizations for the Interstate System, so that it may be completed in 1973. However, until such time as needed additional revenues are provided, under operation of existing law, the Secretary of Commerce can apportion funds authorized for the Interstate System only in amounts that do not result in expenditures in excess of amounts available in the highway trust fund. Thus, based upon present estimates, if no additional revenues are provided for the trust fund, $6 billion of the authorizations for the Interstate System contained in H.R. 14359 cannot be apportioned to the States.

PROTECTION OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

The committee has consistently taken the position that the highway trust fund shall be used only for highway construction. This position is reiterated in H.R. 14359 by specifically providing that authorizations for the Interstate System and the A–B–C program cannot be used to carry out the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, sections 131, 136, and 319(b), title 23, United States Code, or any provisions of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966.

The Highway Beautification Act prohibits use of the highway trust fund to carry out its provisions and authorizes appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury for the first 2 years. The administration has asked that this prohibition be repealed and has recommended that one point of the present automobile excise tax, along with such additional amounts from the general fund as may be necessary, be appropriated to the trust fund to finance the Highway Beautification Act and traffic and highway safety programs now being considered by the Congress. To insure that the already inadequate revenues of the trust fund will not be diverted from highway construction to other purposes, the bill provides that no moneys shall be appropriated from the trust fund to carry out the Highway Beautification Act or any highway safety legislation enacted after May 1, 1966, except to the extent that at least an equal amount of money, in the aggregate, shall have been first appropriated to the trust fund from the imposition of a 1-percent excise tax on automobiles or from the general fund.

STUDY OF ADVANCE ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

Another important provision of H.R. 14359 directs the Secretary of Commerce to make a full and complete investigation and study of advance acquisition of rights-of-way for future construction of highways on the Federal-aid system and to submit a report thereon, together with recommendations, to the Congress by January 10, 1967. The committee intends that this study and report include, but not be limited to, the advantages and disadvantages of advance right-of-way acquisition; the extent to which the several States now have legal authority to, and in fact do, acquire rights-of-way substantially in advance of highway construction and the sources and adequacy of funds for such purpose; the time required for removal and disposal of improvements located on rights-of-way and for the relocation of affected individuals, businesses, institutions, and organizations; the management of real property, after its acquisition and before its use for highway purposes, and the costs thereof, including but not limited to, costs of maintenance and preservation of the property, insurance, and taxes; methods that could be employed, by both the States and the Federal Government, for financing advance right-of-way acquisition, including the possible creation of special funds, either revolving or nonrevolving, for such purpose; the extent to

which Federal-aid funds should participate in the costs of advance acquisition of rights-of-way, including interest and holding charges, and in the costs of managing such properties until used for highway purposes; and the extent to which the Federal Government should share in the income produced by such properties.

The rural countryside adjacent to urban areas is rapidly being developed for residential subdivisions, shopping centers, and industrial parks. The few remaining empty lots in cities are disappearing fast, and old residences and commercial buildings are being razed to make way for new multistory office buildings and apartment houses. In many cases, State highway officials have been compelled to watch helplessly as unimproved land is developed with expensive structures and improved lands further developed, without being able to acquire those portions which they know will be needed for highway construction within a few years. Without the proper legal and financial tools highway officials are powerless to acquire such properties at a time when this could be done at minimum expense to the taxpayers. It is hoped that this study will chart the course for providing such tools.

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE STUDY

Highway construction in many urban areas has been plagued by problems of relocation of persons and businesses to be displaced by highway projects. Apparently, the existing provisions of law for relocation assistance have proved to be inadequate in some areas. H.R. 14359 directs the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the State highway departments, and other affected Federal and State agencies, to make a full and complete study and investigation to determine what action can and should be taken to provide additional relocation assistance for persons, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced by Federal-aid highway projects and to submit a report, together with recommendations, to the Congress by January 10, 1967.

The committee intends that the study include, among other things, consideration of payment of full relocation costs, rather than the maximum of $200 for an individual or family and $3,000 for a business, as now provided by Federal-aid highway law; the coordination of highway construction with other types of construction within an area; the feasibility of constructing within the highway right-of-way or upon adjacent property, publicly or privately owned buildings or other facilities to aid in the relocation of displaced persons, businesses, and nonprofit organizations; and the sources of financing and the sharing of costs of such land, buildings, and facilities.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, as ordered reported by the committee, contains other provisions to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, to increase the amount of funds available for the repair or reconstruction of highways damaged as the result of natural disasters, to authorize State highway departments to use consulting engineers in accordance with requirements prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, and to authorize the Secretary to make highway studies in Guam and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14359, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966. Each of us and each citizen of this great country recognizes the vast improvements which are taking place in our highway systems.

This legislation will continue highway development at a phased and orderly rate and provide for significant improvements in the fields of safety, beautification, relocation assistance, and highway design. This legislation authorizes funds for the next 2 years which are vital to the continued program of construction and improvement for the Interstate System as well as primary, secondary, and urban roads.

The Interstate System has conferred spectacular benefits on our country and on our people. Most citizens praise the ease, comfort, and time-saving advantages provided by this system which is still less than half completed and forget about other real and valuable benefits of the system.

In 1956 when we created this program, the Nation's industries were operating at less than capacity. Steel production, for example, was running about 38 percent of capacity. We passed this great act, and we have witnessed an upturn in our economy which is unprecedented.

The interstate program contributed heavily to this upswing. Construction of bridges and heavy duty highways required vast amounts of steel, concrete, and other building materials. The construction provided jobs for tens of thousands which in turn spread economic benefits throughout the free enterprise system.

With highway travel becoming more pleasant, people have found places to go, creating demands for automobiles, petroleum products, tires, motels, restaurants, and the vast portion of the economy devoted to recreation and tourism. Indeed, 92 percent of all intercity passenger travel is by highway.

The highways have opened up new and previously isolated areas where new and previously isolated areas where new industries are reviving dying villages and where rural areas are brought into direct contact with the centers of commerce and industry.

A very important benefit of the Interstate System has been the saving of human life. With only half of the interstate mileage open to traffic, experts estimate that more than 3,000 people are alive today who would have been killed last year alone if they had been required to make their trip over inadequately designed highways.

And the state of highway design for improved safety is increasing every day. These new safety features will be incorporated into the future mileage of the Interstate System and will be used to make improvements as well in the primary, secondary, and urban roads.

In considering these vast and enormous benefits, it behooves us to push for the most rapid completion of the Interstate System and the improvement and expansion of our primary and secondary roads.

The Federal-aid highway program, which was first conceived 50 years ago, has been a landmark in the relations between Federal Government and the States. It is fortunate that this Federal-State partnership has worked so well and has achieved a sound working operation.

We need this partnership now more than ever because the vast benefits of the Interstate System accelerate year by year and it is unthinkable that we do anything to halt or slow this climb.

Therefore, I urge adoption of H.R. 14359. It is an investment in an enterprise which guarantees returns all out of proportion to the costs involved. It is a guarantee of our national future whose existence depends largely on balanced transportation. It is a demand to meet our obligations to our people and to our future.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14359, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966. We are familiar with the many programs which are covered in this legislation, including the State highways, Federal aid to secondary roads, the forest highways and development roads and public lands highways and development roads; and certainly I want to join those who have spoken in support of these authorizations which will permit our highway and road development programs to continue at a realistic pace. All of these categories of roads are important to the Nation, to the State of California, and to the 19 counties of the Second Congressional District, which I am proud to represent.

There is, however, one category which I would like to discuss in detail because of the urgent need for a realistic and adequate program of financing the development of roads and trails in our national forests.

As many of my colleagues know, the Second Congressional District contains approximately 12,500,000 acres of national forest land, so I have reason to be intimately acquainted with the national forest problems of the State of California and the Nation as a whole.

We in the Second Congressional District and throughout California are particularly concerned that our forest resources be developed fully so as to contribute a full share toward the national economy and enjoyment of recreation by the American people. The national forest timber contributes to an industry which provides a great proportion of all

employment in my congressional district. As solid evidence of the impact of the timber industry upon the 19 counties of the Second Congressional District, I should point out to you that in the last calendar year, national forest timber sales alone accounted for approximately $14 million in revenues, a substantial factor in our economy and a substantial return to the Federal Government realized through sound management of one of our natural resources. Expanding the development of these roads which are relatively inexpensive-type roads will increase this return to the Federal Treasury. There are about 70 million acres of commercial timberland in California and about 9 million of these acres are publicly owned, principally within the national forests. This acreage of commercial timberland constitutes abount 17 percent of the total land area of our State. In some counties which I represent, national forest lands amount to as much as 75 to 80 percent and more of the land area.

On account of the intermingled nature of forest land ownership within the national forest area, it is desirable that, from the standpoint of economy, a single road system be developed to serve all needs. Public Law 88–657 provided the framework under which this road system can be systematically developed with each beneficiary sharing in costs. Such a road system should be constructed to standards needed to provide for all uses, not only timber. It is important, from a timing standpoint, that Federal funds be available to match private funding in building roads to these intermingled lands. I have been told that at the present rate of financing, it has been impossible to build all roads, constructed in connection with national forest timber sales, to maximum economy standards for full multiple use requirements. At the present level of financing more and more roads originally contemplated to require Federal financing have been shoved off on the timber operator and constructed as a condition of timber sale contract.

In addition to the timber resources in national forests, recreation, hunting, and fishing are needed to take care of our population. I should point out at this point that these national forests attracted a total of 13,916,000 visitor-days of recreation use during the last calendar year of 1965. I think you can readily appreciate the impact of recreation on the economy of our area and the importance of providing adequate access to these Federal lands which are used so heavily for recreation purposes. California's resources, especially recreation resources, are shared by the Nation as a whole.

It is unfortunate that we have not been able to finance forest development roads and trails to the extent contemplated in the "Program for the Development of the National Forests," which was submitted to the Congress by President Kennedy in 1962. I have asked the Forest Service for a statement regarding progress on this program and find that the accumulated authorizations for roads and trails up to fiscal year 1967 will lag behind the program by approximately $169 million. I have also been told that the contemplated 10-year level of financing for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 are $167 million and $169 million, respectively. Unless finances are substantially increased, many opportunities which exist for cooperative financing and for preserving resources value would be lost. I therefore recommend that authorization for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 be increased to $170 million each year as recommended by the committee. Thank you.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my full support for the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966, which is before this body today. The constantly increasing impact of the automobile on our society makes this legislation of utmost importance to the Nation, and I am sure our colleagues will recognize its importance by speedy passage of this measure.

There is an important provision in this bill to which I would like to call the attention of the House. This is section 6 which provides for an increased authorization of $170 million for the construction of forest development roads and trails. In 1961, President Kennedy called for completion of this program by 1972 and this is the first time we have had a sufficient authorization to meet that particular goal.

An adequate system of roads and trails is the essential key to the proper development and management of natural resources in the national forests. The same could be said of the Bureau of Land Management areas. An expanded program of this nature will be a genuine and important achievement in making available to the public large areas of heretofore inaccessible Forest Service acreage. It will provide multiple use access for many groups; including, the forest products industry, the camper, the fisherman seeking mountain lakes and streams, the hiker, and young students interested in forestry, biology, and wildlife.

In the beautiful First Congressional District, which I am pleased to be able to represent, we have a large portion of our total area in national forests areas under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. Already, this land provides us with excellent recreational areas, it furnishes the timber products industry with raw materials, it provides grazing land for cattle and it has not yet been developed to any significant extent. The bill before us today will help in that development.

I am especially pleased with the recommendations contained in this legislation to increase the authorization because I have been working for forest development roads and trails for more than 10 years—ever since my service on the board of supervisors of my home county in California.

For the inclusion of the increased authorization for forest access roads, I pay my particular compliments to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], who is chairman of our Roads Subcommittee, and also to the members of the committee, and in particular to Mr. JOHNSON of California, who actually came to our area to see firsthand some of the roadbuilding problems we have in these inaccessible areas. He has stood fast in supporting our request to accelerate the forest access roadbuilding program.

I would also like to express my support for section 9 of this bill, which provides emergency relief where a natural disaster damages or destroys any highway on government land. I am only too familiar with the need to provide for rapid and effective reconstruction after a major natural disaster, because of what has happened with destruction in my area and many other areas of the United States that were hit by disasters in the past few years.

I also want to extend my support for and applaud the gentlemen for the comments they have made about doing everything possible to accelerate the completion of the Interstate Highway System as close to "on schedule" as is possible.

The fact that the gentleman from Florida has so ably articulated some of the financial problems we have in completing the program on schedule demonstrates that all Members of this Congress are going to have to develop a coordinated effort to present our case to the Ways and Means Committee, asking them to give priority to finding the ways and means of financing the program. I would like to suggest that in addition to the cost of $8.921 billion that is authorized here and the $6 billion as outlined by Mr. CRAMER, we should take into consideration the problem of the loss of lives.

When we think in terms of developing a safety program—and I should like to emphasize the safety aspects—I do not know of any program which would provide more safety in America than one to accelerate the completion of the Interstate Highway System.

We are losing some 50,000 lives per year. This is more than we lose in all wars, and more than in the war in Vietnam. We are all concerned about bringing the boys back home, but we should also give attention to saving some lives at home. We in the Congress, in cooperation with the States, must continue to press for the earliest possible completion of the Interstate Highway System. All America will appreciate our efforts.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time in order to ask some questions of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA]. I should like to address the questions to him.

I might say to the gentleman that I have had reports from my district concerning recent highway hearings, in which it has been said that Ohio is not getting its fair share of Federal highway funds, because Ohio does not utilize all the funds which might be available, and it has been said that some of the funds have been reallocated to Arkansas and other States.

In order to set the record straight, is it true that all highway funds for the ABC system are allocated on the basis of a rigid formula set forth in the highway law, in which population, area, mileage of rural delivery and star routes, percentage of population and of the population of urban places are the deciding factors?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I shall be glad to answer the question.

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

Mr. HARSHA. As the gentleman knows, he has conferred with me on a number of occasions on this particular problem, and both he and I have made exhaustive research and inquiry into the problem.

I can say to the gentleman from Ohio, categorically, that Ohio has not lost any funds under the Federal aid highway program. The gentleman is absolutely correct in the fact that he cites that Federal secondary and primary funds are distributed to the various States on a very rigid formula set forth in title 23 of the United States Code.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

I have a further question. In conversations with the Bureau of Public Roads and the Ohio Department of Highways, I am informed that Ohio has always used every available Federal dollar authorized under the formula, and that this is true of every other State.

Does the gentleman know of any year in which Ohio or any other State failed to take advantage of all the Federal funds available?

Mr. HARSHA. If the gentleman will yield further, to my knowledge I know of no State, since the inception of this program, which has failed to take advantage of the funds allocated to it.

I do know that certainly Ohio has not failed to take advantage of them. But to the contrary has been very vigorous in its expedition of its highway program.

As a matter of fact, these funds are available not only in the year they are allocated, but also for the 2 succeeding fiscal years thereafter.

Mr. BOW. Let me ask the gentleman a further question. Is it true that allocations for secondary roads are made by State governments, so that there is some variation between the States, but in general it is a matter for local county officials to take advantage of whatever State and Federal funds may be available to the county?

Mr. HARSHA. If the gentleman will yield further, that is true. The Federal Government makes a 50-percent allocation toward the cost of these highways. It is solely up to the State to determine what highways will be built, and where they will be built, and how the State raises the additional 50 percent. The Federal Government does not instigate any action or activity in the Federal-aid highway program. It is a primary responsibility of each State to determine the location, and what highways will be constructed, and when.

Mr. BOW. In other words, it would be true generally that a county is responsible to raise its own matching funds to take advantage of Federal funds, and so it is a county responsibility whether that county receives for secondary roads all of the money that is available for it? That is in Ohio. Is that correct?

Mr. HARSHA. If the gentleman will yield further, this is the situation in Ohio. There is some variation in other States, but the Federal Government is not concerned with where the State gets the second 50 percent to the allocation of funds. In Ohio it is my understanding that the State contributes 25 percent and the counties are responsible for a 25-percent contribution also. Unless they make this 25 percent available, why, of course, the State may allocate this money to some other county. So the responsibility is on each county to make available the funds.

Mr. BOW. With regard to the primary system, I believe it is correct to say that the government of each State has the responsibility to determine what roads within the State shall be built or improved with primary system funds, so that if any area within a State feels that it has been deprived or is less favored than another area, that fault must lie upon the county or district officials within the State who have been unable to argue successfully in State councils where the division of highway funds is made. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, he is absolutely correct in this statement.

Mr. BOW. With regard to A–B–C moneys—the primary, secondary, and urban systems—is it not true that the functions of the Federal Government are limited to providing funds and making certain that State projects meet the guidelines of the Federal program? The Bureau of Public Roads does not determine where within a State the A–B–C funds are to be used?

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman if the gentleman will yield again, as I pointed out earlier, he is absolutely correct. It is the primary responsibility of the State and local governments to make this determination.

In response to a previous question, I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from records available from the Bureau of Public Roads the State of Ohio under the aggressive and vigorous leadership of Governor Rhodes is first in the Nation, that is, first in the Nation in having expended funds for the completion of interstate highways. In other words, Ohio expended more money on completed interstate highways than any other State in this Nation. It is second in the Nation, exceeded only by California, in the total Federal funds expended and obligated, for highway projects underway and completed.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for that information.

On page 11 of the committee report, I am pleased to note that Ohio is No. 1 among the States in projects completed on the Interstate System, having spent $1,176.4 million, as of March 31.

As many of us will recall, who were here in 1956 and later, the Interstate System was one part of the highway program where Members of Congress were able to take part in determining where the money would be spent. I note, for example, that over $200 million has been spent on Interstate 77, which will connect Cleveland and Canton with southeastern Ohio, West Virginia, and North Carolina. Interstate 77 was added to the system after the original plans were completed, largely if not solely on the insistence of the Members of the House directly concerned including, as I recall, our former colleague John Henderson, members of the Virginia and West Virginia delegations, and myself.

This system and the rapid advance of all highway construction under the Federal aid program is a lasting memorial to our beloved colleague from the 17th District of Ohio, the late Harry McGregor, who can be truly named the father of the interstate highway program. We are proud in Ohio of his sponsorship of this program and of the fact that Ohio is a leader among the States in making the McGregor dream a reality.

Our Governor of Ohio, James Rhodes, is to be congratulated for the manner in which he has carried out the highway program.

Mr. HARSHA. If the gentleman will yield further, I certainly agree with his conclusions. I would like to point out the first and second positions in the Nation I referred to previously in my colloquy with the gentleman dealt with the Interstate System. I would like the RECORD also to show as it applies to the secondary and primary, the A–B–C system, that Ohio is sixth in the Nation in total expenditure of Federal funds for completed projects under the A–B–C program and eighth in the Nation in total Federal funds expended and obligated for highways under the A–B–C program. So Mr. Chairman it should be obvious to everyone that Ohio has an enviable record in the highway construction field.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield for an addition to his statement?

Mr. BOW. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, another great Ohioan served as a ranking Republican on the Roads Subcommittee for years, a gentleman from whom I learned a great deal, former Representative Gordon Scherer, of Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his contribution. I neglected to point out that fact.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] and yield back to the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, it is hardly necessary for me to say that the pending Federal-aid highway bill has my

support. I must state, however, that I most earnestly believe that the proposed expenditure for highway beautification, as distinguished from the item with respect to outdoor advertising and junkyards control, should be deferred.

In addition to the $120 million already authorized for the current fiscal year 1967, the bill proposes an authorization of $135 million for fiscal 1968 and $150 million for fiscal 1969. This is in addition to the proposed expenditure of $40 million each year for control of outdoor advertising and elimination of junkyards.

Whatever the merit in making our highways beautiful, this certainly cannot be said to be an essential item—perhaps desirable but certainly not necessary in view of the extraordinary defense demands for the unforeseeable future and the mounting inflation from Government spending. In this connection I might add that I attended several meetings at the White House at which the President was critical of the Congress for spending too much. Here is a place where a saving can be made of several million dollars without a hardship being worked on anyone.

While I am interested in all phases of our highway program, as a member of the Armed Services Committee I am particularly interested in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. This national interstate highway program was first authorized in 1944 and developed in the historic Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

This nationwide program is a part of our defense program. Its purpose is to link our major cities from coast to coast, north and south, east and west, on the most direct route practicable. In all transportation, and in defense transportation particularly, it is imperative that we be able to go from one major point to another by the shortest route and in the fastest possible time.

That we have enjoyed such a high degree of success over these past 10 years in developing this Interstate Highway System has been due to the wisdom of our Public Works Committee in fixing the legal standards for the Interstate System, faithful adherence to those standards by the Federal Bureau of Roads, and the cooperation the Federal Government has in general received from the 50 States.

An important distinction must be made between the program for the National System of Interstate Highways and that for all other roads, primary and secondary. In the interstate program the national interest is paramount over any State or local interests. At no time should State or local interests be allowed to prevail over that of the national interest.

That is why the Federal Government bears 90 percent of the construction costs of the Interstate System and the States only 10 percent.

In the program for primary and secondary roads it is the State and local needs and interests that are paramount to the national. Here the primary consideration is to what is needed locally rather than nationally. And, in keeping with this premise, the Federal aid to the States is on a 50–50 basis.

As a matter of fact, it is clearly set forth in the "declaration of policy" in the very first section of the first chapter of the United States Code—title 23—relative to Federal-aid highways that the Interstate System should take priority and that the national interest is paramount.

We also stipulated that in the Interstate System routes through the States and across the Nation shall be as direct as practicable: "as the crow flies," if you will.

This obviously means that the individual States must forgo what they might like, or what some locality within a State might like, that the national objective of direct routes be served. At no time and under no circumstances, for the success of the national interstate highway program, can a purely local interest, be it economic or political, be allowed to prevail over the national needs.

As a representative from the State of Illinois I am embarrassed to have to say that the Governor of our great State would have the Federal Bureau of Roads depart from this well-established principle. While I am anxious to advance the interests of my home State of Illinois, I do not believe I am serving the interests of the people of Illinois when I do not most vigorously protest the action taken by our Governor which is inimical to the best interests of all 50 States.

Approximately 10 years ago the Federal Bureau of Roads approved the interstate route, as directed as any route could possibly be, between St. Louis and Chicago. It is known as Interstate 55. It is presently in various stages of construction.

Suddenly, to the complete surprise of everyone, the State of Illinois submitted in August of last year an official request for a change in the route. It means an abandonment of some of the interstate mileage that has already been constructed. And yet it is part of our national policy to construct the Interstate System as quickly as possible. It means an extension of the interstate route by 30 miles. And yet it is part of our national policy to keep these interstate defense routes as direct and as short as possible. And, of course, this would represent substantial additional cost to the Federal Government.

I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the time nor place to argue the relative merits of what has been proposed for an interstate highway in Illinois and the change that is now proposed. This is something to be argued with the Federal Bureau of Roads. We have done this in detail with the able Commissioner of Federal Highways present.

But, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, what should be an economic and engineering decision is apparently going to be a political one. The question to be resolved, whether to approve or disapprove the change proposed by the Governor, has been pending for over a year. I am not only amazed that our Governor recommended the change, for reasons no one can understand, except possibly to serve some local economic or political interests; but, I am also amazed to find that this whole matter has been placed in the White House, or perhaps more accurately, taken out of the hands of the Federal Bureau of Roads by the White House.

I have talked with a representative of the White House, Governor Bryant, on two occasions on this subject, and the only satisfaction I can obtain from him is that the matter is still pending.

Were it left to the Commissioner of Federal Highways to decide, I feel certain he would resolve this problem on the merits of the case. He would, I believe, insist that Interstate 55 in Illinois proceed as originally approved by the Bureau 10 years ago. It will be a sad day for our interstate highway program, designed to serve the Nation as a whole, if decisions with respect to it are to be made solely on a political basis to serve political needs in any of the States.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the committee for taking up your time on a matter of this character. But I think you would want to know and should know that a very fine program is being sabotaged by the interjection of politics in some of the decisions. I am embarrassed that the Governor of my home State should be instrumental in seeking a national political decision to satisfy a purely local political purpose at the expense of a program of this character so essential to our national defense planning and effectiveness.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that this proposed relocation would cost additional sums of money from the highway funds?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes, it would increase costs for we already have spent millions of dollars in preparing for the eventual construction of this particular highway now known as Route I–55.

Mr. McCLORY. I am particularly interested in the subject of funds for our interstate and Federal-aid highways because I have a communication here from Mr. Francis S. Lorenz, director of the Department of Public Works and Buildings, State of Illinois, in which he brings out the fact that unless this legislation is enacted, it will be impossible for the State of Illinois to authorize any contract lettings after September 16. I am extremely interested in the enactment of this legislation to provide additional funds and especially funds for necessary highway construction in Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The original plan would have obviated the necessity for the State of Illinois to ask for additional funds for construction of I–55 since they now plan to change a route involving the building of over 30 more miles. This necessitates additional funding.

That is a plan which is being followed throughout my district where the route long ago was established and the specifications made. Now to find that we are going to make a big change, I say that if this change of interstate routes can be made in the State of Illinois, it can

be done in every State of the United States of America. It is wrong and is as wrong as can be when we recall what the original concept of our Interstate Highway System was to be.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is correct. If this authorization is not passed in the near future, the States will not have available the needed apportionments so that they can let contracts in the time to get the job done.

Mr. ARENDS. I have no quarrel with the committee, and I apologize in a way for having brought this up at this time but it was my only alternative. We face a decision about to be made on a political basis rather than on the basis of a highway system which was determined a long time ago, a program which the Bureau of Roads would like, in my opinion, to follow if permitted so to do.

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

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, the subject of Federal aid to highways, and the Federal-Aid Highway Act in particular, is of particular significance to the State of Illinois. I am sure that every Member of this body recognizes the importance of motor-vehicle transportation to our economy and the need for Federal assistance in the building of adequate roads to insure the smooth flow of interstate and intrastate commerce, as well as to provide our citizens with convenient motor travel.

However, Mr. Chairman, the passage of this legislation today is more than a matter of economic importance to the people of Illinois; it is also a matter of utmost urgency. I am informed by the Honorable Francis S. Lorenz, director of the Illinois Department of Public Works and Buildings, that the remainder of Federal-aid highway funds available for fiscal 1967 is barely enough to see the Department through the next contract letting period beginning September 16. I am sure that many other States are similarly situated.

Mr. Chairman, unless congressional action is completed on this legislation by October 1, and funds appropriated for fiscal 1968, the proposed contract letting for the period beginning October 28 will have to be canceled or postponed. I hope such a step will not have to be taken by the State of Illinois or any other State concerned with maintaining a program of highway construction capable of serving the Nation's economy and the needs of its citizens. I urge favorable action on this legislation so that Illinois and the other 49 States can get on with the important job of highway construction.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to commend our friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], chairman of this Subcommittee on Public Works, together with his associates, for the very fine job that they have done back through the years. It is their foresight which has contributed greatly to the progress we have made with the Interstate Highway System. I know they, too, wish that the trust funds set aside for highways were sufficient to further increase the mileage.

However, I take this time to point out some other things to which I believe the American people and the Congress might give some thought. We need highways and we need them now. Certainly the action taken some 10 years ago, when taxes closely tied to the use for highways were set up, a trust fund for highway construction was sound. However, I would go further and say that in this day of specialization, when we find that practically everyone in our various States is specializing, be it in agriculture or whatever it is, we have become a nation of interstate traffic. Funds that seemed ample then are not sufficient today.

Our legislature has recently taken action to try to meet the problem—but it will be next to impossible to keep up with the increased numbers of automobiles, trucks, and other vehicles which use our highways.

We have traffic jams regularly on at least four major highways in my district, and I know there is hardly any better way that we might invest the income of our country. As I pointed out in support of my successful motion to override President Eisenhower's second veto of the public works appropriation in 1959, the more our problems the greater the need to at least look after and develop our own country. I feel that way about highways.

In my own district, covering north Mississippi, we need highways not merely to meet future development, but to handle the needs of the present.

I am not a candidate for Governor, and I have no intention of being a candidate; but I have frequently said that if I were, I would certainly run on a platform of building highways, by borrowing if need be, so the highways could help pay for themselves. Pay-as-you-go is fine, but there, as here, growth in people, in cars, and in traffic, make pay-as-you-go too slow for sound economics.

We need to go ahead with the construction of the adequate highway system which is so badly needed and let the increased development which will follow make such highways a sound investment.

We, as a nation, are committed around the world to support of foreign aid and many other programs, most of which I have opposed. We would be much smarter if we, as a Congress, the President, and the Bureau of the Budget, would recognize that in effect the Federal Government has preempted the income tax of the American people to a degree that it is next to impossible to raise sufficient funds at the local level on behalf of the States, and as much as I hate to see many things become federalized, we have grown as a nation in such a way that our traffic is in interstate commerce. We are each so dependent upon the other that I trust this committee will in its studies and recommendations give thought to this problem.

This fine committee, in the studies that it generally makes, I am sure will give attention to recommending using funds in addition to trust funds, where needed, to expand the Federal system, because circumstances as I have pointed out are making the need for interstate highways greater and greater? The situation has changed from that of a few years ago.

It is said that there is a new baby born each 12 seconds and a new car comes off the assembly line each 8 seconds. As to that I don't know but an increase of 3½ million people each year adds to highway needs, I know.

I again commend my friends on the committee—for the fine job and foresight which they have shown. May I ask what current studies are being carried on by the committee, or under its supervision, as to the continuing need or planning for roads and highways, over and above that on which the committee has done such a good job in the bill before us?

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

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] asked earlier, in answer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], I would say that, acting under the authority of the existing law, through the Bureau of Public Roads, we have a report to the Congress in January of 1968, and every second calendar year thereafter, to give us an estimate of the future highway needs of the Nation. They are doing an excellent job in the Bureau of Public Roads and in the Commerce Department.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

I believe the feeling I express here is rather general and should be considered in connection with any such study. I believe it will be found that the American people have come to recognize that travel and movement of things and people has become interstate; and in order to handle the job properly we will have to look for finances in addition to those of the trust fund with which the gentleman is dealing with here.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to express my public support for the provisions of H.R. 14359, the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1966. Ten years have now passed since the enactment of the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act—legislation which converted the Interstate System from an idea to a concrete fact through the most far-reaching road construction program in the history of the world. A total of 21,377 miles of the Interstate System was

completed and open to traffic on March 31 with work on another 17,068 miles underway. Thus, some form of work has been completed or is in progress on 38,445 miles, or 94 percent, of the entire 41,000-mile system. We are well on the way to the completion of this tremendous undertaking, and the Congress must do its part to see that the necessary funds continue to be available.

Highway transportation today accounts for over 90 percent of intercity travel of our citizens, and now accounts for over 300 billion ton-miles of goods transported annually. Americans will spend about $100 billion this year for highway-related travel and transportation expenses—about one-seventh of our gross national product. Such statistics make it abundantly clear that support for better roads is absolutely essential for the economic and social well-being of the Nation now and in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 should go a long way toward satisfying the transportation needs of this and future generations. Although I have doubt about the desirability of all the authorizations under section 8 of the bill in view of present conditions, I am happy to voice my full support for all the other sections.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of Birmingham, Ala., the largest urban area in the State, I support H.R. 14359, the highway bill now pending before the House.

This bill includes funds for the A–B–C Federal highway aid program which allocates Federal funds to the States for road construction in urban areas, as well as for primary and secondary highway construction.

In the bill now before the House, an allocation is included in the amount of $3,361,000 specifically for the construction of urban roads in the State of Alabama for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. Under the same program, $3,255,671 was allocated for urban roads in Alabama for 1966.

These funds are of importance to cities like Birmingham. Under the program, the only restriction is that roads, to be eligible for the Federal funds, in an urban area, must be part of the State primary and secondary highway system. Because of the many connecting roads traversing the city which are part of these systems, these funds can be a major factor in the building and improvement of our major highway arteries in Birmingham.

Under the A–B–C highway program, the plans for urban road construction and improvement developed at the local level must be submitted to the Alabama State Highway Department for approval, and State approval is required before Federal funds can be used for this construction.

Federal funds, upon State approval of a proposed urban project, are then available to the State on a matching—50–50—basis, and these funds are drawn, not from the general Federal tax fund, but from the highway trust fund which consists of moneys from some of the Federal highway-user funds, and places the highway program on a self-supporting, pay-as-you-build basis. Allocations to each State are also based on a mileage population formula.

The funds allocated in the bill now before the House for the State of Alabama for construction and improvement of highways and roads in Birmingham and other urban areas in the State for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 assure the availability of funds for any urban road development and improvement which may be scheduled and approved at the State level through fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Public Works Committee on the excellent job they have done on this bill.

The Interstate Highway System is the backbone of our Nation's economy. Completion of the system as close to the originally scheduled date as possible is essential if we are going to continue making the rapid economic and social progress we have made in the last decade. Approval of this bill will enable us to provide the transportation essential in the years immediately ahead.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear, however, that while the present Interstate System has contributed greatly to our recent economic growth, much more will need to be done above and beyond the scope of the present Interstate Highway System, as presently conceived. Significant gaps remain. Entire new communities have come into existence since the Interstate System was first approved. We must, therefore, take steps now to provide for a substantial extension of the present system unless we are willing to risk the stagnation of our growing economy.

In south Florida the extension of two interstate highways is essential to the continued orderly growth in the area as well as to the defense of our country. Interstate 95 must be extended from its present terminus in Miami south to Key West. Interstate 75 should be extended from its present terminus at Tampa southeastward to Miami.

Every economic indicator and study shows that the area between Miami and Key West will be among the fastest growing in the country. Half a million people presently live in this area and it is estimated that in the next 25 years as many as 2 million people may live south of the city of Miami.

It is obvious that I–95 must be extended to this area to provide not only the backbone of its urban transportation system, but more importantly as an access route to interstate commerce.

Even today there is tremendous need for the extension of this highway to the southern part of Dade County. Many of the fresh vegetables you will enjoy this winter come from the truck farms of southern Dade County. A large proportion of these vegetables are carried by truck, and the present trend would indicate that this percentage will increase.

More important than any of these reasons is the need for the extension of I–95 and I–75 to provide defense against the nearest Communist country to the continental United States. Both the Key West Naval Base and Homestead Air Force Base are the vanguard of our defense against threatened or real Communist aggression from Cuba. Key West, which is only 90 miles from Cuba is presently connected to the mainland by only a single aging two-lane highway. The Cuban missile crisis clearly indicated that this road was not enough.

The only direct threat to the security of the mainland United States in the last 152 years was that the two rail lines and the single existing interstate highway are inadequate to provide the men and materiel necessary for the defense of south Florida in the event of another crisis centered in the Caribbean. It is for this reason as well as because of the expanding commerce between Tampa and Miami that I–75 should be extended to Miami as soon as possible.

Last year in a joint resolution we provided for a continuing study by the Bureau of Public Roads to determine the future highway needs of the country. I urge the Bureau and its able Director, Rex Whitton, to include these two extensions not only in their study but in their recommendations to the Congress.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for H.R. 14395, which we are considering. As a member of the House Public Works Committee, I had the opportunity to actively work for this measure in the committee, and I firmly believe it will contribute much to the rapid development of and improvement of our highway system and to the safety of motorists.

I am happy to say that my own State of Iowa is one of the States that has made unusually rapid progress in the utilization of Federal highway aid funds. This bill which we are considering will accelerate construction by providing additional funds, thus eliminating possible delays in the full development of interstate highways. Second, this bill incorporates the requirement that the system maintain a minimum of at least four lanes and also incorporates a provision for wide bridges, and additional lanes in regions where the need exists because of increased traffic.

Another key provision provides for regular biennial authorization for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, for the regular Federal-aid highway program. This will enable the Iowa Highway Commission to continue its efforts to provide vitally needed four-lane expressways. I strongly support this provision which is of vital importance to the residents of my district.

Finally, I believe approval of this bill will contribute much to the safety of all motorists. Statistics have shown the significant decrease in tragic automobile fatalities on modern four-lane, controlled-access highways. The full development of our Nation's highway system is a vital part of our national effort to end the slaughter on our Nation's highways. Passage of this bill and the pending safety legislation, I believe, will bring us closer to the day when families will not be torn by the tragic loss of a loved one killed in an unsafe car or an outdated road.

For these reasons, I strongly endorse H.R. 14359, and I commend my colleagues on the Public Works Committee and the staff for their fine job on this important legislation.

The section relating to authorization for funds for highway beautification can be deferred until positive action is forthcoming on needed tax reforms to eliminate longstanding loopholes. I have introduced several measures including a major bill to reduce the indefensible oil depletion allowance. I urge the President to stimulate his departments to issue reports on my tax reform measures. When this is done, we can adequately fund this worthwhile beautification program on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I want to make two observations in respect to H.R. 14359, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966.

First I want to once again express my disapproval of the highway beautification section. I voted against it when the proposal first came before us. I shall vote against it again.

There are several grounds for my opposition: I think the basic bill treats unfairly landowners with billboard sites but who have not erected boards as compared with those who have. I think, as a matter of fact, that the bill is close to being unconstitutional. Further, the costs involved are not capable of being calculated and the fund allocation formula is unjust to some States.

As important as any is my objection to spending about one-quarter of a billion dollars a year during a time of developing inflationary trends and rising costs of the war in Vietnam which are approaching the rate of about $2 billion a month. We should curtail rather than expand unnecessary or deferrable Federal spending and this program is certainly not necessary at this time, much as we all support beauty.

So I support the motion to recommit the bill with instructions to delete the highway beautification authorization. But I shall support the bill with or without the highway beautification provisions.

The adequate development of roads and trails within national forests is of vital importance to Oregon and this bill increases the authorization to $170 million—double the present amount. These national forests are important to Oregon in many ways. Forest-related industry is the primary economic base in Oregon and valuable commercial timberlands are included in the national forests. Besides timber, the national forests are areas for hunting and fishing.

For years I have contended that forest roads should be built by appropriated funds rather than by the timber operators. Standards can be better controlled, the small purchasers can better compete with the big companies for timber, and the timber can still bear the cost of building the road to the grade necessary for logging because timber revenues will increase.

In 1962, President Kennedy sent to the Congress a "Program for the Development of the National Forests." The report envisioned an adequate and satisfactory long-range program of financing forest development of roads and trails. However, we have not been able to finance this adequately.

This has a number of implications. One, for example, is that if financing of these roads is inadequate then the cost is placed upon timber operators who work the forests—or the roads do not get built and opportunities are lost for developing and protecting natural resources. But, if financing provisions are adequate, then cooperative financing arrangements involving both the Federal Government and the timber operators can be established.

Intensive management of secondary-growth timber stands cannot be practiced unless there is an adequate forest road network in place. In my State of Oregon alone, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management could harvest somewhere between 500 million and 1 billion board feet of additional timber a year merely from the thinning of secondary-growth stands and salvage cuts in other stands. In the face of growing pressures brought on by export of logs to Japan, by rising log costs and falling lumber and plywood prices, the accessibility of these timber stands through an adequate road net is still another factor to consider.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see in this bill the natural disaster legislation already passed by the House but not, so far, acted on by the Senate. Oregon has been through a terrible windstorm and a terrible flood in recent years. These liberalized provisions for Federal assistance in times of trouble must become law.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, while I listened with interest to the colloquy between my colleagues from Ohio [Mr. Bow and Mr. HARSHA] here on the floor of the House today with respect to the Interstate Highway System in Ohio, it brought to my mind a road-paving project in my own district. The project to which I refer is the paving of Dorothy Lane, Dayton, Ohio, which was begun several months ago.

I am a property owner on Dorothy Lane and at first suffered along with my neighbors the inconvenience of not being able to get into my driveway. The 3-week period the driveway was supposed to be blocked extended to several months so I decided to inquire from the Bureau of Public Roads as to the cause of the unreasonable delay.

I asked about the roadbed which permitted a drop-off of from 2 to 3 feet which was left open to traffic and thereby created a hazard. I had had complaints from residents and businessmen, not only about the inconvenience, but the money lost by business. I feel sure this situation could have been planned with greater efficiency. In light of the intent to keep the road open to traffic, the length of the paving plans on the north side of Dorothy Lane was most unreasonable.

In response to my letter to the Bureau of Public Roads, Mr. Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, replied:

Secondary Road Plan projects are not routinely inspected by the Bureau of Public Roads. During the investigation of this situation, our division office noted one aspect of the work which should be improved.

Neither the construction plans nor the specifications specifically limited the length of highway which could be closed to abutting property at any one time. Consequently the contractor excavated approximately three miles along the north side of Dorothy Lane with the intent of paving that entire length at one time.

Weather and utility delays unfortunately set back the contractor's operations.

Our division office will refer this matter to the State and ask that they establish a more thorough review of traffic maintenance procedures for urban secondary projects. This should result in a minimum period of delay to the abutting properties.

Mr. Chairman, I bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues to keep the record straight and in the hope that it may serve to prevent residents and businessmen in other cities from suffering the same inconveniences and financial losses to businesses.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will join with me in supporting the Federal-Aid Highway Act, H.R. 14359, the measure we have before us today.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the substitute amendment in the bill as an original bill for purposes of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966".

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $1,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $3,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the additional sum of $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1969, the additional sum of $4,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the additional sum of $4,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the additional sum of $4,306,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the appropriation of any sums to carry out section 131, 136, or 319(b) of this title, or any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966."

AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF COST ESTIMATE FOR APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make the apportionment for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and 1969, of the sums authorized to be appropriated for such years for expenditures on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, using the apportionment factors contained in table 5 of House Document Numbered 42, Eighty-ninth Congress.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETION OF SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) The second paragraph of section 101(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "fifteen years" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixteen years" and by striking out "June 30, 1971", and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1972".

(b) The introductory phrase and the second and third sentences of section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, are amended by striking "1971" where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1972", and such section 104(b)(5) is further amended by striking "fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.", at the end of the penultimate sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal years ending June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972."

FOUR-LANING THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 5. Section 109(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "except that such standards shall provide for not less than four traffic lanes for the main traveled way of the Interstate System."

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code, the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) For the Federal-aid primary system and the Federal-aid secondary system and for their extension within urban areas, out of the highway trust fund, $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the appropriation of any sums to carry out section 131, 136, or 319(b) of this title, or any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966. The sums authorized in this paragraph for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system;

(B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and

(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary highway systems in urban areas.

(2) For forest highways $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(3) For public lands highways $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(4) For forest development roads and trails, $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(5) For public lands development roads and trails, $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(6) For park roads and trails, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(7) For parkways, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(8) For Indian reservation roads and bridges, $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

SEC. 7. (a) The last sentence of subsection (m) of section 131, and the last sentence of subsection (m) of section 136, of title 23, United States Code, are each amended to read as follows: "The provisions of chapter 1 of this title relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid primary highway funds shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section after June 30, 1967."

(b) The last sentence of subsection (b) of section 319 of title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The provisions of chapter 1 of this title relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid primary highway funds shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection after June 30, 1967."

(c)(1) Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 137. Limitation on authorization of appropriations for certain purposes

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, neither sections 131, 136, and 319(b) of this title, nor any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966, shall be construed to be authority for any appropriations for any fiscal year for which appropriations are not specifically authorized by fiscal year in such sections or provisions.

(b) Any appropriation to carry out section 131, 136, or 319(b) of this title or any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966, must be authorized by a provision of law, specifically setting forth the total amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year to carry out such section or other provision of law.

"(c) The highway trust fund established by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 shall not be available for any appropriation to carry out sections 131, 136, and 319(b) of this title, and any provision of law realting to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966, in an aggregate amount which exceeds the amount of tax that would be imposed under section 4061(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 if such section imposed a tax at the rate of 1 per centum plus such additional amounts as are appropriated from the general fund to the highway trust fund for such purposes, but the total of all appropriations made from such fund to carry out these sections and provisions of law shall never exceed the total of all appropriations made to such fund based on the imposition of such tax plus such additional amounts as are appropriated from the general fund to the highway trust fund for such purposes."

(2) The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"137. Limitation on authorization of appropriations for certain purposes."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BEAUTIFICATION

SEC. 8. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 131 of title 23, United States Code, not to exceed $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 136 of title 23, United States Code, not to exceed $28,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 319(b) of title 23, United States Code, not to exceed $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not to exceed $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

EMERGENCY RELIEF

SEC. 9. (a) The last proviso of subsection (f) of section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(c) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "Subject to the following limitations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to establish the fund authorized by this section and to replenish it on an annual basis: (1) not more than $50,000,000 is authorized to be expended in any one fiscal year to carry out this section except that if in any fiscal year the total of all expenditures under this section is less than $50,000,000, the unexpended balance of such amount shall remain available for expenditure during the next two succeeding fiscal years in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section in such years, and (2) 60 per centum of the expenditures under this section for any fiscal year are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund and the remaining 40 per centum of such expenditures are authorized to be appropriated only from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall take effect July 1, 1966.

STUDY OF ADVANCE ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

SEC. 10. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of the advance acquisition of rights-of-way for future construction of highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, with particular reference to the provision of adequate time for the removal and disposal of improvements located on rights-of-way and the relocation of affected individuals, businesses, institutions, and organizations, the tax status of such property after acquisition and before its use for highway purposes, and the methods for financing advance right-of-way acquisition by both the State governments and the Federal Government, including the possible creation of revolving funds for such purpose. The Secretary shall submit a report of the results of such study to Congress not later than January 10, 1967, together with his recommendations.

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 11. Subsection (a) of section 302 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In meeting the provisions of this subsection, a State may engage, to the extent it deems necessary or desirable, the services of private engineering firms, subject to requirements prescribed by the Secretary."

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE STUDY

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the State highway departments, and other affected Federal and State agencies, a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining what action can and should be taken to provide additional assistance for the relocation and reestablishment of persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations to be displaced by construction of projects on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, and to submit a report of the findings of such study and investigation, together with recommendations, to the Congress not later than January 10, 1967. The study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to—

(1) the need for additional payments or other financial assistance to such displaced persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organization, and the extent to which the making of such payments and the providing of other financial assistance should be mandatory;

(2) the feasibility of constructing, within the right-of-way of a highway or upon real property adjacent thereto acquired for such purposes, publicly or privately owned buildings, improvements, or other facilities to aid in the relocation of such displaced persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations;

(3) the extent to which the costs of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements and other facilities should be paid from the highway trust fund; and

(4) sources of funds to pay the portion of the costs of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements and other facilities, which is not properly chargeable to the highway trust fund.

HIGHWAY STUDY—GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the government of Guam and the government of the Virgin Islands is hereby authorized to make studies of the need for, and estimates and planning surveys relative to, highway construction programs for Guam and the Virgin Islands.

(b) On or before January 10, 1967, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a report to the Congress which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the adequacy of present highway programs to provide satisfactory highways in both the rural and urban areas in Guam and the Virgin Islands;

(2) specific recommendations as to a program for the construction of highways throughout Guam and the Virgin Islands; and

(3) a feasible program for implementing such specific recommendations, including cost estimates, recommendations as to the sharing of cost, responsibilities, and other pertinent matter.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until expended, the sum of $150,000 for the purpose of making the studies, surveys, and report authorized by subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendments at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVENGER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVENGER: On page 10, after line 23 add a new section, and renumbering the following sections:

"SEC. 6. Section 129 of title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) The Secretary may permit the participation of interstate funds apportioned to any State under the provisions of section 104(b)(5) of this chapter to aid in the retirement of the principal outstanding bonds the proceeds of which have actually been expended in the construction of any toll bridge, tunnel, or road on the Interstate System, which was constructed on or prior to the date of enactment of this Act. Any State desiring to use interstate funds under this subsection shall substitute the mileage for such toll bridge, tunnel, or road for an equivalent designated mileage on the Interstate System within the State. Such toll bridge, tunnel, or road shall meet the standards adopted for projects on the Interstate System. The Federal share payable under this subsection shall be the same as for the construction of projects on the Interstate System. No interstate funds shall be obligated under this subsection until the State highway department or departments have entered into an agreement with the Secretary providing that such bridge, tunnel, or road shall be maintained and operated by the State highway department or departments as a free bridge, tunnel, or road upon the retirement of the outstanding bonds.'"

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this chance to speak to a very perplexing question, a question that arises every time we talk about the Interstate System. The question is whether this Interstate System is going to be a free system or whether it is going to be a toll system. I have part of the Interstate System in my district. I have many miles of interstate roadway. But on one small part of the Interstate System, and a part of the Interstate System, I have a bridge called the Mackinac Bridge. It costs us $3.75 to go one way cross this bridge, and it costs us $7.50 for a roundtrip.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit the States to use part of their allocations of funds to pay off the bonds so that these toll facilities would be free. This includes not only the Mackinac Bridge, but also toll facilities in Illinois, Oklahoma, New York, and every other State that has toll facilities as part of the Interstate System.

I know the members of the committee have studied this problem, and are currently studying it. I know people are going to say, "We cannot do it now; we must have a study." There have been four or five studies of this. Every time we get to the point of trying to get a free Interstate System we have a study to determine why it should not remain partly free.

This amendment will not increase the amount of interstate mileage. It will not change the standards of the Interstate System. All it will do is permit a person who is on the Interstate System to go from one part of the system to another part of the system without paying a toll.

In Michigan, since the completion of the Mackinac Bridge, which was completed just as the Interstate System was starting, we have spent about $400 million for bridges on the Interstate System. Right now the lower part of Michigan has a bridge being built on the Interstate System which is costing more per foot than the Mackinac Bridge. It is a part of the same system. It is a part of the same State. However, people in one part of the State ride for nothing, while people going to another part of the State have to pay $7.50 and, in the case of trucks, something more than $30.

What do we have when toll facilities are a part of the system? I am not talking about toll facilities off the system, but toll facilities as a part of the system, whether that be the Chicago Skyway or the New York Tollway. We say that the drivers on this system who cross these toll facilities pay twice. They pay once when they pay into the trust fund, and they pay again when they put their dollars into the toll baskets.

One of the primary purposes of the bill we are considering is to recognize that we have to complete the system and that in order to complete it we have to raise more money.

All I say is that if we are going to complete the system we should use the funds, and we should raise an adequate amount of funds to complete the system, but we should do it so that the system will be entirely free and not part toll and part free.

We have to face this decision, and I believe the time to face the decision is now.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Can the gentleman from Michigan tell us from where he contemplates the funds would come?

Mr. CLEVENGER. From the trust fund.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. That is a rather broad statement, because everyone wants to tap the trust fund at a time when we are already in arrears in meeting the financial requirements to complete this program on time. I am sure the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will offer some comments on this.

Can the gentleman tell me whether he came before our Roads Subcommittee with this suggestion?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I introduced a bill with the understanding that it could be offered as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Could the gentleman also tell me whether he attended any of the hearings held in our Roads and Federal-Aid Subcommittees relating to the overall effect toll roads, bridges, and tunnels have on the Interstate System?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Yes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I did not see the gentleman before our Roads Subcommittee which would hear the testimony on behalf of his amendment. It is sort of difficult for him to come in with an amendment on the floor, when the committee has not had an opportunity to evaluate his recommendation. This is the first time I have heard of his particular amendment. This problem has been

the subject of lengthy hearings before our Federal-Aid Subcommittee. We held lengthy hearings before our Roads Subcommittee on this bill—that would have been the time to appear so we could give proper consideration to any recommendations he might have.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The trust fund is now $6 billion short, to finish the balance of the free system by 1973. There seems to be no inclination to put more money into the trust fund through additional taxes to do that job.

From where will the money come to do the $5 billion additional job of paying off existing toll roads and bridges?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am prepared to support legislation to get the funds.

Mr. CRAMER. Has the President made any such proposal? I am sure that he has not.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I cannot speak for him.

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

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

This administration and the previous administrations have all recommended against toll road reimbursement at this time. So I think that the gentleman from Michigan is doing nothing more than wishful thinking, No. 1. No. 2, reimbursement for toll and free roads incorporated into the Interstate System would cost over $4 billion when we are $6 billion in the red already. No. 3, there is little leadership to do something about the $6 billion deficit to finish the present system let alone to provide the additional $4 billion to do anything about toll and free road reimbursement. So I think some people who are pressing the question of toll road reimbursement ought to take equal leadership in pressing people to do something about this $6 billion deficit with regard to the present system of 41,000 miles that has not been completed. If more money is not made available, it will not be completed until 1975. That is the high priority job we have and not returning money for highways which are already constructed on a toll road basis, or authorizing new mileage to States in my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan be defeated as it has consistently been defeated in the Committee on Public Works of the House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at the inception of the Interstate System originally the proposition that this amendment raises was considered at that time, in 1944 and in 1946. It has been a matter of consistent consideration by the Committee on Public Works in connection with its biennial bill which has been reported by the Congress since 1944. Without exception there has never been a State that petitioned the Congress to change the formula and to provide funds for the acquisition of bridges and highways which were utilized as toll facilities. Consequently, AASHO has been consistent in its stand in opposition to this.

Mr. Chairman, this would cause untold turmoil and upset the orderly procedures of programing and financing at local levels and have other disruptive effects that would defeat the whole aim of the completion of the Interstate System.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not be put to the task of trying to evaluate these highways and bridges on the Interstate System. This would cause a disruption of the work now proceeding toward the completion of this system. The problems are huge in trying to bring about the completion of the present 41,000 miles on the target date. If we have to assume obligations that are not envisioned in present law and if this amendment were to pass, I will assure you that we can figure on a decided delay in the completion of this program.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. The gentleman from Alabama is certainly one of the more knowledgeable members of our committee. Would not the net effect of this amendment be just one more raid on the trust fund which we are trying to protect?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It would be more injurious than just a raid on the trust fund. It would mean that you would disrupt the plans of the State of California and other States that have toll roads that would come into the system. Consequently you would have an interruption in the type of program that we want. Also it has a relationship to the total scheme of development of the Interstate System.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. As I read the gentleman's amendment, it is fatally defective, also, in this respect: It does not provide for additional mileage at a later date as reimbursement.

Mr. Chairman, it does not suggest additional funds for reimbursement. It says that you can take the regular apportionment, interstate apportionment, and use them to pay for toll roads and bridges.

Mr. Chairman, that means that if we should do this, the Interstate System is going to be destroyed. A State will not have enough money to finish its interstate mileage within the time period for completion by 1973; is not that correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Not only that, but I will say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] that when you buy up all of these bonds that are issued at the high interest rates that we shall be paying, that is going to represent another capital cost that the Federal Government is going to be obligated to pay.

So, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why under the present arrangement we cannot continue a very satisfactory arrangement of highway construction.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Alabama yield further?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield further to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, even if reimbursement were a sound approach, this approach is wrong. It is wrong to use construction funds, that otherwise would go to finish the 41,000-mile system, to pay for existing toll roads and bridges.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of anyone who has shown a greater concern about this matter than the chairman of our subcommittee. The gentleman has done a magnificent job and has had a situation in the State of Illinois into which the gentleman has gone very thoroughly with the subcommittee. The gentleman is of the opinion that he should not press the matter, because the gentleman wanted to have additional studies made.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to say that the committee is not going to be receptive to the needs of the State highway departments, or to those roads that can probably be utilized in the Interstate System as the necessity arises.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we will not insist upon the amendment, because as I have stated previously, I believe it would do irreparable harm to an orderly program that is now proceeding on a steady course.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank my senior colleagues on the committee for pointing out some of the limitations in the proposed amendment. However, I feel that the gentleman from Michigan is to be commended for bringing before the House one of the most vexing public works problems which exists in the United States. It is a problem that affects constituents in every one of the congressional districts of the United States, because as Americans are traveling more, they are finding that, perhaps, they do not pay tolls back in Missouri or in one part of California or Michigan, but they are, as they travel on vacation. And we are now faced with 20,000 additional miles of toll roads now being contemplated in the United States, in addition to the present toll roads.

Mr. Chairman, the State of New York has spent $800 million and has never been reimbursed for that expenditure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], and the chairman of the special subcommittee on the highway program are aware of this fact and have set up a special investigation to cover toll roads.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have just completed many weeks of hearings or, rather, held many weeks of hearings. These hearings are not printed yet.

But, Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Michigan is to be commended for bringing this matter to the

floor of the House, and I am hopeful that when the hearings are printed that out of this will emerge legislation that will provide a permanent solution to this most vexing problem.

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to believe that it will have to come after 1973. But I believe there is a growing awareness that this is a national and not simply a regional problem and that obviously within the not too distant future we shall have some legislation that will finally come to grips with this very serious problem.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have just been made by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCARTHY].

I think the matter is one that deserves the most careful study. I would like to join in commending the gentleman from Michigan for proposing his amendment. It seems to me that this is a case where the present program works an inequity and it also works so as to penalize those States and communities which in the past have shown initiative enough to have roads and bridges built; now they are suffering for their energy and their investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVELAND: On page 20, after line 12, add the following new section:

"PRESERVATION OF PARKLANDS

"SEC. 14 (a) Chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'§137. Preservation of parklands

"'It is hereby declared to be the national policy that in carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall use maximum effort to preserve Federal, State, and local government parklands and historic sites and the beauty and historic value of such lands and sites. The Secretary shall cooperate with the States in developing highway plans and programs which carry out such policy.'"

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to protect parklands, national forests, and historic sites that are in some instances being threatened by the building of major interstate highways.

Mr. Chairman, I might say the amendment or one similar to it has already been adopted by the Senate. The Senate amendment, as introduced by Senator YARBOROUGH and adopted by the Senate, was considerably more explicit than my amendment.

There was some reason to believe after talking this over with the staff that the Yarborough amendment is defective in some of its details. So what I have done with this amendment is simply to state as a matter of policy that the Secretary shall use maximum effort to preserve Federal, State, and local governments parklands and historic sites. Also the Secretary shall cooperate with the States in developing highway plans and programs which carry out such a policy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see how anybody can object to this statement of policy. Surely if we have the programs which we do, carried on by the Department of the Interior and the National Forest Service and others to enhance the beauty of our open areas, a statement of policy such as this surely should be adopted by the House and is certainly important.

I might say we do have some reports on this proposal in letter form from two departments.

The Department of the Interior feels that this policy is a wise one. The Department of Commerce, however, does express some doubt, not doubts as to my amendment which is more general than the Senate amendment, but some doubts as to the so-called Yarborough amendment which is more explicit.

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29, 1966, commencing at page 17630, the records of the Senate in which Senator YARBOROUGH in some detail sets forth the reasons and the supporting data for the proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the time of the Committee to go into great detail on all of these but I can tell you that in almost every State of the Union there has been a situation where an interstate highway has threatened either a historic site or some beautiful park.

The situations which he calls to our particular attention are in Philadelphia, in San Francisco, in Texas and, indeed, they are in many other parts of the land.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a sound amendment and I urge its adoption.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am reluctant to oppose any amendment offered by a distinguished member of our Committee on Public Works. However, I point out that the amendment has not been studied. We do not know what the implications of the amendment would be. Under the Federal Aid Highway Act the States themselves must determine the alinement of our Interstate System, subject to the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads. So I am sure that if there are historic sites, as alluded to by the gentleman from New Hampshire, in a particular State, that that State itself would want to preserve those sites and therefore would certainly do nothing to disturb their preservation.

Therefore, since the committee has not had an opportunity to study the gentleman's amendment or the subject itself, I hope that the Committee of the Whole will reject the amendment.

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

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I believe actually the gentleman from Illinois has spoken in support of my amendment. Did the gentleman say that if there is a park or a national historic site that is being threatened, the States would certainly not want a highway to affect such park or site?

Mr. GRAY. That is what I said.

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is exactly what my amendment states. If that be so, what earthly objection could there be to my amendment? You do not have to study four printed lines to know what they say. The committee does not have to study it. It is a statement of policy on an important issue that has bothered many conservationists and those who are interested in preserving sites of historic value in this country. It reaffirms what is probably the law. If a State government is careful about such things, there is nothing for that State government to be afraid of. I think you have actually spoken in support of my amendment, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. I am a little surprised that my distinguished friend, who is a strong States righter, would once again want us to write into a Federal law what a State must or must not do in determining the alinement of a particular highway in a particular State. Until we know what the implications are concerning this matter and how far-reaching those implications would be, the question should be studied.

Therefore, the committee is opposing the amendment.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. My amendment specifically states that the Secretary shall cooperate with the States in developing highway plans. There is no dictation here. I think you have either not read my amendment carefully or I have not made it clear as to what its intent is. I quote:

The Secretary shall cooperate with the States.

Mr. GRAY. I have read the amendment very carefully, word for word and line for line, and we do oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise, first, to commend our distinguished chairman and the committee for the splendid job that they have done in continuing the furtherance of a necessary system of highways in our country.

Second, I would like to ask our distinguished chairman a question: Is it true that my State of Georgia is receiving and has been receiving its fair share of all Federal highway moneys appropriated by the Congress?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. You mean the State of Georgia?

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. The State of Georgia.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. If my memory serves me right, the State of Georgia has received a lot more than they ever expected.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. You have a gentleman in the Senate by the name of Senator RUSSELL. He and Bob Kerr used to operate pretty good some years ago when Bob was chairman of that committee. I remember some $500,000 went to Georgia, just like that. Yes, you are getting more.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Thank you very much. That is another good reason we are delighted with our distinguished Senator. I should like to ask one more question for my benefit. Is it not true, also, that any moneys that my First District of Georgia receives must and shall be sent down from the State highway department and/or the State government, and that we have no authority whatsoever in deciding where these highways will be built? Is that right?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. That is correct.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. That is under the law?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the committee for its good work in seeking to further the highway program. We are, of course, in need of the best possible highway system. It is expensive and there are many problems that arise in various areas of the country.

Now, I happen to live in the town of Lubbock, Tex., which is one of the five largest towns in the United States not served by the Interstate Highway System. I well realize that in this bill we are not undertaking to extend the system. We are working on the present system.

But I was most anxious that the committee understand the great pressures under which some of us labor who have areas which are not served by the Interstate Highway System. I know this subject has crept into the debate earlier in the day, but I wanted to reopen the subject. My people are pressing me to tell them when they probably will be able to get on the Interstate System. Naturally I have a great interest in this subject and have sought to be helpful to my area in road matters through the years.

Of course, I realize that the gentleman cannot give me the complete answer to this question. There are a lot of matters involved, but I am interested in knowing whether or not the committee feels that we should undertake to extend the system as soon as is reasonably possible, and will we do anything about it prior to approximately 1973?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama who is widely experienced in highway legislation matters.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, let me explain to the gentleman from Texas just what took place in formulating the scheme of the Interstate System. At the request of the President, in 1944, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Department of the Army, and the directors of the various State highway departments met for the purpose of working out a system of defense highways, which was to connect every principal city of 500,000 or more.

Under the direction of Interstate Highway Director, Mr. Greer, we were given the designation of the roads.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Dewitt Greer, highway engineer of Texas, is the best in the business, we think.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That was included in the act of 1946, which was implemented by the act of 1956. There was no change in 1956 in the implementation of the original act.

We have sought to establish future requirements to be added on the Interstate System by a report to be submitted by the Bureau of Public Roads, after consultation with the State highway departments, in January 1968. So the matter is being given thought and consideration by the departments.

Certainly the committee knows the importance of the additions and the future requirements. The number of vehicles placed on our highways makes it a matter of imperative concern. Therefore, we are going to proceed in as orderly a manner as we know how. Certainly we hope to provide to Lubbock, Tex., and to other of the larger cities accommodations of the highway system that will carry approximately 17 percent of the total traffic in the United States.

Mr. MAHON. I thank my friend from Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman what is his own estimate of the nature of legislation that we might possibly adopt to follow on after the present system is completed?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do not believe there is great urgency of planning because, as the report indicates, we are some $8,900 million behind in our program, if the completion date is to be in 1972. After 1972, that would be the moment to make additions to the Interstate System, or 2 years priors to that time, because we have to have a leadtime of 2 years for rights-of-way and plans and financial obligations.

Mr. MAHON. Is thought being given to some new approach to this problem in new legislation which will follow on? Or is the present system of interstate highways considered by the committee as generally the pattern we want to follow in the future?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I believe the experience we have gained with the Interstate System is certainly a justification that we could proceed in that fashion.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], who holds a position of major responsibility in road legislation.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. The question the gentleman asks is: Will there be more mileage added to the Interstate Highway System?

We have talked about that in the committee time and time again. I anticipate introducing legislation to add about 19,000 miles to the present 41,000 miles, because they are needed in this country.

The target date was 1972, as the gentleman will remember. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], and the Members on the minority side and on the majority side do not want any money taken out of the trust fund or diverted for anything else, sewers or beauty or anything. I have taken a pledge that not one penny will be taken out of that trust fund for anything other than the building of roads.

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

(On request of Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question. We are thinking that once we complete the Interstate Highway System we will try to take care of people like Mr. CLEVENGER and Mr. KLUCZYNSKI and the States in distress, by trying to pick up the toll roads or toll bridges in distress. After we take care of all those people who are in trouble I believe we are going to put some additional miles on the Interstate Highway System.

We want to stop the slaughter of 50,000 people in the United States, and we are going to do it with good roads.

I am sure the gentleman from Texas is with us 100 percent. I am happy to say that, because he happens to be the chairman of that great Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my colleague from Texas, a member of the House Committee on Public Works.

Mr. ROBERTS. I should like to compliment my distinguished colleague from Texas, and to say that the committee certainly appreciates the support it has received from his great committee, even though only a limited portion of the Interstate System is in his district. There never has been a time when the chairman of the committee and his committee have not provided the finances needed for the Interstate System.

This committee is certainly obligated to help in any way it can on future mileage.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. As the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I believe the gentleman has expressed a point of view we have heard oftentimes on our committee. The fundamental problem, of course, is the one of money to be able to complete the system on time. Again, we must have the ways and means. I respectfully ask for the cooperation of the Appropriations Committee in the placing of whatever influence or pressure possible on the Ways and Means Committee to enact legislation to permit us to complete the schedule on time.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the Ways and Means Committee does have a problem.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I believe it can be established that my home city in Iowa is in the same boat as the gentleman's home city in Texas; that is, it is one of some five cities which has no interstate connection, nor anything to look forward to in the immediate future.

With the gentleman, I hope we can get something more than thoughtful consideration from the members of the committee, especially if additional mileage is to be added.

Mr. MAHON. It is true that 1973 seems a long way off at this time. I believe we do need to be giving this matter as much thought as possible, and we need to begin planning for what we will do later on. A lot of preliminary planning and legislation will be required before the necessary roads can be constructed. I hope the Bureau of Public Roads will be able to make a report to Congress long prior to January 1968.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVELAND: On page 15 strike out line 1 and all that follows through and including line 17, and renumber succeeding sections and references thereto accordingly.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, now that the committee has gone on record as having defeated my last amendment, and now that it has gone on record as being opposed to the preservation of parks and park lands, and historic sights, I believe it is appropriate for us to review this beautification section in the bill before us.

I ask Members to turn to page 15 of the printed bill, H.R. 14359.

My amendment very simply strikes out the first three sections on page 15, the authorization of appropriations for beautification for fiscal 1968 and 1969. Let me make it clear at the outset that I have been informed the administration did not request these authorizations. The administration did not request these authorizations at this time. Let me make another point quite clear. These authorizations for the beautification program are for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 and 1969. So the action we take here, I hope, which is to strike these authorizations out, is not a final vote on the authorization for the beuatification program. What it means in essence is that next year, next year—and presumably some of us will be here next year—we will then have to consider the amount of money we are going to authorize for the beautification program. There is considerable uncertainty about the beautification program, about its implications, its impact, its costs and how it is going to work out. To force ourselves to review this program next year makes eminent good sense. I do not think I have to remind you of the pressures on the available Federal dollar and I do not think I have to remind you of the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], who earlier today pointed out to you that the President of the United States has called legislative leaders to the White House on occasion after occasion and has counseled fiscal restraint. I do not have to remind you that the President of the United States is now pointing a finger at Congress and saying that we are authorizing and appropriating more than he has asked for, and this is one example of it. I do not have to remind you that inflation and the high cost of living is an issue which is here presently, right now. Some of you may be able to follow the wise counsel of that distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, and some of you may be able to slip, slide, and duck the inflation issue. However, I think every legitimate opportunity that we have to face it head on should be taken. It should be taken forthrightly and immediately. Here is an opportunity to face up to the problem by striking out from this bill on page 15 section 8 (a), (b), and (c). It is not a final vote that kills for all time the beautification program. This was not asked for in the first instance by the administration. It simply defers it to next year, when the fiscal situation facing this country may be clearer and when the actual workings of the beautification program may be clearer and when the state of the American dollar and our budget may be clearer. It simply defers it until next year. It is simply putting off to that time consideration of how much this House wishes to authorize for the highly controversial beautification program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire. In the first place, the gentleman had the opportunity available to him in the committee to oppose this section he brings up on the floor here today. He voted to report the bill favorably with this section in the bill that we are offering today. The reason why we have this item in here is because if this is not authorized in this bill, then the beautification program is dead. It will have to be passed again at a subsequent date.

Mr. Chairman, under the bill that was sent up here by the administration, they said that no funds will be available to carry out this section after July 1, 1966, which means that any funds in the trust fund will be available after July 1, 1966 out of the trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, the amounts in here specifically stated that this money will come out of the general fund or out of money that will be transferred into the trust fund for this purpose so that it will not touch any of the money for construction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Congress passed this legislation in 1965. What the gentleman's amendment will do, if it is adopted, is to simply do away with the Beautification Act entirely.

Mr. Chairman, if that is the gentleman's intention, that is exactly what it will do. He is not cutting down the funds. He is striking out the whole section authorizing the appropriating of the funds.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished chairman of the full committee yield to me at that point for just a moment?

Mr. FALLON. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of our committee is quite correct in saying that I did not raise this point during the committee hearings held on this bill, and I did agree with the adoption of the bill and the report.

But, Mr. Chairman, in fairness I wish to remind the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that all deliberations on this legislation were held more than 2 months ago, and the report was written more than a month ago. And it has been since that time, Mr. Chairman, that the President of the United States has called upon the Congress to stop spending and has pointed to us in public, telling us that we are overspending and are doing things that he did not ask to be done. I understand it is true that this is not part of the administration bill and that it is for the fiscal year ending 1968 and 1969.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is fair to say that this kills the program. I believe it means that we shall have to take another look at it next year.

However, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] is quite correct in saying that I did not propose this amendment in the committee, but I did not know that the President was going to hold Congress up to ridicule and scorn for having exceeded his budgetary requests.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire is making a political speech which has nothing to do with the legislation now pending before the Committee on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, we have always approached this matter on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. Chairman, based upon some of the speeches which have been made it would seem that the approach to every expenditure upon which we are called to act, the same rule is used saying that the President said we must cut expenditures, except for the reasons, probably on which the opposition does agree.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that this was specifically mentioned by the President to be cut as one of the expenditures that are not necessary this year or for next year. As a matter of fact, this program as authorized for appropriations for these programs, do not start until 1968 and 1969.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Public Works and, therefore, do not know what record was made in support of this proposed authorization.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire states that the funds under consideration were not budgeted by the President and were not included in this program as submitted to the Congress. It is my understanding that no funds were included for this purpose in the bill that passed in the other body. So we are here being asked to authorize the spending of about a half billion dollars which the administration did not request, which the other body did not include in the bill which passed there and which I understand will not even be needed next year.

Mr. Chairman, I was present at the White House when the President called all members of the Committee on Appropriations down there a few weeks ago and urged that the line be held and that his budget not be increased. He urged us to try and persuade Congress not to exceed his budget, pointing out that we were threatened with inflation. The fact is that the Government does not have any money to pay current bills and is having to go out into the money market and compete with private enterprise and compete with individuals who are seeking loans to build homes—with what result? We are paying the highest interest rates in modern times.

Recently the U.S. Treasury had to offer 5¼ percent interest to refund some Government bonds that became due. This is the highest interest rate in 45 years.

Fannie Mae just yesterday announced it would sell debentures which will return 5.91 percent interest—almost 6 percent interest on Fannie Mae debentures. Recently, Fannie Mae sold participation certificates in Government mortgages, as good as Government bonds, with the Government guarantee behind them, at discounts that will return an interest rate of 5.75 percent interest—unheard of in modern times.

Why is the situation brought about? Because the Government refuses to live within its means, and continues to borrow money to pay current bills.

Mr. Chairman, now I am going to vote on every occasion when an opportunity presents itself to keep authorizations within budgetary limits and requests.

When appropriation bills are presented on the floor, the argument is made that you have got to go ahead and appropriate this money because it was previously authorized. The place to stop spending is in authorization bills.

Now I will support a reasonable program if the President will budget it and if he will include it in his recommendations. But as I understand it, he has not requested this money. If it is authorized in this bill today, we will be exceeding the President's request by $493 million. I, for one, am not going to be a party to it. I am going to support the President of the United States in his efforts to curtail spending. I suggest his friends on the other side of the aisle should support him in this instance.

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

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am curious to know if anyone, whether it be the President or some lesser official of the Government, has rated this as a high-priority item?

There are a lot of things we can spend money for, but has anyone come forward and designated this as something we must have in a time of war and in a time of inflation?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, in addition to that and over and beyond that, he did not even request it. It is not on any priority list.

Mr. FINDLEY. Surely in these times there ought to be some priority ratings and I would appreciate if anyone can indicate who in the Government has given this a high-priority standing, justifying this at a time of heavy inflationary pressures?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, to the extent that I can, I would like to add weight to the arguments for this amendment on the basis on which it has been presented and to say to the chairman of the committee that I think he is a little unfair in taking these remarks as being political, meaning in a narrow, partisan, political sense.

The President of the United States, I trust, was not being political when he told the committee and told the Congress and told the leaders of Congress that this Nation is in a very serious fiscal situation and that there are serious inflationary pressures, and he would urge the Congress to not exceed his requests in authorization bills and in appropriation bills. These statements directed criticism at us, the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have appeared many times on the floor to make the point, and this could be regarded as political perhaps—but I hope in a high sense—that the President has the power right now to cut back on expenditures and should do so.

I feel we now have reached the point where it is not a question of just cutting out inefficient programs and programs that might be debatable, but it has reached the point where we are going to have to cut out or cut back or defer some programs on which there is agreement they are good programs, and to be picked up when we can get around to financing them.

So, I hope, this is not to be viewed by the House today as a Republican-Democratic argument; or, if the Democrat leaders want to make it so, I would be pleased to campaign this fall on that basis. But I happen to know that there are many Democrats in the House who feel as deeply about this point as I do and who do not want it placed on a party basis and feel that it should not be. I hope that at this point we will evaluate this proposal, a proposal that the President, himself, has not listed, and as has been pointed out, and I think the Committee recognizes in the statement of the Chairman, did not specifically request.

This is exactly the kind of program we would do well to defer.

I think the gentleman from New Hampshire makes the point—and I think this is an accurate point—that this is not killing the program because we have a deferral date to 1969. We will have next year an opportunity to look at it again to see what sort of fiscal climate exists then. But today let us begin to exercise the kind of discretion which the President has requested and which I would urge each of you, as Members of Congress, we badly need to do. This country is in serious fiscal difficulty.

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

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

Mr. JONAS. Before the gentleman finishes, I think the record should show the amount of money involved here is $493 million, and it will have to come out of the general fund of the Treasury. Since we are still operating in the red, the money will have to be borrowed.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to thank the gentleman. I wish to point out that on page 15 of the committee report there is some very pertinent language:

> Since 1963 there has been a consistent 2½-percent-a-year increase in construction costs. The committee is convinced that unless there is a substantial change in the general economic condition of the Nation, construction costs will continue to increase about the same rate during the forseeable future.

Inflation is the very thing that is cutting back on our ability to build the highways and has brought about the picture that the committee further reports to us on page 18, that we are now about $6 billion shy in the trust fund, and unless my committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, comes forward with increased taxes, we are going to have to stretch the highway program itself out until 1975.

So these are pertinent arguments, not narrow partisan political arguments, and I do hope that the Committee will view it in the light of those arguments.

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

Mr CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I would like to compliment the gentleman on what he has stated and assure the committee I am in favor of the bill as a whole, but I am strongly in support of the amendment. I think it has been well demonstrated that the bill is inflationary. Second, it is not an administrative request. Third, it is not budgeted, although it will authorize increased obligationary authority.

I would like to point out one other thing. In section (a) of section 8 there is an increase of $120,000 in the 2 fiscal years, and in section (b), the junkyard control section, there is an $88 million increase for fiscal year 1968, and in the landscaping section, section (c) of section 8, there is a $15 million increase in 1968 and a $30 million increase in 1969.

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

I think we are at a point in the consideration of this particular section that we are being moved as a Committee in

two directions. On the one hand, the minority suggests to the Nation that the record of achievement of the Interstate Highway System is such that it is imperative and in the national interest that we should proceed without delay with the orderly continuance of this wonderful program that is so benefiting America, and which has such a dramatic effect of benefit upon my State, yours, and every area of the country.

On the other hand, for purposes of perhaps political tact, in the consideration of this particular amendment, the tune changes to, "Let us support the President and slow down spending."

Let us set the record straight. As I understood the administration's proposal as it originally came down, as it was undertaken in discussions in the Subcommittee on Roads and in the full committee, the proposal was that the highway trust fund for beautification be incorporated without limitation. So this administration did not only seek authorization but sought unlimited resources for the promotion of the elimination of billboards, for the elimination of junkyards, and for the elimination of other offensive things, and for the scenic enhancement along our interstate highways.

Every one of us knows, as the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works has pointed out, that the efficiency of these programs depends upon long-range planning. The distinguished gentleman from Florida stood in the well not more than an hour ago and told us how we needed at least an 18-month lead so as to permit the departments of highway directors throughout the country to program for highway beautification.

Gentlemen, in my State—and I am sure in the States of other Members, the patience of the people of this Nation has worn thin with the tolerance along our public highways of the billboards, the junkyards, and all the things that offend scenic beauty. In my State—and perhaps in other States—we have already undertaken, as a consequence of the previous action by this body, to plan a vigorous attack upon billboards, junkyards, and other offensive things along our highways.

I would ask the Committee to reject unanimously the suggestion, which is a belated 11th-hour suggestion—that we scuttle the national effort to clean up our highways.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman mentioned my name, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes, but I will say to the gentleman that I believe in view of his statements the record ought to be clarified.

First, the striking of this section 8 on page 15 will not scuttle the program, because we do not have to authorize until 1967, which is next year, and it will not scuttle the program. Secondly, the basic reason for even considering putting any authorization in was to try to make certain that money would not come in the future out of the trust fund. That language is not affected in any way by the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND]. Those provisions were drafted to make certain beautification or safety will not come out of the trust fund and they appear in other sections. That remains in the language of the bill and is not stricken by the amendment of the gentleman. So that basic justification for putting any money in is not affected by the gentleman's amendment. Those restrictions remain in if any money is going to be used for beautification after 1967.

I call attention to the fact that the 1966 and 1967 authorizations were approved last year in the substantive language of the basic act. So we are discussing in this legislation the authorizations for the years 1968 and 1969. The amendment of the gentleman does not, in my opinion, do destructive damage to the beautification program. Basically the problem I have with regard to the figures contained in the specific authorizations in the bill is that we have no testimony whatsoever on the record of our hearings as to how much money it would take in 1968 to, first, take care of the billboards, second, take care of the junkyards, and third, provide for general beautification purposes.

So I say it is not imprudent at all to consider next year how much money should go in, in the form of specific authorization, because I challenge anyone to show—yes, the gentleman who just rose, Mr. SWEENEY—where in the record it shows how much money is going to be needed. Where did the $80 million figure come from in the record?

Where is the amount of money? I asked the question. I had no answer.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I mentioned the gentleman's name, and if he wants to answer my question I will yield to him.

Where did the money figure come from?

Mr. SWEENEY. I should like to address myself to that point, but I wish to say one thing in correction of a statement the gentleman made when he mentioned my name.

The gentleman suggested that the Cleveland amendment would not do enormous destruction to the beautification effort.

Mr. CRAMER. It would not. We can do that next year.

Mr. SWEENEY. I respectfully suggest, it would gut the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. I refuse to yield further. The gentleman is not answering the question.

I ask the gentleman again, where is there evidence in the record that $80 million is needed in 1968, and $80 million is needed in 1969 for billboard control?

Mr. SWEENEY. The gentleman will agree that when this came from the administration there was an unlimited ceiling.

Mr. CRAMER. I asked the gentleman a question. There is nothing in the record to show how much money is needed. They do not know. For that reason I am going to support the gentleman's amendment.

I would suggest that we take a look at this next year, and consider putting in the amount of money that is proven to be needed.

There is nothing in the Senate bill whatsoever. There is no authorization in the Senate bill. The Senate did not think it would gut this program to leave it out this year. They put nothing in, because they know one cannot substantiate these figures.

We wanted to keep the money from coming out of construction in the trust fund. We will do that even if we pass the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire because his amendment does not strike that language.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There is nothing in the President's budget or any document which has come from the executive branch of the Government supporting or justifying this $493 million included in this particular bill.

Let me say that within the past 2 weeks, or perhaps 3 weeks, the President has asked the leadership on both sides of the aisle, from both ends of the Capitol, to come down to discuss with him the problems of inflation which he sees resulting from the action of Congress in increasing his budget, both as to authorizations and appropriations.

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

(On request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CRAMER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If my recollection is correct, the President has said publicly as well as otherwise that this Congress so far has increased in authorization his budget recommendations by $6 billion. This proposal would increase it another $493 million.

It seems to me if we are going to help the President with the effort that he is now, and I emphasize now, making to try to control the problems of inflation and the problems of increases in the cost of living, we should support the Cleveland amendment. If you are for economy, we should try to strike from the bill the additional authorization of $493 million.

For that reason I intend to support the amendment. I hope the committee will as well.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate this, to make certain everyone understands. There was no money authorization in the Senate bill, which has already passed the other body. They did not believe it was necessary to put it in now. They intend to take a look at this next year.

The fact that we do not have money justification testimony by the administration, based upon which we could fix a reasonable and sound figure, means it makes sense for us to take the same action, so long as we protect the trust fund and keep it inviolate, against the taking of money from the construction money for beautification. We will do that even if we adopt the Cleveland amendment.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and I had fully intended to file supplemental views to the committee report on this bill setting forth my objections to this particular provision in an otherwise very fine piece of legislation. However, as my colleagues know, I was granted an official leave of absence because of serious illness in my family and therefore was precluded from filing my objections.

In this particular provision, while the concept of beautifying our highways is a worthy one, it is certainly an untimely approach to alleviating the problem. As others have pointed out, the fiscal policies of this Government have contributed to the continual increase in the cost of living for all Americans and, until and unless this Government reduces its unnecessary spending on untimely domestic programs, I feel that the cost of living will continue to rise.

The President has, from time to time, reprimanded the Congress for exceeding his budgetary requests and as a matter of fact did not request the sum set forth in this legislation for highway beautification.

This provision in the bill authorizes the expenditure of some $493 million and begins with fiscal 1968. We have ample time next year to review this program and make a reasonable authorization if conditions warrant at that time.

One of the principal causes for the continuing increase in interest rates is the fact that the Federal Government has no money of its own with which to pay for this largesse and, therefore, must compete in the commercial market for money. This has driven the cost of borrowing money to an alltime high and has also created a lack of available funds. The results of this activity are reflected in the many problems the people of America, the small businessmen, and the homebuilders, are encountering in trying to find adequate funds with which to meet their current needs.

For this and many other reasons, Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment should be adopted and the Committee should take another look at this particular program next year. There is ample time without upsetting the beautification program to do so.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 48, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 20, insert after line 12 the following:

"USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION PURPOSES

"SEC. 14(a) The Governor of a State may elect to have any funds apportioned to such State after the date of enactment of this Act under section 104 of title 23, United States Code, made available, in a manner prescribed by regulations of the Secretary of Commerce, to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for making grants, for urban mass transportation purposes within such State, under section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

"(b) For purposes of this section:

"(1) the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and

"(2) the term 'Governor' means the chief executive officer of a State."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and it is foreign to the objectives of the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RYAN. The purpose of the amendment is very clear, Mr. Chairman. I believe it is germane. It deals specifically with the funds authorized by the pending bill. It would make it possible for the Governor of a State to elect to use the funds apportioned under the Federal-aid highway program for the purposes of mass transportation if he so desires. It neither directs nor compels a Governor; but at his option the funds would be available so that a State could allocate funds for mass transportation purposes as well as highways in order to achieve a balanced transportation system.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama insists on his point of order.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would permit use of highway funds for mass transportation and is completely foreign to the bill under consideration. Under clause 7 of rule XVI no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment. This is a highway bill and it does not go to the mass transportation problem. Under the rules, the Chair sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Alabama.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the full 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when I argued the point of order, I explained the purpose of my amendment. The urban transportation problem is increasingly critical and should no longer be the stepchild to the Federal-aid highway program. Congress has been profligate in the amount of money committed to the highway programs.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] pointed out earlier that the State of Georgia has received far more than its share of highway funds. I might add that the highway program has received far more than its share of Federal funds in comparison to the need for financing mass transit.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will give serious consideration to our urban needs before more time has elapsed. The cities of our Nation are now being choked by automobiles; the highways are pouring them into our urban centers; the problem of mass transportation cannot be ignored any longer.

The need for more mass transportation in our Nation must be evident to all, yet the cities and States of our Nation do not have the resources to meet the need. In 1961 the Institute of Public Administration, in a report to the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, estimated that the total capital requirements for mass transportation during the 1960's would be at least $9.8 billion. Today, 5 years later, this estimate must be regarded as conservative.

Despite the glaring need for Federal action, the Congress has not met the challenge. Our major action in the field is the Mass Transportation Act of 1964, but that measure provided for only $375 million in Federal aid, and even this small amount was spread over 3 years, with only $75 million for fiscal year 1965, and $150 million for each of the following 2 fiscal years.

On the other hand, the bill we consider today would authorize appropriations of almost $12 billion for the next 2 fiscal years for highway construction. This is part of a $51 billion Federal-aid highway program, and almost 80 times the amount spent annually on mass transportation. The stinginess of Federal Government in the field of mass transportation is being matched by extreme generosity in highway legislation.

These figures raise the question of priorities: whether we are going to forsake our mass transportation needs while subsidizing the commuter through highway legislation. The extent of this auto subsidization is staggering. Prof. William Vickrey, a Columbia University economist, estimated that highway addition specifically required to handle rush-hour traffic on a projected Washington, D.C., highway would cost an additional $23,000 for each commuter's car. In New York City, the Regional Plan Association, using Professor Vickrey's studies, estimates the subsidy to urban rush-hour motorists as 10 cents a mile per car. This is the equivalent of paying each motorist the cost of gas, oil, and depreciation for all his commuting travel.

The effect of this priority decision is apparent in terms of Federal grants. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of a highway if it is part of the Interstate System, and 50 percent of the cost of a highway if it is not part of the system. Through these terms, we have poured billions of Federal taxpayers' dollars into highways since 1956—10 years ago. Yet we have had only limited funds available for mass transportation—and those only since 1964, 2 years ago.

The amendment which I proposed is similar to my bill, H.R. 12852, and legislation introduced by our colleague from New York [Mr. BINGHAM], and Senator TYDINGS. It would permit the Governors of the several States to elect to use part of their highway apportionment for mass transit. I regard it as a stop-gap measure, but it would be an important

step in achieving balance in transportation systems. We must eventually coordinate roads and rails and allocate funds according to an overall, comprehensive plan.

I regret that we will not begin today.

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

Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon I understood one of the speakers to state that the West Virginia toll road had been taken into the Interstate System.

I would like someone, preferably a member of the committee, to respond to the question of whether or not it is true if the West Virginia toll road has been taken into the Interstate System, and if so, upon what basis?

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

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

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, that is something new to me. I have never heard of anything like that. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that the Interstate Highway System has taken in the West Virginia toll road?

Mr. GROSS. I believe that is what was indicated.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I did not know that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am making inquiry as to the status of that roadway.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. But, has it been taken into the Interstate System?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I do not know.

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

Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman has sponsored legislation to try to make it possible to freeze some of these toll roads. Since the Interstate System has frozen roads into the Interstate System, we do have at this time, in some States, designations of toll roads as routes available, as extensions of the Interstate System, where you do not have available roads which measure up to the Interstate standards which go between the two State points.

However, I believe it is accurate to say that this represents an actual incorporation into the Interstate System of these turnpikes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that no toll roads have been taken into the Interstate System on the basis of payment from interstate funds.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have also driven across the country and am quite aware of the fact that one will see the markers up on some toll roads where they are not available between certain routes.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that perfectly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to call attention to the fact that the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 now before us serves to perpetuate a discrimination against commuters in our metropolitan centers. A little more than a year ago, on July 27, 1965, I submitted a bill, H.R. 10126, which would give State and local governments the authority to use a portion of the huge amounts of Federal aid now going into superhighway construction for mass transit where, in the judgment of the local government, creation of a balanced transportation system requires it. At the same time, Senator TYDINGS introduced a companion bill in the Senate, S. 2339. Shortly thereafter Representatives ASHLEY (H.R. 10170), FARBSTEIN (H.R. 10171) and HALPERN (H.R. 10172) introduced companion bills. Earlier this year, my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], also introduced the proposal in the House, H.R. 12823.

On July 28, 1965, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 14, pages 18685–18687, the full text of a joint statement which I issued with Senator TYDINGS on this subject. It describes in detail some of the more compelling arguments in support of this proposal. I am pleased to say that in the months following submission of this proposal, it has drawn extensive support.

The Regional Plan Association, a highly respected private organization which concerns itself with the problems of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut region, has endorsed the idea of pooling Federal mass transit and highway aid. The mayor of New York City and the president of the city council have each endorsed this bill, as have city officials of Baltimore and many other private and public bodies and individuals.

As the President noted in advocating creation of a northeast corridor rapid rail transit which would provide new insights into the technology of mass transit, 7 out of every 10 U.S. citizens now reside within city limits. This presents a problem of movement of people to and from work, school, residences, and service facilities which staggers the imagination. As the transit strike in New York City demonstrated earlier this year, private motor vehicles cannot hope to meet this task.

The bill before us authorizes many billions of dollars for the highway program, $4,500 million for the next fiscal year, and a total of well over $22 billion from now until 1972. By contrast, the Mass Transit Act reported out by the House Banking and Currency Committee authorizes only $175 million and the Senate version $225 million. Whatever sum will emerge from the Congress, the disparity between this amount and the figure for highway aid is enormous. The relation between the two seems to be in inverse proportion to the numbers of people to be served and to the demonstrated need.

In my own city, New York, the mass transit system is wholly inadequate. The fare has just been raised by one-third and the predictions are that it will be raised by an additional one-fourth in the near future. In a period of rising prices, where those least able to support themselves on their incomes are already hard-pressed and where the specter of inflation threatens to further reduce their capacity to be self-supporting, a marked increase in the cost of daily commuting aggravates the pressures.

I regret to report that various pressure groups have done much to attempt to distort the meaning and impact of my proposal. Some of them have suggested that the proposal is aimed at preventing any further construction of highways; an assertion which is untrue. Most of these groups argue that there is something "immoral" or "un-American" about using taxes collected from the sale of motor fuel or automotive products for anything other than highways.

In that connection, I urge our colleagues to read very carefully the text of the report accompanying the pending bill—House Report No. 1704. On page 4, the committee traces the history of earmarking taxes for highways. It points out that, prior to 1956, all such taxes simply went into the General Treasury, presumably for use as the priority of general national needs dictated at any given time.

I also would call attention to a serious misleading statement of fact on that same page of the report: a common misstatement that has distored the picture of present benefits and burdens. The report says that the "Federal-aid program was placed on a wholly highway-user-financed, pay-as-you-build basis." In fact, the cost of the highways is paid by all who use automotive goods or services, regardless of whether they ever use a 90-percent federally subsidized road. Some vehicles use such roads constantly, others only rarely or never. This was confirmed in studies made on the Kennedy Expressway in Chicago and on the New York City expressways. These studies show that taxes paid by users of these roads often pay less than 30 percent of the cost. If equivalent subsidies were paid to subway and bus riders such as are given to those who drive on the expressways, we would have to pay the subway and bus riders to get on these conveyances.

Every time we buy gasoline we contribute to this fund, regardless of whether our travels are along city streets or nonsubsidized roadways. The only way in which we could truly have highway users foot the whole cost of these ribbons of concrete would be to impose tolls based on construction and maintenance costs. I do not advocate this extreme action but I would think that so long as the financing is done as it is, that the equating of highway users with all who pay the automotive and gasoline taxes should stop.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that hearings be held on the various proposals for adequate mass transit aid. As our cities get more congested and as it gets more expensive and more onerous to move about in our metropolitan centers, the need for coordinated planning and balanced effort grows more urgent. Those who must use automobiles and trucks should welcome a program which would reduce highway congestion by diverting the daily communter to mass transit.

It is incongrous that we speak so often about the need to rejuvenate our cities and to reduce the cost of living but do so

little to provide the means which would permit more effective planning for our metropolitan areas and, at the same time, reduce the heavy burdens upon our commuters.

Implicit in our Federal transportation aid programs is the conclusion that it is better to move commuters by private automobile than by mass transit. The sheer weight of funds reflects this and, because of the matching fund character of the highway aid program, States and cities are virtually obligated to commit large sums to highway construction which might otherwise be available for mass transit. My proposal would give each local government the flexibility to determine how best to allocate available transportation funds—on the basis of local needs.

I believe that any fair review of the experience of our metropolitan centers will show that the mass transit needs are more urgent than the highway needs. I urge that that review be made by the Congress and that more adequate and equitable programs be devised to meet the needs of our cities and the large majority of our people.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that perhaps he would wish to discuss these points he is making today before this Committee next week when the Committee will consider the bill, H.R. 14180, the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1966.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comment. My point is that I think that some of the funds that are now being used for the purpose of highway aid should on the basis of local option be made available for transfer to the mass transportation needs.

Mr. Chairman, this is not something that can be done within the scope of mass transit aid programs as they have been submitted to this House in the past and as they will be submitted next week.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14359) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 936, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GERALD R. FORD moves to recommit the bill H.R. 14359 to the Committee on Public Works with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

"Page 15, strike out line 1 and all that follows through and including line 17 and renumber succeeding sections and references thereto accordingly."

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

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMER. Do I correctly understand that this is the same as the amendment offered in the committee by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] to strike out the beautification section?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no personal knowledge. 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 173, nays 175, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

YEAS—173

Abbitt	Cleveland	Goodell
Abernethy	Collier	Green, Oreg.
Adair	Colmer	Gross
Anderson, Ill.	Conable	Grover
Andrews, Glenn	Conte	Gurney
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cooley	Hagan, Ga.
Arends	Corbett	Haley
Ashmore	Craley	Hall
Ayres	Cramer	Halpern
Bates	Culver	Hamilton
Battin	Curtin	Hansen, Idaho
Belcher	Curtis	Hardy
Bell	Dague	Harsha
Bennett	Davis, Wis.	Harvey, Mich.
Berry	Derwinski	Henderson
Betts	Devine	Horton
Bolton	Dickinson	Hosmer
Bow	Dole	Huot
Bray	Dowdy	Hutchinson
Broomfield	Downing	Ichord
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Dulski	Johnson, Pa.
Broyhill, N.C.	Duncan, Oreg.	Jonas
Broyhill, Va.	Duncan, Tenn.	Jones, N.C.
Buchanan	Dwyer	Keith
Burleson	Edwards, Ala.	Kornegay
Byrnes, Wis.	Ellsworth	Kunkel
Cabell	Erlenborn	Langen
Cahill	Evans, Colo.	Latta
Callaway	Findley	Lennon
Carter	Fino	Lipscomb
Cederberg	Fisher	McClory
Chamberlain	Flynt	McCulloch
Clancy	Foley	McDade
Clausen, Don H.	Ford, Gerald R.	McEwen
Clawson, Del	Fountain	McVicker
	Frelinghuysen	MacGregor
	Fuqua	Mailliard
	Gathings	Marsh
	Gettys	Matthews
May	Rogers, Tex.	Talcott
Minshall	Roush	Teague, Calif.
Mize	Rumsfeld	Teague, Tex.
Moore	Satterfield	Thomson, Wis.
Morton	Schmidhauser	Tuck
Mosher	Schneebeli	Tunney
Nelsen	Schweiker	Ullman
O'Brien	Secrest	Utt
O'Neal, Ga.	Selden	Vigorito
Pelly	Shriver	Walker, Miss.
Pirnie	Smith, Calif.	Watkins
Poff	Smith, Iowa	Watson
Pucinski	Smith, N.Y.	Whalley
Quie	Smith, Va.	Whitener
Quillen	Springer	Widnall
Randall	Stafford	Williams
Reid, Ill.	Stalbaum	Wolff
Reid, N.Y.	Stanton	Wyatt
Reifel	Stephens	Wydler
Robison	Stratton	Younger

NAYS—175

Adams	Hanna	O'Neill, Mass.
Addabbo	Hansen, Iowa	Ottinger
Albert	Hansen, Wash.	Patman
Annunzio	Hathaway	Patten
Aspinall	Hays	Pepper
Barrett	Hechler	Perkins
Beckworth	Helstoski	Pickle
Bingham	Hicks	Pike
Blatnik	Holifield	Poage
Brooks	Holland	Price
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Race
Burke	Hull	Redlin
Burton, Calif.	Irwin	Resnick
Byrne, Pa.	Jacobs	Reuss
Chelf	Jarman	Rhodes, Pa.
Clark	Jennings	Rivers, S.C.
Clevenger	Joelson	Roberts
Cohelan	Johnson, Calif.	Rodino
Cunningham	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Colo.
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Daniels	Karsten	Ronan
de la Garza	Kastenmeier	Rooney, N.Y.
Dent	Kee	Rooney, Pa.
Denton	Kelly	Rosenthal
Dingell	King, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Dorn	Kluczynski	Roybal
Dow	Leggett	Ryan
Dyal	Long, Md.	St Germain
Edmondson	Love	St. Onge
Edwards, Calif.	McCarthy	Saylor
Everett	McDowell	Scheuer
Evins, Tenn.	McFall	Shipley
Fallon	McGrath	Sikes
Farbstein	Macdonald	Sisk
Farnsley	Machen	Slack
Fascell	Mackay	Staggers
Feighan	Mackie	Steed
Flood	Madden	Stubblefield
Fogarty	Mahon	Sullivan
Ford, William D.	Matsunaga	Sweeney
Fraser	Meeds	Taylor
Friedel	Miller	Tenzer
Fulton, Pa.	Mills	Thomas
Fulton, Tenn.	Minish	Thompson, N.J.
Gallagher	Mink	Thompson, Tex.
Garmatz	Moeller	Todd
Giaimo	Monagan	Udall
Gibbons	Morgan	Vanik
Gilbert	Morris	Vivian
Gilligan	Moss	Waggonner
Gonzalez	Multer	Waldie
Grabowski	Murphy, Ill.	Watts
Gray	Murphy, N.Y.	White, Tex.
Green, Pa.	Natcher	Whitten
Grider	Nix	Wright
Griffiths	O'Hara, Ill.	Yates
Hagen, Calif.	O'Konski	Young
Hanley	Olsen, Mont.	Zablocki
	Olson, Minn.	

NOT VOTING—84

Anderson, Tenn.	Delaney	Long, La.
Andrews, George W.	Diggs	McMillan
Ashbrook	Donohue	Martin, Ala.
Ashley	Edwards, La.	Martin, Mass.
Bandstra	Farnum	Martin, Nebr.
Baring	Greigg	Mathias
Boggs	Gubser	Michel
Boland	Halleck	Moorhead
Bolling	Harvey, Ind.	Morrison
Brademas	Hawkins	Morse
Brock	Hébert	Murray
Burton, Utah	Herlong	Nedzi
Callan	Hungate	O'Hara, Mich.
Cameron	Jones, Mo.	Passman
Carey	Karth	Philbin
Casey	Keogh	Pool
Celler	King, N.Y.	Powell
Conyers	King, Utah	Purcell
Corman	Kirwan	Rees
Davis, Ga.	Krebs	Reinecke
Dawson	Kupferman	Rhodes, Ariz.
	Laird	Rivers, Alaska
	Landrum	Roncalio

Roudebush	Toll	Weltner
Schisler	Trimble	White, Idaho
Scott	Tupper	Willis
Senner	Tuten	Wilson, Bob
Sickles	Van Deerlin	Wilson,
Skubitz	Walker, N. Mex.	Charles H.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Baring with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Krebs with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Brademas.
Mr. Callan with Mr. Carey.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Willis.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Greigg.
Mr. Farnum with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Boland.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Bandstra.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Nedzi.
Mr. Tuten with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Pool with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. RACE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN and Mr. TUNNEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 341, nays 1, answered "present" 2, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

YEAS—341

Abbitt	Ayres	Broomfield
Abernethy	Barrett	Brown, Calif.
Adair	Bates	Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Adams	Battin	Broyhill, N.C.
Addabbo	Beckworth	Broyhill, Va.
Albert	Belcher	Buchanan
Anderson, Ill.	Bell	Burke
Andrews, Glenn	Bennett	Burleson
Andrews, N. Dak.	Berry	Burton, Calif.
Annunzio	Betts	Byrne, Pa.
Arends	Bingham	Byrnes, Wis.
Ashmore	Blatnik	Cabell
Aspinall	Bolton	Cahill
	Bray	Callaway
	Brooks	
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Pickle
Cederberg	Hansen, Iowa	Pike
Chamberlain	Hansen, Wash.	Pirnie
Chelf	Hardy	Poage
Clancy	Harsha	Poff
Clark	Harvey, Mich.	Price
Clausen, Don H.	Hathaway	Pucinski
Clawson, Del	Hays	Quie
Cleveland	Hechler	Quillen
Clevenger	Helstoski	Race
Cohelan	Henderson	Randall
Collier	Hicks	Redlin
Colmer	Holifield	Reid, Ill.
Conable	Holland	Reid, N.Y.
Conte	Horton	Reifel
Cooley	Hosmer	Resnick
Corbett	Howard	Reuss
Craley	Hull	Rhodes, Pa.
Cramer	Huot	Rivers, S.C.
Culver	Hutchinson	Roberts
Cunningham	Ichord	Robison
Curtin	Irwin	Rodino
Curtis	Jacobs	Rogers, Colo.
Daddario	Jarman	Rogers, Fla.
Dague	Jennings	Rogers, Tex.
Daniels	Joelson	Ronan
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney, N.Y.
de la Garza	Johnson, Okla.	Rooney, Pa.
Dent	Johnson, Pa.	Rosenthal
Denton	Jonas	Rostenkowski
Derwinski	Jones, Ala.	Roush
Devine	Jones, N.C.	Roybal
Dickinson	Karsten	Rumsfeld
Dingell	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Dole	Kee	Satterfield
Dorn	Keith	St Germain
Dow	Kelly	St. Onge
Dowdy	King, Calif.	Saylor
Downing	Kluczynski	Scheuer
Dulski	Kornegay	Schmidhauser
Duncan, Oreg.	Kunkel	Schneebeli
Duncan, Tenn.	Langen	Schweiker
Dwyer	Latta	Secrest
Dyal	Leggett	Selden
Edmondson	Lennon	Shipley
Edwards, Ala.	Lipscomb	Shriver
Edwards, Calif.	Long, Md.	Sikes
Ellsworth	Love	Sisk
Erlenborn	McCarthy	Slack
Evans, Colo.	McClory	Smith, Calif.
Everett	McCulloch	Smith, Iowa
Evins, Tenn.	McDade	Smith, N.Y.
Fallon	McDowell	Smith, Va.
Farbstein	McEwen	Springer
Farnsley	McFall	Stafford
Fascell	McGrath	Staggers
Feighan	McVicker	Stalbaum
Findley	Macdonald	Stanton
Fino	Machen	Steed
Fisher	Mackay	Stephens
Flood	Mackie	Stratton
Flynt	Madden	Stubblefield
Fogarty	Mahon	Sullivan
Foley	Mailliard	Sweeney
Ford, William D.	Marsh	Talcott
Fountain	Matsunaga	Taylor
Fraser	Matthews	Teague, Calif.
Frelinghuysen	May	Tenzer
Friedel	Meeds	Thomas
Fulton, Pa.	Miller	Thompson, N.J.
Fulton, Tenn.	Mills	Thompson, Tex.
Fuqua	Minish	Thomson, Wis.
Gallagher	Minshall	Todd
Garmatz	Mize	Tuck
Gathings	Moeller	Tunney
Gettys	Monagan	Udall
Giaimo	Moore	Ullman
Gibbons	Morgan	Vanik
Gilbert	Morris	Vigorito
Gilligan	Morton	Vivian
Gonzalez	Mosher	Waggonner
Goodell	Moss	Waldie
Grabowski	Multer	Watkins
Gray	Murphy, Ill.	Watson
Green, Oreg.	Murphy, N.Y.	Watts
Green, Pa.	Natcher	Whalley
Grider	Nelsen	White, Tex.
Griffiths	Nix	Whitener
Gross	O'Brien	Whitten
Grover	O'Hara, Ill.	Widnall
Gurney	O'Konski	Williams
Hagan, Ga.	Olsen, Mont.	Wolff
Hagen, Calif.	Olson, Minn.	Wright
Haley	O'Neal, Ga.	Wyatt
Hall	O'Neill, Mass.	Wydler
Halpern	Ottinger	Yates
Hamilton	Patman	Young
Hanley	Patten	Younger
Hanna	Pelly	Zablocki
	Pepper	
	Perkins	

NAYS—1

Teague, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Ford, Gerald R. Utt

NOT VOTING—88

Anderson, Tenn.	Halleck	Passman
Andrews, George W.	Harvey, Ind.	Philbin
Ashbrook	Hawkins	Pool
Ashley	Hébert	Powell
Bandstra	Herlong	Purcell
Baring	Hungate	Rees
Boggs	Jones, Mo.	Reinecke
Boland	Karth	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolling	Keogh	Rivers, Alaska
Bow	King, N.Y.	Roncalio
Brademas	King, Utah	Roudebush
Brock	Kirwan	Schisler
Burton, Utah	Krebs	Scott
Callan	Kupferman	Senner
Cameron	Laird	Sickles
Carey	Landrum	Skubitz
Casey	Long, La.	Toll
Celler	McMillan	Trimble
Conyers	MacGregor	Tupper
Corman	Martin, Ala.	Tuten
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Mass.	Van Deerlin
Dawson	Martin, Nebr.	Walker, Miss.
Delaney	Mathias	Walker, N. Mex.
Diggs	Michel	Weltner
Donohue	Mink	White, Idaho
Edwards, La.	Moorhead	Willis
Farnum	Morrison	Wilson, Bob
Greigg	Morse	Wilson, Charles H.
Gubser	Murray	
	Nedzi	
	O'Hara, Mich.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Gerald R. Ford against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Utt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Schisler with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Krebs with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Walker of New Mexico with Mr. Van Deerlin.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. O'Hara of Michigan.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Callan.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Brademas.
Mr. Sickles with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Willis.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Greigg.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Nedzi.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Bandstra.
Mr. Farnum with Mr. Tuten.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Murray.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. If he were present he

would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3155) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3155

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966".

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $1,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $3,300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the additional sum of $3,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF COST ESTIMATE FOR APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make the apportionment for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968 and 1969, of the sums authorized to be appropriated for such years for expenditures on the National Systems of Interstate and Defense Highways, using the apportionment factors contained in table 5 of House Document Numbered 42, Eighty-ninth Congress.

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) Section 109(b) of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: "Such standards shall in all cases provide for at least four lanes of traffic."

(b) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to modify project agreements entered into prior to the date of enactment of this Act pursuant to section 106 of title 23 of the United States Code for the purpose of effectuating the amendment made by this section with respect to as much of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways as may be possible.

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code, the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) For the Federal-aid primary system and the Federal-aid secondary system and for their extension within urban areas, out of the highway trust fund, $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The sums authorized in this paragraph for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system;

(B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and

(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary highway systems in urban areas.

(2) For forest highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(3) For public lands highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(4) For forest development roads and trails, $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(5) For public lands development roads and trails, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(6) For park roads and trails, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(7) For parkways, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(8) For Indian reservation roads and bridges, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

ALASKAN ASSISTANCE

SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 116, funds made available to the State of Alaska under title 23, United States Code, may be expended by the State for maintenance of Federal aid highways.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 103, funds made available to the State of Alaska under title 23, United States Code, may be expended for construction of access and development roads that will serve resource development, recreational, residential, commercial, industrial, or other like purposes.

(c) For construction and maintenance of highways in the State of Alaska, out of the highway trust fund, and in addition to funds otherwise made available to the State of Alaska under title 23, United States Code, $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972.

EMERGENCY RELIEF

SEC. 7. (a) The last proviso of subsection (f) of section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(c) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is hereby deleted and the following is substituted therefor: "Subject to the following limitations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to establish the fund authorized by this section and to replenish it on an annual basis: (1) not more than $50,000,000 is authorized to be expended in any one fiscal year to carry out this section except that if in any fiscal year the total of all expenditures under this section is less than $50,000,000 the unexpended balance of such amounts shall remain available for expenditure during the next two succeeding fiscal years in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section in such years, and (2) 60 per centum of the expenditures under this section for any fiscal year are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund and the remaining 40 per centum of such expenditures are authorized to be appropriated only from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

(d) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 125 of title 23, United States Code, are amended by striking the words "from the emergency fund" where they appear.

STUDY OF ADVANCE ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of the advance acquisition of rights-of-way for future construction of highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, with particular reference to the provision of adequate time for the removal and disposal of improvements located on rights-of-way and the relocation of affected individuals, businesses, institutions, and organizations, the tax status of such property after acquisition and before its use for highway purposes, and the methods for financing advance right-of-way acquisition by both the State governments and the Federal Government, including the possible creation of revolving funds for such purpose. The Secretary shall submit a report of the results of such study to Congress not later than January 10, 1968, together with his recommendations.

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 9. Subsection (a) of section 302 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In meeting the provisions of this subsection, a State may engage, to the extent it deems necessary or desirable, the services of private engineering firms."

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE STUDY

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the

State highway departments, and other affected Federal and State agencies, a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining what action can and should be taken to provide additional assistance for the relocation and reestablishment of persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations to be displaced by construction of projects on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, and to submit a report of the findings of such study and investigation, together with recommendations, to the Congress not later than July 1, 1967. The study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to—

(1) the need for additional payments or other financial assistance to such displaced persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations, and the extent to which the making of such payments and the providing of other financial assistance should be mandatory;

(2) the feasibility of constructing, within the right-of-way of a highway or upon real property adjacent thereto acquired for such purposes, publicly or privately owned, buildings, improvements, or other facilities to aid in the relocation of such displaced persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations;

(3) the extent to which the cost of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements, and other facilities should be paid from the highway trust fund; and

(4) sources of funds to pay the portion of the costs of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements, and other facilities, which is not properly chargeable to the highway trust fund.

HIGHWAY STUDY—GUAM, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the government of Guam, the government of American Samoa, and the government of the Virgin Islands is hereby authorized to make studies of the need for, and estimates and planning surveys relative to, highway construction programs for Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(b) On or before January 10, 1968, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a report to the Congress which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the adequacy of present highway programs to provide satisfactory highways in both the rural and urban areas in Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands;

(2) specific recommendations as to a program for the construction of highways throughout Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands; and

(3) a feasible program for implementing such specific recommendations, including cost estimates, recommendations as to the sharing of cost responsibilities, and other pertinent matters.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until expended, the sum of $200,000 for the purpose of making the studies, surveys, and report authorized by subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

SOIL EROSION CONTROL

SEC. 12. Section 109 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The Secretary shall not approve plans and specifications for proposed projects on any Federal-aid system unless he determines, after consultation with the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, that the plans include adequate measures to minimize soil erosion which might be caused by the proposed excavations and construction."

PRESERVATION OF PARK LANDS

SEC. 13. (a) Chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 137. Preservation of park lands.

"It is hereby declared to be the national policy that in carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall use maximum effort to preserve Federal, State, and local government park lands and historic sites and the beauty and historic value of such lands and sites. The Secretary shall cooperate with the States in developing highway plans and programs which carry out such policy. After July 1, 1968, the Secretary shall not approve under section 105 of this title any program for a project which requires the use for such project of any land from a Federal, State, or local government park or historic site unless (1) there is no feasible alternative to the use of such land, (2) such program includes all possible planning to minimize any harm to such park or site resulting from such use."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WRIGHT: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, S. 3155, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill, H.R. 14359, as passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill, H.R. 14359 was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill, S. 3155, and that the House request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messers FALLON, KLUCZYNSKI, BLATNIK, JONES of Alabama, CLARK, CRAMER, HARSHA, and CLEVELAND.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF AUGUST 15, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, we have finished our legislative business for this week and the request will be made to adjourn over following the announcement of the legislative program.

Monday is the Consent Calendar—suspensions—16 bills:

H.R. 15639, to increase FNMA borrowing authority;

H.R. 16897, providing for the collection, compilation, publication, and sale of standard reference data;

H.R. 15566, amending Great Salt Lake Relicted Lands Act;

H.R. 16114, correction of certain employment inequities with respect to premium compensation;

H.R. 14604, authorizing a study of facilities and services for visitors to the Nation's Capital;

H.R. 15024, amendment to Public Buildings Act of 1959;

H.R. 11555, the Chamizal Memorial Highway;

H.R. 11880, solution of lower Rio Grande salinity problem;

Senate Joint Resolution 108, Pan American Institute of Geography and History;

H.R. 13825, Tijuana River international flood control project;

House Joint Resolution 1169, International Conference on Water for Peace;

H.R. 16559, authorizing the establishment and operation of sea-grant colleges and programs;

H.R. 14136, authorizing increase in fee for migratory bird hunting stamp;

H.R. 12723, drugs and medicine for aid-and-attendance pensioners;

H.R. 16330, Philippine hospitalization and medical care; and

H.R. 16367, war orphans' training for children of certain Philippine veterans.

The above bills will not necessarily be called up in the order listed.

Tuesday and the balance of the week: Private Calendar and the consideration of the following bills:

H.R. 14810, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966—open rule, 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 13228, National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966—open rule, 3 hours of debate, making it in order to consider committee substitute for purpose of amendment;

H.R. 13290, Highway Safety Act of 1966—open rule, 2 hours of debate, making it in order to consider committee substitute for purpose of amendment;

S. 2934, Rural Community Development Act—open rule, 2 hours of debate; and

H.R. 15098, relating to U.S. Participation in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition—open rule, 1 hour of debate.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman has anything in mind with respect to the airline strike and the possibility of legislation, the possibility of any word from the White House as to a position in that matter—anything that he can give us with respect to the possibility of action.

Mr. ALBERT. All I can say to the gentleman is that before we can program the legislation, we must have legislation reported from the committee and we must have a rule. We have neither yet.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman see any hope for legislation or any hope for action on the part of the White House with respect to this situation leading to some kind of conclusion?

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot speak for the White House, I will say to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO AUTHORIZE THE PRINTING OF THE HEARINGS OF THE UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO AS SENATE DOCUMENTS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 82 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 82

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as Senate documents, in separate volumes, the transcripts of the bilingual public hearings held by the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico on (1) legal constitutional matters, (2) social-cultural matters, and (3) economic matters held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, on May 14–18, July 28–August 2, and November 27–December 1, 1965, respectively.

SEC. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed four thousand five hundred copies of such Senate document for the use of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.

With the following amendment:

On the first page, immediately after line 12, add the following new section:

"SEC. 3. The Public Printer is authorized to accept from the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico an amount equal to one-half of the total cost of printing incurred under this concurrent resolution."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE COMMITTEE PRINT, "A STUDY OF FEDERAL CREDIT PROGRAMS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 666 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 666

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, four thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "A Study of Federal Credit Programs", prepared by that committee during the Eighty-eight Congress.

With the following committee amendment:

On the first page, line 4, strike out the word "four" and insert "two" in lieu thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT OF A REPORT ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD ASIA BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FAR EAST AND THE PACIFIC OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, BY THAT SUBCOMMITTEE, AND OF ADDITIONAL COPIES THEREOF

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 791 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 791

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the document "United States Policy Toward Asia", a report by the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, together with hearings thereon held by that subcommittee, dated May 19, 1966, be printed as a House document and that an additional six thousand copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

On the first page, line 7, strike out the word "six" and insert "three" in lieu thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR PRINTING 2,000 ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART I OF UNITED STATES-SOUTH AFRICAN RELATIONS FOR USE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 879 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 879

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, two thousand additional copies of part I of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Africa in March 1966 on the subject of "United States-South African Relations."

With the following committee amendment:

On the first page, line 3, strike out the word "two" and insert "one" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 939, with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 939

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress eight thousand additional copies of its final report to the Congress pursuant to S. Con. Res. 2, Eighty-ninth Congress, first session.

With the following committee amendment:

On the first page, lines two and three, strike out the words "eight thousand" and insert "six thousand four hundred and fifty" in lieu thereof.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR CAPITOL"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 98 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 98

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be

printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol"; and that one hundred and sixty-one thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed, of which fifty-one thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and one hundred and nine thousand seven hundred and fifty copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The additional copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balances shall be distributed as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY QUESTIONS, CANAL ZONE—PANAMA CANAL SOVEREIGNTY, PANAMA CANAL MODERNIZATION, NEW CANAL"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 925 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 925

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the document entitled "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions, Canal Zone—Panama Canal Sovereignty, Panama Canal Modernization, New Canal", a compilation of addresses and remarks by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, be printed as a House document, and that an additional ten thousand five hundred copies be printed of which seven thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and two thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PUBLIC LAW 89–97, 89TH CONGRESS, THE "SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 872 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 872

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the House Document Room, House of Representatives, four thousand six hundred and eighty-seven additional copies of Public Law 89–97, Eighty-ninth Congress, the "Social Security Amendments of 1965".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 1539 BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 887 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 887

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies of House Report Numbered 1539 by that committee on the International Education Act of 1966, H.R. 14643.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 891 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 891

Resolved, That the transcript of the proceedings in the Committee on the District of Columbia of May 18, 1966, incident to the presentation of a portrait of Honorable John L. McMillan to the Committee on the District of Columbia be printed as a House document with an illustration and suitable binding.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 1568 OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 946 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 946

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the document room, House of Representatives, two thousand five hundred additional copies of House Report Numbered 1568, of the Eighty-ninth Congress. Said reports will be distributed solely by the superintendent of the document room for the use of the Members of the House during consideration of H.R. 15111, Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 4671, the Colorado River Basin project.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight Saturday, August 13, to file a report on Senate Joint Resolution 186, air strike regulation.

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

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

TRANSPORTATION, SALE, AND HANDLING OF DOGS AND CATS FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES

Mr. RESNICK (on behalf of Mr. COOLEY) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 13881) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes.

FREEZING FOOD STAPLE PRICES

Mr. FARBSTEIN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to put a temporary freeze on the prices of food staples, in an effort to halt what has become an alarming rate of inflation in the market basket. This bill imposes a 90-day freeze on such items as the Secretary of Agriculture designates as food staples. At the same time, it requires the Secretary to undertake immediately an investigation of inflation in foodstuffs and, within the stated period, to take administrative action or make legislative recommendations to deal with the emergency. I regard this as a moderate and sensible method of dealing with an exceedingly serious situation.

As you may have noticed in the press, Mr. Speaker, I notified the Secretary of Agriculture of my intention to introduce this bill in a letter last week. The Secretary made public his answer to me in a letter he released to the newspapers over the weekend. I feel it is only fair to the Secretary to present the full text of that letter which I herein insert in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

Hon. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FARBSTEIN: I have your letter of August 2 indicating your intention to introduce a bill to freeze food prices for 90 days. I share your deep concern about the effects of inflation on the well-being of people in the low and middle income groups. Rising prices of many commodities and services, not only of food, makes their lot increasingly difficult.

As you know, I met on August 4 with the members of the New York City Council to discuss recent retail price increases of bread and milk in that city as well as the overall food price situation (copy of statement enclosed). Although some part of the increases for bread and milk in New York City reflect increases in farm prices to provide badly needed income to farmers and to ensure adequate supplies, there are real questions as to the justification for most of the rise which has been reported.

I look forward to the findings of the City Council as it investigates recent food price developments and I have pledged full cooperation, support and assistance of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Further, on August 4 I asked the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission "to review immediately the pricing policies and actions for bread and fluid milk, including recent price changes of these food items and their relation to all factors affecting costs and the conditions of competition."

At this time, I do not believe that action by the Congress to freeze food prices even for a temporary period is justified or in the long run interest of consumers or the food industry. As we know from past history price and wage controls are difficult to administer equitably, require a large and expensive government operation, and should not be undertaken unless the case for doing so is crystal clear. They tend to distort price relationships, and make it more difficult for producers to make their plans.

An action to freeze food prices could have a chaotic effect on markets and prices. It also could have a depressing effect on farm production at a time when increasing production of a few commodities, such as milk, is needed.

Some farm prices have increased in recent months; some have decreased. Some costs of food manufacturers and distributors have increased as well. Even so there are prospects that the overall retail price index for foods will remain fairly steady during the rest of this year.

At present, there is strong domestic and foreign demand for food. The capacity of American agriculture is abundantly adequate to supply all of our food needs under foreseeable conditions at prices that would be fair to both consumers and farmers. Steps have been taken recently to increase farm output to meet this growing demand. These include increasing acreage allotments for wheat and rice, and increasing support prices for milk at the farm level so as to encourage dairy farmers to remain in the business and reverse the downward trend in milk production.

We should keep in mind also that although food prices have risen in the past year, the incomes of most consumers have also increased. The average consumer today spends only 18.2 percent of this take home pay for food—the same percentage as a year ago and the lowest in our history.

In view of these facts, I do not see the need at present to freeze food prices even temporarily. I do see some dangers in attempting to do so.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

The Secretary opposes my proposal. I do not feel, however, that the Secretary's answer was sufficiently persuasive to deter me from introducing the bill. I feel the Members can read the Secretary's communication and make their own judgment on the merits of my measure.

Mr. Speaker, inflation in the price of food is the most nefarious type of inflation because it so grievously hits at the poor. We can put off the purchase of cars and television sets, even clothing for a time, but we cannot put off the purchase of food. This is a regressive tax of the worst kind. It is a direct counterweight to the war against poverty and the other economic objectives of the administration and of Congress itself. If the administration feels we can indulge in the luxury of tolerating price increases in other fields, I do not think it is right to tolerate price increases in food. Let me remind you that this inflation represents a wage cut to our poorest citizens, a reduction in their already inadequate income. I ask my colleagues to give my bill their most serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize there will be a wide divergence of opinion on how to resolve our problems of inflation. I do not pretend that my solution is the only one feasible. For that very reason, I made the price freeze temporary, until the Secretary of Agriculture or the President could make alternative recommendations. But I believe that to do nothing is to behave irresponsibly in acquitting our obligations. I call upon my colleagues to come to the rostrum, hopefully to support my bill. But if they feel they have a more adequate answer, I urge them to speak out with it. Perhaps most important, I urge them to rise and speak so that we as a body can convey to the President and the Secretary our deep concern about this serious problem. I ask my colleagues to let the administration and the people know that we are alarmed by the skyrocketing price of the periodic trip to the market. I cannot agree with the President that we can afford to wait, weeks or months. I think the time to act to halt inflation is now.

THE DANGER OF INFLATION

Mr. TODD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the plainest possible speaking about the state of the economy. I have been warning of our present problems for over a year now, but I feel I must speak more strongly than ever. Bluntly, we are faced with an inflationary situation of the most serious sort. In the face of this danger, I am afraid that both the Congress and the administration have preferred largely to ignore the situation, hoping that it will in some manner go away. It will not, and I think we had better realize it.

There are things that can be done to stop inflation, but so far they have not been done or they have been ineffective. The Congress has chosen not only to keep Government spending at high levels, but also to increase appropriations over the President's budget requests. I have spoken out against this practice, and I have voted against some appropriations and "pork barrel" projects which I thought were unnecessary at this time. I fear I have not had much effect.

Both the Congress and the administration have so far shied away from one of the most effective ways to fight inflation: Increasing the tax revenues of the Federal Government by suspending the 7-percent deduction from their income tax given to corporations for investment in plant and equipment. This deduction from their income tax, allowed to corporations, was a needed way of getting the economy going again when it was granted; there is no excuse for its continuation when there is overheating of the economy—particularly in investment which this credit overstimulates.

I realize that it is not considered politically wise to propose such a tax increase just before elections. But political expediency should not be permitted to be used as an excuse for failing to act prudently when conditions clearly demand it.

The Government has tried to use monetary policy—that is, increasing interest rates—to cut inflationary pressures. The evidence shows that monetary policy alone has not succeeded. Last month, the cost-of-living index rose 4 percent, at an annual rate. Most authorities expect the index to rise again this month, making it the 10th straight month that the cost of living has either increased or remained steady. There is no stop to further increases in sight.

The prices of many things are going up. The housewife knows this only too well. She does not need to read statistical tables. She encounters a new increase every week at the grocery store. She will soon be unpleasantly surprised as she buys shoes and clothing for her children to return to school.

Relying exclusively on tight money and high-interest rates has caused severe dislocations in some sectors of our economy, while not being powerful enough to restrain the inflationary push by itself. It is causing severe problems for some of our thrift institutions, and has cut homebuilding back sharply, thereby threatening the homebuilding industry.

For the past several years, the Kennedy and then the Johnson administrations have tried to use the voluntary wage-price guideposts as another method of coping with inflationary pressures. In theory such guideposts—which suggest that wages should not increase by more than 3.2-percent increase in overall productivity—are a useful tool by which to judge the inflationary impact of wage increases. But the airlines strike and the steel price increase have destroyed the guideposts, if they were not dead already.

Until now, the administration has by and large tried successfully to use the guideposts as a tool to persuade both management and union leadership to restrain their demands. But using the guideposts as persuaders from now on seems dead.

Based on the most recent pronouncements, if there is anything to be salvaged, they are "creeping guideposts" to accompany "creeping inflation." I fear we will soon have galloping guideposts accompanying galloping inflation.

So where do we stand? The guideposts are dead. Monetary policy alone has failed. Government spending, both at home and abroad, continues. What

stands between us and a serious inflation? Very little, I fear, unless Congress at last meets its clear responsibility and starts facing the facts.

The only ways left to fight inflation are cutting expenditures, increasing taxes, or reducing investment. And unless Congress does something, and soon, either to examine ways to reduce Government spending or to thoroughly investigate fiscal—that is, tax—policies designed to cope with inflation, we are going to be in serious trouble. I have been urging the Congress to act for over a year, and with the wage-price guideposts now in shreds, perhaps we can get down to business.

I deeply hope there will be thorough and searching debate, starting right now, on this issue. Inflation can kill our economy, impoverish our citizens living on fixed incomes or on social security, imperil our international balance of payments, and make all the economic growth of the past 5 years nothing more than a cruel prelude for a crash. It could wipe out the increase in employment opportunities which are the foundation of success of our poverty programs.

To contribute to this debate, I am today introducing a bill to suspend for 1 year the investment tax credit law, on a graduated basis designed to help the small businessman. In effect, the investment tax credit law allows businesses to reduce their income tax up to 7 percent of their yearly investment. The law was passed as a way to stimulate investment in a lagging economy in the early 1960's, and clearly it has been effective. Suspending the tax credit would cut back the least productive investments. Investment is now $16 billion above 2 years ago, and this has the same inflationary impact as an increase of $16 billion in Government public works spending. Cutting back some of this investment would reduce inflationary pressure.

Investment is the key to most of the economy's workings. Investment usually comes ahead of expansion, it presages increases in demand, it has an impact on the economy much larger than the sum of the investment alone. Investment has remained high during this period of inflation, and unless it is reduced now we are merely guaranteeing ourselves that demand pressures will continue to work within the economy—pressures which cannot help but contribute to inflation. And in addition, the need for job-creating investments would not exist when the economy slackens.

I believe that suspension of the tax credit law should not, however, be straight across the board. Large companies generally can get just about as much investment capital as they want; they are big enough to finance their own expansion or to command low-interest rates from banks. But the small businessman—already hard hit by the tightest money market in many years—is in an entirely different situation. He cannot finance his own expansion, because he does not make that much profit; he cannot command prime interest rates, because he is small.

My bill is designed in such a way that large companies, employing over 1,000 people, would find the full 7-percent credit repealed. It is such corporations that do the major investment in our economy, and it is such investment that we want to reduce to fight inflation. Companies employing from 501 to 1,000 workers would receive only 3-percent investment credit; companies employing from 101 to 500 workers would receive 5-percent credit. And the very small businesses, employing from 1 to 100 workers, would receive the full 7-percent credit.

I am introducing this bill today to serve as a basis for debate—debate not only over the specific provisions of the bill but also on the entire issue of inflation and our proper response toward it. If introducing such a bill can help the Congress get its head out of the sand when it comes to inflation, it will have been very useful.

One alternative now being talked about to congressional failure to act to stop inflation is the imposition of wage and price controls. I consider them the worst possible alternative. I believe that nobody wants such controls. From past experience, we know that they are only temporary, that they are inefficient and artificial, that they lead to redtape and bureaucracy, and that they can lead to the breakdown of a free competitive system. They would prevent the businessman from pricing his product competitively. They would bring some form of control to free collective bargaining, which has been the basis for progress in the labor movement. In short, they would botch up the economy.

In conclusion, let me summarize the objectives of our economic policy:

First, full employment; second, stable prices; third, economic institutions and processes regulated by the forces of competition and not by Government.

The wage-price guidelines were, in a real sense, a means by which Government encouraged voluntary restraints on our economic institutions and processes. While they worked, even with full employment, we had very modest price increases until this year. Now that these guidelines are out the window, inflation will be likely to accelerate.

If we fail to act now—if we fail to meet our clear responsibility to take decisive action to stop inflation—wage and price controls are inevitable. If this Congress were to move forthrightly and honestly to stop inflation, all the election-year jitters which so worry the cynics could be faced. For the Congress would have met its responsibilities. To do anything else is simply unacceptable.

GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY IN PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY

Mr. MACHEN. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to complete the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac River shoreline in Prince Georges County.

Briefly, my bill would:

First. Authorize the unappropriated balance of the Capper-Cramton Act of 1930 to be spent for land acquisition of the parkland in Prince Georges County.

Second. Transfer land acquisition authority from the National Capital Planning Commission to the National Park Service under the Secretary of the Interior.

Third. Delineate a shoreline route for the parkway by law.

Mr. Speaker, there are several motives behind my introduction of this legislation:

First. I am determined to try every possible means, legislative or otherwise, to make this parkway a reality in order to save the Potomac River shoreline in Prince Georges County.

Second. It was made clear in hearings before the House Appropriations Committee this year that the committee does not consider the original Capper-Cramton Act of 1930 sufficient legislative authority to complete the parkway in Prince Georges County. Therefore, we must go back to the authorizing committees with a new authorization before we again attempt to secure the necessary appropriations from Congress.

Third. There has been such a dispute about the alinement of the parkway route over the years that I feel it is high time to tie it down to specifics in legislation. Once this is accomplished and it becomes law it should end once and for all time the controversy about the route.

The history of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Prince Georges County has not been one of which we can all be proud. It has been authorized since 1930 and it still remains to be completed in Prince Georges County. Meanwhile, the assault on the Potomac River shoreline led by land speculators and aided by a handful of political opportunists grows by leaps and bounds each year that the parkway is delayed.

Frankly, I sincerely felt that this was to be the year of the parkway—the year that all those who have been fighting for it in Congress, in the State and in the county would make that final united push to success.

Obviously this was not the case. We have been foiled again by a limited number of diehard parkway opponents and their thousands of dollars for lobbyists, their utter disregard for the public interest, their design to despoil the Potomac River shoreline and profit by their landholdings, their vendetta against everyone who backs the parkway, their provincialism and their own selfish interests.

Mr. Speaker, I was optimistic about the parkway this year because many officials and citizens interested in completing it got together and agreed on a compromise route. In reaching this compromise the Federal Government did its share by promising that those few homeowners in the right-of-way would be paid for their property and they could spend the rest of their lives in their homes. These 29 property owners were still not satisfied. They refused to negotiate, to accept the compromise route that evolved from a meeting of many minds, and now because of their vested interests they still oppose the parkway.

Now, I am less than optimistic about the parkway becoming a reality to preserve the Potomac River shoreline. But this does not mean that I am surrendering, like some have, to the forces which have chalked up one defeat after another for the parkway.

I intend to pursue the final goal—of preserving the shoreline for future generations—in Congress and I intend to carry it back to the Maryland General Assembly, as I did this year. I intend to make a maximum effort to get the new State legislature that will soon be elected to repair the damage that was done to the bond authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, this session of the 89th Congress we have enacted the final legislative authority to preserve the view from Mount Vernon at Piscataway Park along the Potomac shoreline. We have laid a cornerstone at Piscataway Park from which to build our entire Potomac River preservation program. The next step is to secure for all time the shoreline in Prince Georges County between Piscataway Park and the Capital Beltway.

It can only be done by the same united effort which made the Piscataway Park bill a success.

We also must make everyone understand that our method and means of preserving the shoreline does not include condemnation and that we are not taking homes and property away from families. Land acquisition will be carried out in the most equitable manner available because we want the citizens of the county to understand that the parkway is for everyone's benefit and that no personal sacrifices are involved.

We must convince some of those landowners who oppose the parkway that they have been misled by a handful of political opportunists who talk out of both sides of their mouths. These opportunists battle the parkway year after year crying that the Government is going to condemn thousands of homes. Then they turn right around and charge that the same governmental body is not buying parkland fast enough in the county because that body does not use the powers of condemnation.

I know that with the introduction of my new bill the debate and the controversy will start again. I am not afraid of it and I welcome it because the debate gives us a vehicle and an opportunity to tell the public our side of the story. And when the public knows both sides, they usually make the right decision. I know that in this case they will.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to a new round of hearings on this new bill. In my new bill I am offering a new approach to accomplish a longtime objective. I believe that this legislation will be the proper means to final preservation of the Potomac River shoreline in Prince Georges County with the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

VICTORIA ASARE AMERICAN EMBASSY ESSAY CONTEST WINNER

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today it was my privilege and pleasure to meet and converse at some length with a remarkable young woman from Ghana in Africa—Miss Victoria Asare, 19, student and winner of the American Embassy essay contest who is now on tour of the United States under the foreign specialist program of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State. I was happy to extend to Miss Asare the warm welcome of the Congress.

There were 4,500 essays entered in the essay contest won by Miss Asare. The contest was open to the students at all the high schools in Ghana, and the fact that there were so many entries speaks very well indeed for the schools of Ghana, and the personnel of the American Embassy that conducted the contest and of the Ministry of Education of Ghana.

Miss Asare was born June 6, 1947, at Adukrom, Akwapim Ghana. After finishing Agogo Middle School in Ashanti, Miss Asare entered the St. Louis Secondary School in Kumasi, where she is now in form 4. Because of her exceptional ability, she has been permitted to take advance subjects in form 5.

Miss Asare is the first-prize winner in the nationwide high school essay contest sponsored by the Embassy and Ministry of Education. The subject of the essay competition was "Democracy: What It Means to Me."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include the entire text of the essay by this remarkable young woman from Africa:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Victoria Asare)

Democracy is such a wide and diversified concept that to my mind it defies definition. However, although it may seem impossible to capture its essence in one neat phrase, one can say that democracy rests on a trinity of permanent values; Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. The latter two fall easily into line but how can one and the same system incorporate Liberty and Equality since Liberty of its very nature would seem to demand diversity? Edward Lindeman puts it like this: "Where conformity is imposed as an external discipline, liberty is by definition excluded."

But to my mind it is this very tension between Liberty and Equality that gives democracy its vital force. It leaves room for a fruitful clash of ideas resulting in new developments. Edmund Burke, believing that liberty was "the dearest of the democratic graces" more or less ignored the idea of equality. On the other hand, Rousseau held that since men were by nature unequal, it was the work of society to make them equal. What exactly he meant by making them equal I am not sure, but, it seems to me that under a democratic regime all should have equal opportunities to develop whatever talent they may possess since all are equally worthy of respect on account of their dignity as human beings.

All through the ages men have been searching for a way—a system of living that would set them free, help them to live in harmony with their inner selves and with other men. Plato, Rousseau, Lincoln, Aggrey are just a few of the apostles of democracy. With each of them the ideal became more and more fully realized till today there is hardly a corner of the world which is not in love with freedom. Africa is no exception, nor is Ghana. The very fact that *Animal Farm* was once confiscated in our schools shows that the youth were wide awake but applying the moral too closely to home!

The trouble about democracy is that it is something which has to mature over a long period, otherwise it loses its roots and withers. No one will deny that the battle-cry of the French Revolutionaries was "Liberty, Fraternity, Equality," yet in their fanatic pursuit of their ideals their cry was turned into "License, Fratricide, Inequality." The quest for liberty, fraternity, equality must be a patient one and the leader of a democratic government must be prepared for many false starts and disappointments. "Instability, tension and immaturity are inevitable when people are just beginning to face collectively and individually, a wide range of new situations and problems."[1] And to try to make everyone follow 'the party line' just because one thinks it the best for them is to invite disaster as we have already seen here in Ghana. There must be a democratic approach. A leader must be willing to see his plans only partially realized. There must be give and take and it is here that Africans have an advantage over more developed countries. Living close to the soil and living with its slow, peaceful rhythm, most Africans can wait patiently for growth. The large and extended family system too gives every opportunity for give and take.

It is futile to argue that a newly independent country "cannot afford" to be democratic. A one-party system may seem to be the inevitable choice for a developing country which has to build up its economy, give an illiterate population much guidance and do in ten years what other nations have taken hundreds of years to do. This may seem on the face of it very wise indeed but recent events in our country have shown it to be a short-sighted policy. The eighty-percent illiterate population soon tired of the forced "guidance." They were not willing to be led by the nose forever. This goes to show that people who thought that democracy was not practicable in a country like Ghana were all wrong. They seemed to imply that we ought not to try out democracy until we had become wise and good under dictatorship. What folly! Any man who resolves never to get into the water until he has learned to swim will indeed wait forever and never learn.

We could do worse than base our teaching of democracy on a framework which we know already—the family. If I mention family, it includes not only my father, mother, brothers, and sisters, but the extended family or group of relatives living in single or in neighboring communities. We are under the leadership of the elder men of the family, one of whom is popularly acknowledged as the head. I remember once there arose the problem of sending to a secondary school one of the girls whose parents were dead. All the relatives met together and discussed how they were going to do this. It was finally decided that three of the uncles who were fairly well-off should contribute a certain amount of money each month. Though the head died, this system continued to operate because once they had given their opinion and come to a satisfactory agreement they considered that out of loyalty to the family and respect for the head their promises must be kept. This being the

---

[1] Adrian Hastings in his article "The second Revolution"—New Blackfriars, March 1966.

normal family's way of dealing with problems it should not be hard to get people to understand democracy on a larger scale.

Besides, they are already familiar with democratic government, though not consciously so. I am referring to Chieftaincy which holds in embryo almost all the essential features of democracy. A chief is made eligible for office by his birth into the royal family, but his ultimate selection to community headship depends upon the clear recognition of his acquired abilities to lead, by three powerful groups: firstly, by the members of his own family, then by the council representatives of all the other families in the community and finally and most democratically, by the individual members of all the families who register approval or disapproval through their own representatives. His tenure, like that of the family head depends upon his behaviour. If he fails to please, out he goes, to be replaced by another member of the royal family who can gain the necessary approval. In this way autocracy is prevented.

Nowadays, we find that the claims of the native chief are often unduly overlooked when native questions are being dealt with. The chief was formerly a man of very great importance. But his present position is anomalous. Both his rights and duties are ill-defined, and as a natural consequence, he has lost a great deal of self-respect. I think that it is the duty of any democratic government to endeavour to restore the native chief to his former position of trust in the community. He must be given real power, definite responsibilities and definite rights and duties.

If this is done I feel sure we will be developing along lines of natural evolution instead of substituting for our own laws and customs, a system that we think is better just because it happens to be in force in Great Britain or Russia. Improvement on, and not mere imitation of the views of the Western democratic credo, whether in morals, manners and customs or in dress, art or industry is the trade keynote of civilization throughout the world.

If democracy is to have the proper environment in which to develop there must be a stable economy and more and varied educational opportunities.[2] "In general the economy is not developing comparably with education and there is a real danger that higher education—especially if it is incomplete will come to put people out of a job, rather than into one. This is especially true as so little of the educational effort is directed towards a trade or craft. It is academic, geared to professional work or to the white-collar jobs of an advanced industrial society, but that society hardly exists yet in Africa." Therefore there is need for more emphasis on technical training so that there will be skilled workers to fill the jobs made available by an expanding economy.

But preparing people to fill posts is only a minor part of education. Democracy is not just a form of government, it is an attitude of mind and in educating people for it there are many factors to be considered. I shall deal with only two extremes. First, there are those whose ideas of freedom have been so blunted that they may have to be shaken out of a servile frame of mind. To such people it must be pointed out that they have a right to speak their mind, to fight against injustice, to vote for whomsoever they please and in secrecy.

They have a right to education, a just wage, free time, consultation with their employers and so on. Then there are the others, a greater number I think, whose ideas on freedom need to be corrected. They are the people who criticize everything destructively but who fail to realize that they are not exercising liberty here, but taking liberties, which is entirely different.[3] Among those who offend against liberty are many of us young students. Since democracy is a way of walking and not of talking, we must have opportunities to live it in school. There is already the prefectorial system which teaches that positions of honour and trust bring their own responsibilities and duties.

But not all young people appreciate that the responsibilities are at least as important as the privileges, if not more so. Let me illustrate this point. In a certain boy's school the students were continually clamouring for more democratic treatment. They felt they should be consulted and have a say in the drawing up of the menu for meals. The Headmaster eventually decided to teach them a lesson. He allowed the Students' Food Committee to take over completely the ordering of provisions. They were to be entirely responsible for handing out the food to the cooks and hardest of all for keeping within a fixed budget. The experiment failed. After a week the boys tired of the extra work involved and worse still half the school was reporting at the dispensary with stomach-ache! But the committee had learnt at least this: that democracy is not all shouting for rights.

Freedom has limits and we should all respect each other's. What makes a society is a common aim; and to have a solid, lasting society there should be rules and some basic moral standards. What should be learned is that we are what we are today because of our neighbours, their personalities and the influence of all those we have ever met. Therefore, we should respect the ideas of other people and accept and bear our own mistakes if we are in the wrong, for we are all fallible.

People who have recognized their freedom, its limits and their fallibility from a free-state. A man of a Free-state is bold enough to stand by the light given him. This means he is able to bear witness to the right and wrong he sees. He need not close windows and doors in order to talk about the government, religion or a frivolous book on politics found in the library. This does not mean that he may always criticize the government if it intervenes in certain of his affairs. There is no use in its giving me a full scholarship while I sit down at my desk enjoying the breeze. The head of my school, acting in the government's interests, has a right to withdraw that scholarship.

To conclude, we know that only love, goodwill, friendship and spiritual togetherness can secure the well-being prosperity and progression of our nation. Above all, I feel strongly that as far as we Ghanaians are concerned, we shall be depending for a long time to come on an educated minority. Let them be truly educated then. Let them put away all thought of personal gain and advancement and be men of sympathy, imagination and above all men of patience. For "all this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will be finished in the first 1,000 days, . . ., nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin."[3]

BOOKS CONSULTED FOR IDEAS BUT NOT QUOTED DIRECTLY

"My Hope for America," President Lyndon B. Johnson.

"The Quest for Order," Fred G. Burke.

"Africa, The Politics of Independence," Emmanual Wallerstain.

"The Gold Coast of Today," Sir John P. Rodger.

[2] Adrian Hastings in his article "The Second Revolution"—New Blackfriars, March 1966.

[3] President John F. Kennedy in his First Inaugural Address.

CONCLUSIONS OF GRAND JURY ON THE HOUGH DISTURBANCE IN THE CITY OF CLEVELAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I included in the body of the RECORD the Cuyahoga County grand jury's report on the Hough disturbances in Cleveland. The conclusions reached by the jury after several weeks of intensive investigation by Cleveland law enforcement agencies and lengthy testimony by participants in and witnesses to the riots not only revealed Communist infiltration of the civil rights movement, but spell out the possibility of a recurrence.

I respectfully call the attention of the House to this report which appears on pages 18827–18830 of the August 10 RECORD. Let me urge you to read it in its entirety, but I will quote to you now a few excerpts which compel me to ask again that the Congress take immediate appropriate action to investigate outside influence in the series of racial uprisings in our country:

In part the report says:

The jury respectfully calls attention to the effective uses made of impressionable, emotionally immature and susceptible young minds by those who for one reason or another have set out to accomplish their designs and objectives in Europe, Asia, South America and elsewhere. . .

Continuing the report says:

Special movies of an undisclosed and voluntary interview shown to the jury presented Harllel Jones—

Identified as one of the leaders of the Hough riots—

as an outright exponent of violence, a black power apostle with a bitter hatred of all whites, a cofounder of the rifle club.

The report declares:

There was evidence placed before the jury that rifle clubs were formed, that ammunition was purchased and that a range was established and used, that speeches were made at JFK House advocating the need for rifle clubs and that instructions were given in the use of molotov cocktails, and how and when to throw them to obtain maximum effect.

I quote further:

With specific regard to the W. E. B. DuBois Club—

Which the report identified as a moving spirit in the riots—

the evidence shows that Mike Bayer, Daniel Mack, Ron Lucas and Steve Shreeter, previously living and residing a large part of their time outside of Cleveland are currently making plans to move their efforts from the Hough area over to the west side of Cleveland.

I appeal to this House to take immediate action to investigate this situation and the smoldering situations which certainly exist in our other big cities.

The major cities of the Nation are under threat of future blood baths. The Department of Justice, I am sorry to say, appears relatively undisturbed by the matter and it is the duty and responsibility of the Congress to take appropriate steps.

IT IS NOW TIME FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO COME FORWARD AND REVEAL ALL SOURCES OF INCOME AND FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS

Mr. GATHINGS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the Arkansas democratic primary on July 26, 1966, the people of the First Congressional District of Arkansas voted overwhelmingly to continue my services by renominating me as their Representative in Congress. Since I do not have Republican opposition, this decision on the part of the people I represent is virtually tantamount to reelection to the next Congress. I am extremely grateful for the trust that my people have placed in me, and I want to take this opportunity to hereby pledge to my congressional colleagues and to my people to continue to serve with honesty, with integrity, and with the utmost devotion to the best interests of Arkansas, as well as those of the United States, in fulfilling my duties and obligations as a Member of this body in which I am honored to serve.

Since there have been occasions recently that cast suspicion on the wholehearted willingness of some Members of Congress to serve unselfishly in the public interest and not for personal gain, I feel that it is now time for Members of Congress to come forward and reveal all sources of income and financial obligations. It is for this reason that I wish to make public my financial status.

Because of my great interest and work in the field of agriculture, some people want to know if I own, operate, or have a financial interest in any farmland or cotton gins in this country or in any foreign country. To this I must answer that I do not now, nor have I at any time in the past.

Although I am a lawyer by profession, as soon as I was first elected to Congress, I closed my law office and canceled all my legal affiliations so that I could devote my full attention to the business pertaining to the Congress. I never accept a fee from anyone for any purpose. My friends do make contributions, however, when I am engaged in a political campaign. What funds are not used for campaigning are returned to the donors.

My family and I live on the income paid to a Member of Congress by the Federal Government. It is my only source of income, and my wife has no income of her own.

Our main expenditures are for housing, transportation, and the education of our two children. Royston will be a senior at the University of Arkansas this fall, and Tolise is studying for a master's degree at George Washington University.

We have been fortunate in the housing field due to the rising value of real estate. Our home at 421 West Barton Street, West Memphis, Ark., was purchased a good many years ago for $14,600. Today I feel that the appraisal and value would be considerably higher.

Finding it cheaper to buy a house than to rent one in the Washington area, we bought our first house for $16,500 by borrowing $2,500 for the downpayment. We are now in our fourth house purchased in or around the District of Columbia. By being able to sell the other three houses for more than we paid for them, we purchased a house at 1105 Villamay Boulevard, Alexandria, Va., in 1960 for approximately $41,500. On January 1, 1966, we still owed $25,492.54 on this mortgage. We own the furnishings in the two homes. We have no other real estate holdings.

Our daughter, Tolise, has a 1960 Rambler, and Royston drives a 1965 Karman Ghia Volkswagen; Mrs. Gathings rides in a 1963 Biscayne Chevrolet, and I have a 1964 Chrysler New Yorker.

Our total investments are $200 I invested several years ago in the Christian Foundation Life Insurance Co. of Little Rock, Ark., and $200 in the West Memphis Federal Savings & Loan Association. We have $5 in a checking account at the Bank of Earle, Earle, Ark.; and we also have $5 in the First Federal Savings & Loan of Alexandria, Va. Mrs. Gathings went on a spree one year and bought one share of Gyrodyne for $12. An additional asset is the amount paid in over the years to the retirement fund.

The following congressional business expenses which were incurred last year and paid from my salary, since there are no Federal funds to take care of such items, are: Arkansas newspaper subscriptions, $181.10; taking constituents to lunch—it is my pleasure to have this opportunity to see my friends when they come to Washington—$724.29; travel over the district above the amount reimbursed by the Government, $1,749.40.

For the year 1965 we paid a total of $5,696.96 for Federal and State taxes, which includes $3,693.83 paid by me for Federal income tax. We also paid during the same year $2,459.57 in interest on debts. We are gradually paying off our debts by making monthly installment payments to Sears, Roebuck & Co., First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Washington, the First National Bank in Blytheville, Commercial Credit Corp., First National Bank in West Memphis, and J. C. Penney Co.

It is my hope that this information will bring you to the understanding that I vote as a Representative, not for myself, but for what I truly feel to be in the best interest of the people of the First Congressional District of Arkansas and for our beloved Nation as a whole.

TAXES, HIDDEN AMONG PEOPLE?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, "it is reliably reported," as the saying goes, that Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, spoke to a closed-door meeting of Democrat congressional candidates in Washington a few days ago. Neither my staff nor I am privy to such meeting but the Chicago Tribune reported that a candidate from Columbus, Ohio, asked the Secretary's advice on how to handle questions about inflation and the rising cost of living:

I've been trying to figure out an answer to that question for 6 years—

Freeman replied—

Slip, slide and duck any question of higher consumer prices if you possibly can.

Statements of this nature are typical of attempts by the present administration to conceal the truth. L.B.J. and Secretary Freeman have placed the blame for inflation on rising farm prices. In reality, farmers' prices are down 13 percent while food prices are up 17 percent since the Korean war. Farm prices, in fact, are presently at only 79 percent of parity—the lowest level since the great depression.

Certainly the fault is not with the farmer. About 60 percent of the increase in food prices is added after products leave the farm. The real blame must be placed on the multiplicity of hidden taxes which rob the American consumers of billions of dollars every year, and on the inflationary deficit-spending policies which are being employed by the current administration.

Many people blame the all-important middleman for the tremendous rise in consumer prices. In the final analysis, however, the wholesaler, the transporter, the packager, and other middlemen do not really make as large a profit as might at first be assumed. Most of their markup is due to hidden taxes—the increasingly significant factor which is so often overlooked. These taxes, which are collected in such a way that the public is hardly aware of them, cost many Americans more than the income tax. The impact which these taxes have on an average family has been long since set forth in easily understood language by the famed ABC commentator, Paul Harvey, in his article. "Only People Pay Taxes," which I will submit for the purpose of being reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I quote in part, from the article:

When I finally retracked the loaf of bread back to the grocer's shelf I understood why that price tag is more than 10 times what the wheat farmer gets.

Because here are 151 separate taxes on that loaf of bread.

You and I have been complaining, however feebly, about the whack the income tax takes out of our weekly paycheck. While we were watching our wallet pocket the hidden tax has been emptying our coin purse. And again and again and again.

The hidden tax is little more than a means by which big government can spend the people's money without them knowing about it. Indeed it is a direct abuse of the people's right to be informed of Government activities.

The much-talked-about inflation problem has also had an effect on the food price situation. Farmers are the direct victims of inflation. As a result, since 1960—when Freeman became Secretary of Agriculture—3.2 million workers have left the farm.

Freeman does not seem to be much concerned about the farmer's plight. Instead, he seems to be working against the farmer. According to Freeman himself, he was "pleased" when corn prices went down after surplus corn was dumped on the market. In addition, he has advised housewives and the Secretary of Defense to buy cheaper cuts of meat in order to avoid the price increase. This is especially poor advice when the Federal Government is spending billions on social experiments and wages an undeclared war. Even so, Freeman continues to pursue his antifarmer policies.

Congress does not need to create a new agency or another study commission of any type, to deal with the problems of hidden taxes and inflation. The executive branch must simply devote itself to responsible government along with economic progress. The various departments are quite well equipped to settle their problems and perform their duties under legislative oversight and review. So now the question to ask is a simple one—Mr. Freeman, why do you not get busy and do something for the farmer instead of blaming him for things he can do nothing about? You have "slipped, slid and ducked" far too often.

The article follows:

WHO'S DOUBLING THE PRICE YOU PAY FOR YOUR DAILY BREAD? PAUL HARVEY NAMES THE CULPRIT IN "ONLY PEOPLE PAY TAXES"

Americans, 2 weeks ago, I, Paul Harvey, started out chasing a sneak thief and I ended up with the detection of public enemy No. 1.

I have been 2 weeks on the trail.

I am very tired. But the job is done.

No conviction yet. But I can name him now. And he is yours to prosecute as you see fit. Before I tell you his name. * * *

Here's what happened.

Two weeks ago I got a letter from a farmer on the subject of the last election.

But he included this question, "Who is the middle man who is getting rich off the farmer?"

He said he sells a bushel of wheat for $1.73.

By the time that bushel of wheat is made into 66 loaves of bread it costs housewives $15.84. Whoa, there.

"Who's getting rich on me?" the farmer wanted to know.

Well, I've heard that question repeated so often that I had stopped listening to it.

But suddenly I decided the one way to silence that noisome question—nobody had tried—and that was to answer it.

Well, with my limited staff we started playing detective.

For the wheat in a loaf of bread the farmer gets 2½ cents.

But you pay 24 cents.

So you are both being robbed by somebody. Who?

I figured I'd backtrack on the culprit. So I went to the grocery store. "How much do you take out, Mr. Grocer, when you sell a loaf of bread?" I said. "There's more than 20 cents missing that somebody's getting. Is it you?"

Well the grocer showed me that his markup is confined by competition to only 3 cents.

In view of his salaries, overhead, that markup seemed fair enough, especially when he explained that he has to pay more than half of it back in corporate income taxes not covered in the sales tax.

And also he contributes to the social security and unemployment taxes of his employees.

He pays an electric bill every month plus a tax on it. And his delivery truck was taxed when he bought it and the gasoline it uses and the license plates it wears are all taxed.

So all this overhead, not to mention his own income taxes, made 3 cents seem a fair enough profit for the grocer to make on that loaf of bread.

Anyway, he was not the robber I was looking for.

I went to the wholesaler and rode on one of the trucks that delivers the bread.

Maybe this driver was the boy who's been picking the farmer's pocket.

After all, the teamsters union, you know.

But I divided the number of loaves of bread the man delivers by his wages per week and his take is less than one-twentieth of 1 cent a loaf. So he's doing all right. But he's not stealing anything.

There's too much spread between the price and the cost of a loaf of bread. The guy I was looking for doesn't have just a finger in the kitty.

He's in there with both fists.

I kept looking.

There were two tedious days of sleuthing for this sneak thief before I backtracked on that loaf of bread as far as the flour mill. But I made sure that I didn't miss any possible middlemen in the bakery or in the railroad that hauled the flour, or anywhere.

And not one was getting away with anything. I mean the profit slice which each took for his services was an infinitesimal fraction of one-tenth of 1 penny per loaf. Not even measurable.

Then I got a tip. Check the sugar source. If nobody in the wheat-flour ingredient was robbing us—maybe the sugar people. I backtracked to a New Orleans refiner and it was another deadend. The price you pay for the sugar and the salt and the yeast and the milk solids and the shortening in the loaf of bread—all put together—come to less than one-fourth of 1 cent per loaf.

So. * * *

And here is where I stubbed my toe. By the time I added everybody's profit for handling the materials and the finished product plus the cost of the ingredients—I figured it all up—and it came to 12 cents for a loaf of bread. You should be paying 12 cents for a loaf of bread.

But I can't get my grocer to sell me a loaf for less than 24 cents.

Who's doubling the price of my loaf of bread?

Who's getting away with that other 12 cents?

I had figured every handler's wage down to the most minute fraction. My figures could not be wrong.

But a loaf of bread added up to 12 cents and it's still selling for 24 cents. I was getting as angry as the farmer who'd written me that letter. It's frustrating to have your wife go to the grocery store and—somewhere in there—get robbed by a ghost.

Well I went back to the farmer. I decided to start all over again, but working forward from the farmer. The research went faster this time because I knew the direction.

And this time I caught him. Red handed. The guy who's picked your pocket every time you buy a loaf of bread. And he's been dealing himself in when you buy milk, too. There are 206 separate transactions involved in getting a quart of milk from the pasture to your doorstep. And sure enough, I found the same guy doubling the price.

The syndicate he operates is so smooth and so subtle that it's little wonder he's escaped the rap for this before.

But I'm going to name him tonight.

Because he's gradually aiming to double the price of your loaf of bread again.

And again.

While the farmer fusses and fumes and shadowboxes with imaginary villains, the real one has been in hiding.

I took that farmer's bushel of wheat to market. The farmer got $1.73 for it. Two and one-half cents per loaf of bread.

But when flour mill added its fraction for milling—wait a minute—the flour to make one loaf of bread has suddenly doubled. It comes out of the mill costing 5 cents. Not 2½. Still the mill is getting only a minute fraction of a penny for itself.

But the mill is required to pay. Now the trail gets warm.

The mill has to add on seven Federal taxes and eight separate State taxes.

The railroad which hauls the finished flour—now the trail gets hot—keeps only a tiny fraction of a penny for its services—but it adds on 2 pennies to pay five Federal taxes, plus State taxes in every State through which the shipment passed.

In this case there were three.

Jumping Jehoshaphat.

I thought taxes just soaked the rich.

This is soaking anybody who buys a loaf of bread.

And when I backtracked on those other ingredients, I found the sugar refiner paid eight Federal taxes and six Louisiana State taxes. The railroad that hauled the sugar paid taxes. The warehouse where the salt was stored in Chicago paid taxes. The shortening manufacturer and the yeast factory and the producer of the milk solids.

Each was keeping for himself such a minute profit that the total cost of the ingredients had added only 2 pennies. But the taxes had pyramided to more than twice that.

I am an amateur detective. But I did the best I could. And when I finally retracted the loaf of bread back to the grocer's shelf I understood why that price tag is more than 10 times what the wheat farmer gets.

Because here are 151 separate taxes on that loaf of bread.

You and I have been complaining, however feebly, about the whack the income tax takes out of our weekly paycheck. While we were watching our wallet pocket the hidden tax has been emptying our coin purse. And again and again and again. After all, we've consoled ourselves, the tax man gets only 20 percent of my income. It's worth that to live in America.

But that's a lie and a delusion. The tax man has been picking your pocket for 12 cents every time you buy one loaf of bread. But with such clever sleight of hand—by such an involved and complicated multiplicity of hidden taxes—that his hand was quicker than our eye.

You think you pay a hundred dollars tax when you buy a new $2,000 car. Listen: There have been $288 in hidden taxes collected on that car before it ever leaves the factory.

And then there are all the taxes the dealer pays, taxes on income, property, taxes when

you transfer the title, when you pay the State tax. So when you pay $2,000 for a car—more than one-fourth of that price is just taxes.

You've been figuring the corporation tax would cost only the big corporations. But look what happened. They added it to the price of the car.

We pay it.

The grocer, the trucker, the baker, the miller, they don't pay their taxes. We do.

When we buy that loaf of bread.

Railroads don't pay taxes. Corporations don't pay taxes.

Just people pay taxes.

All the rest of those fellows add their taxes onto the stuff they sell us.

Only people pay taxes.

We can hear that our Federal Government is sending a billion dollars to Tito. * * *

And we figure "so what * * *."

But every time our Government spends a billion it taxes the average American family another $25.

Only people pay. How much different it might have been if our Government had said it that other way. That "every American family is asked to chip in $25 this year for Tito." Wow.

Conversely, every billion dollars which our Government saves—every billion dollars less that it spends—decreases the tax load for the American family of four by $2. Wow.

I'm going to remember that. Every time the Washington or the State spenders speak of spending another billion for something or other, I'm going to remember it's 25 of my dollars they're spending. It'll make a difference.

CONTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO POLITICAL FUND-RAISING AFFAIRS

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the UPI wire service today is a story reporting that Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE has accused a Congressman of blackmail and extortion in soliciting paid attendance at a reception from Federal employees.

The same wire service account goes on to report that Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, charged "An organized shakedown is going on" in the Johnson administration to force Federal employees to contribute to political fund-raising affairs.

I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that a couple of years ago I brought to the attention of the administration illegal solicitations in the REA. These solicitations were investigated by Civil Service investigators and by the FBI. My charges were confirmed by the investigations.

The Hatch Act had been violated as well as the Corrupt Practices Act. Yet those involved who are in the excepted service have gone unpunished, and the classified employee involved was merely permitted to retire.

I believe the Hatch Act is being destroyed rapidly. It is crystal clear that the Johnson administration has set the pattern and waved the green light to permit the widespread arm-twisting of Federal employees. How long will these illegal campaign fund solicitations be permitted to continue in defiance of public law?

The wire service article to which I have referred is as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Sen. CLIFFORD P. CASE, R–N.J., today accused a Congressman of blackmail and extortion in soliciting paid attendance at a reception from Federal employes.

CASE did not identify the Congresman, but a letter he read indicated it was a New Yorker.

In a speech prepared for Senate delivery, CASE read a complaint from a civil service employe who identified herself only as a typist.

CASE said the typist received a letter which started with a glowing biography of the Congressman and ended with this paragraph:

"We have enclosed four tickets with a return card. Kindly let us know if you need more. Please come and enjoy an evening with your friend (blank). If you can't make it, we will certainly appreciate your support."

In her letter, the girl had written that she had "never lived in New York and have never seen, met, or written to Congressman (blank)."

CASE said, "such solicitation make a mockery of our whole democratic system.

"It is blackmail pure and simple and cannot be disguised in the cloak of 'voluntary' contributions.

"When a person's livelihood is at stake it is not a question of what one 'wants to do', there is no choice.

"I consider it a disgrace that the Congress should tolerate such a loophole in the Corrupt Practices Act," CASE said. "It is a loophole that has been increasingly exploited."

Sen. JOHN J. WILLIAMS, R–Del., charged today that "an organized shakedown is going on" in the Johnson administration to force federal employes to contribute to political fund raising affairs.

"The President knows it, he likes it, he condones it," WILLIAMS told the Senate.

WILLIAMS made the charge after CASE accused a Congressman of blackmail and extortion in soliciting paid attendance by federal employes at a reception.

CASE did not identify the Congressman but a letter he read indicated it was a New Yorker.

WILLIAMS followed to say he had received many similar letters. He said he had introduced a resolution to ask the Attorney General to give Congress his recommendations on the problem of "making" contributions from federal job holders but had received no response.

SAM MELLINGER—MR. REPUBLICAN—A GREAT KANSAN

Mr. DOLE. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, a personal friend of mine, Sam Mellinger, passed away on Wednesday. In most instances, following death, it would be improper to even mention politics, but there are exceptions and, in my opinion, this is one. Sam Mellinger, a great Kansan, a dedicated husband and father, and a willing worker in local, State, and National affairs, took his politics seriously. It has been said, by one who knew Sam as well as anyone, that "he left this world one of the richest men ever known—rich in friendship, rich in genuine accomplishments, and very, very rich in common honor and common decency." It was an honor and a privilege to know him, to work with him and to know of his complete dedication to everything he undertook. While I cannot comment about many of his accomplishments, the record is clear that Sam Mellinger not only loved politics, but greatly influenced politics and political activity throughout Kansas and the Nation.

When he passed away on Wednesday, August 10, he was the Republican national committeeman from the State of Kansas. Before reaching this pinnacle in politics, Sam had risen from the ranks of a precinct committeeman to Republican State chairman of Kansas in 1958–60. Because of his devotion and interest, the Republican strength in the Kansas State Legislature increased from 69 members in the 1958 session to 82 in the 1960 session. Sam held numerous positions in the Republican Party in Kansas and was also on the 15-member executive committee of the National Republican Committee. As an indication of his national stature, it is well to point out that the present national chairman of the Republican Party, Ray Bliss, asked Sam to nominate him in 1965 for that position.

There was never any task too small or too large if the objective was sound and in the best interest of building and preserving a strong two-party system in Kansas and the Nation.

All those who knew Sam were enriched because of it and are saddened by his death. To his wife Jerenne, his children Dick and Gwyneth, we offer our sincere and prayerful sympathy, trusting that they will be sustained during this period of sorrow by the memory of a man which will live on and on and on.

MAINE SUGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have followed with deep interest the development of the sugar industry in Maine since 1964 because it has a direct effect upon industry and employment in my congressional district where two cane sugar refineries are located. The cane sugar refining industry has been in existence in Boston for more than 100 years and our refineries are among the most modern cane sugar refining plants in the world. These plants provide steady employment for approximately 1,000 people throughout the year. The average wage of a cane refinery production worker exceeds $3 per hour plus fringe benefits which average $1.05 per hour. These wage rates exceed the average industrial rate in the New England area. The steady

employment of these workers is in jeopardy as a result of the developments which I will bring to the attention of this body. In order that you may fully understand the questions which I have raised with respect to the recent loan of the EDA, I would like to give you a brief summary of the development of the beet sugar industry in the State of Maine.

The Sugar Act of 1962 authorized the establishment of six new beet sugar factories over a period of 4 years. Local business groups in Aroostook County, Maine, were provided with an acreage commitment sufficient to support a new beet factory. The acreage commitment to this area was conditioned upon the construction of a beet factory to process the crop.

In 1964, the Great Western Sugar Co. of Denver, Colo., entered into an agreement with a local business group in the area to supervise the construction and operation of the factory. It was to be built by an industrial development group and the capital requirements of $17,500,000 were to be financed from several sources including the Area Redevelopment Administration which agreed to a loan of $6,931,300. On February 12, 1965, an announcement was made that the Great Western Sugar Co. was withdrawing from the Maine beet sugar project stating at the time that the reason for its withdrawal was because "it feels that sugarbeets cannot be grown properly in northern Maine."

With the withdrawal of the Great Western Co. the Maine local business group sought to interest others in building and operating the factory. A new group was formed and it planned to construct and operate a beet sugar plant in conjunction with an already existing facility which processes other agricultural products. The financing of this plant was then modified and on March 22, 1965, the Area Redevelopment Administration authorized a 20-year loan of 4-percent interest for $6,495,000 to the Aroostook Development Corp. for payment on account of not more than 65 percent of the cost of land acquisition, construction, equipment, and other expenses related to construction of this plant. The development company also arranged for a construction and/or a first mortgage loan in the amount of $6 million from the First National Bank of Boston and the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York. This loan will be fully insured by the Maine Industrial Building Authority. Local financing in the amount of $2,205,000, secured by a third mortgage on the property, completed the long-term financing on the plant which totals $14,700,000. Having secured this financing, the development company on July 15, 1965, entered into an agreement with a West German corporation to design and supply the machinery and equipment for $5,523,045 plus salaries and expenses of German supervising specialists personnel attached to the project. I also am given to understand that the steel for buildings on this project was purchased in Germany.

Let me make it clear that I have always been one of the principal supporters in the Congress of fair and equitable sugar legislation and I supported the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962, which included provisions for the orderly expansion of the beet sugar industry. However, when application was made for an acreage commitment, I publicly expressed my doubts about the wisdom of locating a new beet sugar factory in Maine. Also, on learning about the financing of the new factory, I questioned the desirability of using ARA funds in a project which would tend to cause unemployment in the long established industry in New England.

It is my understanding that this beet sugar plant is to commence processing of the beet crop this October. The Department of Agriculture reserved 33,000 acres of the total national beet acreage goal for this factory, but according to the latest reports, farmers responded by planting less than 3,500 acres. In view of this obvious indication of the lack of farmer interest in the beet operations, the management now plans to provide additional machinery and equipment for the refining of raw cane sugar, completely changing the character of the operation, and offering no further inducement to Maine farmers. Whereas the building of the original beet plant was part of our national program providing for the orderly expansion of the domestic beet industry, I feel very strongly that the modification of this plant to permit it to refine raw cane sugar certainly has no economic justification. To understand the situation it should be borne in mind that it would be necessary to bring raw cane sugar in from overseas points to one of the country's most northerly seaports. This raw sugar will then have to be transported over approximately 200 miles to one of the most northerly points of the United States in an area sparsely populated and lacking in any sizable food processing industries that might be using sugar.

The refined output of this plant—if any salable sugar is actually turned out, since there has as yet been no successful operation of this type of plant anywhere in the United States—will have to be backhauled hundreds of miles to the consumer centers which are concentrated in the Boston area. It may be of interest to the subcommittee to know that almost 50 percent of the entire New England population is concentrated in the radius of some 50 to 75 miles around Boston. It is in this highly populated area where the demand for sugar exists and it is this area that would constitute the real market for any sugar produced at any point in the New England States. But we already have two large sugar refineries in Boston and they have the capacity to turn out refined cane sugar products far in excess of the refined sugar demand in all of the New England States.

I am told, and it is rather obvious, that any sugar produced by the Maine plant and sold in the New England States will clearly replace an equivalent quantity of cane sugar now produced at the Boston refineries. In this manner any added production that might be realized at this Maine plant will directly affect employment within the existing cane refineries. These workers residing in my district are very much concerned about this and have expressed their concern to me.

My interest in this matter goes further. I am particularly distressed that millions of dollars of the construction capital was spent outside the United States for the purchase of machinery, building materials, and services of construction personnel. I am unable to understand why at a time when our balance of trade is unfavorable, and President Johnson is urging American businesses and individuals to curtail spending abroad, it was necessary to export these millions of dollars outside our country for machinery, structural steel, and other equipment which could have been obtained in our United States.

I am advised that a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee was specially appointed in order to conduct a continuing and constructive review of economic development programs under the Public Works and Economic Act of 1965 and other related programs. I respectfully suggest that the information I have given you today, based as it is largely on information I have received through newspapers and press releases of the Government agencies involved, is sufficient to warrant a thorough study of the facts by this subcommittee.

It was the express purpose of the Congress in enacting the Public Works and Economic Development Act to make available Federal financing assistance, provided that such assistance is preceded by and consistent with sound, long-range, economic planning. Based on the information made public so far, it is apparent to me that the latest EDA loan to the Maine Sugar Industries, Inc., fails to meet the standard provided in the statute.

GOV. JOHN A. BURNS SPEAKS ON LABOR'S STAKE IN HAWAII

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, because as Hawaii's Congressman I am frequently asked by my colleagues, "How's Jack Burns doing as Governor?" I would like to offer for the RECORD a recent speech delivered by Gov. John A. Burns of Hawaii, a former Member of this House.

His remarks on "Labor's Stake in Hawaii" will no doubt prove of interest to those who know the Governor, for they reveal much of what he has done and is attempting to do for Hawaii as its first elected Democratic chief executive.

I include his speech in the RECORD at this point:

LABOR'S STAKE IN HAWAII

(Address by Gov. John A. Burns of Hawaii, AFL–CIO leaders conferences, East-West Center, July 24, 1966)

It is always a pleasure to break bread with old friends, particularly with you of Hawaii's

labor movement, with whom I have shared a warm understanding and kinship for many years.

I might add that breaking bread was about all we literally did for supper this evening. Not that I have any complaints. The spartan meal we enjoyed tonight was quite symbolic of the common roots from whence you and I spring. Moreover, it serves as a very real reminder to all of us of the many thousands in our own Nation and the millions throughout the world who do not share in the general affluence that prevails in America.

Bread and beans are more than the daily fare within reach of countless numbers in a world capable of abundant production for all. This very simple supper, then, might well serve as an inspiration to each of us to do everything we are capable of to improve the lot of mankind in our global community.

In a very real sense, this thought represents the sum and substance of "Labor's Stake in Hawaii."

First, it might be in order to look at the record.

We in Hawaii enjoy an unprecedented economic boom today. Every significant index reflects steady, oftentimes remarkable, economic growth and general prosperity.

Total employment was up to 270,000 even before school was out this year. This figure is up more than 35,000 from 1962.

The unemployment rate is down from the 1962 average of 4.7 per cent to a low of 2.6 per cent in April this year. This is more than full employment, as you well know, and there are labor shortages in many sectors of our economy today.

Business activity continues to move at a brisk pace.

As measured by taxes on gross income, business activity for the first quarter of 1966 increased 18 per cent over the comparable period last year.

Wholesaling was up 25 per cent, rentals up 18 per cent, and contracting up 15 per cent for the comparable quarters.

Construction contracts awarded during the 12-month period ending last May totaled a staggering $405.5 million. This represents a 35 per cent increase over the previous 12 months.

Retail sales, diversified manufacturing, diversified agriculture, utilities, financial transactions—all these indices are sharply up from their levels three-and-a-half years ago.

The stimulus for this economic climate comes from several closely-related sources: from the actions of your Legislature; from the policies pursued by your Administration; and, most important, from the confidence you have expressed in your government, and, therefore, in yourselves.

It is most significant that we have enjoyed three-and-a-half years of real stability in labor-management relations while our economy continued upward. I think you will agree that labor has been getting the returns it deserves in the bargaining that has taken place during this period. The minor disruptions we have had, in my judgment, served to further stabilize relationships.

While labor has not been unduly favored, neither has it been neglected. I need not remind you, I am sure, that some 50 pieces of legislation affecting the workingman were written into our lawbooks during the past four legislative sessions.

As a result:

Hawaii today has the most comprehensive unemployment insurance law in the Nation. Three years ago, the Unemployment Trust Fund was on the brink of insolvency. Due to the amendments we have made, plus our low unemployment rate, the Fund balance today is in excess of $23 million. At the same time, the benefits payable to our unemployed have gone up and are now geared to the general economy, as represented by average weekly wages of covered employees.

Our Workmen's Compensation Law has been recodified, with increased benefits as well as more effective provisions for enforcement.

Our "Little Davis-Bacon Act" has been liberalized.

Wage and hour laws have been improved.

We have a Fair Employment Practices Act prohibiting discriminatory hiring.

We also have laws—

Prohibiting lie detector tests as a condition of employment.

Curbing moonlighting by government employees at places of business where there are labor disputes.

Broadening coverage under the Employment Relations Act.

Against hiring strikebreakers.

Creating a Commission on Manpower and Full Employment to identify manpower requirements throughout the State.

The list of what can be called "labor legislation" enacted since 1962 is quite substantial.

Additionally, organized labor is well represented—in balance, and as it should be—on many important State boards and commissions.

Hand in hand, then, with the economic growth we are enjoying, the necessary social changes are taking place to provide more equitable opportunities for all our citizens.

But does labor's stake in Hawaii amount to gains in wages, hours and working conditions alone? Is Labor's stake solely in the dollars-and-cents package won over the bargaining table? In protective legislation? In political patronage?

What is "Labor's Stake in Hawaii?"

In my judgment—and I think we can all agree on this—labor's stake in Hawaii is, essentially, the same stake held by any other citizen of this State—be he a truckdriver, a longshoreman, a housewife, a merchant, a physician, a schoolteacher, a lawyer or a corporation executive.

Labor's stake in Hawaii is for a better Hawaii, a new Hawaii, a greater Hawaii.

Labor's stake in Hawaii is in cultural and artistic pursuits as well as in a balanced climate for labor-management relations; in good government as well as in good wages; in better doctors as well as a better medical plan, in the quality of public education as well as in the numbers of classrooms.

Labor's stake in Hawaii is in better cities for all our citizens to live in; in eliminating slum conditions and the unsightliness that breeds unsightliness; in rehabilitating and assisting those who have been left behind in the rapid pace of modern society; in awakening public concern over those problems of air and water pollution which plague other areas and which could overtake our Islands without adequate preventive action and planning.

Labor's stake is in the total quality of life in this State.

Your stake, then is in each man's opportunity to develop his talents to the fullest. Your concern is with his environment—the community he lives in, the air he breathes, the water he drinks. Your concern is with the enrichment of the schools that educate his children.

Labor's stake in Hawaii is in the untold potential of the Pacific Era, which is so much in the thinking of our National Administration today.

Your stake, therefore, is in everything that leads to the further development of Hawaii as the center for commercial and cultural interchange in the Pacific.

You have a stake, too, in making our Islands the center for oceanographic research in the world.

You have a stake even in what is going on and what is going to happen in the Trust Territory of the Pacific and beyond.

It is clear that our Nation's "sphere of interest" is shifting from Europe to the side of the world we live in. Hawaii will figure more prominently than ever in this shifting interest. We are favored by geography, by the times, by common sense and by the rich heritage which belongs only to our people.

In all these things in which labor has a stake, perhaps the fundamental building brick for the construction of a new and better Hawaii is education. There is no greater single force for the building of a great society than education.

Thus, this Administration's commitment to education is a commitment to you and to your children, to the stake you and every other citizen have in Hawaii.

Effective political action, then, boils down to one thing: political action that leads to the fullest development of our people and to provide the fullest opportunity for them to use their rich native talents and abilities.

This is the ultimate return of your investment and your stake in Hawaii.

There is, in my judgment, a new animus, a new spirit of willingness to meet the bold challenges that face the people of Hawaii today.

When this Administration was inaugurated, there was considerable fear among the higher circles of management that "Labor," as a vested interest, had taken over Hawaii's government. There were fears that "radical" changes were to be expected in our socio-economic life. The fear manifested the very real knowledge that executive control of our State government could be used—or abused—to exercise dominant control of Hawaii's economy.

Such was the fear that it required a visit to New York for me to personally assure the most prominent Eastern bankers and financiers that Hawaii's new Governor was not the black anarchist incarnate.

I am not unaware that there are those in our so-called "liberal" element here who might wish I were so. But the fact is that in our democratic society changes for the good of all the people are effected not by revolution but by evolution.

To put it plainly, there are more ways to skin a cat than with a meat-axe. While I do not eschew entirely the direct approach when a heavy hand is necessary, I find it more effective to use persuasion and to look for the rational avenue that is nearly always available in any circumstance.

It is singularly appropriate that we meet this evening in a hall named for a great American, who enunciated those principles which you of the labor movement have long championed. In speaking of labor's real stake in Hawaii, I am reminded of Thomas Jefferson's words, which concluded my inaugural address in 1962:

"All . . . will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression."

That day when some were more equal than others in Hawaii is long past. It is through the work that you of the A.F.L.–C.I.O. have done over the years that this is so.

Your past achievements are the foundation for the constructive works ahead. What you have achieved will pale in comparison with what you can do when you are guided by the understanding that "Labor's Stake in Hawaii" is indivisible from the stake held by every other citizen of our great State.

We are one people, and we will move toward our destiny as one.

It has been a pleasure being with you this evening. I appreciate your invitation and the many courtesies you have extended me in the past. My association with your officers and members, for whom I have the highest regard and respect, has been most enjoyable

and rewarding. I look forward to a continued and close relationship with you, in the interests of all Hawaii.

Mahalo.

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the August 10, 1966, meeting of the House Republican policy committee, a policy statement regarding the Department of Transportation was adopted. As chairman of the policy committee, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the complete text of this statement:

Historically, the Republican Party has encouraged the development of American transportation. In the 1860's Republicans aided the opening of the West by providing land grant incentives for rail transportation. In the early 1900s, the construction of the Panama Canal under the leadership of President Theodore Roosevelt promoted our vital sea transportation. The highly successful interstate highway system was inaugurated in 1956 under a Republican administration. And in 1959 the St. Lawrence Seaway was placed in operation.

For many years it has been apparent that there was a need for better coordination among the various governmental agencies that deal with transportation. As a result, various proposals have been advanced to coordinate the vast transportation bureaucracy which uses, promotes, regulates, and operates transportation in the United States and throughout the free world. The Hoover Commission Task Force on Transportation recommended the creation of a department in 1946. And in his final budget message to Congress, President Eisenhower stated: "A Department of Transportation should be established so as to bring together at cabinet level the presently fragmented federal functions regarding transportation activities." Now, five years after the Eisenhower message, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has endorsed this proposal. Certainly, the creation of an efficient and effective Department of Transportation has been delayed much too long.

Unfortunately, the bill that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration proposed, and that has now been reported by the Government Operations Committee, is faulty and inadequate in a number of important respects and should be improved. In this bill, important transportation activities have been excluded and those modes of transportation brought under the Department do not have adequate representation. The proposed transfer of aviation accident investigations to the new Department cannot be justified. The broad powers granted the Secretary of Transportation under Section 7 invade the policy-making authority of Congress. And the proposed transfer of the Maritime Administration to the new Department would perpetuate the present trouble-ridden mismanagement of the maritime crisis.

Therefore, while we favor and support legislation that would establish a Department of Transportation, we believe that such legislation should contain the following safeguards and improvements:

1. The aviation accident investigation function of the Civil Aeronautics Board should remain independent. In the event the CAB's Bureau of Safety is transferred to the new Department, as contemplated by the proposed legislation, this country would return to the totally unsatisfactory arrangement that existed prior to 1958. At that time, as a result of complaints and accusations from industry representatives, government personnel and outside observers, Congress enacted the Federal Aviation Act. Under this Act, an independent Federal Aviation Agency was established to regulate and control the airways and the various promotional aspects of aviation. By the same Act, the independent CAB was created. It was charged with the economic regulation of aviation and the conduct of aviation accident investigations. The CAB then created a Bureau of Safety to conduct such investigations. This Bureau has acquired an outstanding reputation for experience, thoroughness, and impartiality in the investigation of aviation accidents. Since the establishment of these twin but independent bodies, aviation has prospered and air safety has advanced. These advances would be jeopardized if these important functions are brought together again within a new Department.

2. To date, little has been done with respect to the problem created by aircraft noise, and no one in government has assumed direct responsibility for taking action. This important problem should receive immediate and continuing attention within the new Department. Adequate research and the establishment of reasonable standards to reduce aircraft noise should be given a high priority.

3. Throughout the hearings on the proposed bill, Section 7 was criticized severely. It was opposed by witness after witness, including the Transportation Association of America whose membership represents all modes of transportation plus shippers and investors. Under this section, the Secretary could adopt national transportation investment standards and criteria without seeking Congressional approval. He would have the authority to determine whether the investment of federal money should be made on behalf of one mode of transportation or another. He could impose his standards of investment on other agencies of government who administer investment programs enacted by Congress. This section should be stricken from the bill.

4. The Administration bill would leave the urban mass transportation program within the newly-established Department of Housing and Urban Development. Certainly, urban transportation is an integral part of mass transportation. The close relationship and interdependence between urban mass transportation and other forms of transportation dictate that the urban mass transportation should be transferred from the Department of HUD to the new Department. This program only recently has been assigned to HUD. Now is the time to make this transfer to the new Department.

5. As the April 20, 1966 House Republican Policy Committee statement pointed out:

"America is facing a crisis of major proportions with respect to its vital Merchant Marine. At the close of World War II, this country had a Merchant Marine fleet of over 3,500 vessels. By 1951, there were 1,955 active U.S. flag ships. Today there are only 1,000, including those reactivated for the Viet Nam War. The U.S. has dropped to 14th place among the world's major shipbuilding nations while Russia has risen from 12th to 7th place as a maritime nation. . . . The Merchant Marine shipbuilding effort in this country must be increased. Unless this is done, our defense commitments throughout the world will be in jeopardy. Indeed, our national survival may depend upon the shipping that should be under construction but which the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has scuttled. We demand that steps be taken to correct this disastrous situation."

Although faced with this major crisis, the proposed bill does little more than transfer the problem to a new Department. There is nothing in the bill that reflects a sense of urgency or that calls for a redirection of effort. Moreover, there is no indication that the functions of the Maritime Administration will even be handled by one man with clear-cut authority. The present plight of the American Merchant Marine demands action. Unfortunately, the present stepchild status would continue under the proposed bill. The proposed transfer does not correct the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's known and apparent deficiencies in the maritime field. Therefore, we believe that the Maritime Administration should be established as an independent agency.

CONTAINERIZATION

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the outstanding authority in the United States on the question of "containerization" in the hauling of freight both by rail and by motor carrier is Mr. Morris Forgash, president of United States Freight Co. On July 20 of this year he made an address before the National Railroad Piggyback Association in Montreal, Canada, covering this subject. His address follows:

PIGGYBACK'S GOAL IS COORDINATION: ARE WE ON TARGET?

(*Address by* Morris Forgash, *president, United States Freight Co., before the National Railroad Piggyback Association,* Montreal, Canada, July 20, 1966)

I am glad to be here and very happy indeed to have this opportunity to appear on your program. We are all mutually concerned with a great and promising development in transportation. I can think of no group of people anywhere with whom I would feel more at home.

Let me congratulate you for your foresight and initiative in forming this association, which I understand is devoted exclusively to matters involving piggybacking. If this vital development in transportation is to achieve its destiny it must continuously be sparked by bold thinking, pioneering enterprise, and dynamic action. Piggybacking is one of the greatest innovations in transportation of this era, but the finest of tools is of little value unless used properly. Concentrated study—the pooling of knowledge and experience—a coordinated approach to piggyback's problems—will help to insure the ultimate success and speed the complete public acceptance of this endeavor which so intimately involves the fortunes and the future of transportation on this Continent.

It came to me quite a few years ago that containerization, one form of which is piggybacking, not only offered the key to most of the problems that were besetting the railroads in a changing era, but held the brightest promise for making available to the users of transportation the best that each mode in the kaleidoscopic complex of transporta-

tion had to offer. I knew the history of the early efforts to coordinate the service of different forms of transport on the basis of containerization. The sectionalized canal boats which were piggybacked over the rail portion of the Pittsburgh-Philadelphia route in the middle of the last century and the "Farmers" Trains which in the latter 1800's combined the highway vehicle of that day—the wagon—with the railroad, appealed to my imagination.

The container-on-flatcar service which was inaugurated by the railroads in the early 1920's was well known to me because the forwarding company with which I was affiliated was a heavy user of such service. That experiment, as you know, faded away after the Commission, in 1931, ordered the railroads to discontinue their flat, per-mile basis of charges, and required the establishment of rates related to the classification.

I watched with great interest the intermittent experiments in the trailer-on-flatcar variety of piggybacking. The first of these was inaugurated by the Chicago North Shore and Milwaukee Railway in 1926. Ten years later, in 1936, the Great Western and Keeshin Motor Express started a piggyback operation. Through the years, the piggyback concept intrigued many people, and evoked a great deal of talk and speculation, but right down to 1954, when the Commission decided the New Haven declaratory-judgment case, the subject remained largely academic, simply because the service was limited and sporadic.

THE NEW HAVEN DECISION

Even though the 20 questions propounded by the New Haven were at that time largely hypothetical, the proceeding fired the imagination of the Nation. Fortune magazine as well as other respected national publications graphically dished up to an avid public a blow-by-blow account of the trial of the issues as though they involved the fate of the Nation. Indeed the decision on the issues was more important than many people realized.

I am sure all of you are familiar with the questions of law answered by the New Haven decision. One of the principal issues was the contention of the motor carriers that piggyback service constituted carriage by motor vehicle which the railroads might not perform without a certificate under Part II. The Commission rejected these arguments, finding that TOFC service is rail service, no matter who owns the trailers, and therefore that the railroads may transport their own freight in their own trailers without a certificate.

Among other conclusions, the Commission found that railroads and motor carriers may enter into through-route and joint-rate arrangements for TOFC sevice and that railroads may transport freight for shippers and for freight forwarders, but not for common motor carriers, on the basis of open tariff rates. An interesting footnote to that part of the decision is that exactly 10 years later, in Ex Parte 230, the Commission reversed its New Haven decision and held that motor common carriers may utilize rail TOFC service at published tariff rates. A three-judge Federal court has overturned that ruling, and the matter has been appealed to the Supreme Court.

In the New Haven case, the Commission also dealt with substituted service arrangements, of the kind now known as Plan I. The Commission pointed out, in its report, that the New Haven was performing substituted service for various motor carriers, and that the railroad and certain motor carriers were parties to a "Substituted Freight Service Directory." The Commission went on to say:

"Division sheet No. F 517-B, used in connection with this directory and the motor common carriers' related tariffs, provides that the New Haven will accept as compensation for its service the charges per trailer set forth in a schedule contained in the division sheet." (293 I.C.C. 93).

The New Haven wanted to know whether such service was connecting carrier service or something else. In answer, the Commission pointed out that in an earlier case, *Substituted Freight Service*, decided in 1939, it had held that "where the substitution service consists of a combination of line-haul movements by rail and motor, it is *in legal effect* a joint service, no matter by what other name it may be signated." (232 I.C.C. 682). The Commission added that in that earlier case, recognizing the substituted freight service presented certain problems in the publication of tariffs, it had indicated "that interested carriers might confer with representatives of our Bureau of Traffic to work out a simplified form of tariff publication." And, said the Commission, the "New England directory referred to contains a substitution rule and concurrences in conformity with the views set forth in that report." Thus the Commission gave its imprimatur to Plan I conditioned on a certain form of tariff publication.

As you know, soon after the 1954 decision many of the railroads began to publish piggyback tariffs for use by the public, but at first such tariffs were limited to Plan II and the charges were on substantially the same basis and level as the going motor carrier rates. It was not until 1958 that the railroads began to publish piggyback charges on the basis of a flat amount per car, and thus inaugurated Plans III and IV.

We have come a long way in the past eight years. Piggybacking has demonstrated its practical worth, proved its acceptability to the public, and survived the most vigorous of legal attacks. Perhaps no transport innovation in history ever grew at a faster rate than TOFC service. In 1958 approximately 277,000 piggyback cars were loaded in the United States. In 1965 more than a million cars were loaded, and the service is still growing at a rate of more than 15 percent per year.

Certainly the piggyback record is a record to be proud of and you, who are devoting your energies to this phase of rail operations, are entitled to congratulations and deserving of a great deal of credit. But, as we must all recognize, there is a long way yet to go. Piggybacking still accounts for only a very small percentage of total rail traffic. The railroad industry, though in better circumstances than it was several years ago, is still not keeping step with the economy. According to an estimate in the May 1966 issue of the I.C.C. publication "Transport Economics", the railroads' share of total ton-miles decreased from 43.3 percent in 1964 to 42.8 percent in 1965.

Unparalleled and magnificent though the piggyback performance has been, it still has not recouped the fortunes of the railroads in that vast category of traffic known as "manufactures and miscellaneous." That is the traffic to which the railroads must look if they are to regain the position in transportation which their natural advantages indicate that they should have. This is the principal category of traffic that was attracted to truck service, and it is the traffic most susceptible of being transported in piggyback service.

Traditionally, manufactured and miscellaneous commodities have accounted for almost a third of rail tonnage and close to 50 percent of rail revenues. The tons and revenue figures in the manufactures and miscellaneous category have been rising since 1961. But the important fact is that in 1963 the railroads handled fewer tons of manufactures and miscellaneous, and received less revenue, than in 1956.

If piggybacking is to be not only the hope but the salvation of the railroads, it must produce a radical change in the statistics of rail operations in the field of manufactured and miscellaneous products.

This, then, is not a time for complacency. It is a time to take stock—to examine the overall picture—to see if we are headed in the right direction. It is a time, in short, to go back to fundamentals and take a new reading on the entire picture as it comes within the framework of piggybacking.

COORDINATION VERSUS SUBSTITUTION

What is the one most important element of piggybacking—the one new, enormously important, and heretofore elusive ingredient which piggybacking introduced into the transportation system? Coordination, of course. There can be no question about it. Piggybacking is a coordinating agent. If it does not fulfill that mission its long-range future will be in jeopardy.

I am absolutely convinced that certain piggyback operations which are engaged in on a rather wide and spreading scale do not represent coordination but are the antithesis of coordination; that such practices are not compatible with the best interests of the railroads and of the public; and that they are inimical to sound transportation policy. I refer particularly to the substituted service type of piggybacking represented by Plan I operations.

However, I include in the category of ill-conceived and injurious piggybacking any arrangement between motor and rail carriers which is not based strictly on through routes, joined together end-to-end, and joint rates, divided between the participating carriers on the basis of the through rates assessed on the commodities transported. To the extent that some of the so-called Plan V arrangements do not conform to those standards, I view them as a subterfuge.

There is no secret about my views on this subject. I have expressed them in formal proceedings before the Commission and on numerous other occasions. Issues involving substituted service or Plan I arrangements are pending before the Commission and in the Courts. It is not my intention to argue the specific issues of pending cases in public, but Plan I is a fact, not a theory—operations under the Plan are being conducted and they are being extended—and I consider that I have not only the right, but because of my responsibility the duty, to speak my mind on the subject.

Every time I think of the finely spun theories of law, the legal controversies, the conflicting and anomalous opinions that have characterized the history of Plan I piggy-backing I am utterly astonished. Aside from that, it seems incredible to me that any railroad would even consider turning over to its most formidable competitor, the long-haul trucker, the right, title, and interest to its own invention and most promising competitive weapon. I should think that Plan I would be viewed by the railroads as hari-kari in modern dress.

Let me ask this question. If the Commission ordered the railroads to let the trucking industry use their rails, their locomotive power, and their flatcars so that the truckers could better serve their own customers, and to accept from the truckmen give-away prices that materially lowered their cost of doing business—could the railroads not have such an order voided in court as an unwarranted invasion of their constitutional rights? I am confident that they could, and I fail to understand why the railroads voluntarily give away the birthright which I am positive no one could arbitrarily take away from them.

Plan I, as I view the matter, was born as an experiment and has been approved and condoned as a matter of expediency. To the premise that Plan I represents a desirable practice has been fitted the legal conclusion that it can be brought within the meaning

of that statute. The premise and the conclusion are both wrong in my firm opinion.

WHAT IS THE STATUTORY BASIS OF PLAN I?

I do not know who invented the term "substituted service." It is an apt term, because it describes what happens under Plan I, but it is not a term that is used or described in the statute. It was simply coined out of whole cloth. As I have indicated, the 1939 *Substituted Freight Service* case, the Commission said that "the substitution service" is "in legal effect a joint service." Having drawn no court challenge to this conclusion, the Commission assumed the legal standing of Plan I in a number of succeeding cases. In the first Red Ball case, in 1950, the Commission said that:

"Substitution by motor carriers of rail service for highway truck service has been considered and approved by this Commission in several proceedings in which it has been found that such services would result in lower costs to the motor carrier, would relieve the motor carrier of the hazards of the road, would relieve congestion on the public highways, would be a desirable source of revenues for the rail carriers and on the whole be advantageous to all parties concerned." (52 M.C.C. 75).

Passing over the fact that the Commission did not cite any evidence to support the foregoing findings, I point out that such findings, if correct, were irrelevant to the issue, which was the lawfulness of the substitution by motor carriers of rail service for highway service. The Commission has a duty to "preserve the inherent advantages" of transportation on the public highways, and the Commission and the Supreme Court have held that a railroad is not a public highway.

The Red Ball case was reopened on the petitions of numerous competing motor carriers and in 1958 the Commission issued a further report. In the second report the Commission approved the Plan I service not because it would take a great deal of traffic off of the highways but because it would divert very little. (303 I.C.C. 421). Red Ball had earlier been unsuccessful in obtaining shorter highway routes between Chicago and Kansas City. Competing motor carriers claimed that the Plan I service would enable Red Ball to do indirectly what it had been forbidden to do directly. The Commission overruled these contentions, finding that Red Ball used the substituted service "only to handle its overflow business from Chicago to Kansas City," and that Red Ball's substituted rail service was no better than its highway service.

To say the very least, the legal theories upon which Plan I has been authorized have remained fluid. They have been tailored to fit the facts of given situations. In the *National Automobile Transporters* or NATA case, decided in 1962, the Commission repudiated the joint-rate theory laid down in earlier cases and held that Plan I represented "true substituted rail-for-motor service." (91 M.C.C. 395). Since under this ruling there was no "interchange," and the motor carrier continued to be the responsible carrier all the way through, the Commission was able to, and did, hold that contract carriers as well as common carriers might use the service. The Commission did not point to any statutory authority for this finding, but presumably it relied on the alternate route provisions of Section 208(b), since that is absolutely the only authority anywhere in the Act by which the Commission may permit any deviation from the highway routes over which a motor carrier is authorized to operate. Of course, Section 208(b) is inapplicable as I will show in a minute.

Just 18 months after the NATA decision the Commission rendered its decision in Ex Parte 230, holding that Plan I constitutes "a valid through-route and joint-rate arrangement within the contemplation of Section 216(c) of the act." (322 I.C.C. 301). Where did that leave the NATA decision? The Commission did not say, but so far as anyone can tell the NATA ruling still stands. In Ex Parte 230 the Commission said, "We, of course, recognize that the conclusions expressed here are at variance with some of the reasoning in the NATA case." But, the Commission said that automobile haulers have "unique problems", and that their TOFC practices would be dealt with separately at a later date.

It is quite clear that the same law applies to automobile haulers as to the haulers of general freight or any other commodity, and TOFC service cannot be regulated as one thing for one carrier and another thing for a different carrier. The law may not be modified by administrative fiat. If the law does not fit the situation, and the Commission thinks the law should be changed, its recourse is to Congress.

It is very difficult to identify the legal basis on which the Commission condones Plan I. Plan I service is substituted service. No one denies that plain fact. The motor carrier solicits the traffic, issues its own through bill of lading, charges its own rate, and elects whether to ship the trailers by rail or haul them over its highway route. The question is whether an operation that is, in fact, one thing, can be authorized as something else. That is the dilemma the Commission has faced.

Section 208(b), the sole authority for alternate routes, provides that motor carriers may "occasionally deviate" from their authorized route under such general or special rules as the Commission may prescribe. Under Plan I the deviation is authorized on a permanent basis, not in accordance with any deviation rule but presumptively as a matter of legal right. And, of course, Section 208(b) refers to public highways and was never intended as authority for motor carriers to substitute a rail route for their highway route, occasionally or otherwise. By definition and by the certificates provisions of the Act motor carriers are confined to the use of the highways.

JOINT SERVICE IS CONJUNCTIVE

The joint-rate theory which the Commission has resorted to in authorizing Plan I is even more vulnerable than the substituted-service theory. The Commission has proceeded on the erroneous premise that what the law does not condemn it permits. Thus, in Ex Parte 230, the Commission said that Section 216(c), the joint-rate authority, does not denote "the particular type of through routes and joint rates" which it authorizes and that the terms "through routes" and "joint rates" are not anywhere specifically defined.

Of course the law does not define the "type" of through routes and joint-rates that are authorized because there is only one type. That is the type that has been known and defined by the Commission and the Courts in numerous decisions since the dawn of regulation. The classic definition of a through route is contained in the Supreme Court's decision in *Thompson* v. *United States*, 353 U.S. 549, which reads as follows:

"A 'through route' is an arrangement, express or implied, between *connecting* railroads for the continuous carriage of goods from the *origin point on the line of one carrier to destination on the line of another.*"

An equally classic definition of a joint rate was given by the Commission in the early case of *Canton Railroad* v. *Ann Arbor Railroad*. It is as follows:

"A joint rate extends over the lines of two or more carriers and is made . . . by arrangement or agreement between such carriers and evidenced by concurrence or power of attorney." (173 I.C.C. 263).

In order to have a through route and a joint rate the routes of two or more carriers must be joined together, end-to-end, and the single rate must be divided on the basis of the amount of service performed by each carrier. Under Plan I there are no "connecting" carriers. The only carrier known to the shipper is the motor carrier. The only rate involved is the motor carrier's rate and it is not "divided" with the railroad. The railroad is paid a flat charge, whether the motor carrier's rate is 50 cents or five dollars per hundred. The motor carrier handles individual shipments whereas the railroad transports only motor carrier trailers.

Every shipment must be handled pursuant to a bill-of-lading contract. The bill of lading identifies the shipment and names the consignor and the consignee. All common carriers are required by law to issue a bill of lading under which they must assume full responsibility "to the lawful holder thereof." But under Plan I the railroad never even knows who the shipper is. The railroad is not named in the bill of lading. How can a railroad assume responsibility to an unknown shipper?

The cardinal test of whether a joint service has been established is whether there is a tariff publication holding out a joint service to the public. No such tariff is published under Plan I. The shipper is given the right to veto the use of piggyback service, but he has no right to demand it. The motor carrier alone decides when and under what circumstances he will put his trailers on the railroad.

Those who contend for the lawfulness of Plan I will argue that it is joint service or, conversely, that it is purely substituted service, depending upon the exigencies of the occasion. Of course Plan I cannot be authorized under both the joint-rate and the certificate or alternate-route sections of the Act. One of the Commission's decisions in this regard must be wrong. We contend that they are both wrong.

The conspicuous fact is that Plan I operations simply do not fit into the pattern of the existing law. This in itself, does not condemn Plan I as an undesirable transportation practice—although I think Plan I is undesirable as well as unlawful. But the fact is that Congress alone has the power to give any transportation practice statutory sanction. The law is not elastic—it cannot be pulled and tugged and stretched to fit situations which it was not designed to cover. That leads me to this question: "If it is believed that Plan I is a desirable method of operation why not change the law?"

Doesn't the fact that there has been so much litigation, so many conflicting decisions, so much debate and so many differences of opinion, indicate that the law, as it is written, was not designed to cover Plan I operations? And if the law does not fit the situation should it not be left to Congress to decide whether it is in the public interest to provide for a given type of service? The Commission constantly recommends changes in particular laws to meet new situations or to clarify provisions that are unclear. Why do things the hard way?

Now, laying aside the question of the statutory authority for Plan I, let me pose another question: "If the motor carriers forsake the highways and substitute rail service under Plan I, at what point will their certificates become void for non use, and when must the commission, in the exercise of its statutory duty, revoke the certificates?"

While you are thinking about that one let me remind you of a few things. Under Plan I, as opposed to Plan V or any true joint-rate operation, the motor carrier may substitute rail service for the entire line-haul. The Commission has imposed no limitation on the amount or percentage of its traffic which a motor carrier may put in rail service under Plan I. In the Red Ball case the Commission approved a Plan I operation even though it said, in its decision, that the motor

carrier planned to put all of its traffic on the rails.

In short, it is entirely possible, consistent with the Commission's decisions, for a certificated motor common carrier to conduct operations within the entire scope of its certificate, without ever putting a truck on the highway or leaving the city streets. And yet, by statutory definition, a motor carrier may only be authorized to provide transportation "by motor vehicle" and "upon the highways." Certificates of regular-route common carriers generally name the specific highways over which operations may be performed. With possible exceptions not known to me, they contain the following condition:

"It is further ordered, and is made a condition of this certificate that the holder thereof shall render reasonably continuous and adequate service to the public in pursuance of the authority herein granted, and that failure to do so shall constitute sufficient grounds for suspension, change, or revocation of this certificate."

In the Substituted Service case in 1939 the Commission said that where a common carrier by motor vehicle "substantially abandons its over-the-road service between any points on its route it runs the risk of having its certificate revoked in whole or in part under Section 212 of Part II." What is substantial abandonment? Can a motor carrier be said to be providing "reasonably continuous and adequate service" over the highway right up to the point of substantial abandonment? Could a motor carrier put one truck a week on the highway to save his certificate and give all of the rest of his traffic to a railroad? I think not. I respectfully suggest that the Commission take a new reading on this aspect of the problem. It may be that some certificates are subject to revocation at this very moment.

Now I pose an additional question: "Are the obvious Fourth Section violations which literally permeate all Plan I operations lawfully excused by the commission's "blanket" orders which are issued without investigation or knowledge of the facts?"

One of the basic reasons for the enactment of railroad regulation in 1887 was to prohibit the type of discrimination dealt with by Section 4. The prime object was to prevent destructive competition. Numerous efforts to repeal Section 4 or render it nugatory have failed. But I respectfully suggest that where Plan I operations are involved Section 4 is being nullified by the manner in which relief is granted.

Let me say—with the utmost respect but the firmest conviction—that in applying the Fourth Section to Plan I operations the Commission has observed form and ignored substance, and in late years form has been reduced to mere formality. The motor carrier representative, generally a publishing agent or bureau, files an application for "blanket" relief which is, so far as appearances go, automatically granted.

When the Commission first considered the Fourth Section question, in connection with the Keeshin-Great Western arrangement in 1936, protesting rail carriers pointed out two kinds of violations of Section 4 which were inherent in the operation. First, between Chicago and St. Paul, for example, the railroad had all-rail rates to numerous intermediate points that were higher than the Plan I rate from Chicago to St. Paul. Second, the motor carrier had rates to points like Eau Claire which, by Keeshin's highway route were intermediate to St. Paul, and which were lower than the Plan I rate from Chicago to St. Paul.

The Commission ruled that no violation occurred by reason of the lower all-rail rates to intermediate points because a "like kind of property" was not involved. Thus railroads never have been required to observe the Fourth Section when they establish Plan I, insofar as any conflict with their own rates is concerned. And, as I said, blanket relief is granted to absolve the violations which occur in the motor carrier rate structure.

Section 4, as you know, imposes an absolute prohibition against charging more for transportation of a like kind of property for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line or route. The only exception is that the Commission "after investigation" and "in special cases," may authorize rates that violate Section 4. But the law specifically provides that in granting Fourth Section relief—

"The Commission shall not permit the establishment of any charge to or from the more distant point that is not reasonably compensatory for the service performed."

Until three or four years ago, in an apparent effort to conform with the foregoing requirement, the applications for Fourth Section relief contained an allegation that the so-called "divisions" or charges made by the rail carriers for transporting motor carrier trailers were "reasonably compensatory." To enable the Commission to conduct its required investigation and satisfy itself on that score the applications contained a schedule showing all of the contractual charges paid by the motor carrier to the railroad between the involved points. That was the only document from which the Commission or anyone else could determine what the rail Plan I charges to motor carriers were.

In recent years the Fourth Section applications have been silent regarding the charges assessed by the Railroads. Consequently, no one knows what the motor carriers are paying for their substituted service in any given movement. Obviously, Plan I operations are capable of producing destructive competition. Clearly, the amounts paid by the motor carriers to the railroads are the determinative factor in the competitive situation. I do not understand how the Commission can investigate without facts or how it can exclude violations without knowing what they are. This is a matter which I should think would be of vital concern to the railroads, for whether they participate in Plan I or simply compete with the service it would seem to me they would want to know what piggyback service is selling for in the Plan I market.

The Fourth Section either serves a useful purpose or it does not. It should apply to all rates to which the railroads are parties or to none at all. If it is the prevailing view that the Fourth Section has outlived its usefulness then let us have it repealed by an Act of Congress and not by administration interpretation.

And now another question: *"Assuming that Plan I is a joint rate arrangement does not sound policy require that control be exercised over Plan I regulations, practices and divisions?"*

Section 216(c), under which Plan I is authorized by the Commission, requires the establishment of "just and reasonable regulations and practices" and "just, reasonable, and equitable divisions." Ex Parte 230 was a rulemaking proceeding that was supposed to cover the waterfront, but of all the rules prescribed in that case none dealt with the charges made by railroads for hauling motor carrier trailers under Plan I. Freight forwarders petitioned the Commission to have a hearing in Ex Parte 230 to develop the facts about Plan I arrangements, and to prescribe rules which would require, among other things, filing of the Plan I charges. The Commission's Bureau of Inquiry and Compliance also recommended that the rail Plan I charges be filed.

But the Commission, disregarding the fact that the only evidence submitted in Ex Parte 230 consisted of the voluntary self-serving declarations of the parties, said that nobody had shown that the "division arrangements" under Plan I were unlawful. The Commission said that if in the future it should be informed that the "unpublished divisions" were being used as "a shield for improper activities'" it would decide whether a rule should be prescribed.

It seems to me that the purpose of rules of law and of administrative rules is to insure that improper activities can be detected and prevented. In whatever legal dress Plan I may be clothed at any given time, everyone knows, and the Commission has recognized, that Plan I operations have a competitive impact on other carriers that is entirely different from the impact of conventional through-route and joint-rate arrangements. The Commission entertained complaints in the early Great Western case about the level of the "divisions" and gave them careful consideration. In the Strickland case of 1962 the Commission rejected a Plan I arrangement on the protest of competing motor carriers that the Plan I rail route was much shorter than Strickland's highway route (318 I.C.C. 395). Indeed, the Commission said in that case that "the competitive effect" of Plan I on other carriers was "one of the principal factors to be considered." This was undobutedly what led the Commission to prescribe a 15 percent circuity limitation on Plan I arrangements in Ex Parte 230.

It is well and good to protect the motor carrier industry from new and devastating Plan I competition by imposing a circuity limitation, but how about the railroad industry and the forwarding industry? Are those industries not entitled to protection from the devastating competition which can be generated by the granting of ridiculously low Plan I charges to motor carriers by certain of the railroads? You and I know that not only are some of the Plan I charges on a basis materially lower than the piggyback tariff rates but certain of the arrangements provide for the hauling of empty trailers at half of the loaded charge or less, and permit heavier loading of trailers. Furthermore, Plan I arrangements permit and encourage diversion of rail boxcar traffic. To my knowledge, very few Plan I arrangements have any mixing requirements.

I could cite specific instances of Plan I charges so low that a motor carrier could load one trailer with high grade commodities and obtain his pay load and have the other trailer left over to ride free. With that free ride the motor carrier could undercut the rail rates on any number of commodities and, with its rail subsidy, steal the railroad's business.

Insofar as forwarders are concerned we maintain that when motor carriers purchase their line-haul transportation from the railroads, and limit their own physical operations to the gathering, assembly, and break-bulk and distribution of the freight, they are, in fact and in law, functioning as freight forwarders. We assert that this is an unlawful invasion of the forwarding business. But, so long as the Commission disagrees with us, and its ruling in that regard has not been overturned, then we strenuously contend that it is neither reasonable nor legally proper for motor carriers to obtain their line-haul transportation at less cost than we are assessed for the same service.

As the Commission said in the NATA case ". . . the physical rail transportation service provided by the railroads under Plans I, III, and V, is identical." When motor carriers act as freight forwarders—as they certainly do in every physical sense under Plan I—what is the justification for the drastic reductions which they obtain as against the charges we pay? The traffic is of the same general nature; in each case it is tendered by a common carrier; it moves in the same kind of equipment and in many instances in the same train. The published charges which we pay have been approved as reasonable on

the basis of tested evidence. Does this mean that our industry is being forced to subsidize its competitors, the long-distance truckers?

It seems to me that there are the most compelling of reasons why the railroad industry itself, as well as the I.C.C., should insist that complete information about Plan I arrangements be filed and made public and subjected to regulatory restraints and controls in the public interest.

It strikes me that the railroads are making a grevious mistake to contribute a substantial portion of their piggyback output to the improvement of the competitive position of their most formidable competitors. Is this a confession of competitive impotence? The motor carriers who participate in Plan I operations are selling motor carrier service and using the railroads to help them reduce their costs and make their own service more attractive to the public.

If there is any doubt about what I am saying I invite attention to the February, 1966, issue of Western Trucking—Motor Transportation. An article in that magazine entitled "Piggyback's New Role" tells the story of what the trucking industry thinks about Plan I and why it uses rail service. Leading truck operators are quoted verbatim. The burden of the article is that motor carriers are using Plan I "to smooth out their power-need peaks."

What does this mean? The article explains:

"They are relying upon piggyback to do the 'peak' hauling (and to haul-back empties, too) during heaviest traffic periods."

With brittle realism the article states:

"Admittedly, no fleet executive calls the 'power peaking' teamup anything like a 'partnership.' Most fleets use the word 'expediency.' Still, fleets seem to be profiting from the relationship, whatever its name, even more than the railroads."

I have maintained all along that Plan I is simply an expedient and it is reassuring to know that the feeling is shared by substantial elements of the trucking industry. The magazine article points out that the primary uses of piggybacking by truckers are as "a backup for highway tractor power," and for "backhauling empties." One truck operator is quoted as saying, with regard to his empties:

"If loading them aboard a piggy train for a nonrevenue ride at 10 cents a mile gets them there, against 30 cents a mile if we hauled them ourselves, I'm for shoving those empties aboard a piggyback."

It stands to reason, of course, that motor carriers will turn their trailers over to the railroads under Plan I only when to do so reduces their highway costs or helps to balance their equipment. This does not strike me as the most desirable way in which the railroads should undertake to sell the piggyback service, nor does it contribute to sound and constructive transportation.

PIGGYBACKING AND NEW HORIZONS

Nothing that I have said about Plan I diminishes the paramount importance of piggybacking as a technique. As a coordinating medium and an economic fulcrum piggybacking, intelligently exploited, can spark a renaissance in railroading. I am sure that your organization is dedicated to seeing that it does so, realizing full well that piggybacking is only at the threshold of its destiny.

I am afraid that there has been a tendency in some quarters to overlook the fact that piggybacking is a railroad development, conceived and inaugurated by the railroads to improve the posture of their service. It is true that piggybacking is the greatest coordinating medium that has yet been developed, but the real economy and importance of the service hinge on the inherent advantage of the railroad in the transportation of great volumes of freight, over long distances, at high speeds, and at the lowest cost.

Insofar as piggybacking is concerned, the only kind of coordination that makes any sense is the combining of a relatively short truck haul with the longest possible rail haul. In that kind of coordination there is no competition between the parties to the combination—the truck haul supplements the rail haul—the rail movement complements the motor haul.

In all of the discussion and consideration of piggybacking I think the picture has tended to be distorted by consideration of the situation of the long-haul truckman. The long-distance motor carrier has a very definite place in the transportation picture. With the immense expansion of the interstate highway system, the raising of size and weight limits, and the improvement in motive power, the future of the long-haul motor carrier seems assured. In the not too distant future we may see the truck-train with tractors pulling multiple trailer units, possibly over highways especially constructed for trucks. The long-distance trucker can remain competitive without purchasing his line-haul transportation from the railroads, and changing the basic nature of his carriage.

The short-haul truck lines are the natural partners of the railroads insofar as piggybacking is concerned. Short-haul trucking was the genesis and is still the backbone of the motor truck industry. Almost a third of the industry has an average length of haul less than 100 miles. Ninety percent of the motor carriers have average hauls less than 500 miles in length.

The short-haul motor carrier is the only trucker who would be economically advantaged by making a true joint rate with a railroad for a piggyback movement. A joint rate between a truck line and a railroad which parallel each other the whole distance simply does not make sense. That is why there are no such joint rates—the parallel arrangements are all on the basis of Plan I substituted service.

Therefore, I say if rail-truck coordination is to come about on an important scale it will have to be through a combination of the services of the railroads and the short-haul trucking industry. It seems to me there is a vast area for exploration here. Possibly thought should be given to some revisions of the rate structure to accommodate the inherent advantages of short-haul as against long-haul transportation. There is room for both.

There are other unexploited areas where industry study and cooperation should open new horizons for piggybacking. Speed and economy are the economic goals of piggybacking and both can be greatly improved if the railroads coordinate their thinking and action and work together. Attention should be focused on the problem of how to run a greater number of solid trains of piggyback cars, on more frequent and faster schedules, and from a greater number of origins to more destinations. I think it would be worthwhile to explore what I call the "union station" concept of piggybacking. If the available piggyback loads were pooled at key points many more solid trains of piggyback cars would be rolling right now.

Think how the solid piggyback train could reduce the transit time from New York, Chicago, and other key cities to San Francisco and Los Angeles. The passenger schedule of today could be bettered by many hours because there would be no layover and few stops. From New York to San Francisco in 50 hours for early third-morning delivery ought to become commonplace.

Speeds of that kind not only ought to prevent further diversion of the railroads' profitable manufactures and miscellaneous commodities but should attract new business. The burgeoning air-freight business is something the railroads are going to have to cope with. The big jets that can airlift at least two boxcar loads and which are capable of hauling containerized freight in great quantity are making a bid for a share of the high-grade tonnage of the country.

Railroads probably never will be able to match the 600-plus speed of the airfreighter, although I predict that in time, with wider tracks and gas turbine-powered or even atomic-powered locomotion, we will achieve railroad speeds that would be considered fantastic by today's standards. I saw an announcement the other day that in 1967 a 160-mile-per-hour train will be plying between Toronto and Montreal. But the railroads do not need to attain air speeds to compete effectively with air freight. Let me explain.

Now and for the predictable future 65 percent of the market for air freight service will be between eastern seaboard cities, such as Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Newark and Washington, on the one hand, and Dallas, Houston, Kansas City, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland and Seattle on the other, and between the specified origin and destination cities and Chicago and St. Louis. Between all of those key cities are main-line tracks where the railroads now maintain high-speed service and over which piggyback or other special freight trains could be run at speeds which would make it economically unsound for most shippers to pay the higher price to save the time involved.

I point out that in the last 10 or 15 years the speed of air cargo over most of the domestic routes has not improved by more than one day. In that same time the speed of transcontinental rail service, for example, has been more than cut in half. The railroads are physically capable of attaining even greater speeds—it is not the terrain but the terminal delays, the lack of synchronization and planning, that are holding us back. I commend that problem to the members of your organization for their analytical study.

CONCLUSION

If piggybacking is to fulfill its great promise and achieve its bright future there is hard work to be done and the challenge is as much to research and planning as to industry and imagination. You have an organization that could bring to bear on the problems that are yet to be solved the concentrated kind of industry planning and cooperation without which too much time will be wasted marching in different directions. If you do not have the machinery for research in the technical and engineering phases of the areas I have mentioned I should hope that you would create such machinery.

We are just beginning to realize in this Country that we have devoted far too little time, money, and energy to research and development in transportation. As the President pointed out in his message recommending a Department of Transportation, less than 1 percent of the Government's total research and development budget is spent on transportation. One purpose—the most vital purpose in my opinion—of the proposed Department is to foster more intensive and extensive research.

Last September a bill was enacted authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development of high-speed ground transportation. It calls for the expenditure of $90 million over a period of three years. The project is generally thought of in terms of the Northeast corridor because that is one of the areas in which experiments will be conducted, but it is not limited to any given area or proposal. It occurs to me that if a Northeast corridor or rapid transportation is feasible it may be expedient to consider such a corridor between New York and Chicago, and perhaps other cities.

However, we should not rely solely on Government to spark research and introduce innovation. You; who are responsible for the conduct of piggybacking on the North Amer-

ican Continent are standing in the spotlight of transportation history. The fact that you have formed an organization of your own reflects the knowledge that progress will best be achieved through unity, planning, and cooperation. Again I commend you and wish you every success.

TAXES AND ECONOMIC INCENTIVES

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 1966, I had the opportunity to address the Forest Industries Committee on Timber Valuation and Taxation. The Forest Industries Committee then reprinted by remarks as an article in the Timber Tax Journal, volume II, No. 1, July 1966. I am introducing these remarks into the RECORD in the hope of developing a dialog on the issue of the impact of taxation on economic incentives. In my opinion, there has been a regrettable lack of discussion about the various types of taxes and their economic effects. Essentially taxes should be enacted in the most expedient way to acquire the revenue necessary to perform governmental functions. However, in pursuit of this objective we tend to overlook the fact that whatever way we choose to tax has serious effects on the amount and direction of economic activity.

Last April, I addressed the annual meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association in Dallas, Tex., setting forth my concepts of both political and economic democracy—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 18, 1966, pages 15959–15961. At that time, I tried to point out how the free enterprise system is the economic counterpart of political democracy. I tried to stress the value as well as the importance of the marketplace as a laboratory where new ideas are constantly being tested on their merits. Another feature of the free market system is that it encourages men to save for future investment, expansion and innovation. We must be very careful when we design our tax laws to avoid distorting the economic incentives provided by the marketplace to save and invest in productive areas. I have always felt that that tax is best which least interferes with the operation of the free market, the most efficient and equitable system of organizing a complex economy yet devised. It needs adjustments from time to time but this should never lead us to forget its fundamental soundness.

The present rates of income taxes are so high, that economic activity is being distorted. If tax rates were lower, I am confident that Federal revenues would actually increase. This seems paradoxical until you consider that revenue equals tax base times tax rate times collectability. Collectability is the term I use for the degree of voluntariness of tax collections. The present level of tax rates lowers the collectability factor. The incentive to avoid or even to evade taxes increases as the rates rise. If tax rates were lowered, revenues would increase because more could be collected from a larger base. If tax rates were lowered and differentials in rates were lessened, the scramble for preferential tax treatment unrelated to any economic reason except the desire to save on income taxes would die out.

I regret that, in this time of accelerating inflation, the propsects for serious consideration of any tax rate decrease are not promising. Yet, if the President of the United States would exercise the necessary spending restraint, we could quickly bring this inflation to a halt. We could then consider the much more popular question of tax reduction—what, how much, and for whom. Under unanimous consent, I insert this material for the RECORD, in the hope that at some future time, we can begin to eliminate the distortions and inequities which the present level of taxes hampers:

PRAGMATIC CONSIDERATIONS UNDERLYING TIMBER CAPITAL GAINS TAXATION

(By Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS [1])

The Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution is a limitation upon a limitation. In other words, the broad power granted to the Congress in the first clause of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, namely "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises" was limited by the fourth clause of Section 9, Article I, which states: "No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken." The Sixteenth Amendment simply removed this limitation of apportionment census and enumeration as it related to direct taxes laid and collected "on incomes from whatever source derived."

One of the important results of this provision was that it made it important for both the tax collector and the taxpayer to distinguish in the flow of money or assets coming into the taxpayer's possession that which was income from that which was merely a return of capital. I have often speculated that the great development of the science of accounting and a considerable development in the science of economics which has occurred in the past half century in the United States is attributable to the Congress' implementation of the Sixteenth Amendment through its development and passage of the various Federal individual and corporate income tax laws.

Indeed I carry my speculation further as I look at the high state of development of the science of accounting the science of economics in the United States in comparison to their states of development elsewhere around the world. I suggest that a great deal of the success of American businessmen can be attributed to the fact that in pursuing these two sciences they have developed the tools to understand many of the many varied and intriguing important economic differences between capital and income.

My regrets are that the theoretical economists as distinguished from the pragmatic economists, my euphemism for businessmen, and the political scientists, both theoretical and pragmatic (my euphemism for politicians, namely people like myself) do not have an understanding equal to that of the economic pragmatists of this important economic differential. Perhaps the explanation lies in the fact that the pragmatic economist being the taxpayer has had to keep two sets of books, one the good set for his own understanding of what he is doing and the second, the unrealistic set for the pragmatic political scientist, the tax collector.

Perhaps if our Federal income tax laws were written with an eye to economic realism the taxpayer would keep only one set of books, thus enabling all concerned to benefit from the advancements in the fields of accounting and economics. We all would understand a little better what is realized economic growth and increased commonwealth in our society. Our failure to understand what is real wealth and economic growth daily leads us to waste rather than to enhance our heritage in many respects. I still observe that more poor laws are written as the result of ignorance rather than as a result of the over-enthusiasm of our lobby groups.

One of the confusions about income and capital results from the unfortunate choice of nomenclature employed in describing one kind of income. I refer to that income called "capital gains." Capital gains, of course, are not return of capital and so are taxable. However, I would observe that because of the Federal government's failure to more clearly understand that which is capital, or perhaps it is the failure of economists and political scientists of all sorts to have this understanding, the Federal government in spite of its lack of power under the Constitution to tax return of capital has been taxing return of capital in many instances.

Probably the most obvious instance where the Federal government is taxing return of capital as capital gains result from the default of the Federal government to maintain honest weights and measures. This is an essentiality if the market place system is to function properly for many reasons. Incidentally, I am referring to a weight and measure felt by the constitutional authors to be so important that it was listed in the Constitution first and separately, apart from the catch basket of all other weights and measures in clause 5 of Section 8 of Article I . . . "to regulate the value of money."

The failure of the Congress through its created arm, the Federal Reserve System, over a period of years to properly regulate the value of money, that most important of all economic measuring sticks, has resulted in a great deal of the capital which has been invested by business and individuals being taxed as it has flowed back to the investor as income, as capital gains. The threat of taxing return of capital as income has created one of the greatest deterrents to economic growth dependent upon the free flow of capital as it is, that exists today in our society. Many refer to the problem as that of locked-in investment. What has locked the investment in? . . . not the 25 percent capital gain tax, high as this may seem, but rather the devaluation of the dollar, which is the measuring stick used to gauge it.

The reason that those in the distributive field lobby the Congress so hard to have inventory taxed on the LIFO rather than the FIFO formula has its origin in the failure of the government to keep an honest standard to the dollar as an economic measure. Maybe last-in-first-out is good economic practice inasmuch as every item has a limit to its shelf-time, but I think it is important to establish accounting procedures on the basis of giving accurate economic information, not for obsolete tax measures or tax measures which may not be obsolete, but are rendered inefficient because of the elasticity of the dollar. Because in periods of deflation . . . if such ever come about again . . . the same businessman dealing with inventory which is turning over will want to adopt FIFO.

[1] 2d Congressional District, Missouri, 82d–89th Congresses; member Ways and Means Committee, Joint Economic Committee; Member, American Law Institute.

The reason for pushing for accelerated depreciation or accelerated depletion arises not so much from the economic goodness of the moving forward in time of the recoupment of the capital invested as it does from trying to get the dollar back as fast as possible before its deterioration in value becomes too great. I am for depreciation schedules being set up however business wishes to set them up . . . or I would be if I could count on the dollar remaining an honest economic measure. In other words, I am for business keeping one set of books . . . the realistic books . . . not a second set of books . . . a set which must be kept because our tax laws are out of date with economic development in a dynamic economy.

Increasingly business judgments are made because of tax consequences, not because of economic considerations. The points I have been making about the failure to properly understand what is return of capital and what is income are only some of the reasons for this economically damaging situation. I think equally damaging is the high rate differential which exists between forms of income, namely capital gains from ordinary income. I think some accounting and economic wisdom has been developed as the result of this differential, because I believe there are many important economic differences between what we call ordinary income and capital gains income. But also a great deal of double bookkeeping has developed.

Again I place the onus not on the practicing economist . . . because he is a realist . . . he is searching for economic truth. Indeed if he deviates in his search for truth the disciplines are such that he might go broke. His books are going to be his best judgment of what he is doing, of economic realities. It is his second set of books which are apt to record fairy stories . . . the books which he is forced to keep for the tax collectors and he sometimes fools himself with these fairy stories. If the second set of books has little relationship to economic reality, it is not because the taxpayer is being unrealistic. Indeed the second set of books has largely been set up under the direction of the tax collector rather because it is the tax collector, or those who have written the tax laws for him, who is being economically unrealistic.

The taxpayer who benefits from having an economic differential reflected in the tax rates, particularly if the differential has the spread of 25 percent to 47 percent or 25 percent to 70 percent, let alone 0 percent to 47 percent and 70 percent, is always in a precarious predicament because what to him is equity to others on the outside is a preferential treatment. To the tax collector and economic and political theorist often the differential is talked about as if it is a subsidy.

Of course, any tax differential can become a preferential treatment or a subsidy if the differential is not truly reflective of the economic difference. For example, 27½ percent depletion allowance, which in 1920 might well have reflected the state of geological knowledge, the availability of oil, the state of development of engineering science and labor and other costs, might now be too great or too little to reflect the true economic cost of replacing the capital invested in producing oil wells. We need to always be constantly on the alert that differentials in our tax laws remain in conformity to economic reality.

So it is with the timber industry. Does the enlightened treatment the tax writers finally gave to them in respect to money invested in forest lands back in 1942 conform to the economic realities of 1966? Has our experience shown that the new concept set forth in the tax code of what is return of capital and what is capital gain and what ordinary income more accurately reflects economic reality than the concept which prevailed prior to that time? I would state rather unequivocally that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. What has happened to the forest industry since that date? Has it grown strong and healthy? Has it enlarged our tax base so that with lower rates of taxes we are extracting more federal revenues? Has the Nation benefited from an increase of forestry wealth? Are good conservation practices encouraged as opposed to being discouraged by the tax treatment? All of these questions I think can be answered in the affirmative clearly revealing that our tax laws are somewhat in conformity with economic truth in this field of endeavor. I hope we keep them in conformity.

Let me utter the warning specifically that I uttered generally. To many outside the forest industry what to you seems economic realty, tax laws which accurately reflect economic differences, appear to be a preference or subsidy. Certainly the school of Fabian socialists who might, if direct actions were foreclosed, willingly subsidize your industry or any economic endeavor because in the process of state subsidy they know they have embarked upon the course toward state ownership, is hard at it telling the general public and those outside your industry that your tax treatment is a subsidy.

Furthermore, those whose industries do not have their economic differences accurately reflected in tax differentials are jealous that you and others have fair treatment when they do not. However, jealousy can lead to taking away that which is right for others to equalize the treatment by all being in misery together, instead of giving to those that which is economically right to equalize the treatment. It is important that businessmen pause before they call tax treatment of another industry subsidy. Maybe it is, but the odds are it is economic reality.

This point is clearly brought home in the endeavor to equalize tax treatment of various competing forms of doing business, specifically the corporation form with the cooperative form. Too many of those who use the corporate form seek to equalize the unfair tax treatment they receive by double taxing the cooperative form instead of concentrating on getting single taxation for the corporate form. I am willing to get a single taxation on the cooperative form of doing business or any form for that matter, but I hesitate to equalize the tax treatment of corporations by being economically unrealistic toward cooperatives. As a matter of fact, it isn't the corporation form of doing business that is being taxed twice but rather the corporate form of doing business when it finances its growth out of new equity issues rather than financing growth out of retained earnings or new debt which is taxed only once.

I have always thought the proper way to lessen the spread of difference between capital gains tax rate and ordinary rates was not to increase the capital gains tax rate and hold the ordinary rates even but rather to reduce the ordinary rates and hold the capital gains rates even. In the long run I would hope to see all rates considerably reduced, because in spite of the recent tax rate reductions I am convinced that our rates are still considerably beyond the point of diminishing returns. We would collect more revenues from a lower rate because the higher rates are impeding the enlarging of the tax base, namely our economic wealth and activities. Lower the rates and the base increases, so does the incidence of tax collectibility and the tax take is enlarged.

This, by the way, was the economic theory behind the tax cut of 1964. Not the theory so loudly heralded by the new economists that we needed to increase aggregate demand through the stimulus of a tax cut. I must pause on this collateral point because there are so many businessmen who have been misled about the 1964 tax cut. Too many are saying, "Well, I guess there is something to this new economics. The tax cut of 1964 certainly produced increased economic activity, of which a great deal was wealth." It is important to realize that although the new economists won their battle in the Congress they lost their war in the Executive Branch of the Government. It is true President Johnson soft pedalled what he was doing and let loose loud blasts of distracting noises to divert attention from what he was really doing, but the record is there for anyone to see. It is new history.

What was the issue? Well, first, the issue was not over having a tax cut. The classical economists, if I can so categorize myself, had been arguing for years that our Federal income tax rates were too high and that those rates were impeding economic growth. So when the new economists came along in 1962 to say, let's reduce Federal income tax rates in order to help the economy, our reaction was, welcome aboard . . . even though the reasons you give for wishing to reduce taxes are contrary to ours.

The reason the new economists gave for wishing a tax cut was to stimulate the economy. Note the metaphor. What happens when a stimulus, a shot in the arm, wears off? You are apt to need or to want another. There is no end to this kind of an operation. The new economists argued that aggregate demand needed boosting up . . . that cutting Federal taxes by say $12 billion would increase consumer demand and investment spending by this much released purchasing power. They argued also, and this is the key to the disagreement, that Federal spending must continue its rate of upward increase. If, they argued, the rate of increase of Federal spending were cut, this would wash out a great deal of the increased total demand which otherwise would come about.

I asked Dr. Heller, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, when the Joint Economic Committee held hearings on the tax cut proposals if it were not true that if we financed the Federal spending by Federal bonds, in lieu of the lost tax revenue, and sold the bonds to the private sector, then the private sector would not have "12 billion increased purchasing power" and there would not be "$12 billion addition to aggregate demand." He agreed and responded that he thought the Federal Reserve System should absorb these bonds. I responded by saying I thought this would increase the money and credit within the society beyond that which the anticipated economic growth warranted. He responded by saying, "The unutilized plant capacity and the unemployed would sop up this additional purchasing power," and so avert the inflation which I pointed to. I responded by saying I thought a great deal of what he called unused plant capacity was largely obsolete and inefficient plant capacity and a great deal of the unemployed were persons unskilled or with obsolete skills who would need training or retraining before the labor market would take them up. I did not argue, nor do I now argue, that you cannot get roast pork—full employment—by burning the barn down but I argued that there are better ways of getting roast pork and I tried to point up the damage which results to the barn. Here the dialogue ended.

The net result of this dispute came out in the House of Representatives in the motion to amend the 1964 tax bill to hold that it should not go into effect unless the President held expenditures in the administrative budget to $97 billion for fiscal year 1964 and $98 billion for fiscal 1965. Those of us who proposed the amendment felt that if Federal expenditures were held to this level, the benefit derived from removing some of the impediments to economic growth inherent in the high Federal income tax rates by

lowering these rates somewhat in increased economic activity would enlarge the Federal tax base and so enable us to balance the budget at the end of fiscal year 1966, namely this June 30. On the other hand, we felt if Dr. Heller's theory were followed and expenditures were permitted to go up to $104 billion for fiscal year 1964 and thence to $110 billion for fiscal year 1965, the benefits would be more than outweighed by the damage resulting from the inflationary pressure we felt would be let loose.

The rest is recorded history, but largely unreported history. The motion to amend was defeated. The tax bill was passed and signed by the President with no restrictions placed on his rate of spending, the accumulated powers to spend granted to him by the Congress in the appropriation bills. But then with the battle lost, the war was won. President Johnson proceeded to exercise expenditure control. The expenditures for fiscal year 1964 were held to $97.7 billion and in fiscal year 1965, the year which just ended last June 30, the expenditures were held to $96.5—$1.5 billion below our suggested figures of $98 billion.

Yes, the tax cut of 1964 proved to be a resounding economic success, on the basis of classical economics and tax theory.

Why were so many fooled and why do so many remain fooled? Partly because of the boasting of the new economists. But this would be shown to be without basis but for the lack of understanding in Congress, in the news media and perforce generally among the people, about the difference between the expenditure and the appropriation process of the Federal government. Each year the country's attention is directed to the congressional appropriation process, the process of deciding how much new authority to spend money the Congress will give to the President—not to be spent in the current fiscal year but for the new fiscal year beginning a half year away and ending a year and a half away.

The expenditure process is another thing, entirely apart, and has little to do with the Congress. This expenditure process relates to what the President actually does with the power to spend the Congress has given him. Contrary to popular conception, the President does not have to use the power to spend the Congress gives to him. Every President has frozen funds for certain programs, slowed down other programs, accelerated some. This is a flexibility I think every President must have, but it means that he can have $200 billion power to spend derived from authorities granted to him by Congress and yet spend less than half of it in a given fiscal year. The President did have the authority to spend almost $200 billion last fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. He has over $200 billion power to spend right now.

Many of us thought he would spend about $110 billion of the $200 billion he had in fiscal 1965. He did not. He spent only $96.5 billion of it and carried over $100 billion unutilized power to spend, which he than added to the $119 billion additional power to spend he got out of that 1965 session of the Congress. The President Johnson the people were watching was not the President Johnson who was watching his nickels but the President Johnson who was asking the Congress in clouds of great rhetoric power to spend $119 billion additional for the future. I kept asking why doesn't the President send back some of the power to spend he has not used and hopefully isn't going to use. I kept asking when is the real President Johnson going to stand up—the President who cut his spending to $96.5 billion last year or the President who has asked for $119 billion to spend even though he has $100 billion left over he still hasn't spent.

This January I was less interested in the proposals in the President's budget message for power to spend in fiscal 1967 than I was in the proposals in the same budget message which radically revised the expenditure levels for the fiscal year we were currently in and are still in and will be in until this June 30. In his Budget Message this year he upped his spending levels for our current fiscal year from an estimated $99.7 billion given us in his 1965 Budget Message, January of 1965, to $108 billion.

Now we are seeing the new economics in operation. We have been seeing it since September 1965. It was in this month the President radically changed his expenditure levels. He had started off the first two months of the new fiscal year 1966, namely the months of July and August 1965, at the very commendable level of $97.3 billion. The level jumped to $9.5 billion for the month of September, or to an annual rate of $114 billion. Until just a month ago this increased level has remained at approximately this high level. I say until a month ago I have reason to think that perhaps President Johnson in light of what is transpiring in the cost of living indexes, this Republican cliche called inflation as the Democrat Majority Leader of the House termed it, is shucking aside his new economists and cutting back on expenditures. I certainly hope so. I can assure you that if he is not cutting back his expenditures, I for one will listen with a deaf ear to any pleas he might make for increased taxes.

I am pleased about one important point, however. Behind all of this talk about increasing taxes in order to dampen "aggregate demand"—this is the new economists' way of describing the cause of the inflation we are experiencing—the new economists are suggesting that it is better to increase taxes than to increase the Federal debt.

We can dampen aggregate demand just about as effectively by increasing the Federal debt as increasing Federal taxes, if that is what we are talking about; that is, we can if we can sell the new debt securities to the private sector, to the consumers and the businesses which otherwise would devote their purchasing power for consumption and plant expansion. However, the new economist knows that we cannot sell the additional securities to the public without increasing interest rates and he shies away from increasing interest rates even further than they are increasing as the result of other forces. He knows that increased interest rates, though in one sense a deflator, are in another sense like a fever is to a disease—not the cause, but a symptom and a healing symptom within bounds, but out of bounds something that can be as deleterious as the disease itself. He knows also that the 4¼ percent interest ceiling on long term Federal bonds prevents the government from selling other than in the short range field and the shorter the term of the bond the closer to money it is. He also knows that if the Federal Reserve System is helping the Treasury maintain a market for its securities, which is one of its functions, it can do so only by concomitantly increasing the supply of money and credit within the society without regard to maintaining the dollar as an accurate economic measure.

Furthermore, the new economist knows that the day when we could with ease export our monetary inflation, our deficits, to nations abroad is over and in the wake of this dangerous operation in the past is an accumulation of great economic power in the hands of those nations which have taken heavy dollar holdings. No longer will nations abroad take the dollar as they have in the past. They are demanding higher prices, prices which go out of economics into serious political demands. Our domestic governmental deficits now are coming out in price increases in our own economy because we are resisting at least some of the political demands.

In other words, the new economists are tacitly admitting, "What's wrong with debt?" For some time they have been asking this question in a supercilious fashion of their critics as if concern about the Federal debt was an outmoded Puritan ethic, a myth to be put away with other childish things. Of course, what the new economists have never been willing to do is honestly state what their critics were really saying. No one was saying that debt per se was bad. What they were saying, however, was that the size of the debt—yes, in relation to GNP or any other indicator—was of serious concern and that we could not continue to finance federal expenditures out of deficits particularly during economic expansions without creating further economic problems and probable damage.

At least as I say, the new economist who argues that the size of the Federal debt was of no concern is now saying it is preferable to have the economic damage ensuing from increasing tax rates which we have just reduced than to put a further load on the Federal debt.

The proper economic solution of course lies in cutting back on Federal expenditures. This time I think the public and the Congress should ask the President to agree to the rescission of some of the power to spend previously granted to him and not just cut back on his expenditure levels. I hope the word that he is cutting back on his expenditure levels is true, that is the first and most important step; but let's let it be clearly known that, if true, that is what he is doing. The best way to do this is for him, with some fanfare (at which he is good) turn back to the Congress some of the power to spend that he is not going to use. He can also stop whetting the peoples' and the Congress' appetite for government to spend, which he has been doing with his great command in the field of rhetoric pointing out all the good things that can come about in a Great Society.

Unless the President is willing to do the basic things necessary to keep the Great Society we have inherited, these good things that could be will not be. Among the basic things necessary is to realize that we have not been good enough to have all these desired things tomorrow or possibly within our lifetime. Many of these promised things we will, like Moses, have to content ourselves with observing from afar, taking the satisfaction that by our regained forebearance and self-discipline we might have made them available to our children.

KANSAS HAS LOST A STATESMAN

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to our beloved Republican national committeeman, Sam Mellinger, of Emporia, Kans., who departed this life on August 10, 1966.

The stature of a man is measured always by the services to his fellow man, by the purposes to which he has given his life and by the essence of his spirit, Measured, too, by his industry, integrity, honor, and his allegiances. And by his capacity to endure, his good humor when the going is rough, and the deep lasting

love he gives to his dear ones. In all these Sam Mellinger was a man.

Sam Mellinger had long been active in county, State, and National politics and since 1964 has been Republican national committeeman, a post which he filled with distinction. And now he is gone—a fair, stalwart, and cherished friend, who made the glittering Kansas scene seem brighter just because he was around and an immutable part of it. William L. White, editor and publisher of the Emporia, Kans., Gazette, has most ably expressed in the following editorial a richly deserved tribute to Sam and his wife, Jerenne:

HOME AGAIN

So Sam Mellinger is back from Mayo's. The important thing is that he is home again. Sam has always been ours; this is where he belongs. Like my father, his mother was a school teacher, early widowed. Like my father, after finishing the University of Kansas, instead of leaving for the East or California where the smarter boys go who get to thinking they are too big for their pants and too important for our little town. Sam Mellinger came back to Emporia to build his career. Like my father, he cared about politics and, again like him, he rose to be Republican National Committeeman of this state, the only other Emporian to hold this job, which he will hold against all comers while he greatly serves us.

So Sam has had, in recent months, a rough row to hoe? Don't waste your pity on Sam; he is used to rough rows. It was rough when he worked his way through school carrying Gazettes, and through high school jerking sodas at Warren Morris' Drug Store, along with Leon Peterson, another local boy who made good the hard way. It was rough when he had to work his way through the University of Kansas and its Law School. It was rough when he came back here to hang out his law shingle and run for county attorney, without a dime of family money back of him except what he had earned for himself.

It was rough when he enlisted in World War II and was sent to Alaska, the most rugged theater in which ever a shot was fired in anger. There, good soldier that he is, he met and married a soldier's daughter, a girl his equal in brains and character, which is saying considerable. So don't waste your pity on them; people like that don't want or need pity.

What matters is that Sam—flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, blood of our blood—is home again. Of that you can be proud and glad.

W.L.W.

FIGHT TO SAVE SMALL WATERSHED PROGRAM HAS JUST BEGUN

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, 1966, the Bureau of the Budget transmitted to the Congress for referral to the Committee on Public Works for subsequent action thereon some 19 watershed work plans pursuant to the authority vested in the President by section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, Public Law 566, and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956. The Bureau of the Budget also transmitted to the Congress for referral to the Committee on Agriculture an even larger number of watershed work plans for its consideration.

This transmittal of watershed work plans to the Congress represented a substantial victory for the legislative branch of our Federal Government. But that victory may be short lived unless the Congress asserts itself even more fully on the questions which have been raised by the President on procedures similar to that embodied in Public Law 566.

Every since so-called constitutional questions were raised by the President last October 27 with the signing into law of the Flood Control Act of 1965, Public Law 89–298, concerning procedures similar to the one embodied in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, to transmit to the Congress work plans for approval by the appropriate committees of the Congress so designated in the act, the President had directed the Bureau of the Budget to cease from sending any watershed work plans, public building prospectuses, small reclamation project work plans, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reports recommending favorable enactment to the Congress until such time as amendatory language to the basic acts was agreed upon by the Executive and congressional leaders.

THE CONTROVERSY BEGINS—THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1965

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, this controversy concerning the authority of the Congress to approve certain work plans and prospectuses prepared by the administration before construction can commence thereon began with the statement of the President last October 27 in signing into law the Flood Control Act of 1965. At that time the President directed the Secretary of the Army not to implement section 201(a) of the Flood Control Act which provided for only approval by the House and Senate Committees on Public Works of water resource projects of the Corps of Engineers costing less than $10 million. This procedure would eliminate the necessity of taking these many projects to the floor of the House for extended floor debate and consideration, and it would streamline the procedures for congressional approval of Corps projects costing less than $10 million. Inasmuch as the controversial projects for the improvement of this Nation's waterways and rivers are customarily more than $10 million in estimated total Federal costs, this procedure would not eliminate the essential floor debate and consideration on controversial Corps projects and would not have vested undue jursidictional authority in the House and Senate Committees on Public Works.

Under the old procedure, if a corps project's report favorably recommending construction thereon was transmitted to the Congress only 1 day after the enactment of an Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act, then it would often have to wait a needless 2 years before it was enacted by the Congress. The announcement last session by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, that the committee thereafter would consider omnibus acts on an annual basis came as a great relief to those of us interested in going ahead as rapidly as possible with the orderly growth and development of our Nation's waterways. However, favorable corps projects still might have to wait as long as an entire year even under the recently announced "Jones procedure"; therefore, the enactment of section 201(a) is indeed not only worth while but essential to the growth of our water resource program.

The President's strong statement at last year's bill signing ceremony directed the Secretary of the Army to refrain from exercising the authority which section 201(a) vests in him. Furthermore, the President accused the Congress of enacting legislation which, in his opinion, ran counter to the Constitution of the United States.

In signing the bill, the President said that the provisions of section 201(a) "would dilute and diminish the authority and power of the Presidency" and that he had not been elected to "preside over its erosion." I agree with the President that he was not elected to preside over the erosion of Executive power, but likewise the 435 Members of this body and the fivescore Members of the other body were not elected to preside over the erosion of legislative prerogatives, either The views of the President on this matter came as a profound shock to the Congress and to many authorities in the area of constitutional law.

SIMILAR PROVISIONS IN OTHER LAWS

It is indeed interesting to point out that provisions similar to those in the Flood Control Act have been embodied in other acts of Congress for many years.

The Public Buildings Act of 1959, Public Law 86–249, has been administered without any constitutional "questions" being raised by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and even Johnson in his first years of office. The similar provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, were also administered without complaint by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, until the present occupant of the White House raised his points on the matter last October. Furthermore, the House and Senate Committees on Public Works and their predecessor committees have had the authority to authorize resurveys of Corps of Engineers surveys without an act of Congress and with only a committee resolution since 1913. The eight Presidents of the United States who have not raised objections to such a procedure since 1913, from President Wilson through President Kennedy, might have had objection to President Johnson's criticism of similar procedures. The Small Reclamation Projects Act also contains language similar to that found in the Watershed Act.

FALLACIES OF PRESIDENT'S POSITION

Mr. Speaker, during the past two decades the Congress has been developing a mechanism of legislative oversight

which promises to be a satisfactory answer to maintaining a proper balance between the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government. This mechanism consists of a legislative veto which takes the form of authorizing an executive official to take a specified action but requires that the action not go into effect until subjected to some form of congressional assent.

As Prof. Arthur Maass and Joseph Cooper at Harvard University pointed out in a widely publicized article on this very subject during December last:

The mechanism is well suited for modern government in situations in which the executive is better suited than the legislative to formulate a specific decision, but in which the legislature feels that the decision is too important to be delegated outright to the executive. Perhaps the most noted example of this concerns the grant of power to the President to reorganize agencies and functions in the executive branch. The President makes reorganization plans, but they do not go into effect until they have been before Congress for 60 days—when either House can disallow them by a simple majority vote.

The enlightening article continued:

We feel this mechanism is constitutional and that it would be deplorable to strike it down on the basis of a civics book interpretation of the Constitution. The purposes for which the veto is used and the forms through which it is applied should be judged by criteria based on policy considerations, and in this instance the purpose is desirable and the form not inappropriate.

After a very learned discussion by these two professors of government at one of this Nation's leading institutions of higher education, the authors concluded by overwhelmingly calling for the President to withdraw his decision not to have section 201(a) implemented by the Secretary of Army. Drs. Maass and Cooper concluded by stating emphatically:

We believe his action was wrong as regards both constitutionality and desirability. The President should withdraw, or simply ignore, the statement he made in signing the bill and order the development of standards for the design of river projects that he can propose to Congress—thus putting to use the leadership powers that are unquestionably his.

On February 21 of this year, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the ranking minority member on the Committee on Public Works, included this article in the Appendix of the RECORD, commencing on page A863 thereof, so I will not request that the Maass-Cooper article be printed in its entirety once again. However, I do want to assert and assert strongly that the arguments set forth in this article are the strongest which I have ever seen come from the academic community in this Nation against the steady encroachment of legislative prerogatives by the President of the United States. The professors have almost totally destroyed the arguments put forth by the Executive in directing the Secretary of the Army not to implement section 201(a).

THE PRESIDENT AND THE WATERSHED PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, I have devoted some amount of time and attention to a discussion of section 201(a) of the Flood Control Act of last year to clarify the positions surrounding the existing controversy on the transmittal of watershed work plans to the Congress. The Committee on Public Works in its report on last year's omnibus legislation cited the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act and the Public Buildings Act as two examples of instituted procedures similar to that embodied in section 201(a), yet instead of following the precedents set by these prior acts, the President decided to attack those prior acts also. This was most discouraging to Members of Congress who had worked diligently for years to strengthen the existing acts. The Watershed Act was one of the first to suffer.

Since its enactment in 1954 during the 83d Congress the act has fostered the growth of one of the most beneficial rural development programs in history. Erosion and flood damages in the watersheds of the rivers and streams of our Nation which cause loss of life and damage to property have been substantially checked by the projects constructed under the authority of this act. In carrying out the act, the Federal Government has cooperated thoroughly with States and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, flood prevention and control districts, and many other local public bodies for the purpose of preventing erosion, floodwater, and sediment damages and for the purpose of furthering the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, thereby preserving and protecting our Nation's land and water resources, as called for in the act.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving in Congress for some 4 years, and I have recently been appointed to the Watersheds Development Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, and during this time I have seen not only the need but the necessity for the continuation and even the expansion of the small watershed development program. As a matter of fact, I am strongly in favor of expanding the authorizations and authority of the program, and I have so stated on numerous occasions.

Because the Congress, in its wisdom, enacted this valuable piece of legislation in 1954 and has continued it during subsequent years, the enhancement of the natural resources of America has been given a sizable boost. Millions of tons of silt from valuable and irreplaceable topsoil which erodes away to clog inland waterway channels and coastal harbors has been greatly checked. Ravaging flood waters which destroy practically everything on the flood plain have also been retarded by the construction of watershed projects. Water storage supplies have been increased for various water uses.

During the 12 years since the enactment of Public Law 566, 729 projects have been approved by the Department of Agriculture. These 729 projects constitute 4,336 single purpose floodwater retarding structures, 280 multiple-purpose structures, and 29 other single purpose structures through fiscal year 1966. The total drainage area encompassed by these 729 projects covers 41,486,600 acres. Through fiscal year 1965, the floodwater storage capacity of these 729 projects was an astounding 3,675,174 acre-feet; sediment storage was 633,771 acre-feet; and water supply storage for municipal, recreation, irrigation, and other purposes was an additional 431,151 acre-feet.

In addition to projects approved by the Department, another 1,211 projects have been approved for planning which would encompass a drainage area of an additional 84,124,800 acres. Furthermore, some 2,502 applications have been filed for even more watershed projects which would encompass a drainage area of an astounding 181,617,600 acres. If these proposed projects are allowed to suffer because of administrative disruption which could easily result from the President's decision, then we will have permitted a great injustice to the development of this Nation's resource to have come about.

In my opinion, the staff of the Soil Conservation Service and its watersheds office of the Department of Agriculture has done an outstanding job of administering this highly important program. They are to be commended for it.

PRESIDENT PROMISES NOT TO SEND ANY MORE WATERSHED WORK PLANS TO CONGRESS AFTER 1966

Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson finally released his grip on these watershed workplans, primarily because of congressional pressure, and finally had the Bureau of the Budget transmit the work plans to the Congress during late July, many Members of Congress thought that the battle had been won. However, this is not the case at all. As a matter of fact, the President reiterated his position that he was opposed to the provisions of the Watershed Act and all other acts which provide the legislative branch with some form of oversight veto on projects.

At this point in my discussion, I consider it essential to quote verbatim from the letter to the Speaker of July 22, 1966, from Mr. Phillip S. Hughes, Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget. After transmitting 19 work plans to the Congress for consideration by the Committee on Public Works, the letter stated:

The President has held discussions with the Chairman both of the Agriculture and Public Works Committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate concerning the requirement in section 2 of the Act which conditions appropriations for certain watershed protection projects upon prior approval of their plans by the substantive committees. The President has objected to a similar provision in the Flood Control Act of 1965, and has directed the Secretary of the Army to refrain from exercising the authority which that provision attempted to vest in him.

Since the procedure established by section 2 of the Act has been in effect for a number of years, the President has approved the submission of these projects to the Congress despite his view that this procedure represents an unwarranted encroachment on the authority of the Executive. However, the President considers that he has given clear expression of his views of the need for revision of this procedure and he has therefore directed that no further projects be transmitted under that procedure after this session.

Accordingly, legislation will be transmitted to the Congress which would replace the present authorization procedure for watershed protection projects with one which in

our view would provide opportunity for congressional review of project plans without presenting the problems to which the President referred in his statement.

I would like to reiterate one phrase of this letter:

He has therefore directed that no further projects be transmitted under that procedure after this session.

Mr. Speaker, I think that every Member of Congress can clearly see that even if we receive additional work plans during this session, that the President will not transmit any to the Congress thereafter despite the widespread national need for these works. It is of great concern to me, as I am sure it is for many other Members, that the President has placed this artificially created argument against the so-called encroachments on his powers on higher priority than the continuation of this program through a procedure which is not only operative but which is also not contrary to the Constitution.

I hope to see Members of Congress taking the floor in ever-increasing numbers this session in defense of this most worthwhile watershed development program, and I hope that when the President does send to the Congress his recommended amendatory language for the Watershed Act and any other acts which he feels need amending to prevent this "repugnance" to the Constitution that we stand firm and exert our free and independent will against the removal of prerogatives which are rightly ours.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the idea of universal service for our young people—either in the military or in civilian endeavors—has been a topic of discussion off and on for many years.

An article in the New York Times magazine last Sunday, August 7, explores the idea and points to an essay by William James on the subject more than 60 years ago. There has been wide discussion of such a program recently as a result of remarks by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara before the American Society of Newspaper Editors last May 18 in Montreal.

Last Sunday's article delves into some of the courses that could be followed, and also some of the problems involved, in this kind of program. Although the author, Marion K. Sanders, expresses an interest in seeing at least a small voluntary national service corps set up at this time, there is no commitment to the proposal in its broader terms on the part of either myself or the author.

However, the article does offer a number of ideas and covers the subject from many angles, all of which are worth some good hard thought. I believe many people will be interested in reading it, particularly at this time when there is so much concern about the inequities in our draft laws.

The article follows:

THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

(By Marion K. Sanders)

"If now there were, instead of military conscription, a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against Nature, the injustice would tend to be evened out and numerous other goods to the commonwealth would follow."

So wrote William James more than sixty years ago in an essay whose title has proved more memorable than its content. A "Moral Equivalent for War" has endured as a dream of philosophers and poets. But few Americans have been attracted to the notion of an army of civilian conscripts.

Thus it was something of a shock—which reverberated in front-page headlines—when Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara appeared to embrace the idea not long ago in a speech in Montreal.

"Our present Selective Service system draws on only a minority of eligible young men. That is an inequity," Mr. McNamara said. "It seems to me that we could move toward remedying that inequity by asking every young person in the United States to give two years of service to his country—whether in the Peace Corps or in some other volunteer developmental work at home or abroad."

Mr. McNamara did not define the phrase "every young person." Was he referring to the more than three million male and female Americans who reach the age of 18 every year? Or was he thinking of the whole 18–26 age group of both sexes—numbering over 25 million? Either way, it is a grandiose concept. Reaction to his proposal on Capitol Hill was generally cool and the White House firmly disavowed the notion of drafting the young for civilian duties. Yet despite official efforts to shoot it down, McNamara's trial balloon remained aloft. For the idea of a national service program is appealing. It will be explored on an official level by the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service which was appointed by President Johnson last month and which will report to him in January.

Enthusiasts for national service see it as an outlet for youthful idealism, as an antidote for the moral lassitude of our time and as a practical means of tackling the immense problems of our society and of the world's less affluent nations.

But before it can be even considered a possible alternative to military service, a number of hard questions will have to be answered. Among them these:

(1) Should service be voluntary or compulsory? (2) Precisely what would members of the service corps do? (3) Who would mobilize, train and direct them?

On the first point there is a sharp split. Secretary McNamara, for example, though he did not amplify his suggestion personally, allowed his office to issue a statement to the effect that the operative word in his proposal was "ask," meaning that young persons would be invited rather than required to serve. Similarly, Dean John Monro of Harvard College is unequivocally opposed to the idea of compulsory service, characterizing it as "totalitarian." Young people, he said, should be free to make their own choices; they should be left alone to lead their own lives. Nonetheless, he heartily favors a comprehensive civilian program in which those who so desire can volunteer.

This, generally speaking, is the "conservative" position.

It is the "liberal" side which favors compulsory service. One of its eloquent voices is Prof. Roger Shattuck of the University of Texas. Writing in The Texas Observer, he conceded that a draft for civilian service seems, at first glance, an invasion of political freedom. But he believes in a compulsory program because it is "a mission dedicated to peace and freedom and raising living standards. It could spell a political and moral regeneration for the whole country. Our colleges and universities are rapidly becoming institutions of higher segregation where sub-adults are kept at a low simmer, held apart from certified adults in the 'real world.'" All young people, he argued, should be required to "help with their own hands in solving the technological, economic and moral mess we have got ourselves into."

A middle position is taken by Harris Wofford, Associate Director of the Peace Corps. "I don't know," he said recently, "whether this needs to be done by law or whether we can do it by spreading the volunteer idea and making it a recognized part of the citizenship training of every American."

Donald J. Eberle—who has spent many years teaching in Africa and is particularly interested in the possibilities of everseas service for young Americans—called together in early May some thirty interested educators, foundation officials, students and other concerned citizens who spent the day discussing a national service program at the Princeton Club in New York. Everyone present supported the idea of such a program but the conference reached no firm conclusion on how to go about putting it into effect. Subsequently, Mr. Eberle and a small ad hoc committee pulled together some tentative proposals which provide a concrete basis for discussion. This is their plan:

The program would be administered by the 4,000 existing Selective Service boards. (Women are not dealt with in this particular proposal, which is primarily designed as an alternative to the present draft system.) On being called up at 18, each young man would be offered the following options:

(1) Immediate military service for two years, including training;

(2) Immediate nonmilitary service for *three* years, including training;

(3) Delayed service—either military or nonmilitary—to be fulfilled before the age of 26; or,

(4) The young man could choose not to volunteer at all, in which case his name would be placed in a pool to be drafted possibly by lottery whenever the armed services might need him.

A key feature of this plan is the difference in length of service; this factor, it is thought, plus such added inducements as better pay and greater G.I. benefits, might entice enough youths into the armed forces to meet military manpower requirements. Though this may be so, most of the young people I have talked to regard three years—the period specified for civilian service in the program discussed above—as an excessive chunk out of one's life before the age of 26. Several felt, too, that it was presumptuous to place a time value on military versus civilian service. And how, others asked, could civilian service be considered "equality of sacrifice" compared with risking one's life in Vietnam?

Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame, a stanch advocate of universal service, also objects to the time differential. "Making non-military service of longer duration," he said, "would seem to indicate to the public that it is not as valuable as military service."

To most people, the closest equivalent to military duty seems the Peace Corps, which entails real hazards and hardships. Unfortunately, however, the Peace Corps cannot become an instrument for correcting "inequities" in the draft. There are only 14,000 volunteers in its ranks; in its first five years, 86 per cent of its workers had A.B., B.S. or higher degrees; 11 per cent had some college education and only 3 per cent had never been to college. Obviously, Peace Corps service

would provide an avenue of escape from the military for precisely the same group of well-educated young men who are now being deferred. Similarly, VISTA—the Domestic Peace Corps—has fewer than 3,000 in its ranks and 75 per cent of them are college graduates. The newly launched Teachers' Corps likewise needs well-educated, specially qualified volunteers and is budgeted for only a few thousand.

The plain fact is that there are no existing service groups which could effectively absorb the large numbers of men and women that a national service program would provide. A new framework will have to be invented. It also seems evident that the whole concept will be badly skewed if—in the midst of a shooting war, and a frustrating and unpopular one to boot—we conceive a national service as primarily a solution to the "inequities of the draft."

This does not mean, however, that it is too early to give serious thought to a universal national service program; for surely only the blackest pessimists among us believe that we will forever need three million young men in active combat forces. When that necessity ends, we should be ready to launch a plan that will have constructive value for our young people and for our society.

What services actually could the members of a civilian corps perform? An illuminating statistical clue has been provided by the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress. Its report made a startling estimate of the jobs which currently need to be filled to bring public services in this country up to "acceptable" levels. Here are the commission's estimates:

The jobs:	*The workers needed*
Medical institutions and health services	1,200,000
Educational institutions	1,100,000
National beautification	1,300,000
Welfare and home care	700,000
Public protection	350,000
Urban renewal and sanitation	650,000
Total	5,300,000

Could much of this work be done by members of a national service corps? And would their presence be accepted by organized labor?

I put these questions to Brendan Sexton, director of Leadership Studies for the United Auto Workers, who has recently completed a tour of duty in the upper echelons of the Poverty Program. His response, on both counts, was strongly affirmative. He is convinced that an immense amount of useful work could be done by national service corpsmen and women with a minimum of training; that we would, in establishing such a service, create in effect new career opportunities—in the care of the aged and sick, in the rehabilitation of our cities and forests. And he believes that, despite the cost of such a program, there would be an economic gain in terms of mental illness, crime an delinquency prevented.

"Of course, there would be a kind of reflexive hostility at the outset on the part of some old-line unions," he said. "One way to handle this would be to involve plenty of retired craftsmen—plumbers, machinists, electricians, and so forth, as teachers in the program.

"Obviously all unions would object if volunteers took jobs away from workers at a time or in an area of unemployment. They would have a legitimate beef if—for instance—New York City, because of its financial troubles, fired some Park Department employes and replaced them with corpsmen. But I don't see anything of the sort happening in a time of full employment. And the catalogue of things that need to be done is so fabulous that there shouldn't be any danger of real competition on the job market."

It seems a conservative estimate that at least half of the more than 5,000,000 service jobs projected in the automation report could, at least in theory, be filled by suitably trained corpsmen and women. And it seems feasible and desirable to put many of them to work in existing public and private agencies and institutions which are, at the present time, desperately shorthanded.

This is exactly what has happened in our only state-run domestic peace corps—the Commonwealth Service Corps founded in Massachusetts in 1965 as a living memorial to John F. Kennedy. In an initial survey conducted which this corps was being planned, it was found that some 375 state, private and local public agencies could readily use more than 7,000 volunteers. Full-time Massachusetts corpsmen are paid $80 a month (there are also part-time volunteers who serve a minimum of 12 hours a week and are reimbursed for expenses, and students who receive up to $12 a month for at least six hours of service a week).

Some serve in the wards of mental hospitals, others as helpers in homes for the retarded; some run an information and referral service for welfare recipients; others work with prisoners and parolees; and some conduct study halls for teen-agers. The Commonwealth Corps is largely supported by Poverty Program funds; and it has been beset by the administrative, jurisdictional and political difficulties common to so many Poverty Program operations. Though it is functionally an inspiring example, the Commonwealth Corps does not provide an administrative model for a nationwide, large-scale service corps.

The most respected prototype, organizationally, is the Israeli youth service program which, as Harris Wofford put it in a recent talk, recognizes "the need to mobilize the whole younger generation. . . . There are no 4-Fs in Israel. Everyone is 1-A in terms of national service."

The Israel national service is run by the defense forces, in which all young people must enlist. Men between the ages of 18 and 26 serve for 26 months; those between 27 and 29 who have not been called up for one reason or another serve for two years; unmarried women from 18 to 26 serve for 20 months. (Deferment is granted students taking subjects of special importance to the country—namely, medicine, engineering, agronomics or teaching.)

The full period of service is not, however, devoted to military training or duties. In Nahal (Pioneering Fighting Youth) some young men and women do agricultural work in frontier villages or set up new ones. Others teach and provide a variety of social services to the many impoverished, ignorant immigrants who have entered Israel in recent years. The Israel defense forces and the Ministry of Education jointly run a youth corps, Gadna, which provides training along Scout lines for boys and girls from 14 to 18 and also stresses pioneering and agriculture.

A somewhat similar program of national service in Iran is also run by the military. Soldiers in uniform teach, build roads and bridges, give health and sanitation training and, in effect, serve as the shock troops of the country's war against ignorance, poverty, illiteracy and social deprivation.

In this country we have only one prototype for broadly democratic civilian services corps—the depression-era Civilian Conservation Corps. Its peak enrollment in 1935 was 500,000; in all, 2.5 million young men passed through the camps, most staying for six months to plant trees, build reservoirs and fish ponds and check dams. They dug diversion ditches, raised bridges and fire towers, fought blister rust and pine-twig blight and Dutch elm disease, restored historic battlefields, cleared beaches and camping grounds. Arthur Schlesinger Jr. has written in "The Coming of the New Deal": "They did more than reclaim and develop natural resources. They reclaimed and developed themselves."

The young men were recruited by the Labor Department. The Agriculture and Interior Departments organized and supervised the work projects. The camps themselves, however, were run by the War Department; one of the officers associated with them, Schlesinger notes, "was a Col. George Catlett Marshall, who organized 17 camps in the Southeast."

With World War II, the C.C.C. went out of business; but it is important to remember that the Army played a crucial role in making it work.

In any large national service program, our armed forces would have a key part—for in this country only the military has developed real competence in mobilizing, sorting out and training large numbers of men and women. It is fashionable, particularly among those who have never been in military service, to disparage the Army way—but the recruiting posters are not nonsense. The military does a remarkable job of training and of fitting round pegs into round holes. Dr. Eli Ginzberg of Columbia, who is chairman of the National Manpower Advisory Commission, says: "On the basis of observations extending over a quarter of a century, I have no hesitancy in saying that the armed forces' record in personnel-handling is as good as industry's. Of course you find some misassigned men in the Army—but the same is true in universities and industry. The armed services do a careful job of classification. The bizarre yarns you hear—about the man who was taught Japanese and then sent to France—represent rare exceptions."

Furthermore, thousands of young men have acquired useful civilian vocations in the course of their military service. The armed forces do not maintain follow-up records to prove the point. However, a still unpublished study conducted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is illuminating. A random sample of draftees in the lowest intelligence group eligible for military duty was followed for a period of years after service. The earnings of these men were compared with those of a similar group of men who had not had military service. The superiority in earnings of the ex-soldiers was characterized as "fantastic" by one man who participated in this study.

Although the armed forces no longer accept illiterates, they still maintain education centers where high school drop-outs can study during off-duty hours. In the 12 months ending July, 1965, high school diplomas were earned in this way by 43,558 soldiers—a result that stands up well alongside civilian attempts to cope with the same problem.

A compulsory national service corps would involve an administrative task of a scope we haven't seen since World War II, when 16 million men and women were mobilized in our armed forces. Here are the basic personnel figures we would have to work with should a compulsory service corps for both sexes be set up in this country:

Total men and women at present in the 18–26 age group: more than 25 million.

Exemptions: 11 million. (Mothers and men and women in essential jobs—7 million; men and women in the armed forces—2 million; physically and mentally unfit—2 million.)[1]

[1] These figures presuppose an eventual reduction in military forces from the present 3 million; deferments but not exemptions for students; and fewer exemptions for unfitness, since national-service qualification requirements would be lower than those of the armed forces.

Total men and women available for a compulsory service corps: 14 million.

If each individual in this eight-year (18–26) age span serves for two years, then one-fourth of the 14-million group—i.e., 3.5-million—would be in service at any one time. What would a 3.5-million-strong national service corps cost? Adopting arbitrarily a modest figure of $3,500 per capita to cover training, equipment, maintenance and a token salary, the annual bill would be around $12-billion—exclusive of the undoubtedly heavy cost of tooling up. This is hardly a sum the Congress or the tax-payers are likely to approve at the present time—after all, only $1.5-billion annually has been allocated to the entire Poverty Program.

Apart from its cost, a compulsory program of the size we have projected is up against the fact that we do not have an adequate plan as yet for using the 3.5-million workers it would provide. And I can think of no surer way to foredoom a potentially admirable effort than to launch it without careful advance planning. Furthermore, after discussions with young people, educators and thoughtful public officials, I have concluded that there is an essential conflict between the concepts of conscription and humanitarian service.

I therefore believe that the answer, at least for the present, is a small *voluntary* national service corps, including both men and women. The response of Americans to well-planned voluntary programs has always been impressive. The men's and women's Job Corps, for example, have had to turn down, for budget reasons, nine out of every ten applicants. (There are fewer than 30,000 in the Job Corps today. Well over 500,000 persons—most from deprived backgrounds—have applied to date.) The dedicated service given by volunteers in Operation Headstart and other Poverty Program projects is a measure of a huge untapped reservor of idealism among Americans. Judging by the figures on the 18–26 age group already given, I believe that it would be possible to mobilize at least two million young people in a service corps on a purely voluntary basis.

But a corps of two million is still too large for the moment. We are not yet tooled for it. I propose, instead, that Congress create a National Service Agency authorized to mobilize 500,000 civilian volunteers, selected initially on the basis of their dedication to and aptitude for the corps' varied missions. The cost would be in the neighborhood of $1.7-billion annually. This, theoretically, is how the corps would be set up:

Upon signing in, all volunteers would go to basic-training centers operated by the Army, which would perform the function it did for the C.C.C. The Army also would be requested to operate a classification system designed to match interests, skills and national needs.

Thereafter, volunteers would be dispersed to newly established service centers around the country for training and duty. Some would work in conservation camps administered jointly by the Army and by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, in the C.C.C. pattern. Many would be assigned to public and private institutions to work as nurse-teacher-librarian aides; mental-health assistants; or in recreation and urban-improvement programs. The National Service Agency would be responsible for setting standards and maintaining a continuous check on the performance of volunteers and the agencies authorized to supervise them.

(Experimentally, I think it would be useful to make such voluntary service an alternate to military duty for the men. It seems to me unlikely that the armed forces would be shortchanged if this choice were offered. For only a minute proportion of the civilian corps could be accommodated in such "glamour" agencies as the Peace Corps. The vast majority would face assignment to rugged labor on conservation projects or to the relatively drab tasks cited above.)

Even before establishing a National Service Agency and embarking on this modest pilot program, however, we should take these steps:

(1) Enlarge the Peace Corps and VISTA and the Teachers' Corps to at least double their present size. This is an effort in which the colleges will have to help, as several are already doing.

(2) Increase the Job Corps tenfold—to an estimated 400,000. To do this will require a major shift in emphasis—stressing service to human beings and the career opportunities in welfare fields, rather than routine vocational training. This will also require a more democratic mix in Job Corps enrollment, with the better-educated volunteers spending at least part of their time as teachers of their less-well-equipped colleagues—as is done in Israel. The Job Corps, in effect, should be converted from a rehabilitation program for the poor into an opportunity for democratic service for all. The reconstituted Job Corps—and possibly also the Peace Corps, VISTA and the Teachers' Corps—would be absorbed by the National Service Agency when established. If, as is quite likely, there remains a need for a program of remedial education and vocational training, along the lines of the present Job Corps, it should be set up under educational auspices apart from the service program.

(3) Compile a national inventory of worthwhile conservation and urban-rehabilitation projects and of the urgent manpower and womanpower needs of institutions, schools and social agencies across the country. Supplement this listing with a catalogue of the new services desperately needed by the nation's old people, children harassed working mothers and the footloose adolescents. Such a compilation is by no means beyond the capacity of the nation's social scientists and computers.

By thus translating the nation's human needs into perceivable form, I believe we would dramatize the fact that we do have more than five million unfilled jobs. And we would begin to see a national service corps, not merely as an "alternative to the draft" or as a corrective to the draft's "inequities," but as a tool for alleviating the anguish of neglected patients in our hospitals and mental institutions, the misery of lonely old people, the plight of neglected children and the decay of our neglected land and cities—the medieval blights in our affluent society.

THE STRUGGLE TO END HUNGER: DOLE AMENDMENT WILL HELP

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in this week's issue of Time magazine there appears a very succinct and a very enlightening article on the pending world food and population crisis. This article points out some astonishing statistics. Here are some on the current efforts of the United States: 600 ships now carrying grain to India; 1,000,000 tons of grain per month being donated to that nation. U.S. farmers feed 1 out of every 20 persons in Africa, South America, and non-Red Asia; 25 percent of annual U.S. wheat production is going to India alone.

Here are some data on the magnitude of the problem: 500 million people—one-seventh of the world's population—are "belly hungry."

Two-thirds of Brazil's population suffer nutritional deficiency.

Nigerian food prices have gone up 40 percent in 6 months, forcing a ban on exports.

Six hundred thousand people in Bechuanaland have lived on FAO food donations for 5 years.

There are enough potential mothers alive today to raise world population to 7.4 billion by the turn of this century.

It took from the dawn of time to the year 1800 for mankind to reach a population of 1 billion.

This article points out some of the prospects and methods of meeting the rising world food and population problem and then discusses the recently passed extension of Public Law 480 incorporated in H.R. 14929. I supported that bill, and the amendment by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] to accelerate our agricultural technical assistance program through a "bread and butter corps" as is discussed in this article.

I take this occasion to commend the gentleman from Kansas for his many efforts to meet the massive problems that loom upon the near horizon of world history and insert the Time magazine article of August 12, 1966, into the RECORD at this point:

THE STRUGGLE TO END HUNGER

One of the greatest peacetime armadas ever assembled—600 ships from 50 donor nations—has borne 1,000,000 tons a month of mostly U.S. grain to drought-tormented India this year. Despite alarming predictions that millions of people might starve to death in that land, famine has been fended off. The massive U.S. effort, plus surprisingly effective distribution of rationed wheat and rice through India's bullock-and-leather-bucket economy, proved the apocalyptic prophets wrong.

Yet neither India nor other needy nations dare rely on largesse much longer. With world population in the past five years growing twice as fast, at 2% a year, as food output, man's struggle against hunger has reached a historic turning point. It has already forced dozens of ill-fed countries to start reshaping their pride-twisted economies. It has upset old notions of geopolitics. Most dramatic of all, it has virtually eaten up the perennial overproduction of U.S. agriculture, whose bounty now feeds one out of every 20 persons in Africa, Latin America and non-Communist Asia. The State Department last week told U.S. embassies to discourage requests for wheat because the nation must cut back such aid shipments by 25% this year.

THE GRAIN DRAIN

In the twelve years since the U.S. began dumping its awkward farm surpluses overseas on semi-giveway terms, so much of the glut has disappeared that now the nation must try to expand farm output after 33 years of curbing it. Twice this year, Washington has increased its price supports for dairy products, and it is now asking farmers to plant 10% more rice, 15% more wheat. For lack of grain to store, Cargill, Inc., last month closed its largest elevator in Buffalo. With India consuming a quarter of the U.S. wheat crop this year, as against a fifth last year and an eighth five years ago, U.S. wheat stocks now stand at a 14-year low of just

over 15 million metric tons, not enough for adequate protection against a domestic crop failure. The supply of soybeans, the dull yellow seed that goes into everything from vegetable oil to paint and constitutes the world's cheapest source of protein equals just four months' consumption. Five years ago, Government warehouses were jammed with butter and cheese; now they hold none. Washington has had to go into the market to buy dried milk for its program of free school lunches for 50 million children in 52 foreign countries.

The U.S. shift from surplus toward scarcity leaves the nation with abundant food of every kind, but at prices rising swiftly enough to cause wrath among consumers in Manhattan, pandemonium on the grain market in Chicago, and smiles on farmers' faces from Keokuk to Calexico. Cash receipts by farmers are expected to rise 14% this year above their 1964 level, to a record $44.5 billion, and their net incomes will jump 16% to more than $15 billion. The change calls into question assumptions of many years' standing. For instance, does the U.S. still need crop-area controls and subsidies on such avidly sought foodstuffs as wheat? As things stand now, even though the market price of wheat has climbed 26.5% in a year to $1.91½, farmers are holding near-record amounts off the market in expectation of still higher prices—and Government wheat subsidies are helping to finance that gamble. The need for oil banking is also diminishing; 10 million of the 56 million acres of idle farm land, which costs taxpayers an irksome $1.6 billion a year, will be put to use to reach the new grain goals.

So far, man's ability to improve his environment has thwarted the 168-year-old Malthusian hypothesis that the human race is doomed to starve because population will outstrip food supply. Enriched by the 19th century industrial revolution that Malthus failed to foresee, Europe turned abroad for food. The U.S. began mechanizing its farming well over a century ago. Since then, compounding its prowess with irrigation, hybrid seeds, pesticides, continually improved fertilizers, and now even computers, the nation has marched to its present-day high farm productivity. Yet even without these benefits, the countries now called "underdeveloped" were able to feed themselves until World War II, and to export as much as 11 million tons of grain a year to Europe. Then postwar population pressures forced them to begin importing food, and now they bring in 25 million tons a year.

Now they are frighteningly short of self-sufficiency. Half a billion people—almost a seventh of the earth's 3.28 billion inhabitants—are "belly hungry," as an official of the United Nations Food & Agriculture Organization puts it. For another billion only a shade better off, poorly balanced diets smother their lives in lethargy, chronic illness and early death. Protein and vitamin deficiencies condemn millions of their children to such widespread, dwarfing diseases as kwashiorkor, which produces skin sores, swollen limbs and resentful apathy, and marasmus, which bloats bellies, shrivels limbs to the girth of the bones, and enfeebles brains to the point where schooling is useless. Imprisoned in poverty by ignorance and malnutrition, such virus fodder can contribute little to the development of their nations. Almost all of them live in Asia, Africa and Latin America, where farming is mostly mired in Babylonian technology.

In bejungled Brazil, which imports even some of its beans from Mexico, two-thirds of the population suffers from nutritional deficiency; the northeastern "Brazilian bulge" is one of the worst-fed areas of the world. In Africa's Bechuanaland, the population of 600,000 has subsisted on handouts from the FAO for five years of drought—a curse now spreading to Morocco and western Algeria. In fertile Nigeria, a food shortage has boosted prices 40% in six months, forcing the new regime to forbid the export of such African staples as yams, cassava flour (made from a high-calorie but protein-short root), corn and rice to neighboring countries.

THE HIGH COST OF INDIA

By any measure, India bears the most burdensome load of food problems—as elsewhere, mostly self-inflicted. The country is 75% illiterate, riven by language differences, hobbled by its caste system. Millions of impoverished peasants are at the mercy of the annual monsoon to water their crops, but the government has yet to survey many areas for underground sources of water. Though the seas around the subcontinent teem with protein-rich fish, which keep the Japanese healthy, religious taboos prevent orthodox Hindus from eating them. Farms average a mere two acres, precluding their mechanization. Why don't farmers pool their holdings in cooperatives, share the tools they so desperately need? Explains Punjab Farmer Kewal Singh: "Everyone suspects everyone else of being dishonest."

India loses a third of its harvest to insects, rats and rot, and high cost prevents big-scale food canning. From what should be fertile basins, India gets rice yields only a third of Egypt's, acre for acre, and grain production half that of the U.S. Misled by the example of Soviet industrialization, India for years concentrated on creating a socialistic state dominated by government-owned industries, diverting its own meager resources and $6.5 billions of U.S. economic assistance to do so. U.S. wheat helped to keep food prices low for industrial workers, but this cut farmers' incentive and prevented them from buying factory goods. At last, India's planners have realized that industry and agriculture must develop together if either is to thrive.

Now India's government has made overcoming its food deficit the first order of business, and Roger Revelle, director of Harvard's Center for Population Studies, believes that remedies can take root: better irrigation, more fertilizer plants, higher-yielding seeds, pest control. Equally vital are a farm-credit system, roads and storehouses (so that farmers need not dump their crops on the market at harvest time, when prices dip), and crop insurance to overcome the penniless farmers' reluctance to try new methods.

PROSPECTS AND PROPOSALS

Though India escaped famine this year, the pangs of world hunger are going to grow worse. Since DDT and antibiotics cut their death rates by one-third in the 1940s, backward countries have seen their once slow gait of population growth change to a gallop. Fully 80% of the post-World War II population spurt has occurred in the countries least able to support it. It took from the dawn of time until 1800 for the earth's population to reach 1 billion but only 130 years after that to reach 2 billion, and only 36 years more to reach the present 3.28 billion. Enough girls have already been born, Fortune points out, to be the mothers of sufficient children to raise the population to 7.4 billion by the year 2000—but birth control should cut that figure down a lot. So should reduced child mortality—by giving peasants less need to rely on sheer number of offspring as insurance that some will survive to care for them in their old age. In any case, most of the added people will live in regions already seething with the pressures of deprivation.

"Unless the hungry nations learn to feed themselves," warns Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, "there will be world famine in less than 20 years. More human lives hang in the balance than have been lost in all the wars of history." President Johnson warns that "one new element in today's world is the threat of mass starvation." Agrees FAO Director-General Binay Rajan Sen: "Either we take the fullest measures both to raise productivity and stabilize population growth, or we face a disaster of unprecedented magnitude."

The threat of famine is real, but barring an improbable collapse of U.S. agriculture, it is not imminent. And the means for avoiding famine lie well within man's technology, if not necessarily within his politics. "If there should be a famine, it will be the result of ill-advised government action—in the U.S. and abroad," says Stanford Professor Karl Brandt, former director of its Food Research Institute. Plant Pathologist J. George Harrar, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, holds that "we know enough today to transform the food production of the world. There is no longer any excuse for human starvation."

The gathering crisis has at least exposed the defects of the U.S.'s twelve-year-old $15 billion Food for Peace giveaway, Public Law 480. Even that program's first coordinator, Don Paarlberg, now a Purdue professor of agricultural economics, castigates it. "All that free food depresses foreign markets, discourages their farmers, makes them victims of food imperialism," says he. "It's not good for them, and it's not good for us." In effect, the bill was so explicitly designed to let the U.S. get rid of surpluses that it neglected to encourage foreign agriculture. Many developing countries—notably India, Egypt and Indonesia—used U.S. food as a crutch to let them spend money on prestige projects such as airlines, steel mills and monumental public works.

Acknowledging the old mistakes, the Administration's $6.6 billion Food for Freedom bill, recently passed by the House of Representatives and expected to clear the Senate without major difficulty, calls for a fundamental shift in U.S. food-aid policy. It still proposes to keep the world from starving by expanding food shipments abroad and drops the requirement of the expiring law that such aid must come from U.S. surpluses. But the bill would require countries receiving food to build up their own agricultural output through self-help. And it quite bluntly advocates that they take birth-control measures, too.

A few years ago, such a proviso might have raised cries of a Western plot against the growth of colored races. Hunger's pressures have helped to calm that fallacious fear. Even in the most unlikely region, Roman Catholic South America, resistance to birth control has dwindled. "Religion is getting out of the way," says University of Chicago Economist Theodore W. Schultz.

If the short-range solution to hunger overseas is more U.S. food, the long-range answer must be the export of technology, along with capital and brains to see that it is applied wisely. The rest of the world needs to catch up with the mechanization and efficiency of U.S. farms. Half the world's tractors operate in North America. California rice growers have gone so far as to plant, fertilize and spray their crops entirely from planes. A single U.S. farm worker now feeds 37 people, nearly twice as many as he did only a decade ago. And despite rising prices, U.S. consumers get off with spending the world's smallest share of their after-tax income for food: 19% (*v.* 29% in Britain, 45% in Italy, 80% in India).

American-backed research has already begun that immense catch-up task. Mexico was able to convert its wheat deficit into a small surplus at least partly because the Rockefeller Foundation helped Mexican scientists to develop new high-yielding varieties, which are stubby enough not to topple over of their own weight (as native wheat did) when heavily fertilized. Transplanted, the Mexican wheat is now doubling yields in West Pakistan, undergoing tests in India. In 1962, the Ford and Rockefeller foundations

jointly set up an International Rice Research Institute near Manila. Already, its 20 scientists—half Americans, half Asians—have crossbred new strains of rice that have raised crop output in Pakistan and elsewhere.

The next task is research on tropical farming. Only 7.6% of the earth's land surface is cultivated today, because the rest is mostly too hot, cold, dry, wet or steep. Man's food supply is adequate only in the cool temperate zone, where grow most of the grains and soybeans that supply 60% of human energy. Crops in tropical rain forests are still grown as the Mayan Indians grew them 20 centuries ago: by burning off a tract, tilling it three years, then abandoning it.

Vital as research is, victory over hunger also demands that backward countries scale new heights of social, political and economic organization. As the U.S. example shows, it takes vast amounts of capital—$30,500 per U.S. farm worker *v.* $19,600 for an industrial worker. Some experts figure that developing countries must invest $80 billion before 1980 just to feed their growing populations at today's unhappy level. Beyond that, there is a need for chains of agricultural-research centers and schools abroad, partly staffed by an army of young U.S. technicians—one Congressman would call them the "bread and butter corps." Incentives that boost farm output by rewarding it must replace stifling state controls. The old Danish proverb applies: "When the mayor is a baker, the breads are always small."

PROTEIN FROM PETROLEUM

For the 25-year future, scientists are already busy with new ways to feed the hungry planet. Los Angeles' Rand Corp. feels confident that fish will be herded like cattle and raised in offshore pens, that kelp, seaweed, plankton and microscopic sea plants will be grown by divers living for months at a time in undersea bunkhouses. Oilmen have lately discovered how to derive a high-grade, edible protein from petroleum. The U.S. Army has figured out how to irradiate meats to preserve them for three years—a development of vast potential for refrigeration-shy countries. Would people eat such stuff? Happily, entrenched habits can be changed. In India's rice-shy Kerala state, people are learning to down wheat they once spurned.

The food-rich West has enough conventional resources to stave off starvation on less fortunate continents long enough for existing farm technology—plus increasing birth control—to restore the balance between food and people. What then? Says Harvard's Revelle: "One cannot go to India without feeling that the average Indian is a prisoner of biology and environment. The problem of development is giving these human beings the freedom they need. They will use it very well." America's fabulous farm underpinnings have conferred that freedom—and power—on its people. With carrot and stick, the U.S. now offers the underdeveloped world a chance—perhaps its last—to borrow U.S. techniques and reach for the same nourishing reward.

CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY'S 1966 OPINION POLL

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since coming to Congress to send to my constituents in the 20th Congressional District of Illinois an annual questionnaire on major issues facing our Nation on the foreign and domestic fronts. The results have been very helpful and enlightening, as I have thus received the opinions and additional views of thousands of citizens. It is gratifying to observe a genuine and ever-growing interest in legislative affairs.

The names this year were selected at random from the telephone books and other public listings. More than 14,000 questionnaires have been returned, and since many returns represented the joint views of the husband and wife the poll then was participated in by almost 22,000 people. Hundreds included personal letters or notes in which they explained their positions, and many informed me of other alternatives to such crucial questions as Vietnam. This information has been helpful to me in committee work and in floor deliberations.

The results of the poll have been tabulated and are as follows:

TWENTIETH DISTRICT, ILLINOIS, 1966 SURVEY OF HOME-DISTRICT OPINION

Vietnam—Under present circumstances, which of these courses of action do you favor:

Withdraw all U.S. combat forces	1,704
Use all available forces and weapons to clear all areas of South Vietnam of Communist control at the earliest possible date	8,301
Withdraw to easily-defended coastal areas	185
Keep ground forces at present level (or less) but make wider use of air and sea power against North Vietnam	2,173
Discontinue bombing North Vietnam	81
Call free nations to a council meeting where allied policy on Vietnam (and Southeast Asia) can be decided, and an allied command established to carry it out	3,153

Vietnam—Assuming military action ends on a satisfactory basis, which of these long-range policies do you favor:

Withdraw all U.S. military bases from South Vietnam	4,277
Seek to keep at least one major military base in South Vietnam under U.S. control	9,342
Offer South Vietnam territorial status in the U.S. with possibility of statehood later	999

Do you feel the President, in his relationship with Congress, is—

Too influential	11,525
Not influential enough	622
About right	2,724

	Yes	No	No opinion
In regard to unemployment compensation—			
The President has proposed that benefits be made bigger and easier to get. Do you agree?	1,325	14,121	404
Others have proposed that those who get benefits be required to pay back part of the money when they get a job. Do you agree?	8,185	6,372	803
In general, do you favor—			
Tax relief for those supporting students in college?	9,085	6,014	511
The President's proposal to increase the term of U.S. Representatives from 2 to 4 years?	6,952	7,722	1,004
A $3,000 annual limit on Government payments to any one farmer?	11,260	2,077	1,731
Deferring college students from the draft providing their grades are good?	9,474	5,786	544
Calling up reserves before married men are drafted?	8,992	4,980	1,440
The President's proposal to expand trade with the Soviet Union and Communist-bloc nations?	3,677	10,344	1,373

A bipartisan group of Congressmen propose a convention of NATO nations aimed at agreement on a declaration that the eventual goal is to transform the alliance into a federal union government:

Favorable	6,910
Unfavorable	3,230
No opinion	4,679

MAJORITY LEADER'S CHART INSERTION REVEALS HIGH-LEVEL ADMINISTRATION CONCERN OVER INFLATION

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I was fascinated to read the little chart introduced into the RECORD yesterday by the distinguished majority leader purporting to show how much better off American consumers are, in spite of our rising prices, in comparison with some of our allies. This chart shows that consumer prices in the United States during the period 1961–66 have risen the least of a list of other nations including the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Germany, and Japan. This is very interesting, if true, although Americans have been better off than the rest of the world for many years. It would have been a more interesting statistical demonstration if the majority leader's chart had showed the U.S. figures to be worse than those of our allies. Indeed, I am rather surprised that our relative position is not far greater than the majority leader's chart reveals.

What is really interesting, however, is the fact that he put the chart in the RECORD at all. Is it a sign that the Democratic leadership is acknowledging at last that the inflation issue is a real one? Did he do it to help congressional candidates of his party to "slip, slide, or

duck" the question of rising consumer prices as they have been advised to do by the Secretary of Agriculture?

The introductory remarks of the majority leader are unrevealing. The little chart is merely dropped into the RECORD and allowed to lie there, gleaming from the front page, enticing us to explain its presence as we will.

I choose to believe that it represents the well-founded, deep concern felt in the highest administration circles over the issue of inflation and high prices. Otherwise, there is no point for the insertion.

I welcome this sign of concern. How much impression it will make on the public is problematical. Perhaps the American housewife, struggling to meet her weekly grocery bills will be vastly comforted by the knowledge that her counterparts in England, France, Italy, Germany, and Japan are worse off but I doubt it. She more likely will reflect, if she reflects about it at all, that we are heading in the same direction in spite of our efforts to sustain, aid, and support those countries. She might look at England, for instance, which is ruled by a Socialist government which exercises rigid control over nearly every aspect of the national economy, except the demands of unions from which it draws primary support. She may reflect that our country is heading in the same direction. Britain is deep in debt, nearly bankrupt, her credit in doubt. While it is undoubtedly true that the British pound will be defended to the last dollar, what kindly ally will haul us up if we go under?

We are not impressed by the majority leader's chart. We are impressed, howver, by his tacit admission of the importance of the inflation issue. We hope this concern results in action.

PUBLIC COLLEGES AND IMPROVED VOCATIONAL TRAINING FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—H.R. 16958

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been concerned with the general condition of education here in our Nation's Capital. I have had the privilege of serving 8 years on the House District Committee and as a result been in the position to observe carefully the course that education has generally taken here. For years, I and many of our colleagues have been concerned about the lack of a public college here in the District of Columbia. Indeed every State has at least one public college or university; many have several available free to its taxpayers. The Nation's Capital City is a unique entity, a separate jurisdiction similar in many respects to our States but it is the only one without a public college or university. Many of Washington's schoolchildren possess excellent academic potential but lack the finances necessary to afford admittance to our private schools. To my knowledge no other city of like size lacks such a public institution of learning. Certainly the Capital of the Nation should not be the one city to do without such a vital institution; on the contrary, it should be in a position to set an example for the rest of the Nation.

Along with my concern about the lack of a public college in the District I have been concentrating my energies toward establishing an improved system of vocational training for our District citizens; to this end, your District Committee heard extensive testimony and recommendations last spring, looking toward a vastly improved vocational training program.

In order to meet both needs as nearly as possible, yesterday I introduced H.R. 16958, a bill which would authorize a public 4-year college which would provide emphasis on the arts and sciences looking toward a bachelor's degree. In addition, my bill would provide for a 2-year community college which would emphasize, but not be limited to, vocational training. In effect, this bill is a package proposal—a synthesis of two vital needs in the field of education here in the Nation's Capital, a 4-year arts and science college and a 2-year community college emphasizing vocational education, both quartered in a new general education complex.

I hasten to add that I take no pride in authorship for this bill. This bill reflects the thinking of everyone concerned with this problem including the President, the Senate, the House, and our educational experts. Technically, this bill might not be letter perfect but it at least provides us with something concrete to discuss and amend if necessary. It is my earnest hope that we can schedule hearings on this bill at the earliest possible time. I fully realize that it is getting late in the session but there is a serious need for this legislation and it is my hope that we will come up with something positive before the end of the 89th Congress.

Briefly, the bill creates a District of Columbia Board of Higher Education which would plan, establish, and govern both the 4-year college and the 2-year community-vocational college. The Board of Higher Education would consist of nine members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The 4-year arts and sciences college would be designed initially for 2,000 students and would point toward the award of a bachelor's degree.

The 2-year community-vocational college would likewise be designed initially for 2,000 students and could award an associate in arts degrees; but primarily it would be oriented toward vocational training, that is, the training of badly needed skilled technicians and semiprofessionals.

The college would absorb the present District of Columbia Teachers College.

Both colleges would be tuition-free to legal residents; nonresidents would be required to pay tuition based on cost.

The bill would authorize all necessary appropriations to carry out the act; furthermore, $20 million in additional District of Columbia borrowing authority would be authorized for construction purposes.

Cost estimates—prepared by the U.S. Office of Education: The 4-year college, $10 million; the 2-year college, $8 million.

The bill would substantially agree with the recommendations made by the President's Committee on Public Higher Education in its report of June 1964.

Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that I claim no special credit for this bill. In effect, it encompasses the thinking of many, many people, both on the Hill, in the District government, and in the Federal departments. I think it is a step in the right direction and I would be delighted to hear my colleagues' reaction to this proposal.

Still to be met, however, is an improved and expanded vocational program for the District of Columbia high schools. The District of Columbia school authorities have done marvels with what they have, but what they have is not near enough to meet the needs of our schoolchildren. Many students now have to be turned away because of the lack of space in the vocational program. To correct this should be our next step.

STRIKES AGAINST SOCIETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in New York City, I have witnessed, in the recent past, three unconscionable strikes which caused great inconvenience and havoc to the general public and every segment of society. The strikes I refer to are the newspaper strike, the transit strike, and now the airline strike.

We have received no help or action for ameliorating the condition of what I call "strikes against society" from our national administration, much less from our Secretary of Labor.

There follows a telegram sent by me to the Secretary of Labor on July 19 in connection with the airline strike:

> The current airline strike again points up your failure and that of this administration to protect the public where major strikes against society are involved. This strike, especially in the height of the tourist season, costs business a fortune from the flower and fruit growers to the sea food suppliers to the travel agents to the hotel owners, etc. President Johnson in the state of the Union message proposed emergency strike legislation, but without action. So far you have failed the people of New York City, whom I represent, in the transit strike, the past newspaper strike and now the airline strike. When will you do something constructive in this field?

Obviously this administration does not want to antagonize those in the labor movement, and I can understand that, but some solution must be offered to protect the public.

It remains for a group of authors who help give this country its culture, to

come forward with a sensible suggestion to protect the public and yet not cause difficulties for labor or industry.

The proposal of the Authors League of America, Inc., was made to Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City, my predecessor in my congressional seat, during the recent transit strike. It is a "strike-work" agreement.

The proposal follows:

THE AUTHORS LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 7, 1966.

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Mayor of the City of New York,
City Hall, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MAYOR LINDSAY: We hope that by the time this letter reaches you the suggestion we make will have become academic—insofar as the transit stoppage is concerned. But we would like to propose a moral (and practical) equivalent to the strike weapon in the area of public services—the "strike-work" agreement. The transit strike and the two recent City-wide newspaper strikes vividly demonstrate that we need new procedures which would permit voluntary negotiation of contracts by unions and employers who provide indispensable public services, without a stoppage of the services.

As organizations representing many authors who reside in and near the City, we are deeply concerned with the widespread impact of the strike on everyone in the metropolitan community. We are especially concerned with the irreparable injury it has caused the New York theatre, for which many of our members write. Some plays have already been destroyed. Others will perish if the strike continues. The actors, writers, stagehands, musicians and many others who were employed in these productions, as well as the producers and the backers who financed them, have suffered heavy losses. Moreover, the strike may well cripple the theatre—one of the City's most valued cultural and commercial assets—for years to come.

There must be some alternative to a work stoppage as a means of settling labor disputes involving public services—whether furnished by government or private industry. We think that there is such an alternative and that it is not limited to compulsory arbitration. Many unions and employers reject the concept of compulsory arbitration and prefer to settle their disputes by voluntary bargaining. In this process, the economic pressures that each side brings to bear on the other by a strike are an essential factor.

Obviously, the tactical aim of a strike or lockout is to impose economic injury on the opposition in order to bring it to terms. By striking, the union imposes losses on the employer. By refusing to accept the union's offer, the employer brings economic pressure on union members—the loss of wages. Without these pressures negotiations might continue interminably and there would not be the incentive necessary to compel settlement. Unfortunately, when public services are involved the public is caught in the middle. We doubt that either side would admit that the public should be a hostage. We think that each would contend that this was a regrettable by-product of the bargaining and strike process.

We think that it is possible to take the public out of the middle in this type of dispute and at the same time preserve the economic pressures that each side seeks to employ to its advantage in a strike situation. And we believe that this procedure could be employed in the transit controversy by adopting a "strike-work" agreement. Under this procedure a contract dispute is negotiated voluntarily, but there is no work stoppage. However, by agreement, the economic consequences of a strike are imposed upon each side.

At least one union and employer have adopted this approach. On May 21, 1964, "The New York Times" reported the signing of a new collective bargaining agreement between the Dunbar Furniture Corporation and the Upholsterers International Union, which incorporated a "strike-work" arrangement. This agreement provides that if on the expiration of a contract the parties do not agree on a new one, the consequences of a strike would follow, but production would continue—while the union and the Company continue to bargain out a new contract. During this bargaining period, a portion of the wages payable to the employees under the expired contract would be placed in an escrow fund. A similar amount would be paid by the Company into the fund. If the contract is negotiated within a specified period, the escrow funds are returned to both sides. If it has not been negotiated by that time, the money deposited by both sides is forfeited and paid to designated charities. The monies forfeited under such an agreement would be lost as irretrievably to both labor and management, as would be the wages and operating income lost by both in an actual strike. When this contract was signed, a Union spokesman said that under the new agreement "the cash incentive for both sides to settle in the first six weeks is almost overwhelming."

We suggest that such an arrangement could have prevented the present transit stoppage. The Union and the Transit Authority would have been under the same economic pressures to bargain with each other, but we would have avoided the irretrievable injury to the public—the staggering losses of wages to hundreds of thousands of employees (many of them union members) and the heavy toll paid by business and industry in the metropolitan area.

This is not the only form in which a "strike-work" arrangement could be employed. We understand that during the present transit crisis it was proposed that the transit facilities be operated on a restricted basis and without any fare being charged. Such an arrangement might also have imposed the necessary economic pressures on both sides in the bargaining process and yet would have avoided the devastating effects of total stoppage. And if it is a premise of strikes that public hardship is also a permissible objective, restricted operation of the transit facilities would have accomplished even this pressure while at the same time avoiding complete paralysis.

Sincerely,

REX STOUT,
President, the Authors League of America, Inc.,
ELIZABETH JANEWAY,
President, the Authors Guild, Inc.,
SIDNEY KINGSLEY,
President, the Dramatists Guild, Inc.,
IRWIN KARP,
Counsel.

As the Authors League points out, the strike-work agreement is not completely novel.

Attached is a New York Times article of Thursday, May 21, 1964, which details such an agreement entered into by the Upholsterers International Union of North America:

NEW STRIKE PLAN BARS WALKOUTS—ESCROW CLAUSE CALLS FOR BOTH SIDES TO PAY HEAVILY

A new type of collective bargaining agreement that requires employees to continue work while on strike will be signed today by one of the country's best known furniture manufacturers and one of the oldest unions in the industry.

The agreement, which also requires continued production in the event of a company lockout, is intended "to take the consumer out of the middle in industrial disputes" while protecting the economic position of both the company and its employes.

The agreement is between the Dunbar Furniture Corporation of Berne, Ind., manufacturers of contemporary design furniture, and the Upholsterers International Union of North America, which has its headquarters in Philadelphia.

It is scheduled to be signed at 11 A.M. today at the company's offices here at 305 East 63d Street. The signers will be Harold D. Sprunger, president of the 47-year-old family operated company, and Sal B. Hoffmann, president of the 82-year-old union.

The agreement provides that when a contract ends and the union and management fail to agree on a new one, production will continue. But to pressure both sides to reach an agreement, increasing amounts of wages and matching company funds will be put into a trust over a 12-week period.

FUND GOES TO CHARITY

If there is no settlement at the end of the 12 weeks, Dunbar and its 275 employees will surrender all the funds to a community or charity project. Mr. Sprunger and Mr. Hoffmann say they know of no similar provision in any contract anywhere, but that they expect to see many in the future.

Should a strike or lockout occur, under the agreement 50 per cent of the workers' wages and an equal amount of company funds are to be placed with an independent referee or bank during the first six weeks. If the strike or walkout is settled in that time, all the money is returned to the employees and the company.

If the parties fail to reach an agreement during the next three weeks, the contributions by the company and the employees continue. However, they will get back only 75 percent of their money if they settle before the ninth week, and the referee or bank will be paid a small charge.

Only 50 percent of the contributions will be returned if a settlement comes in the next two weeks.

THE 12TH WEEK IS CRUCIAL

The 12th week has been termed the "sudden death" week if the agreement is reached during that period, 25 percent of the contributions will be returned. After the 12th week, none of the money can be returned. Instead, the fund will be turned over to an association of clergymen in Berne for their disposal.

After the 12-week period, either the company or the union may go back to the traditional lockout or strike. But unless they give notice of such, the old contract will be automatically renewed for a year.

The agreement also provides that all injury and illness insurance will continue to be paid to the employes during the first 12 weeks.

A spokesman for the union explained that under the new agreement "the cash incentive for both sides to settle in the first six weeks of dispute is almost overwhelming."

The original concept for the "strike-work" agreement was conceived by the late Lynn W. Beman, who was labor consultant for the National Association of Furniture Manufacturers, of which Dunbar is a member.

The last strike at Dunbar, which lasted six weeks, was five years ago.

The Authors League proposal was commented upon by Forbes magazine and their comment was reprinted throughout the country.

Attached is such a reprint from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 14, 1966:

A SUBSTITUTE FOR TRANSIT STRIKES

(From an open letter to Mayor John V. Lindsay, of New York)

We would like to propose a moral (and practical) equivalent to the strike weapon in the area of public services—the "strike-work" agreement. The New York transit strike and the two recent city-wide newspaper strikes vividly demonstrate that we need new procedures which would permit voluntary negotiation of contracts by unions and employers who provide indispensable public services, without a stoppage of the services.

There must be some alternative to a work stoppage as a means of settling labor disputes involving public services—whether furnished by government or private industry. We think that there is such an alternative and that it is not limited to compulsory arbitration. Many unions and employers reject the concept of compulsory arbitration and prefer to settle their disputes by voluntary bargaining. In this process, the economic pressures that each side brings to bear on the other by a strike are an essential factor.

Obviously, the tactical aim of a strike or lockout is to impose economic injury on the opposition in order to bring it to terms. By striking, the union imposes losses on the employer. By refusing to accept the union's offer, the employer brings economic pressure on union members—the loss of wages. Without these pressures negotiations might continue interminably and there would not be the incentive necessary to compel settlement. Unfortunately, when public services are involved the public is caught in the middle. We doubt that either side would admit that the public should be a hostage. We think that each would contend that this was a regrettable by-product of the bargaining and strike process.

We think that it is possible to take the public out of the middle in this type of dispute and at the same time preserve the economic pressures that each side seeks to employ to its advantage in a strike situation.

On May 24, 1964, The New York Times reported the signing of a new collective bargaining agreement between the Dunbar Furniture Corporation and the Upholsterers International Union, which incorporated a "strike-work" arrangement.

This agreement provides that if on the expiration of a contract the parties do not agree on a new one, the consequences of a strike would follow, but production would continue—while the union and the company continue to bargain out a new contract.

During this bargaining period, a portion of the wages payable to the employees under the expired contract would be placed in an escrow fund. A similar amount would be paid by the company into the fund. If the contract is negotiated within a specified period, the escrow funds are returned to both sides. If it has not been negotiated by that time, the money deposited by both sides is forfeited and paid to designated charities.

The monies forfeited under such an agreement would be lost as irretrievably to both labor and management, as would be the wages and operating income lost by both in an actual strike. When this contract was signed, a union spokesman said that under the new agreement "the cash incentive for both sides to settle in the first six weeks is almost overwhelming."

We suggest that such an arrangement could have prevented the transit stoppage. The union and the Transit Authority would have been under the same economic pressures to bargain with each other, but we would have avoided the irretrievable injury to the public—the staggering losses of wages to hundreds of thousands of employees (many of them union members) and the heavy toll paid by business and industry in the metropolitan area.

REX STOUT,
President, Authors League of America, Inc.
ELIZABETH JANEWAY,
President, the Authors Guild, Inc.
SIDNEY KINGSLEY,
President, the Dramatists Guild, Inc.
IRWIN KARP,
Counsel.

First broached during the previous New York City newspaper strike by Irwin Karp, Esquire, in a letter to the Saturday Review as a way of confining the economic struggle of strike and lockout to the "belligerents," the idea of a strike-work agreement is set forth in the Saturday Review of March 9, 1963, and follows:

Your editorial raises the question of whether such a struggle can be confined to the belligerents. I believe that, at least, it could be transformed so that only the belligerents, and not innocent bystanders, are injured. The tactical aim of a strike (or lockout) is to impose economic injury on the opposition (loss of wages, loss of profits) to bring it to terms. Unfortunately, the newspaper stoppage is an indiscriminate means of applying this pressure. It hurts not only the belligerents, but everyone else. The publishers and printers could apply the same pressure more discriminatingly (to themselves and no one else) if they put the newspapers back in operation, and each agreed to impose upon itself—until a settlement were negotiated—the same economic loss it now suffers because of the strike. They could, in effect, transform the current "literal" strike into a "figurative" one.

Under such an agreement, until the dispute is settled, the publishers would surrender a portion of their profits, and the printers a portion of their wages, to a fund to be used for charitable or other agreed purposes. The amounts thus forfeited during the figurative strike would be lost as irretrievably as the profits and wages now being lost by the actual strike, and the "belligerents" would be under the same pressures to bargain with each other. But the injury to the public, and the devastating losses suffered by non-striking employees, and by businesses that require newspaper services, would be ended.

—IRWIN KARP.

Because this whole area of strikes and labor disputes and the involvement of society at large grows increasingly difficult and demands an immediate answer, I commend this solution to my colleagues.

AUTHORITY PROPOSED FOR RECLAIMING STRIP MINE AREAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of this body to a serious problem involving the Nation's soil and water resources. The problem stems from the failure to reclaim and rehabilitate surface-mined lands. I am extremely concerned about this matter in my district, and many of my colleagues here are equally concerned.

There are large areas of land in the United States which have been damaged by surface or strip mining which have never been restored or rehabilitated. Such lands are seriously impairing the beauty of the natural landscape, causing erosion of soils, the deposit of sediment into stream channels and reservoirs, the pollution of water by sediment and acid drainage, and injury to public health and safety.

The present efforts to rehabilitate old surface-mined areas are inadequate. Damages to adjacent lands, water, fish, wildlife, and beauty continue. Much needs to be done and can be done to restore these areas and make them assets to the communities where they exist. The incentive of Federal participation is needed to stimulate local action. The necessary local organizations already exist and are ready to participate in sponsoring needed improvements when assistance is available.

For these reasons I am today introducing a bill which, when passed, will effectively deal with the problem and aid the economic development of communities and rural areas affected.

The principal benefits to come from the action proposed in the bill are off-site and for the general welfare, rather than economic gains to the present owners of such denuded private lands. The problems and opportunities associated with these old untreated surface-mined lands are not restricted to my district. Thus, I know my colleagues will join me in supporting this urgently needed legislation.

PRESENT PROGRAMS ARE INADEQUATE

Eight States have enacted laws requiring reclamation of surface-mined areas. Ohio is one of them. Obligations under these laws extend only to areas mined after the effective dates of the laws. It is the areas mined prior to enactment of these statutes that created the continuing problem and which require Federal attention.

Throughout this great land there are 800,000 acres of privately owned land scarred from strip mining badly in need of reclamation measures.

Existing cost-sharing programs in the Department of Agriculture do not fit the needs for restoring surface-mined areas. These programs were designed to assist landowners in the treatment of land having capacity for profitable production of grass, trees, or field crops. Such lands hold promise of return to the farmer in the foreseeable future. No such returns can be expected from the treatment of surface-mined areas.

Reclamation of surface-mined areas will serve the public interest in two ways. First, off-site damages—pollution, sedimentation, and so forth—can be eliminated. Second, these idle wastelands can be converted to useful purposes and made to protect the public interest in land, water, and plant resources. While the monetary returns will not be great, they can become assets to the communities in which they are located through a realization of their potential for woodland, wildlife, forage production, and recreation.

It is known that these problems can be dealt with effectively. The Soil Conservation Service is assisting with surface-minded area reclamation work

where the finances are available to do the job. The SCS staff of experienced engineers, hydrologists, geologists, soil scientists, agronomists, biologists, plant materials specialists, and range and woodland conservationists are assisting with technical aspects of the job.

Although soil conservation districts having areas affected by surface mining are doing all they can to deal with this problem, the financial limitations on the part of the owners and the absence of any continuing effective assistance from governmental sources results in scant attention to the problem.

PROPOSED AUTHORITY

The solution of these problems on older mined sites will require considerably more Federal attention than has been available in the past. Most of these lands are nonagricultural and are privately owned. Therefore, authorities provided for cost-sharing on agricultural lands and the authorities provided for the care of public lands are not applicable to these lands.

The legislation I propose would provide an authority to fill this void by authorizing a massive national effort to rehabilitate old surface-mined areas. These are the areas that do not come under State laws requiring reclamation. They are the spoils that have remained untreated because no incentive, private nor public, encouraged their reclamation.

The proposed legislation will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a program of restoration and rehabilitation of lands which have been damaged by surface or strip mining and which are presently in a scarred or unrestored condition. The program would be carried out in cooperation with States, their political subdivisions, and local entities such as soil and water conservation districts. It would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to:

First. Provide, upon the request of States, their political subdivisions, or local agencies, technical assistance for developing a plan of restoration and rehabilitation of lands damaged by surface or strip mining.

Second. Provide long-term cost-sharing agreements of up to 10 years for strip mine reclamation through which the Federal Government would share up to 75 percent of the cost of rehabilitation and restoration.

Third. Carry out rehabilitation and restoration measures.

The program will not apply to lands damaged after the passage of the act.

It is the intent of this legislation that the Soil Conservation Service would be assigned the administrative responsibility for leadership within the Department of Agriculture. The broad experience of the Soil Conservation Service in operating the small watershed and flood prevention programs and the Great Plains conservation program, all of which require long-term planning and operation, including contracting, in cooperation with State and local interests, has provided the experience necessary to move in on a sizable area rehabilitation job and do it effectively and efficiently.

Areas would be treated by planting grasses, trees, shrubs, and other adapted vegetation including the application of fertilizers and needed soil amendments. Where necessary, this work will be supported by mechanical measures such as land smoothing, diversions, grade stabilization structures, debris basins, bank sloping, drainage, and access roads for maintenance.

Measures to improve wildlife habitat and recreation opportunities would be included where appropriate.

The program would emphasize the control of erosion on surface-mined areas and the prevention of pollution and sediment damages on adjacent and downstream lands and would promote the conservation of the soil, water, and plant resources along with their development for improved uses.

The program would apply to the approximately 800,000 acres of old untreated non-Federal surface-mined areas on which reclamation is not presently required of anyone by State law. In States not having laws requiring reclamation of newly surfaced mined areas, the program would be limited to a few installations to show the benefits of reclamation work and to encourage the enactment of suitable legislation and ordinances.

The legislation I propose would provide an authorization of $50 million for the restoration and rehabilitation of the surface of lands damaged by surface or strip mining. I urge its enactment by the 89th Congress.

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

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I was more than delighted throughout the 1st session of the 89th Congress to note the gentleman's constant interest in the broad subject of the national program to do an effective job in soil conservation programing and particularly the contribution of the gentleman in the well insofar as the problem as it related to strip mining operations were concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I was more than delighted again to note this morning the introduction by the gentleman in the well of this very much needed legislation which will have such a tremendous national impact upon the struggle to reclaim so many hundreds of thousands of acres of American land that have been denuded and raped by the greed of man in his abuse of the rich natural resources with which God has endowed this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite familiar, as the Congressman at Large in Ohio, of the rape of the lands of the gentleman in the well's congressional district and the destruction of the lands in the district adjoining the gentleman.

Hundreds of thousands of acres of usable land that have a really remarkable economic future insofar as development is concerned have through the greed of the coal mine operators been ruined forever. I congratulate the gentleman in focusing attention on this problem as to how we are going to reclaim these lands effectively and this acreage.

The gentleman knows at the time of the consideration of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the provision as it applies to the strip mining acreage reclamation program was confined exclusively to publicly owned lands and that was but, as the gentleman knows, an infinitesimal factor insofar as the lands that have been lost and are yet to be reclaimed.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has accurately appraised the problem when he has said that the State, county and local communities have no longer the capacity to engage in a realistic reclamation effort and that the full energy of the Federal Government and the full taxing resources and revenues of the Government have to be focused upon this problem.

It is certainly contradictory in my opinion to promote economic development in the gentleman's region if on the other hand we do not realize the rape that has occurred there and the loss of the lands that have occurred there.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman concerning whether or not the gentleman would regard the bonds that are asked of some of these strip mine operators who are directly responsible in the destruction of the lands, whether the gentleman would feel that under existing State laws the bonds asked of these strip mining companies are adequate so as to protect and insure that after they have removed the resources of coal or any other mineral from the land that they will restore the lands to the condition in which they found them. Whether or not these bonds required of them by State governments have been sufficient in their amount so as to be a remedy and an assurance to the public that the lands will not be destroyed as the result of having been used for these purposes.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to thank the gentleman for his fine comments and contributions. With respect to whether or not the bonds required are sufficient to cause the miners to properly reclaim and rehabilitate this land, I think remains a question with the various and several States.

It is very apparent that the bonds are not high enough to cause some of these strip miners to carry out their agreements. As a result, many of these acres that have been stripped of the coal remain abandoned, barren, and denuded.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation does not direct itself so much to the failures of the present miners as it does to correcting a situation that is very, very old in some areas. A situation that has obtained before States passed reclamation laws.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that in our State, as you well know, that many of those engaged in strip mining years ago found it very convenient to walk away and leave it in this condition and as they want us to accept it today.

Where bonds are met I gather the State is using the funds to restore the land. I am not in a position to say whether or not they are high enough. I can tell you most assuredly that rehabilitation and reclaiming of this land

in our State is not moving forward as it ought to.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentleman for his comments. I thank the gentleman.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation relating to the financial burden imposed upon the St. Lawrence Seaway. This legislation is cosponsored by 37 Congressmen from 7 States.

The St. Lawrence Seaway has proved to be a tremendous boon to the economies of the States bordering the St. Lawrence River as well as those which benefit by its encouragement of cheaper shipping. While it is estimated that users of the port of Duluth in Minnesota saved in excess of $200 million in transportation costs from 1959 through 1965, the beneficiaries of the port's growth—the States of the upper Midwest—have, at the same time, greatly increased their foreign trade: North Dakota by 46 percent, South Dakota by 35 percent, Wisconsin by 30 percent, and Minnesota by 32 percent. And only now, in 1966, 7 years after the seaway's opening, has the actual tonnage carried on the seaway approached its predicted full capacity operation.

Especially now, when the seaway's capacity is within reach and, with further development of seaway and port facilities, would be substantially increased, tolls must remain the same to maintain present shipping levels and encourage further expansion. Larger tolls would erase the progress of the seaway over the last 7 years. This legislation would set tolls to cover the seaway's operating costs and provide a return on the Government's original investment without exceeding present toll levels.

The bills that have been introduced also would change the means of payment by the Seaway Corporation. Under the present arrangement, the capital cost of the seaway's construction must be repaid in 50 years. Other transportation systems have received and are receiving direct or indirect subsidies from the Federal Government. Yet the seaway, within a short time, must not only cover its own maintenance and operating costs and pay interest on the original loan, but also repay the total amount of the original money invested.

This bill would convert this fixed-term bond system to capital stocks in which the Government would retain an interest and receive dividends in perpetuity—eventually exceeding many times its original investment.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would maintain and encourage shipping through the St. Lawrence Seaway and thus further the economic development of the States of the Midwest. I urge that Congress consider this legislation as soon as possible.

CONGRESSMAN JIM WRIGHT MAKES SUPERB PLEA FOR ELECTION LAW REFORM: "LET'S REVITALIZE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY"

Mr. GIBBONS. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the major unfinished items on America's agenda of political reform is a thorough overhaul of our archaic laws governing campaign financing and spending.

As every Member of this body well knows, the existing laws are so circumvented and avoided as to be totally meaningless. It is said, of course, that the laws are unrealistic and unworkable. But as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] said in a recent statement to the Committee on House Administration:

> There may be some excuse when the general populace ignores an obviously unworkable and commonly disobeyed ordinance. But what excuse can there be for us, who have it in our hands to change the law? It is our very profession to make the law, and to make it mean something—if, in fact, we want it to mean something! By refusing either to abide by it or to change it, we present a sad spectacle indeed.

The gentleman from Texas, JIM WRIGHT, has presented a superb statement in behalf of election law reform which I hope will be read and considered by every Member of the House.

He shows not only the great need for the valuable reforms recommended by President Johnson and incorporated in the Election Reform Act of 1966. He also suggests improvements on the administration's proposal which deserve careful study. These provisions would broaden popular participation in the financing of campaigns by providing a small tax credit, rather than a deduction, for political contributions and would place a limit of $30,000 spending each in a party primary and general election contest for a House seat. The spending limit applied to Senate contests would be the House limit of $30,000 multiplied by the number of House seats allotted to that State.

The gentleman from Texas, Congressman WRIGHT, also urged the committee to consider "some requirement that a certain minimum amount of prime television time be made available without charge as a public service equally to all candidates for the office of U.S. Senator or Representative."

I include the full statement hereafter:

LET'S REVITALIZE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

(Statement of Congressman JIM WRIGHT, in behalf of Election Reform Act of 1966, to House Administration Committee, Thursday, July 14, 1966)

This Committee has a rare opportunity to rejuvenate and revitalize the free elective processes of this country. I hope no member of this Committee will underestimate either the importance or the urgency of this opportunity.

By presenting the Congress with a meaningful bill to reform the almost incredibly antiquated, unworkable and unenforceable campaign laws that are intentionally evaded by almost every candidate and ridiculed by the public, this Committee could perform a truly refreshing service to the revivification of American democracy.

The enactment of proposals presented to this Congress could pump new life into the bloodstream of our elective procedures and restore public confidence in both the integrity of Congress and the viability of our democratic institutions.

Or, by giving these bills a mere perfunctory hearing, failing to push for legislative reform, and simply letting the dust of long neglect slowly settle back in all its accustomed corners, you could confirm the shadowy suspicion held by many that Congress is content with the gaping loopholes which make a mockery of our ancient and inadequate campaign spending laws, and that, in spite of our pious protests, we do not really want reform.

SHAMEFUL NEGLECT

And it would be difficult to blame the public for reaching such a concluson. Congress in the past two decades has shamefully neglected to act on a single one of seventeen different proposals designed to bring a semblance of sense and order to the legal sham that is supposed to govern campaign expenditures. Each of us to some degree bears the onus of that failure.

The Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 originally must have been inspired by sincere purpose. It must have had some meaning in its day. In 1966, it is about as sensible, and about as enforceable, as trying to apply horse and buggy speed limits to jet age transportation. I daresay there is not a member of Congress, myself included, who has not knowingly evaded its purpose in one way or another.

That law provides that a candidate for Congress can spend no more than $5,000 in his bid for election, and a candidate for the Senate no more than $25,000. If I told you that I had abided wholly by the spirit of that statute, I'd be an utter hypocrite—and everyone in this room knows it.

Today, in our larger and more populous states, it has become common practice to spend upwards of a million dollars to win a Governorship or a seat in the U.S. Senate. Some such statewide races, from an analysis of mailings, billboards, newspaper ads and radio and television time used in promoting an individual candidacy, are estimated to have exacted a financial toll in the neighborhood of $3 million each. Researchers have documented more than $200 million spent in the various elections in 1964.

A FEW TYPICAL EXPENSES

If these figures should be surprising to anyone, let me itemize a few typical expenses, as they would apply to my particular state. Similar statistics can be compiled on other states. Perhaps little of this will be really new to elective officials, but it should be an eye opener to the public.

Just one first-class letter to every family in Texas would cost—in production and postage—approximately $300,000.

One of the huge billboards—just one in one of our big Texas cities—with no more than a touched-up picture and a slick slogan—costs $550 a month. They're not all that expensive. Many are only $300 or $200 a month. But multiply the individual cost by the thousands it takes to cover a large state, and you'll have a fair idea what billboard coverage comes to in dollars.

Recently I did a 30-minute television broadcast on 18 of the 50 television stations

in Texas. It cost me a little over $10,000. But the same total amount of time, on exactly the same stations, if taken in 20-second spots, would have cost $400,000! By far the most expensive thing in television is the juvenile little quickie which slips up on you and shouts a name or a singing commercial at you before you have a chance to turn it off.

A CYNICAL THING

I mention these things because I think the public is entitled to know them. It's their government that's at stake. The practice of campaign spending and financing has become a thoroughly cynical thing. The law is such that only a very small percentage of the contributions, and expenditures, have to be reported. Like an iceberg, it's all about seven-eighths under water. And every penny of it ought to be right out in the sunlight of public knowledge!

By totaling up the costs of various mass media advertising employed by one candidate last month in an unsuccessful bid for a primary nomination to the U.S. House of Representatives in North Carolina, it is calculated that he spent approximately $250,000. And one of our colleagues in the House frankly reported following the last election that $193,000 had been expended in his successful bid for election. He is to be commended for his candor in exposing the total worthlessness of a law which pretends to limit him to $5,000.

But what kind of example do we give to the public for obedience to law? There may be some excuse when the general populace ignores an obviously unworkable and commonly disobeyed ordinance. But what excuse can there be for us, who have it directly in our hands to change the law? It is our very profession to make the law, and to make it mean something—if, in fact, we want it to mean something! By refusing either to abide by it or to change it, we present a sad spectacle indeed.

THE INSIDIOUS DANGER

Yet, there are far more deadly perils than the mere flouting of a law which loom in the direction in which campaign practices have been drifting.

Politics, which Webster defined as "the science and art of government," is becoming a rich man's game in which the stakes are so high that relatively few can play. Therein lurks an insidious danger to our political institutions, as subtle as a creeping fog at night.

The skyrocketing costs of campaigning are making it impossible for men of modest means to seek high elective office—unless they are willing wards of the wealthy.

By so doing, these costs are choking off the wellsprings of fresh, new thought from which the system can get new life—and severely limiting the field of elective choice which is offered to the public.

The commonly accepted practice is placing the premium not so much upon ability or understanding of national issues as upon money or the talent for wheedling money from those who have it.

In this way, it is creating an elite power class with an open-sesame to political influence—the willingness to contribute in large denominations.

And it is casting a pall of cynicism and mistrust upon the hallowed institutions of democracy.

The costs of electioneering, and the growing reliance upon big contributors, have spawned a variety of evils which are encrusting themselves like barnacles upon our ship of state. Like parasitic growths, they are sapping the very life of the plant itself.

At this moment in the other body, we witness the spectacle of a Senate committee examining the ethics of one of its members who held testimonial dinners to pay off campaign debts.

Perhaps I know something about the necessity that he faced. In 1961, I made an unsuccessful race in a special election for the U.S. Senate from Texas. After it was all over, we figured that a total of some $270,000 had been spent in my campaign. Obviously, it hadn't been quite enough. But I ended up owing $68,000, for which I signed personal notes to pay off creditors, mostly for debts of which I'd had no personal knowledge. It took me two and a half years to retire the notes.

But this is nothing when compared with the poignant personal experience of James E. Turman who in 1962 conducted an unavailing campaign for Lieutenant Governor in our state. He came close, making the run-off but losing in the second primary. For four years, he has been paying from his personal income a regular monthly amount in principal and interest to retire the indebtedness he incurred in that one campaign—and he calculates that, on this steady amortization schedule, it will take him 15 more years of monthly payments to get even. Nineteen years to pay for one near miss at the polls!

Maybe you're saying, "That's too bad, but it's his tough luck. A fellow without adequate financial backing should have had better sense than to get into a campaign of that kind." And perhaps you'd be right. But where does that leave the fond old American dream that a mother in this country, even though her circumstances be impoverished, could look into the eyes of her infant son and say: "There lies the future President of the United States"?

We have tarnished the dream.

And where does it leave the sincere young American of the coming generation who earnestly desires to make a contribution of his time and talent to the political life of his country? I'll tell you exactly where it leaves him. Unless he has inherited spectacular wealth, it leaves him at the mercy of those who can make large political contributions, and who'll expect him in one way or another to serve their particular interests.

SOME CURRENT PRACTICES

The state of affairs which we've allowed to develop has given rise to the now familiar cocktail party attended and financed by lobbyists, with congressional candidates as the beneficiaries. One Washington-based lobbying group last year bought tickets, ranging from $50 to $1,000 to eleven different parties for eleven different members of the House and Senate.

At the national level, it has bred the sale of ads for $15,000 a page in fancy party brochures. Among others who have bought these ads are eleven of the nation's top 25 defense contractors, and they've deducted the price from their taxes as a "business expense." Many of the advertisers have been corporations, legally prohibited from contributing to campaigns, but the proceeds from the ads were dedicated to paying for political campaigns. In addition to government contractors, the advertisers have included companies, such as airlines, whose business activities are directly regulated by the government.

Can it be argued that these people—and others who more quietly slip multi-thousand dollar contributions into the campaign coffers of their favorite candidates, often with no public reporting of any kind—do so with no expectation of selfish return?

Or must it be said that, contrary to all we have professed—we really are creating two classes of citizen-stockholders in our Democracy—common stock and preferred stock.

In a more subtle way, the flattering allure of an exclusive chance to visit socially with the President must beckon to some of those who join the President's Club at annual dues of $1,000.

And now it is reported in the Washington newspapers that plans are underway to create an "elite" President's Club, with dues pegged at $10,000, whose members are to enjoy the additional boon of an invitation to the White House. The motives of the givers may be wholly pure; this is not my basic concern. But I can't help feeling a sense of embarrassment for the President of the United States—any President—that such a thing as this should have become necessary.

I am not specifically criticizing those who organize these various endeavors—nor those who respond to them. But I am criticizing the rather commonly accepted practices which have grown up in this legal vacuum to make these endeavors necessary. I am criticizing the prevalent sophisticated view among political practitioners which accepts these practices blandly and without any perceptible sense of outrage. For they are strangling the breath from the ideal of government "by the people." And they cry out to heaven for reform!

A CHANCE AND A DUTY

We have a chance in this session to reform them. It is my conviction that we have the duty to do so.

(1) First, the President has asked us to burn away the fog that has so long enshrouded the realm of campaign financing and turn the clear, clean spotlight of public awareness upon it. The President is to be commended for his leadership in this field. His Election Reform Act of 1966 would require every gift and every expenditure of $100 and more, whether taken or spent by the candidate himself or by one of his "committees," to be publicly reported.

This would do away with the widespread dodge of setting up an elaborate proliferation of "voluntary" committees on the patently absurd theory that the candidate is blissfully unaware of their activities in his behalf and, like Pontius Pilate, can simply wash his hands of the whole sordid mess.

Certainly all such contributions, together with their sources, and all such expenditures should be identified and reported. But under the present law, it has become a completely cynical business in which Congressional and Senatorial candidates, in complying with the letter of the law, have been literally forced to evade the spirit of the law.

(2) To minimize the financial dependence upon a few mammoth contributors, the President proposes that an absolute maximum of $5,000 should be established as the amount which any one individual or interest may lawfully contribute to any one campaign.

The present law purports to impose such a limit, but it is blithely evaded by the multiplicity of committees formed in the interest of the same candidate, thus allowing the individual with a desire to buy himself a lawmaker to contribute $5,000 to each such committee. President Johnson has described this practice as "putting the maximum amount into different pockets of the same suit."

Under the bills before you, only one such contribution—whether directly to the candidate or to any committee acting in his behalf—would be allowed. In my view the amount is still too much. A dependence by any candidate upon $5,000 contributions is in my opinion extremely unhealthy and potentially inimical to the spirit of democracy. I think it would be far preferable to reduce the figure to, let us say, $1,000. But the bill would at least provide some improvement by preventing the callous evasion of the clear intent of the present law, and I can think of no justification for failing to adopt this provision.

(3) Unquestionably the most important feature of the Administration bill is that which would broaden the base of political contributions by encouraging hundreds of thousands of modest contributors, by tax deductibility of small and medium-sized

campaign donations, to take up the slack and provide the wherewithal which has been coming principally from a little coterie of fat cats.

If thousands of average Americans—with no ax to grind except good government—can be induced and inspired to assume an individual responsibility through small individual contributions, this would be the healthiest possible tonic for the ills that beset our elective processes.

The President proposes that political contributions of up to a total of $100 be specifically deductible from income taxes as a stimulus to widespread popular financial support of political campaigns. This is the key to the workability of the entire program. In fact, I'd like to make it even stronger—not by raising the deductible amount, but by making still smaller contributions still more attractive to the average citizen. If we really want to widen the base of financial participation and make it a truly popular function of citizenship, we could do so by providing a tax credit—deductible from the tax itself rather than from reportable income—of $25 for any citizen who had contributed that much to the campaign of his chosen party or candidate.

Certainly it makes for a more vigorous democracy, free from unsavory influence, when the cost of gaining public office can be distributed among many small contributors rather than being borne by a comparative handful of really big ones. Far better, if one sets out to raise $25,000 for a political race, that he should elicit $5 from each of 5,000 people, rather than $5,000 from each of five people! Anybody who contributes in the latter range—unless he is a pure philanthropist—is likely to expect something commensurate in return. But nobody who joins with 5,000 others can expect preferred representation.

By encouraging popular financial participation and thus protecting the public official's independence from private obligation, such a reform could go a long way toward making it possible for our ablest and most sincere people to seek and hold elective office.

(4) To be effective, individual tax deductions and ceilings on individual contributions should be coupled with a practical and legally enforceable upper limit of allowable expenditures. In this area, I personally feel that the Administration bill is deficient. It would remove the laughably low and totally unrealistic limits of existing law, but it would replace them with nothing.

LET'S LIMIT EXPENDITURES

Surely there should be some limit. But it should be a workable limit. It should be high enough to permit each side an adequate campaign of public enlightenment but low enough to remove our public forums from the crass commercial market place where it almost can be said in far too many cases that public office is up for sale to the highest bidder! The limit should be sufficiently realistic to evoke respect and abidance—and public censure for those who try to flout it.

I have introduced a bill which differs from the Administration measure only in that it proposes to set limits on campaign expenditures. The ceilings I advocate may be too high; perhaps they are too low. But surely if we are serious about reform, there needs to be some sensible and enforceable legal limit to the amount that a candidate or his well-wishers can spend in seeking a seat in either house of the U.S. Congress.

My bill undertakes to limit expenditures for any candidate to the U.S. House of Representatives to not more than $30,000 for a party primary and an additional $30,000 for a general election. Taken together, the two figures would come, not altogether coincidentially, to precisely the amount of the Congressman's salary for a two-year term. There seems something oddly incongruous about allowing any candidate for the House to spend more to gain the office than his total public income for his term of office. For almost any constituency, I believe this figure would be wholly adequate, perhaps not for a lavish campaign but for a sufficient campaign, if candidates would concentrate on informing rather than brainwashing their constituencies ad nauseum.

Since our several states differ so widely in population, obviously there could be no single arbitrary figure which would apply with equal fairness to all Senatorial candidates. Therefore, I have undertaken to set the ceilings at multiples of $30,000, with the multiplier determined by the number of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives to which each state's population entitles it. For Texas, with 23 members of the House, the top permissible figures for any Senate candidacy would be $30,000 times 23—or $690,000 for a primary and a similar amount for a general election. In New Hampshire or New Mexico, with two House seats each, the figure would come to $60,000 in each instance. For Maryland, it would be $240,000 for a primary and a like sum for the general election. In New York and California, the lid would figure at a little more than a million dollars. With all parties and all contestants honoring the same law, this should be enough.

I do not pretend to know how much should be considered adequate for a Presidential campaign. The present legal ceiling is, of course, utterly removed from reality and almost fraudulently deceptive. Existing law purports to limit a party committee to the raising and spending to no more than $3 million a year. In 1964, there were no fewer than 107 national-level committees which among them reported expenditures of $29 million for the national campaigns of the two major political parties. Nobody knows how much more went unreported. Perhaps it is best that we not attempt to place a specific ceiling on the amount a party may spend for the Presidency, but surely it is nothing short of sheer hypocrisy to leave the present meaningless statute on the books.

(5) The Administration bill, additionally, would require all Members of the House and Senate to make annual, inclusive, public reports of all sources of income received by them and their immediate families. Surely this is a desirable provision. Where there is nothing to hide, there can be nothing to fear. And it would be pointless to complain about the goldfish bowl. Each of us knew that public service is a goldfish bowl when we entered it.

Such a financial disclosure act, making regular public revelations of all sources of our individual incomes, could go a long way to inform the public and to lift the vague cloud of often unwarranted suspicion from the legislative chambers.

Fully two-thirds of the Congressional membership have no substantial income at all aside from our Congressional salaries. An additional 20 percent may enjoy stock dividends or returns from investments made prior to our entry into the halls of Congress. In most cases, whatever outside business connections we had were general knowledge in our respective districts prior to our elections. In perhaps five percent of the cases, constituents might learn something which was not already generally known about the private finances of their chosen Senator or Representative. In my opinion, there would be relatively few shocking revelations.

But the very fact that Congressmen were required to make such a sworn declaration could serve as a reassurance to the public and as an inducement for legislators to hew hard to the straight path. As former Congressman Paul Kilday often said, "Anything you have to explain, you would be wiser not to do."

Perhaps you are questioning why it should be necessary for members of the national lawmaking body to hang their finances out for public view like so many garments on the public washline. A poll conducted in the spring of 1964 by Lou Harris gives a somewhat disquieting answer. In nationwide interviews, Harris discovered that a full 50 percent of those questioned feel that Members of Congress tend to represent "special interests." An additional 20 percent were "not sure." And only 30 percent believed firmly enough in the legislative integrity to respond that Congressmen basically represent "public interests."

It is both interesting and significant that, regardless of the section of the country, citizens characteristically place a greater confidence in the financial honesty of their own individual Congressman and Senator than they do in the body as a whole. This fact is borne out clearly by many opinion samplings. The human tendency is to mistrust the unknown, to doubt the unfamiliar. A mandatory public airing of individual Congressional finances, therefore, by the simple expediency of dissipating the mist of mystery, might help to restore the quality of public respect in those who govern us, so necessary to the efficient functioning of democracy.

(6) While nobody to my knowledge has included any such provision in any of the bills before you, I think it might be well worth the Committee's considering in this connection the possibility of some requirement that a certain minimum amount of prime television time be made available without charge as a public service equality to all candidates for the office of United States Senator or Representative.

Such a practice, of course, has long been observed in Great Britain as well as in certain other countries. I am informed that, in England, public opinion itself has so crystalized in favor of the restrained approach to campaign spending, that lavish campaigns are considered not only bad form but actually hurtful to the cause of the spenders.

THE INTELLECTUAL LEVEL

Political campaigns can be either extremely educational or surpassingly offensive to the public. In the tradition of a free country, they should provide the medium for an intelligent and intellectually rewarding biennial examintion of our national policies. In far too many cases, they have descended to the level of shouting contests, reminiscent of the side-show barker at a carnival, with new overtones supplied by Madison Avenue, rending the air with florid claims designed to assault the eye and ear so incessantly with quick, slick slogans and nauseating name-repetition that the public in theory will become subliminally hypnotized.

It is my personal feeling that, in our emphasis upon such coarse spending and shallow sloganeering, we insult the public's intelligence and do the electorate a grave disservice. While this admittedly is more a matter of taste than of morals, I am convinced that the total quality of American political life could be elevated by de-emphasizing the repetitious quickie commercials and replacing them with intelligent discussion in some depth of the issues that confront the Republic. Anything that might be done to encourage the availability and use of prime television time in 30-minute or at least 15-minute segments for such a purpose undoubtedly would be a service to public understanding—as well as to the candidate who isn't willing to put his soul in a safe-deposit box and auction off the key to the biggest campaign contributor.

In these ways, this Congress could restore the vibrancy and viability of American democracy. The increasingly sordid emphasis upon big spending and blue chip money raising which has pervaded the political scene

runs alarmingly counter to the American experiment in self-government. From the very beginning our people have traditionally exhibited a healthy mistrust of the concentration of too much power in the hands of too few. But directly juxtaposed to our systematical expansion of the electorate and our democracizing of the ballot is the insidious encroachment of circumstances which place the public official or office seeker unwillingly at the mercy of those few who can provide the wherewithal to conduct campaigns in this day of extravagantly expensive mass media.

LET'S REDEEM OUR OWN HISTORY

Creation of an elite propertied class with a sort of divine right to rule the country, against which Jefferson waged his unrelenting warfare, has come about in spite of our considerable efforts to broaden the franchise. These successive and cumulative efforts have run like a constantly recurring theme through the symphony of our national past. To the anguished cries of the few, we adopted the principle of universal manhood suffrage. We abolished slavery and the cruel protocols of a vested caste system. We let the women vote.

In just the past generation, we have sounded the death knell to the "white man's primary," passed Civil Rights Voting Laws, swept aside the rotten boroughs of maladjusted districts, and outlawed the poll tax. But of what real effect is all of this if practice imposes a restrictive financial bottleneck upon the sources from which we can recruit our elected officials? Of what value is "one man, one vote" if all of us know the real power lies in the hands of the few who provide the money for political campaigns, and if the realities of the age permit the voter so limited a choice of those for whom he gets a chance to cast his ballot?

While the tide of American history has inexorably swept away the restrictions on voting and widened the channels of public participation in the electoral process, these gains have been largely negated by the rapidly climbing costs of electioneering and concomitant dependence upon the few who privately provide those costs.

The system itself is good—the best that any nation has devised. But it needs updating and modernizing to the end that "one man, one vote" may be indeed a reality. Let us not, through inaction, permit it to drift in its present direction until we bring down upon ourselves the condemnation hurled at the scribes and pharisees, for permitting our free elective processes to become like "whited sepulchers, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within filled with dead men's bones and uncleanness."

The bills before us permit us an opportunity to revive the spirit of Democracy itself. Let it not be lamented that we neglected the opportunity.

BUILDING BRIDGE CANYON DAM WOULD BE CONTRARY TO THE PURPOSES OF THE GRAND CANYON PARK ACT

Mr. GIBBONS. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of two huge power dams in the Grand Canyon have often stated that "provision for a dam at Bridge Canyon was made in the very act establishing Grand Canyon National Park in 1919" and that "the very act of Congress in 1919, which created Grand Canyon National Park, provides specifically for hydroelectric developments in or along its borders."

It has even been said that Congress made a "sacred commitment" to allow the Bridge Canyon Dam.

Of course no Congress can bind its successors. But in view of the emphasis that has been given to the claim that the 65th Congress in effect endorsed the Bridge Canyon Dam in the Grand Canyon Park Act (40 Stat. 1175), it is worth looking at the act.

The conclusion of any fairminded review of the act and its legislative history must be that while the 65th Congress did not attempt to definitely resolve the issue, it barely left the door open to a very limited future reclamation use of the Grand Canyon.

The decision as to whether the door is to be swung wide to admit the Bridge Canyon Dam or whether it is to be firmly shut against exploitation of the canyon is one that this Congress must decide on the merits. The act of 1919 contains no commitment, sacred or otherwise.

As originally introduced the Grand Canyon National Park bill contained the following language:

SEC. 7. That the United States Reclamation Service may enter upon and utilize for flowage or other purposes any area within said park which may be necessary for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project.

This is the provision that the proponents of the Bridge Canyon Dam now wish had become embedded in the law. But it did not.

The then Secretary of the Interior, Franklin K. Lane, objected to section 7 of the bill as introduced, arguing that it "is not in harmony with the other general provisions of the measure."

Lane suggested the following language which became part of the act:

SEC. 7. That, *whenever consistent with the primary purposes of said park*, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to permit the utilization of areas therein *which may be necessary* for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project. (Emphasis added.)

In the brief debate on the Grand Canyon Park Act in the House, my predecessor from the Fifth District of Wisconsin, Mr. Stafford, questioned the need for any authority for irrigation and reclamation projects in the canyon.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire further as to the need of granting authority for irrigation and reclamation projects such as is conferred by this bill in the canyon proper.

The gentleman from Arizona, Mr. HAYDEN, hastened to assure the House that nothing was proposed to be allowed that would detract from the primary purposes of the park.

Mr. HAYDEN. The provision contained in the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, *when consistent with the primary purposes of the park*—that is, not to impair its scenic beauty—to allow storage reservoirs to be constructed for conserving the water of the Colorado River for irrigation purposes. I understand that there are in the canyon a number of reservoir sites where it is proposed in time to come, when full utilization is made of that stream, to build reservoirs for the storage of water. *If that can be done without disturbing the primary purposes of the park*, there is authority in this bill to do so. (Emphasis added.)

So, first, the question is raised of whether the Bridge Canyon Dam would be "consistent with the primary purposes" of the Grand Canyon National Park.

The purposes of the Grand Canyon National Park, and of all parks, as declared by Congress in 1916 are "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

The Bridge Canyon Dam would back up the Colorado River within the Grand Canyon National Park for 13 miles. It would destroy scenes of great natural beauty. It would obscure important geological features. It would wipe out the habitats of plants and wildlife in the canyon.

In my judgment, the effects of the dam cannot be squared with the policy of "conserving the scenery and the natural objects and the wildlife" in the park.

Second, there is the question of whether the dam would be "necessary," as the statute requires, "for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project."

The answer is that the dam is not necessary for a reclamation project in the ordinary sense of the term. No one, I believe, contends that the central Arizona project to divert water from the Colorado into Arizona cannot be built and paid for without Bridge Canyon Dam. The administration does not recommend the authorization of Bridge Canyon Dam. In fact, the primary purpose of the dam is to finance part of the cost of a vast program of interregional water transfer.

This purpose is similarly out of accord with then Representative HAYDEN's explanation that the provisions of section 7 were intended to allow "storage reservoirs" so as to make "full utilization" of the Colorado River. By now, however, adequate water storage capacity has been built on the Colorado to allow full use of that river without marring the Grand Canyon. Neither Bridge nor Marble Canyon Dam is needed for water impoundment.

Thus it comes back to the question of whether this Congress is willing to alter significantly the ecology of the entire Grand Canyon and to turn the living river into reservoirs for 13 miles of the national park, 38 miles—the entire length—of the national monument, and in all through about half of the 280-mile length of the Grand Canyon that nature made, in order to allow an ill-conceived and economically unsound project.

THE FEDERAL COURT CLERK

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a speech delivered on August 10 by my dear friend Mario T. Noto before the Federal Court Clerks' Association's 38th Annual Conference in Florida. In his remarks, Mr. Noto, Associate Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, has touched on many phases of citizenship, and on the important role which the Federal court clerks play in this process.

In so doing, the Commissioner makes each of us reflect once again on the precious honor of citizenship, and I am happy to commend the statement of this dedicated and skilled administrator to my colleagues' attention:

I want to express my appreciation for the privilege you have given me to address the 38th Annual Conference of the Federal Court Clerks' Association. It is a genuine and sincere pleasure to be permitted to participate in this memorable event.

In addressing your Association, I want to pay tribute to and acknowledge the dedication and devotion to duty of the court clerks of our Federal judiciary system. Each clerk is an integral and indispensable part of that vast machinery through which our Federal courts administer justice.

It is a commendable characteristic of our American way of life that we Americans have a tendency to group into associations. We do this for good reason. Ironically, Alexis de Tocqueville perceived this trait among Americans, more than 100 years ago on his visit from France to the United States, in his comprehensive analysis of social and political life in America. We group because of our desire to promote unity in causes, some of which are practical and some of which are idealistic. But just the same they are causes in which we express our deep convictions and profound beliefs. And this is good. For this is the American way of life.

We of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice, recoganize and find in the federal court clerks, officers who, as part of our judiciary system, give unstintingly of themselves in joining our Service to assist aliens in the judicial acquisition of citizenship. Their help is indispensable and of inestimable worth.

No person with reason can deny or even cast doubt that American citizenship is a priceless possession. We as Americans have been endowed with this immeasurable treasure either by the accident of birth or have earned it as a matter of choice through court proceedings.

Twenty-four years ago in ruling upon a case involving the revocation of naturalization, the highest Court in the land wrote: "It is safe to assert that nowhere in the world today is the right of citizenship of greater worth to an individual than it is in this country. It would be difficult to exaggerate its value and importance. By many it is regarded as the highest hope of civilized men." This right, by judicial description, is and continues to be a priceless possession. And the sacred worth of American citizenship is no less in value today than it was at the time when the Court wrote its words. In fact, it is today incapable of measurement. And since our nation declared its freedom and independence in 1776, it has continuously spiraled in worth. So long as God continues to endow this nation of ours with the inheritance of the tremendous resources which we through our efforts have multiplied, the privilege of citizenship will continue to assume greater heights.

No matter how remote, there is no area in our globe today where a man does not live who would give but short of his life to acquire the privileges which are bestowed by American citizenship.

Yet, in our national life today our liberties have become challenged increasingly and the price of American citizenship and its freedoms have become more exacting and demanding.

At this hour we are living in a world which is divided. We are in an era of ideological conflict which crystallizes into sharp focus the question as to what place does man truly hold in our society. Is man to continue to remain free and be the master of his destiny; or shall he become subservient to satisfy the needs of a totalitarian state? This is a challenge which all Americans must reflect upon and be prepared to accept. Whatever the cost we must insure that we retain the blessings which belong to us by American citizenship. We were founded upon the concept that the State serves the people and so shall it be. In our country the principle of the sovereignty of the people has been a fact of existence since our birth as a nation. As the Deity reigns in the universe, the people in our land reign in their government.

Some of us have acquired our citizenship by birth, and thus by right. Some of us have acquired our citizenship by court proceedings and thus by privilege. Regardless of its source we share in common the rights and privileges of all American citizens. But, whether by birth or naturalization there is a common bond among us. We are linked by a deep and unshatterable cord which joins us into a mighty nation. We share in common the desire for liberty and the preservation of the sanctity of our human rights.

Be it blood by birth, be it blood by naturalization, the passage of time has merged us all into one people. Whether we descend from those who long ago preceded us to this land or whether we are new arrivals, we Americans who have the heritage of citizenship by birth or naturalization, are amalgamated into American might. Together, we represent the sum total which is our America in the community of nations.

While naturalization activity is but one of the functions of our Service and similarly only one of your many duties and responsibilities, it is befitting for this assembly to reflect for a moment upon the route and significance of citizenship by naturalization. In our history, we know that in 1790 our Congress established for the first time a judicial way to divest oneself of foreign allegiance and acquire American citizenship. Our legislature decreed that it was necessary to pass through the portals of the sanctity of the courtroom to acquire this privilege. With the passage of time, the naturalization process has become one of the most significant and penetrating acts to be performed by the judge in a United States District Court. To add to the tribute of such privilege which only the qualified may receive, the naturalization proceeding has been cloaked with ceremonial significance which leaves an impact deeply embedded in the soul of man. The sacred trust which the court grants to the petitioner for naturalization remains in heart and mind for a lifetime.

The passage of time and increased work loads upon the judiciary, prompted Congress to legislate responsibility upon the Immigration nad Naturalization Service to process and examine the petitioners for citizenship. Thus, the naturalization examiner of the Service has in fact become an instrument of the federal court. The trust and confidence imposed upon the Service by legislation has been diligently and competently fulfilled. But despite this mandate, citizenship is still granted only by order of the court and it is the culmination of a complete judicial proceeding.

In turn this trust has been reconfirmed as the courts have manifested their faith in the Service by accepting with rare exceptions, the recommendation of the examiner which is required by law. Between 1961 and 1965 there were 600,468 new citizens admitted by court order. This judicial trust in the Service has made the court dispense with the appearances of witnesses and further examination of the petitioners at the final hearing in the absence of special circumstances where a court will require it.

Our work has been aided by the cooperative spirit and untiring efforts of the clerks of the court. You have made the ceremonies of the naturalization proceedings assume new and deepened significance. The final hearing has become a show place where responsibilities meaningful to citizenship are vested in people who have finally achieved the goal of their aspiration to become Americans. Thus, the clerk of the court has given the new citizen a deeper understanding of American society. With the broad cooperation which exists between us, and your dedicated efforts, the naturalization ceremony has become the most thrilling of all judicial proceedings. It is fraught with emotion and although it is the end of one road, of the end of allegiance to a land of birth, it is the beginning of a new era for new Americans who have by choice earned it. This proceeding becomes one of cherished memory.

The court and ceremony serve to emphasize the significance of the new citizenship. They instill in the new Americans a better understanding of the value of their new government and the importance of their place in its society. You are helping us in the Service to write and add new chapters to the history of America.

These new citizens and their children will enhance our strength and as assimilated members of our free society they become peaceful people dedicated to the preservation of our heritage. These are people who have chosen to stand united with us to preserve freedom and Constitutional government. Thus, in behavior, in attitude and in aspiration, they have a remarkable similarity to those who emigrated to this land long before in time.

And together you and the Service give to each man his chance. To every man, regardless of the land of his birth, we give opportunity to become one of us. To every man, we give the right to live, to work, to contribute his talents, to be himself. To every man we give the chance to achieve whatever hope his manhood and his ability can combine to make him. This which we give him is the promise of America.

I want to express sincere and genuine gratitude from the Service to all the Federal Court clerks for your past and continuing help in the naturalization process. I voice the hope that with your continued cooperation we may in the troubled climates of the world today add to the goodwill, understanding and compassion which these new citizens will contribute to the wealth of our nation.

I close my remarks with pride in the realization that we stand and serve together to achieve a better American citizenry.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, once again in the interest of keeping our membership fully informed concerning a request for an appropriation for the Dickey-Lincoln School Federal hydroelectric power project which will soon be before us, I would like to present several items of information.

It may well be of interest to the Members to note that these two items in opposition to the project come from very contrasting sources. One is a statement by Mr. Charles E. Hardy, a vice president of the Brotherhood of Utility Workers of New England, Inc., and the other an excerpt from the Utility Stock Valuations report of the financial concern of McDonnell & Co., member of the New York Stock Exchange, American Stock Exchange and other leading exchanges.

I am sure that when the Members have an opportunity to study them they will once again agree with me that this project requires considerably more study before we appropriate any further funds for it. It is quite plain to me that when a project of this kind is opposed by segments of organized labor, the Association of Chambers of Commerce, by the electric companies of the region, and when it is seriously questioned by financial houses, the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, the Appalachian Mountain Club on a conservationist basis, then, in my opinion, the Members of this House are entitled to considerably more information than we have received from Federal agencies to date.

The McDonnell report says in part:

The threat of a public power complex is more apparent than real. The proposed Dickey-Lincoln project is a step in the wrong direction—but in focus is designed only to provide power for a few hours of peaking per day. Studies seem to indicate the whole project is economically absurd—this however does not preclude development. A legislative battle should precede any final implementation of plans. While such a development may be considered a "threat," the impact upon private utility investment within the present context should not be significantly injurious.

The outlook for utility operations is excellent. The demand growth should continue with economic growth and the favorable economies of the utility industry are finally being experienced in New England. Power-pooling is leading to the installation of larger and larger units in New England with an impressive impact upon operations. CTP [Central Maine Power Company] is planning the installation of a 700,000 kilowatt unit in 1972. This will be a joint project with other New England utilities, with CTP participation in ownership and power take of about 38%. The impact of atomic energy on New England will be dramatic. CTP for istance is currently dependent mainly on Bunker C Oil which costs about 35¢ per million BTU. Atomic power is supposed to be currently competitive with 23¢–24¢ conventional fuel costs—or roughly 70% of current fuel cost. This development should serve over the longer-term to make power costs more competitive with other areas of the country as well as increasing profitability.

Mr. Hardy, in a statement to the press has charged that certain Members of the Congress were being deliberately misled as to the amount of support that exists within various union groups for the $300 million Federal power dam that has been proposed for the northernmost reaches of Maine. Mr. Hardy's statement follows:

Charles E. Hardy, Vice President of the Brotherhood of Utility Workers of New England Inc. said that Congressmen were being deluded by false claims of total union support for the much-publicized hydroelectric scheme of the Interior Department.

Most of the union support statements are emanating from groups which are about as far removed from the utility industry as you can get and we fail to see what jurisdiction or what possible stake they can have in an industry where we make our living.

Opposition to the Dickey-Lincoln project comes from thousands of knowledgeable members of the Utility Workers Union of America, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, both members of the AFL–CIO and the United Mine Workers, District 50, who represent organized utility workers in every state in the New England area.

We are taxpayers, too, said Mr. Hardy, and we sure hate to see millions of taxpayers' dollars being poured into a senseless scheme, that has had little or no study, that will provide no answer to New England's rate problems, that will generate only higher-cost power than is presently available—and that will provide no jobs for our membership.

I think that we have proven time and again that we have become "economists" said Hardy; it is now an indispensable asset for union leadership to precisely know the hills and valleys of charts and graphs what causes them, and where they affect our livelihood.

If only for this reason alone, said the union official, we have cause to see nothing but trouble with government intervention into the New England power business. Our industry, by proper planning and conscientious and continuous effort, has always sought to level out the economic peaks and to produce a New England power system that is service conscious, that is union conscious and that is rate conscious. I read a statement by an electric company official the other day with which I fully concur: "What product do you know today—that costs less than it did in 1940?"

We in the B.U.W. NE know the power business far better than our Detroit brethren, and certainly more intimately than newspapermen or bureaucrats who incessantly harp on a federal power "yardstick" that has no digits for taxes, which incidentally are 37 per cent higher in Massachusetts than the national average. These are the same taxes we unionists will have to pay for federal subsidization of our industry for a few choice "preference" customers, and we think the money could be better spent . . . in places like Viet Nam.

DICKEY–LINCOLN SCHOOL HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER PROJECT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Dickey-Lincoln school hydroelectric power project, authorized by Congress last year, was called to our attention on Monday of this week by our distinguished colleague, Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, in his remarks before the House.

As all my colleagues in the House of Representatives know, I am the chief proponent of the Dickey project while Mr. CLARK has led the opposition to this needed facility.

Mr. CLARK, stating that he wishes to keep the Members of the House well informed on the status of this project, entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 8, the last of an article written by Mr. Raymond Moley which appeared in Newsweek magazine on February 28 of this year.

I, too, am interested in keeping my colleagues informed, and welcome the opportunity to rebut the statements made by Mr. Moley.

When Newsweek published the article in question, I, together with my distinguished Republican colleague from Maine [Mr. TUPPER], responded to it by letter to the publishers. They refused to publish our rebuttal.

Now that Mr. CLARK has submitted the article into the RECORD, we have at last an opportunity to publish our comments on this worthwhile project.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the letter written by Mr. TUPPER and myself to the publishers of Newsweek.

FEBRUARY 25, 1966.

The EDITOR,
Newsweek Magazine,
1750 Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The article by Raymond Moley entitled "Guns and Butter Plus" in February 28 Newsweek is replete with errors. In fact, the only correct statement in Mr. Moley's comment regarding the Dickey-Lincoln School Project is that the Interior Department under Secretary Udall was asked to study it in 1961 and that the project since then has been authorized in last year's Rivers and Harbors Bill with an appropriation of $800,000 for preliminary construction and planning. An analysis of the project by the Federal Power Commission and other agencies revealed that Dickey was one of the best hydroelectric sites in the East and that it should be developed.

In speaking of the Dickey-Lincoln School Hydro-electric Project Mr. Moley described the site as "far up in Northern Maine." May we remind the gentleman that far up in Maine as you can possibly go is still the United States. Mr. Moley's attitude reminds us of the story of the man from northern Maine who visited Washington D.C. and said it was "a fine place to visit but a long way from everything."

Mr. Moley lauds the 19 private power companies of New England for their plan for power expansion over the next seven years. Although we welcome any private utilities' proposal which would provide low cost power to New England, we are justifiably skeptical of a plan which was contrived only after Congressional authorization of the Dickey-Lincoln School Project became imminent. This group of 19 private power companies in New England has been organized since 1948 and has never before even hinted at plans to substantially reduce power costs.

Over the years we have become well acquainted with Mr. Moley's assertions against hydro-electric projects both in the Tennessee Valley and the Columbia River Valley. The fact is that these two areas are blessed with Federal hydro-electric power and enjoy the lowest cost power in the Nation. We say that it is time the people in New England be given their chance to share in the benefits which will flow from developments of Federal hydroelectric power.

Sincerely,

MAINE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION,
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,
Democrat, Second District.
STANLEY R. TUPPER,
Republican, First District.

POLLUTED WATER

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce legislation vital to the Nation's health and welfare. For what could be more vital than the condition of our water? Water has been and is a major source of food, transportation, and power, and it is becoming more and more a primary source of recreation.

All of these uses are threatened by the condition of our rivers and streams. All the good to which our water can be put is endangered by the pollution of our waterways. The issue with which I am dealing is pollution. Too much of our water is polluted—dirty, diseased, and dangerous.

Today I am introducing a bill which would deal with this problem, a bill to provide a program of pollution control and abatement in selected river basins of the United States through comprehensive planning and financial assistance.

We have already begun work on pollution. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965 has made some headway, but our rivers are still carrying industrial waste, raw sewage, and bloated fish across the landscape.

I do not wish to sound like an alarmist; our water supplies can be made drinkable and many people swim safely in our rivers. But this is the critical point, for acting now to clean up our waterways will insure a useful and healthful water supply tomorrow.

This bill will authorize a program in selected river basins that supplements other Federal pollution programs. It would provide for the maximum cooperation of all levels of government to reclaim and restore the natural waters of the Nation's rivers, lakes, streams, estuaries, bays, and coastal waters to adequate standards of water quality for all our present and future health, welfare, and resource needs.

It would accomplish this through the comprehensive planning of pollution control for all or part of a river basin. It would establish incentives to water users to conserve water and minimize wastes. It would also establish a permanent organization with authority to coordinate the actions necessary to carry out a comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan. The bill will provide for the establishment of local or interstate bodies for the purpose of controlling water pollution and aid such bodies to coordinate their policies within a geographical area.

The object of this bill is clean water—undefiled, unpolluted water. The bill would achieve its objective through the cooperative effort of State, local, and Federal agencies who would jointly plan and finance the clean water program. It would extend and broaden existing programs that are attacking pollution from other than the clean rivers viewpoint.

This bill authorizes $6 billion as the minimum Federal investment to provide an adequate water quality program for municipalities for the next 6 years. The bill eliminates dollar ceilings for grants to State, local, and interstate agencies for the construction of sewage treatment works. It provides for funds to aid basic research in the areas of waste discharge, agricultural runoff, and many of the other pollution problems which plague our rivers.

This bill recognizes the duty and the right of local and State agencies to implement water quality programs to provide clean water for their citizens. It aids these agencies and coordinates their activities in a cooperative effort which will benefit the entire Nation.

A river is not located in one place—it winds and flows across the landscape. It ignores municipal and State boundaries. Thus we need a program that will coordinate efforts of many municipalities and States for the good of all.

My own State of Massachusetts is an example of the good this bill will accomplish. Those of my colleagues who have visited Massachusetts can attest to the beauty of its landscape. The Connecticut River has one of the loveliest basins in the Northeast. Its banks are relatively unspoiled.

But the Connecticut River is polluted. Tons of industrial and home waste over the years have been washed into the river. Many of its beaches are now unsafe for swimming, boating, or other recreation. Four States—Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Massachusetts—border the Connecticut River. Hundreds of municipalities are affected by its course. Water quality control of the Connecticut River is more than a local or a State job. It needs the coordinated effort that this bill will provide.

Another example is the Charles River that runs through my district. The Charles is a famous river of great historical importance. It has been regaled in song and poetry for 200 years. Yet a popular song currently leading the lists mentions the Charles not only as a scenic spot, but as "dirty water."

Those of you who have seen the Charles will remember the beauty of its tree-lined banks and the impressiveness of its bridge-arched flow. But it is useless, even in the spring, for a young man's fancy to turn to anything beautiful if he is in the path of a strong breeze from the Charles. Conditions along the entire length of the river have deteriorated to a point where beaches have been condemned because they are totally unsafe for bathers. Fishing has become a tragedy rather than a sport.

The chief cause of pollution of the Charles River Basin is the overflow of raw sewage and storm drainage. We need many more facilities to cope with this drainage problem; research has to be done to discover efficient and successful ways to prevent pollution as well as methods to eliminate the already existing condition.

The Charles River, like many rivers in our country, is too beautiful to become an open sewer. It has too many historic associations to be relegated to the status of a back alley. Too much beauty, grandeur, utility, and recreation would be lost if the Charles River were lost to posterity.

In the past we have concerned ourselves with necessities, with utility. Now we have the chance to combine what is necessary—a clean water supply—with what is useful—an attractive, unspoiled system of waterways—with what is beautiful—a clean, flowing river.

I know this bill would help Massachusetts. I also know it would help every other State in the Union. The Charles needs help, the Connecticut needs help, and so do the Delaware, the Mississippi, the Colorado, the Merrimack, the Ohio, the Arkansas, the Missouri.

The Charles River, the Connecticut River, the Merrimack River and rivers all across the country can and should be cleaned up. Beaches can be reopened, basins can be stocked, and most importantly, the water can be used and enjoyed.

Many wonderful benefits can come from pollution control, but pollution control itself is a necessity. The rivers and water of the United States should not be lost to posterity, nor should they become a place to be shunned.

In the past year Massachusetts received $3 million in Federal assistance, 1% of what she needs. Under my bill the Federal Government would give Massachusetts $160 million in the next 6 years, a figure that makes clean water a possibility rather than a myth.

I urge support of this bill by all Members of the House. This is the critical point at which we must decide whether we consider clean water important. If we do, I believe this bill will help us to that end.

The bill is as follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments and Clean Rivers Restoration Act of 1966.

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection 5(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, is amended by striking out all of paragraph (2) of such subsection, and inserting a new paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection there is authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1968, $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1969, and $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1970 and each year thereafter, sums so appropriated to remain available until expended."

(b) Such section 5 of the Act is further amended by adding immediately at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) For the purpose of protecting the public health and welfare, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Commerce, shall conduct a study of the extent of pollution from boats and vessels on such part of the Great Lakes as is under the jurisdiction of the United States, in harbors or ports of such lakes under such jurisdiction and on other navigable waters of the United States, and shall report the results

of such study, together with recommendations for an effective program to control the dumping of refuse and the discharge of waste from boats and vessels on such waters, to the Congress no later than July 1, 1967.

"(2) The Secretary shall appoint a technical committee to meet at his discretion and advise in the formulation of recommendations pursuant to this section. Such committee shall be composed of representatives of the Departments of the Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, the Army, and Commerce, the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, owners and operators of Great Lakes vessels, and such other persons as the Secretary may determine. Members of such technical committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings of such committee or otherwise engaged on business of such committee, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including traveltime, 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.

"(3) For the purposes of this section the term—

"(A) 'waste' includes human toilet waste, wash and laundry waste, and kitchen and galley waste; and

"(B) 'refuse' includes garbage, dunnage, and other trash."

SEC. 3. Section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of—

"(1) assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other wastes from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, or

"(2) assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate advanced waste treatment and water purification methods or new or improved methods of joint treatment systems for municipal and industrial wastes,

and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the conduct of research and demonstrations relating to the purpose set forth in clause (1) or (2) by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations:

"(1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary;

"(2) No grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 75 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; and

"(3) No grant shall be made for any project under this section unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve as a useful demonstration for the purpose set forth in clause (1) or (2) of subsection (a).

"(c) For the purposes of this section there are authorized to be appropriated—

"(1) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose set forth in clause (1) of subsection (a), including contracts pursuant to such subsection for such purpose; and

"(2) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for each of the next four succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $25,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose set forth in clause (2) of subsection (2), including contracts pursuant to such subsection for such purpose.

Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. No grant or contract for the purpose of either such clause (1) or (2) shall be made for any project in any fiscal year in an amount exceeding 12½ per centum of the total amount authorized for the purpose of such clause in such fiscal year."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $5,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $5,000,000, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $10,000,000".

SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 30 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary, or in an amount exceeding 40 per centum of such reasonable cost if the State agrees to match equally not less than 30 per centum of such estimated reasonable cost of each project in such State approved under this section: *Provided*, That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost: *Provided further*, That, in the case of a project which will serve more than one municipality, the Secretary shall, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable, allocate to each municipality to be served by such project its share of the estimated reasonable cost of such project; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works after completion of the construction thereof; and (4) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project is in conformity with the State water pollution control plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 7 and has been certified by the State water pollution control agency as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs.

SEC. 6. Subsection (c) of section 8 is amended by inserting after "The allotments of a State under the second, third, and fourth sentences of this subsection shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this section, for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this section" a comma and the following: "except that in the case of any project on which construction was initiated in such State after June 30, 1966, and which meets the requirements for assistance under this section but was constructed without such assistance, such allotments for any fiscal year prior to 1972 shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project prior to July 1, 1972, to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if such project had been approved pursuant to this section and adequate funds had been available. In the case of any project on which construction was initiated in such State after June 30, 1966, and which was constructed with assistance pursuant to this section but the amount of such assistance was a lesser per centum of the cost of construction than was allowable pursuant to this section, such allotments shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project prior to July 1, 1972, to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if adequate funds had been available."

SEC. 7. Subsection (d) of section 8 is amended by striking out all beginning with "and $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967" through the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

SEC. 8. Section 8 is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h)(1) Upon application the Secretary may make a loan to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency to which he has agreed to make a grant pursuant to this section, for the purpose of helping to finance its share of cost of construction for which such grant is to be made. Any such loan shall be made only (A) after the Secretary determines that such State, municipality, or agency has made satisfactory provision for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the treatment works being constructed after completion of such construction, and (B) if such State, municipality, or agency shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Secretary determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this section. Loans pursuant to this subsection shall bear interest at a rate which the Secretary determines to be adequate to cover the cost of the funds of the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made pursuant to this subsection. Such loans may not be used for the State's share of the cost of a project pursuant to a matching agreement entered into under section 8(b)(2).

"(2) Loans pursuant to this subsection shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Secretary to be appropriate but not exceeding forty years.

"(3) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection but not to exceed a total of $250,000,000. No loan or loans pursuant to this subsection with respect to any one project shall exceed an amount equal to 10 per centum of such total."

SEC. 9. Section 10(d)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after the last sentence therein the following:

"(2) Whenever the Secretary, upon receipt of reports, surveys, or studies from any duly constituted international agency, has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) of this section which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a foreign country is occurring, and the Secretary of State requests him to abate such pollution, he shall give formal notification thereof to the State water pollution control agency of the State in which such discharge

or discharges originate and to the interstate water pollution control agency, if any, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies, if in his judgment the effect of such pollution on the legitimate uses of the waters is of sufficient significance to warrant such action. The Secretary, through the Secretary of State, shall invite the foreign country which may be adversely affected by the pollution to attend and participate in the conference, and the representative of such country shall, for the purpose of the conference and any further proceeding resulting from such conference, have all rights of a State water pollution control agency. This paragraph shall apply only to a foreign country which the Secretary determines has given the United States essentially the same rights with respect to the prevention and control of water pollution occurring in that country as is given that country by this paragraph. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to modify, amend, repeal, or otherwise affect the provision of the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty between Canada and the United States relative to the control and abatement of water pollution in waters covered by that treaty."

SEC. 10. Section 10(d)(2) is amended to insert after the first sentence thereof the following: "In addition, it shall be the responsibility of the chairman of the conference to give every person contributing to the alleged pollution or affected by it an opportunity to make a full statement of his views to the conference."

SEC. 11. Section 10 is further amended by adding a new subsection (k) to read as follows:

"(k)(1) In connection with any conference called under this section the Secretary is authorized to require any person whose alleged activities result in discharges causing or contributing to water pollution, or whose activities may affect the quality of the waters involved in such conference, to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, based on existing data, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonable be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of such discharges and the use of facilities or other means to prevent or reduce such discharges by the person filing such a report. After such conference has been held, the Secretary shall require such additional reports to the extent recommended by such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. No person shall be required in such report to divulge trade secrets or secret processes, and all information reported shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(2) If any person required to file any report under this subsection shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(3) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures."

SEC. 12. Such Act is further amended by redesignating sections 12 through 16 as sections 14 through 18, and by inserting after section 11 thereof the following new sections 12 and 13:

"CLEAN RIVERS RESTORATION PROGRAM

"SEC. 12. (a) In order to reclaim, restore, and maintain the natural waters of the Nation through the preparation and development of comprehensive river basin pollution control and abatement plans and through the establishment of economic incentives to encourage waste treatment consistent with water quality standards effected pursuant to section 10(c) of this Act, the Secretary shall, at the request of the Governor or Governors of one or more States, designate a planning agency which provides for adequate representation of appropriate Federal, State, interstate, local, or when appropriate, international interests in the river basin or portion thereof involved and which is capable of developing an effective, comprehensive water quality control and abatement plan that is part of or consistent with a comprehensive river basin water resources plan.

"(b) Each planning agency designated pursuant to subsection (a) shall develop a comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan in a manner which is part of or consistent with a comprehensive river basin water resources plan. Such comprehensive pollution control abatement plan (A) shall be consistent with water quality standards established for interstate waters within the river basin pursuant to section 10(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; (B) shall recommend such treatment works and sewer system as will provide the most effective and economical means of collection, storage, treatment, and purification of wastes and which will encourage both municipal and industrial use of such treatment system; and (C) shall provide for maintenance and improvement of water quality standards within the basin or portion thereof and shall include proposed methods of adequately financing those facilities as may be necessary to implement the plan.

"(c) Upon completion of a proposed comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan or portion thereof, each planning agency shall transmit the plan to the Governor of each State, each interstate agency, international commission, and each local agency covered by the plan or portion thereof. Each person, agency, or commission shall have sixty days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan to submit views, comments, and recommendations. The planning agency shall consider such views, comments, and recommendations and may make appropriate changes or modifications in the proposed plan. The planning agency shall then submit the proposed plan to the Secretary of the Interior together with the views, comments, and recommendations of each such person, agency, or international commission.

"(d)(1) Upon receipt of a proposed comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan or portion thereof from a planning agency, the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit it to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Water Resources Council, and, when appropriate, the Secretary of State, for review.

"(2) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Water Resources Council and, when appropriate, the Secretary of State, shall notify the Secretary of the Interior, within sixty days, of the results of their review.

"(3) The Secretary of the Interior shall review the plan or portion thereof and the agency comments, and, if he determines that the plan or portion thereof adequately and effectively complies with subsection (b), he shall approve the plan or portion thereof.

"(e) After designation of an appropriate planning agency, the Secretary of the Interior may accept applications from and make grants to such local, State, or interstate agencies from such funds as may be appropriated pursuant to section 8(d) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to assist in financing construction of treatment works subject to the following limitations: (1) the amount of the grant shall not exceed 50 per centum of the estimated reasonable construction costs of such treatment works; (2) no application for grants under this section to assist in financing the construction of treatment works in the area included within the jurisdiction of the planning agency shall be approved until the Secretary determines that the proposed project (a) is consistent with and carries out the purpose of this Act, (b) will be properly and efficiently operated and maintained, (c) is designed so that an adequate capacity will be available to serve the reasonably foreseeable growth need of the area, (d) when located, in whole or in part, in urbanized areas, meets the same requirements with respect to planning and programing as shall have been prescribed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to water and sewer projects under title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and (e) provides, when appropriate, for joint waste treatment; (3) grants made under this Act shall not be available to assist in financing the construction of any such works which are receiving a Federal grant under other provisions of law: *Provided*, That a Federal grant made pursuant to this section may be increased above this percentage by supplemental grants made pursuant to the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 or title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; (4) no application for a grant under this section shall be approved unless the Governor agrees to establish statewide water quality standards consistent with section 10(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; (5) no application for a grant under this section shall be approved unless the State in which the project is located agrees to provide not less than 30 per centum of the estimated total project cost; and (6) no application for a grant under this section shall be approved, after three years following the date of designation of a planning agency, unless such project is in conformance with an approved plan as provided in subsection (d)(3).

"(f) Subsections 8(g) and 14 (d) and (e), as redesignated herein, shall apply and are made applicable to any grant made by the Secretary pursuant to this section.

"(g) After the Secretary of the Interior approves a comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan or portion thereof for a river basin or portion thereof that is part of or consistent with a comprehensive river basin water resources plan, an application for a grant to assist in financing the construction of treatment works in such basin or portion thereof made under any other provision of law shall not be approved by the head of any other Federal agency, by the Appalachian Regional Commission or other regional commissions established pursuant to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 unless it substantially conforms, in the judgment of the Secretary, to such plan.

"(h)(1) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (b), the Secretary is authorized to pay such expenses of each planning agency as are necessary to implement formulation of the plan. Each planning agency shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Secretary.

"(2) There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary

to carry out the provisions of this section, which sums shall be available until expended.

"(i) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'planning agency' includes, but is not limited to, interstate agencies, or commissions established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress.

"(2) the term 'local, State, or interstate agencies' include States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of a State, public corporate bodies, public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, Indian tribes, conservancy districts, interstate agencies, or commissions established by or pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress.

"(3) the term 'construction' includes preliminary planning to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of treatment works, the engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action necessary to the construction of treatment works; and the erection, building, acquisition, alteration, remodeling, improvement, or extension of treatment works; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of treatment works.

"(4) the term 'river basin' includes, but is not limited to, land areas drained by a river and its tributaries, coastal waters, estuaries, bays, and lakes.

"(j) Nothing in this section shall be construed to displace, supersede, limit, or modify any interstate compact or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or two or more States and the Federal Government, or to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, the Permanent Engineering Board and the United States operating entity or entities established pursuant to the Columbia River Basin Treaty, signed at Washington, January 17, 1961, or the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

"COST AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY

"SEC. 13. In order to provide the basis for evaluating programs authorized by this Act, the development of new programs, and to furnish the Congress with the information necessary for authorization of appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1972, the Secretary, in cooperation with State water pollution control agencies and other water pollution control planning agencies, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of carrying out the provisions of this Act; a comprehensive study of the economic impact on affected units of government of the cost of installation of treatment facilities; and a comprehensive analysis of the national requirements for and cost of treating municipal, industrial, and other effluent to attain such water quality standards as established pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, or applicable State law. The Secretary shall submit such detailed estimate and such comprehensive study of such cost for the five-year period beginning July 1, 1968, to the Congress no later than January 10, 1968, such study to be updated each year thereafter."

SEC. 13. Section 13 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1152; 33 U.S.C. 407) is amended by inserting after the word "thereby" in the second proviso the following: "and whenever the Secretary of the Interior determines that it is consistent with the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.),".

SEC. 14. The Oil Pollution Act, 1924 (43 Stat. 604), is amended to read as follows:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Oil Pollution Act, 1924'.

"SEC. 2. When used in this Act, unless the context otherwise requires—

"(a) 'oil' means oil of any kind or in any form, including fuel oil, sludge, and oil refuse;

"(b) 'person' means an individual, company, partnership, corporation, or association; any owner, operator, master, officer, or employee of a vessel; any owner, operator, officer, or employee of a shore installation or terminal facility; and any officer, agency, or employee of the United States;

"(c) 'terminal facility' means any pier, wharf, dock, or similar structure to which a vessel may be moored or secured, or upon, within, or contiguous to which equipment and appurtenances dealing with oil may be located, including, but not limited to, storage tanks, pipelines, pumps, and oil trucks;

"(d) 'shore installation' means any building, group of buildings, manufacturing or industrial plants, or equipment of any kind adjacent to the navigable waters of the United States, upon, within, or contiguous to which equipment and appurtenances dealing with oil may be located, including, but not limited to, storage tanks, pipelines, pumps, and oil trucks;

"(e) 'discharge' means any accidental, negligent, or willful spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, or other release of liquid; and

"(f) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 3. (a) Except in case of emergency imperiling life or property, or unavoidable accident, collision, or stranding, and except as otherwise permitted by regulations prescribed by the Secretary as hereinafter authorized, it is unlawful for any person to discharge or permit the discharge from any boat, vessel, shore installation, or terminal facility of oil by any method, means, or manner into or upon the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters and adjoining shorelines of the United States.

"(b) Any person discharging or permitting the discharge of oil from any boats, vessel, shore installation, or terminal facility into or upon the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters of the United States shall remove the same from the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters, and adjoining shorelines immediately. If such person fails to do so, the Secretary may remove the oil or may arrange for its removal, and such person shall be liable to the United States, in addition to the penalties prescribed in section 4 of this Act, for all costs and expenses reasonably incurred by the Secretary in removing the oil from the coastal, interstate, or navigable waters, and adjoining shorelines of the United States. When the oil has been discharged from a boat or vessel, these costs and expenses shall constitute a lien on such vessel which may be recovered in proceedings by libel in rem. When the oil has been discharged from a shore installation or terminal facility, these costs and expenses may be recovered in proceedings by libel in personam.

"(c) The Secretary may prescribe regulations which—

"(1) permit the discharge of oil from boats or vessels in such quantities, under such conditions, and at such times and places as in his opinion will not be deleterious to health or marine life or a menace to navigation, or dangerous to persons or property engaged in commerce on such waters;

"(2) relate to the loading, handling, and unloading of oil on or contiguous to boats or vessels, shore installations, and terminal facilities; and

"(3) relate to the removal or cost of removal, or both, of oil from the interstate or navigable waters of the United States.

"SEC. 4. (a) Any person who violates section 3(a) of this Act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment for each offense.

"(b) Any boat or vessel other than a boat or vessel owned and operated by the United States from which oil is discharged in violation of section 3(a) of this Act shall be liable for a penalty of not more than $10,000. Clearance of a boat or vessel liable for this penalty from a port of the United States may be withheld until the penalty is paid. The penalty shall constitute a lien on the boat or vessel which may be recovered in proceedings by libel in the district court of the United States for any district within which the boat or vessel may be.

"(c) The owner or operator of a shore installation or terminal facility from which oil is discharged in violation of section 3(a) of this Act shall be liable for a penalty of not more than $10,000 which may be recovered in proceedings by libel in personam in the district court of the United States of the district within which the shore installation or terminal facility is located.

"(d) Any person who violates any regulation prescribed under section 3(c) of this Act shall, if there has been no discharge of oil, be liable for a penalty of not more than $100.

"SEC. 5. The Commandant of the Coast Guard may, subject to the provisions of section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U.S.C. 239), suspend or revoke a license issued to the master or other licensed officer of any boat or vessel found violating the provisions of section 3 of this Act.

"SEC. 6. In the administration of this Act the Secretary may, with the consent of the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Secretary of the Army, make use of the organization, equipment, and agencies including engineering, clerical, and other personnel employed by the Coast Guard or the Department of the Army for the preservation and protection of interstate or navigable waters. And for better enforcement of the provisions of this Act, the officers and agents of the United States in charge of river and harbor improvements, and persons employed under them by authority of the Secretary of the Army, and persons employed by the Secretary, and officers of the customs and Coast Guard of the United States shall have power and authority and it shall be their duty to swear out process and to arrest and take into custody, with or without process, any person who may violate any of said provisions: *Provided*, That no person shall be arrested without process for a violation not committed in the presence of some one of the aforesaid officials: *And provided further*, That whenever any arrest is made under the provisions of this Act, the person so arrested shall be brought forthwith before a commissioner, judge, or court of the United States for examination of the offenses alleged against him and such commissioner, judge, or court shall proceed in respect thereto as authorized by law in cases of crimes against the United States.

"SEC. 7. This Act shall be in addition to other laws for the preservation and protection of interstate or navigable waters and shall not be construed as repealing, modifying, or in any manner affecting the provisions of such laws."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1966, REAFFIRMS NEED OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, despite the efforts of some circles in this country to play down the annual Captive Nations Week because imperialist Moscow disapproves of it, the 1966 observance has set new records in citizen understanding of the captive nations and in nationwide participation in the event. In contrast to previous years, 36 Governors, or over 75 percent of our States, proclaimed the week. Mayors of all major cities, from Boston to Miami and from Seattle to Los Angeles, likewise proclaimed it, as well as those of numerous smaller cities. In addition, new committees have sprung up, as in Tampa, Fla., and more in New York City. More radio and TV coverage has been given to the week than ever before, and the variety of the observance, ranging from receptions to parades, has expanded considerably under the direction of the National Captive Nations Committee.

Throughout the week emphasis was placed on the need for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. It is evident that, at the grass roots, our people do not buy the illusion that the captive nations, the peoples themselves, can be brushed under the rug while the deceptive policy of peaceful coexistence is being relentlessly pursued by Moscow and its Red syndicate. A heavy moral burden rests on our leadership to sustain the freedom aspirations of all the captive nations and, at the same time, to uphold the truths about the captivity of these peoples. Anything short of this plays into the political warfare hands of the modern totalitarians in the Red empire. And the best and most effective way to counteract the soporific effects of Moscow's strategy is to establish now a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

The extent of the 1966 observance can be easily gleaned from these selected items which I request be appended to my remarks. They include:

First. A proclamation by Mayor Joseph W. Barr and his deputy, David Stahl, of Pittsburgh, Pa.

Second. The report of the July 31 Free China Weekly on Vice President C. K. Yen's Captive Nations Week address.

Third. The Newark Evening News, July 18, on "Captive Nations Sting Lost," followed by a reply by Mr. Donald L. Miller, executive director of the National Captive Nations Committee, and an editorial "Hope for Freedom" and a report "Will Join in Prayer."

Fourth. The August 1–15 reports in the Ukrainian Bulletin on "Captive Nations Week Observed Throughout the Nation," "Pamphlet on Captive Nations," "Archpastoral Appeal of the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn," "Radio Discussion on Captive Nations," "Urges Support of All Captive Nations," "Discussion on Captive Nations at Georgetown University Forum."

Fifth. The July 21 issue of the Wanderer, a national Catholic weekly, on "Captive Nations Week."

Sixth. The published statement of Dr. Guy D. Newman, president of Howard Payne College on "Captive Nations Week Step Toward Reducing Red Rule."

Seventh. An editorial on "L.B.J. Signs Captive Nations Proclamation" in the August 1966 issue of Freedom's Facts.

Eighth. Another editorial on "Captive Nations Week" in the Hairenik Weekly of July 7.

Ninth. The appeal of the Anti-Communist International on Captive Nations Week.

Tenth. An editorial in the July 21 issue of the Hartford Times on "A Noble Cause Lost?"

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF PITTSBURGH

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossakia, Croatia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86–90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support of the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence: Now,

Therefore, I David Stahl, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Deputy Mayor of the City of Pittsburgh, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 17, 1966 be observed as Captive Nations Week in Pittsburgh, and call upon the citizens of this city to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Done this day, July 22, 1966 at the Office of the Mayor, in witness whereof I have hereunto set my signature and cause the Seal of the City of Pittsburgh to be affixed.

JOSEPH M. BARR,
Mayor.

DAVID STAHL,
Deputy Mayor.

[From Free China Weekly]

MAINLAND ANTI-RED WAVE WILL HASTEN PEIPING'S DOWNFALL: YEN

Vice President C. K. Yen said last week that the current purge on the Chinese mainland shows that intellectuals, students and Communist party cadres under the Communists "are fed up with Communism."

"In many ways, they have also manifested their profound interest in Dr. Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People as well as the traditional Chinese civilization and culture," he said. "Such a change of loyalty constitutes a direct threat to the very survival of the Communists, and, in a sense, forces the Chinese Communists to resort to terroristic measures," Yen said.

Yen was speaking to a "Captive Nations Week" mass rally held in the Taipei City Hall on July 23.

Pointing out that the downfall of the Chinese Communists is imminent despite their ruthless suppression of the people's resistance, Yen said:

"Therefore, this is the right moment for us, the people of the Republic of China, to free our fellow citizens on the mainland. This is also the right moment for all the freedom-loving peoples to destroy the common enemy."

In asserting the Vietnam war as "being waged for the purpose of safeguarding the freedom and liberty of the whole mankind," the Vice President urged immediate aid to the anti-Communist forces in Vietnam by free peoples "to shatter the chains on their enslaved brethren entrapped in the captive nations."

The rally, attended by 2,000 people, was presided over by Ku Cheng-kang, president of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League (APACL), China Chapter.

Chung Yul Kim, chairman of APACL council, and Dr. Anthony Kubec, chairman of the department of history of the University of Dallas, in Texas, also spoke at the meeting.

The rally adopted a declaration in support of the emancipation of all enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

It also sent messages to President Chiang Kai-shek, U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson, the government and people of South Vietnam, the allied forces fighting in Vietnam, all captive nations, and the suffering masses on the Chinese mainland.

"CAPTIVE NATIONS" STING LOST

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is not exactly shouting the fact, but he has designated this week as "Captive Nations Week," in keeping with a joint Congressional resolution of 1959 that the White House wishes had never been passed.

Every third week in July, Congress "authorizes and requests" the President to issue a proclamation and to set aside seven days to take note of the world's captive nations.

When the resolution was originally approved, it caused something of a stir because Vice President Richard M. Nixon was in Moscow at the time, and President Eisenhower's proclamation accused the Soviet government of "imperialistic and aggressive" policies.

Nixon, on his return, said Nikita S. Khrushchev told him "This resolution stinks."

Eisenhower took the congressional resolution seriously.

As drafted for Congress by Lev E. Dobriansky, a Georgetown University professor and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., the original resolution said "Communist imperialism" had enslaved "a substantial part of the world's population" and that this "makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence."

In 1959 and in 1960, Eisenhower dutifully accused the Soviet government of enslaving various Communist nations, but both President Kennedy and President Johnson, in their proclamations, dropped the reference to the Soviet Union.

This year's proclamation, issued without any fanfare two weeks ago, bears little resemblance to the harsh-sounding 1959 resolution.

Johnson limited himself to saying that "freedom and justice are the inalienable rights of all peoples."

Prof. Dobriansky, who was an official in Barry Goldwater's 1964 campaign, is not very happy about the way the Democratic administrations have soft-pedaled the Captive Nations Week resolution.

"High on the priority list in Red psychopolitical warfare is the downgrading and eventual elimination of Captive Nations Week," he wrote in the current issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly.

Both the White House and the State Department believe there are better ways of dealing with Communist nations than trading invectives with them. The current U.S. policy is to take advantage of the growing autonomy of the various Communist nations—and deal with them wherever possible.

This "building bridges" policy calls for a gradual increase in commerce and cultural exchanges and more encouragement to tourism. The long-range hope is that the liberal, less doctrinaire forces in these countries will come to the fore—thereby improving the life of the peoples of these nations, and indirectly, increasing their freedom.

Dobriansky says this is "foggy and murky talk . . . figments of confused minds." In the words of the old Goldwater campaign, he calls for "positive victory in the Cold War." His only recommendation, however, seems to be a complete isolation of the Communist lands—something that hardly is possible today.

A troublesome aspect of Captive Nations Week is the actual list of nations that Congress considered "captive" in 1959. Presumably Cuba would be a latecomer. This is the list—and quiz yourself if you can place them all geographically:

Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Romania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Viet Nam.

Presumably some top scholars would have trouble with White Ruthenia, Idel-Ural, and Cossackia. They might even doubt that some of them ever were "nations" in the sense that they had viable governments.

Some Russian emigres have been unhappy that the Russians were not listed as "captives." And various Yugoslav emigres have complained about their homeland's omission. Actually, Congress appended an "and others" to the list, so it is possible to add any nation at any time.

JULY 20, 1966.

Mr. BERNARD GWERTZMAN,
The Washington Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GWERTZMAN: Thank you for writing about Captive Nations. We agree, at least, that our best hope of peace is to bring liberal forces to the fore in captive nations and thus increase the freedom of the peoples. As their freedom increases, we can hope that the aggression of their governments internally and externally will decrease. So there is no conflict on goals.

There are many disagreements on means and we feel that these deserve widespread discussion. Men who graduate from college, go into State, travel the embassy route, and end at the policy level have one kind of experience and point of view to offer. Former Ambassadors, government officials, businessmen, housewives, students, labor leaders who lived under Communist rule and escaped as refugees have a different, and, we believe, more realistic, kind of experience to provide.

We were very pleased with the President's proclamation this year, especially since he released it on July 8, the anniversary of the ringing of the Liberty Bell and first public announcement of the Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia in 1776. This symbolism will be noted throughout the Communist Empire. Our Declaration, if you recall, was made not for Americans alone, but in the name of all mankind. During Captive Nations Week we reaffirm that stand for the just aspirations for freedom of peoples throughout all captive nations.

If you are a materialist and believe man has no soul and no mind aside from what spirit and thought created by his physical environment, then this means nothing to you. But if you believe, as we do, that man has a spirit and a mind and that both can work to change environment to fit any image man choses, then both the Declaration of Independence and the Captive Nations Week Resolution have great significance.

Then, let's discuss the ways of building bridges to individual freedom and national independence, not only bridges made of consumer goods but ones of the spirit, as well. We are carrying on one half of a dialogue. So far there are not many answers from the other side. But these, in time, will increase as people become convinced that freedom and independence are not merely aspirations they share with us, but are human rights—civil rights, if you will—which people working together can gain for themselves. One day, we can all hope, we will be carrying on free dialogue on every subject. The Iron and Bamboo Curtains will be gone. The Berlin wall will be gone. The Cold War will be over.

May I add—in fact, I cannot resist it—that first, Russia is, in a sense, a captive nation—a fact which Khrushchev recognized without being told and so was motivated to attack Mr. Nixon on this issue in 1959 by pointing out Russians in a park and shouting—There are our captives. Where are their chains? Lenin seized Russia from moderate parliamentarian socialists, who had overthrown the Czar by means of military coup d'etat.

Second, Yugoslavia is not a nation but a country composed of three main nations—Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. These, too, must be considered captive peoples since they are forced to live under an absolute, totalitarian Communist Party as President Tito just recently has demonstrated. Likewise Czechoslovakia is a country made up from the Czech and Slovak nations, as anyone who carries on dialogues with these two peoples quickly discovers.

Sincerely,

DONALD L. MILLER,
Executive Director.

[From the Newark Evening News, July 18, 1966]

HOPE FOR FREEDOM

Imperialism being a sin for which it continually reproaches the West, the Soviet Union naturally is pained by the observance in the United States, by presidential proclamation, of Captive Nations Week.

Mikhail Suslov, a Soviet spokesman, last year called the observance "particularly repulsive," and from his standpoint it would be. For Captive Nations Week keeps the world from forgetting the Russian imperialism that engulfed the Baltic states and the Soviet military force that keeps other Eastern countries in subjection.

Imperialism has become an anachronism everywhere except in communism's self-righteous sphere. And Captive Nations Week offers its victims a spark of hope that the tide of history will one day restore their freedom and independence.

WILL JOIN IN PRAYER—NEW JERSEY CHURCHES TO HAVE SERVICES FOR OPPRESSED

Churches of various denominations throughout the state will observe the beginning of Captive Nations Week today with services in which prayers will be offered for the return of democracy behind the Iron Curtain.

The week has been dedicated to Iron Curtain countries by President Johnson.

A sign over the entrance of City Hall here will ask residents to remember citizens of the nations taken over by communism mostly following World War II.

There are an estimated 50,000 refugees from these countries in New Jersey. They include Hungarians, many of whom fled here after the uprising in 1956. Others are from Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia the Ukraine and Byelorussia.

IN MANY STATES

Captive Nations Week is observed annually with church services, and in numerous states with demonstrations and rallies.

The observances last year were described by Mikhail Suslov, a major party theoretician in the Soviet Union, as "particularly repulsive."

Said Nicholas L. Chirovsky, spokesman for the Newark and vicinity branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America: "Suslov's statement indicates that the celebration of Captive Nations Week to some extent gives a shot in the arm to the people of the countries behind the Iron Curtain. We hope in this way to keep the spark of hope in the hearts of those to whom liberty is denied."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVED THROUGHOUT THE NATION

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The week of July 17 to July 23, 1966 marked the 8th national observance of Capitive Nations Week with observances, gatherings, rallies and public manifestations held in all major U.S. cities, and in many countries of the free world.

Nationwide observances in the United States were sponsored by the National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC), headed by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, in conjunction with many American national and ethnic organizations.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY URGE SUPPORT FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS

In Washington both President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY issued special proclamations urging the American people to lend their support to the just cause of the captive nations everywhere.

President Johnson, in his proclamation said that "the United States of America from its founding as a nation has firmly subscribed to the principles of national independence and human liberty," and since the "basic rights are presently denied to many peoples throughout the world," he appealed to and urged the American people "to give devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

In a similar vein Vice President HUMPHREY stressed the importance of the Captive Nations Week cause and expressed a belief in the forthcoming day of liberation of all who are presently subjugated by Communist tyranny.

CONCERN EXPRESSED IN U.S. CONGRESS

During the Captive Nations Week many U.S. Senators and Congressmen issued appropriate statements expressing support of the captive nations in their struggle for freedom and national independence.

Prior to Captive Nations Week 1966 Dr. Dobriansky, as President of the National Captive Nations Committee, sent an appeal to every U.S. Senator and every Congressman urging them to participate in this year's observance of Captive Nations Week and to give their full and sympathetic support to the cause of the captive nations. Recalling last year's attack on the Captive Nations Week observance in this country by Mikhail Suslov, top Soviet ideologist, Dr. Dobriansky expressed hope that U.S. legislators will take pride in speaking out in behalf of the freedom aspirations and struggle of all the captive nations in Central Europe, the USSR, Asia and Cuba.

PASTORAL LETTER BY UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC METROPOLITAN

In Philadelphia, Pa. the Most Rev. Ambrose Senyshyn, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States, issued a special Pastoral Letter on the occasion of the Captive Nations

Week observance and urged the clergy and the faithful of his Archdiocese to say special prayers for the speedy liberation of the captive nations.

GOVERNORS AND MAYORS ACTIVE

In many States of the Union and in cities throughout the nation special proclamations were issued by Governors and Mayors urging their respective citizens to observe Captive Nations Week and thus support the captive peoples everywhere. In New York, Washington, Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, Cleveland, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Tucson, Phoenix, Omaha, Miami, and many other cities, special manifestations were held by local Captive Nations Committees. All Branches and Member Organizations of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America took part in these observances and in many localities led in the preparation and implementation of special programs.

PAMPHLET ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Prior to the "Captive Nations Week 1966" 1,300 copies of *The Traditional Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope,* a reprint of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky's article from *The Ukrainian Quarterly* (Vol. XXII, No. 2, Summer, 1966) were distributed by the UCCA office in New York and the National Captive Nations Committee office in Washington. Recipients of the pamphlet were all U.S. Senators and Congressmen, all Governors, all foreign missions to the U.N. and major U.S. newspapers, radio and TV stations throughout the country.

ARCHPASTORAL APPEAL OF THE MOST REVEREND AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O.S.B.M., ARCHBISHOP AND METROPOLITAN OF PHILADELPHIA, ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1966

Throughout the course of mankind's history evil has made its scene in diverse ways. We read of the woes of war which many of you have personally endured; epidemics; massacres; slavery; persecutions and serfdom. For us, however, such evils have passed. But another evil exists in our day and age which has stretched out its red veil over captive nations behind the iron, the bamboo, and the sugar curtains and threatens the free world. This evil is none other than atheistic communism.

We are grateful to the Lord that the United States is aware of the fate of captive nations. America is convinced of the dreadful fate of many nations. Thus the joint resolution of Congress, ratified by both the House of Representatives and the Senate on July 17, 1959 sanctioned the President of the United States to issue an annual proclamation designating the third week of the month of July as Captive Nations Week until such time when all the nations of the world attain freedom and independence. This proclamation recalls for everyone the frightful picture of communist tyranny over captive peoples.

The question can be properly asked in this twentieth century why so many peoples suffer under the oppression of the hammer and the sickle. Why did communist authorities starve millions of Ukrainians to death? Why did so many sons and daughters of the Ukraine perish in dungeons and the taiga or swampy Siberian forests? Why is the forced resettlement of the youth of Ukraine in the remote regions of the USSR being tolerated by the world? Why are hundreds of thousands of innocent people undergoing the tortures of the secret police, brainwashing and other cruelties? Why did the communist regime liquidate the Ukrainian Catholic Church and other churches in Ukraine? Why are millions of refugees not permitted to return to their homelands? Why does the communist regime, through its agents, cause unrest and confusion in the free world? Why does the communist underground nurture animosity and dissension among Ukrainian organizations in the free world? And the continuous assault upon the Ukrainian Catholic Church and her leadership, especially here in the United States?

To all of these questions there is but one answer, and that is because the communist system is essentially evil. Our Divine Savior said that an evil tree cannot bear good fruit (Mt. 6, 18). Even though the communist regime has recently opened its doors to tourists there are untold restrictions as to what they are permitted to see and not to see. They have no real opportunity to see a true picture of communist tyranny because they are restrained and prevented from obtaining an objective evaluation of conditions as they are in the USSR. The Vicars of Christ have spoken their part about the evil of communism and have reaffirmed the position that communism is essentially evil, because it casts away Divine laws and Christian mortality. It deprives men of human rights and the very dignity of humanity.

Thus, in our times, the petition in the Lord's Prayer: ". . . deliver us from evil," has a special significance and need, since Captive Nations Week is only one small step to liberation of the Ukrainian and other captive peoples from the shackles of communism. It hardly sufficies but to emphasize the communistic evil. What is really necessary are sincere prayers and good works, consonant with the words of the Ukrainian poet, Bohdan Lepky: "It isn't tears we need, but rather power of spirit."

We must pray for those who are in captivity, apparently forgotten by the world and dying far from loved ones at the hands of henchmen. Let us pray for the godless traitors and tormentors of Christ's Church, so that persecuting Sauls might become liberating Pauls. Let us pray also for ourselves, so that selfish materialism, which surrounds us everywhere, would not ensnare our hearts and make us soulless monsters, deaf to the crying needs of our people.

We trust that Captive Nations Week will stir consciences to works of mercy and help for the sick, old displaced persons and those behind the iron curtain who are in desperate need of our aid. Many of them live in hunger, cold and want.

Therefore, I appeal to the hearts of Catholic Ukrainians, that Captive Nations Week be a time of prayer and good deeds for our needy brothers and sisters, whose fate was less gracious than ours.

I direct all the Very Reverend and Reverend clergy to take up a collection during Liturgies in all churches of the Archeparchy on Sunday, July 17, 1966.

I ask and implore all the faithful to make their contribution generous, as the needs of the poor and indigent are great. Disheartening letters of those in dire straits to the Ukrainian Catholic Committee for Refugees in Philadelphia bear this out. Hearken to the words of Sacred Scripture: "It is more blessed to give, than to receive." (Acts 20, 25).

RADIO DISCUSSION ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

On July 10–11, 1966, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, President of the UCCA, and Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI of Illinois participated in a radio discussion on "Captive Nations Week." The discussion was carried over four radio stations in Illinois and Indiana.

URGES SUPPORT OF ALL CAPTIVE NATIONS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following two letters by Miss Vera A. Dowhan of Washington, D.C., are self-explanatory. The first was sent to The Washington Post, The Evening Star and The Washington Daily News and stresses the national importance of the captive nations. The second letter, sent to the N.Y. Daily News, correct the impression made by an editorial in said paper which emphasized only a few captive nations, and bypassed the majority of them.)

In the course of our Nation's history, perhaps no Congressional resolution has shown more substantive proof of this country's position as a vanguard of freedom than the Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86–90) passed by Congress in 1959. And, perhaps too, no resolution has been more grievously attacked by anti-freedom governmental systems. But quite possibly, the greatest pain in freedom's side is the one inflicted by some confused Americans who through lack of knowledge as pertains to these peoples—historic, geographic, ethnographic, linguistic—fail or refuse to recognize the great value potential of the resolution's context. To them, the freedom-aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations behind the Iron, Bamboo and Sugar Curtains are more an occult phenomena than a hope of eventual reality. To speak in behalf of these millions of beleaguered political slaves is to be type-cast as "political," "partisan" or even "radical." Since when has the pursuit of freedom become synonymous with any of these?

With the signing of the first proclamation in 1959 by the President of the United States designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, and in every Presidential proclamation thereafter, the message carries the same rich overtone—that freedom-loving Americans join in appropriate ceremonies and recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom, and that these proclamations and commemorations be continued until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the Red world. Within recent years these commemorative ceremonies have gone beyond our shores. The Week is now also observed in countries of Europe and Asia.

This year, July 17–23 marks the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week. Adding impetus to this yearly celebration is the date on which the 1966 proclamation was signed, July 8, the date of the ringing of the Liberty Bell when the Declaration of Independence was made public in 1776. Additional import augmenting both the proclamation and the date, was the President's signing of the Congressional measure creating the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission at the same time.

That the freedom-aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations have been associated simultaneously with the maxims of the American Revolution and our Declaration of Independence only lends magnitude to the cardinal virtue of justice. For Public Law 86–90, the terms "political," "partisan" and "radical" fast lose their vengeful implications as, slowly but surely, the scales of justice outweigh tyranny.

Your editorial of July 8, "Captive Nations Week," was gravely inaccurate and misleading. The conduct of the annual Captive Nations Week observances has been almost entirely undertaken by the National Captive Nations Committee, headquartered in Washington, D.C. If you would but consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in July and August of every year, you would find all the necessary data substantiating this fact. As for the Assembly of Captive European Nations demonstrating any real sympathy for the numerous captive non-Russian nations in the USSR, this is virtually nil. The few captive nations in Central Europe for which ACEN exclusively speaks, and this in an emigre rather than an American voice, constitute just a small segment of the entire family of captive nations. Those in the Soviet Union, in Asia and in Cuba, far exceed the few in Central Europe.

DISCUSSION ON CAPTIVE NATIONS AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY FORUM

WASHINGTON, D.C.—On June 28, 1966 a roundtable panel discussion was held on the captive nations at the Georgetown University TV and radio forum, with three panelists

and specialists on the problem taking part. Those participating in the discussion, entitled "Captive Nations: Forgotten?", were: Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, and President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA) and also President of the National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC); Lt. Col. Philip J. Corso (Ret.), Military Analyst and Assistant to the Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization Policy, and Frank van der Linden; Wallace Fanning was the moderator.

The discussion ran along the following lines:

Since 1959, when the Captive Nations Week Resolution was passed by the U.S. Congress, Moscow and its Red totalitarian associates and puppets have persistently denounced the resolution and called for its repeal.

During the 1965 Captive Nations Week Observance, the top Russian ideologist and member of the Soviet Presidium, Mikhail Suslov, had this to say: "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogy of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke."

Is one an "imperialistic chieftain" in the United States when he supports an act of Congress directed toward the eventual freedom of all the captive nations? What is it in the Resolution that has produced this unprecedented scare in Russia's Kremlin over this entire period? How is Captive Nations Week related to current developments in the Red Empire, to Vietnam, to the so-called policy of building bridges of understanding, and to America's posture in the Cold War? These are fundamental questions which the panelists discussed during the program.

[From the Wanderer, July 21, 1966]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(Reprinted from the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. XXII, No. 2, summer, 1966, New York, N.Y.)

(By Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman, National Captive Nations Committee)

Confusion, misdirected thinking, and the repetition of old errors dominate the current scene in the United States and thus much of the Free World. These dominant trends are, in part, the logical consequences of the superb maneuver engineered by Moscow in the last decade under the deceptive banner of "peaceful co-existence." Continue to build and strengthen the empire within, while all feasible forces are utilized to undermine the enemy without has been the practical essence of this highly successful maneuver. The functionaries in Moscow's Agitprop have good reason to gloat over the results and doubtless are banking on even phenomenal successes in the near future.

The needless mess in Vietnam, the NATO rupture, self-paralyzing absurdities about "arrogant power," "escalation," and "containment" again, the steady over-all Red penetrations in Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, the repeated softening-up process on Communism in our own body politic, and the insidious deterioration of our national will for positive victory, whether military or psycho-political, are only a few evidences of the new pattern of confusion and old errors. As though the lessons of U.S. trade with the Axis Powers in World War II were never learned, the present drive for easy trade with the Red Empire is another point of evidence. Self-nurtured illusions about "national independence" among the so-called satellites in Central Europe, "the evaporation of the Cold War," a materially explosive Peking-Moscow showdown, and the spread of peace-orienting "capitalism" in the empire also have their able precedents in the illusions of the 30's, when the nature of modern imperio-colonialist totalitarianism eluded the understanding of that generation.

What in all these years has been a cardinal objective of the totalitarian Red Syndicate is a progressive Free World disinterest in the genuine liberation and independence of the captive nations, the oppressed peoples themselves, as against the Red States dominated by totalitarian Communist Parties. The enormous advantages of achieving this should be obvious: easier consolidation of the empire, stronger posture for Cold War successes in the Free World, and the moral and political demolishment of Free World democracies. This Red objective, shared by all in the syndicate, is a crucial and integral part of Red psycho-political warfare which Brezhnev, in his report to the 23rd Party Congress last March, lauded as the prime, unsurpassed weapon wielded by "a political army of revolutionaries for class struggles." (Leonid Brezhnev, Report to 23rd Party Congress, Pravda, March 31st, 1966.) The heavy emphasis placed at the Congress on the "great, complex art" in "leadership of class struggle"—meaning the imperio-colonialist art of psycho-political warfare—is unmistakable as to what we can expect in the years ahead.

High on the priority list in Red psycho-political warfare is the downgrading and eventual elimination of Captive Nations Week. This has been evident since 1959, and unfortunately some in this country have sought to assist Moscow and the syndicate in realizing this aim. One major element that they hope to capitalize on is a protracted American ignorance of the many captive nations in the Red Empire, particularly in the U.S.S.R. Another is the significance of the Week in the current struggle, measured especially by their own reactions. The mountain of evidence formed since 1959 clearly shows that Captive Nations Week is a deep thorn in the side of the Red totalitarians and their efforts to expand the Red Empire chiefly through the art of psycho-political warfare. As in many other cases, they depend on apathy, distraction, indifference, ignorance, and even educated stupidity to accomplish their work for them.

THE ABC'S OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

When this writer wrote the Captive Nations Week Resolution in June, 1959, little did he appreciate the extent to which elements of misunderstanding and cultured ignorance can contribute to Moscow's ends. A sterling example of this was an editorial in a Washington paper that was promptly refuted by the writer. ("Irritating The Bear," *The Washington Post*, July 24th, 1959; author's reply, July 29th, 1959.) In 1964, another editorial attack against the captive nations in the same organ evoked delight and praise in Moscow. (Izvestia, July 15th, 1964.) To identify the misleading and disinforming sources among us and, at the same time, to prevent Red manipulation of such misguiding opinions, it is most essential for every American to become familiar with the ABC's of Captive Nations Week.

The Week is sponsored each year by the National Captive Nations Committee with headquarters at 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. The Honorable Herbert C. Hoover was the honorary chairman of the committee from 1960 to 1964; Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, has occupied this position since 1965. Over one-third of the House of Representatives and close to one-third of the U.S. Senate are members of NCNC. Every year half of the Governors issue Captive Nations Week proclamations, as does every Mayor in each of our major cities.

NCNC is supported by voluntary contributions from individuals and organizations. Its activities are mainly supported by local Captive Nations Committees that extend from Boston to Miami, Washington, D.C. to San Francisco. Almost every major city has a committee made up of citizens who are quite versed in the ABC's of the Week. In the past few years the movement has extended overseas so that observances now are held in Free China, West Germany, Turkey, and Sweden. Much of this steady growth is regularly noted in the U.S. Congress which legislated the Week in 1959.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

It is often curious that some commentators who write about the Week give every evidence of never having read the resolution and law upon which it is based. For example, one writer has this to say: "When I was in Moscow during the October Party Congress, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes." (Stewart Alsop, "The Berlin Crisis: Khrushchev's Weakness," *Saturday Evening Post*, December 16th, 1961.) As I pointed out in another article, this comment is "a gem of fact, illogic, and fiction." (Lev. E. Dobriansky, "Soviet Russian Imperio-Colonialism And The Free World," NATO's Fifteen Nations, September, 1963.) Fact, the Russians violent denunciation; illogic, the supposed innocuousness of the resolution; fiction, Congress' passing it every year to attract minority votes. Now, to see how writers can misguide, read the resolution which is Public Law 86–90, one of the ABC's:

"CAPTIVE NATIONS RESOLUTION

"Whereas, the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

"Whereas, this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

"Whereas, the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful co-existence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

"Whereas, since 1918, the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian Communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

"Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam and others; and

"Whereas, these submerged nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence, and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist or other religious freedoms and of their individual liberties; and

"Whereas, it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of the conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

"Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

"Whereas, it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples, through an appropriate and official means, the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

"The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS: WHO'S NEXT?

The reader will observe that in its fifth paragraph the resolution contains an open-end clause as concerns the enumeration of captive nations. In 1959, after a year of disputes with certain House members who were offered the first opportunity to consider the measure, the writer found it necessary to insert "and others" in order to allow for new captive nations, such as Cuba in 1960, and to gradually familiarize many segments of our public with some old ones. Here, too, the force of stubborn and narrow preconception had to be combatted.

Perspective is the usual, lacking quality in the thinking of those who draw mythical distinctions between "fat" and "lean" Communists, "liberal" and "doctrinaire" Communists, and "independent" and "Soviet-dominated" Red States. Similar distinctions were concocted in the 30's with respect to the imperio-colonialist totalitarians of that period, and easy trade, cultural exchange and other devices were also employed then in the interest of world peace. The list below clearly shows the unitary base of the Red Syndicate; it shows the phenomenal success of the Red imperio-colonialist totalitarians, building an unprecedented empire in the span of less than fifty years and with strikingly inferior resources; it also indicates the poverty of U.S. foreign policy, which committed two colossal political blunders in this century (contributing to the power of the Soviet Russian Empire both after World War I and during World War II) and is now on the brink of committing another with East-West trade plans, the Consular Convention and other myopic measures.

There is nothing like success, and this list is the roll call of Red success, primarily in psycho-political warfare. Given the same course of U.S. foreign policy and the pathetic absence of psycho-political warfare training, this list is bound for extension. Read it carefully and think:

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS—WHO'S NEXT?

Country and people and year of Communist domination	
Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasia	1920
Ukraine	1920
Far Eastern Republic	1922
Turkestan	1922
Mongolian People's Republic	1924
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc., in Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czechoslovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

Who's next? South Vietnam? Guinea? Colombia? Congo? Laos? Tanzania? Bolivia? Thailand?

THE ABC'S AND SOME BASIC ISSUES

The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in enabling us to think clearly and responsibly on the issues basic to the security and freedom of our Nation. Some of these issues deserve mention here. One is an intelligent, concentrated effort focussed on the fundamental reality of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. In the United Nations or elsewhere we have done virtually nothing in this fundamental respect. The more the Red totalitarians prattle about American imperialism," the more millions of minds about the world will believe it.

A second basic issue is the formulation of a sensible liberation policy as the best guarantee against both a hot global war and an interminable string of guerrilla wars. This policy, with its almost exclusive emphasis on psycho-political activity and skillful paramilitary engagement, wasn't sufficiently understood in the 50's, and, with the re-emerging discussion on "containment" today, not to speak of further Communist takeover tomorrow, it stands as the real and winning alternative to the policy of patched-up containment. How unrealistic the proponents of containment are can be gleaned from the evident fact that the Red Syndicate leaped over the Maginot-like containment wall years ago, into Cuba in our Hemisphere, into the Middle East, into Africa and Asia. All this through means of calculated, psycho-political warfare, which is even being applied forthrightly in our own country today.

Thirdly, a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations is necessary for obvious symbolic, legislative, and educational reasons. Equally necessary is the establishment of a Freedom Commission and Academy for psycho-political warfare training.

Other significant issues are the Consular Convention with the U.S.S.R., which should be repudiated by the Senate because it plays into Russian imperio-colonialist hands, and liberalized East-West trade, which should be strongly opposed as a blind repetition of our errors of the 30's and falling into the trap of an over-all Red economic strategy that by now should have been honestly portrayed to our people.

THE UNITARY REALITY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

Through all the foggy and murky talk about "containment," "building bridges of understanding" (with whom?), "detente with the Russians," and similar figments of confused minds, there is one massive, unitary reality that cannot be beclouded by these illusions and exercises in self-deception—the captivity of close to a billion people. These are the people who constitute the captive nations. They are in Red States, but they are not of these States.

Our primary appeal, our foremost efforts should be directed toward the freedom of the captive nations, and not the freedom of action of their unrepresentative Red regimes which will always confront us with syndicated action aimed at the expansion of the Red Empire. The mistakes being made today are in great measure a repetition of those committed in yesteryear. Real, progressive change demands revisions of thought, policy, and action. An ever-broadening knowledge of all the captive nations, particularly those in the U.S.S.R., propels such change—a change for a more secure peace, expanded freedom, and positive victory in the Cold War.

NEWMAN SAYS "CAPTIVE NATIONS" WEEK STEP TOWARD REDUCING RED RULE

Dr. Guy D. Newman, president of Howard Payne College and founder of its Douglas MacArthur Academy of Freedom, thinks that Captive Nations Week may bring about measures which tend to reduce the control of Communist regimes over the captive nations.

Dr. Newman concurs with Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., who conceived the idea of Captive Nations Week, "that the basic truths about Soviet Russian imperialism, genocide and colonialist exploitation in the USSR, as well as the oppression of the captive peoples by their totalitarian governments, are reaching more and more Americans."

Dr. Newman pointed out that the nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week—it started in 1959—has steadily grown, and more than half of our states have issued official proclamations, and practically every major city likewise.

He said that one-third of the House of Representatives and close to one-third of the U.S. Senate have become members of the National Captive Nations Committee, which guides the annual observance.

"This week," Dr. Newman said, "is the time for all Americans to again raise their voices to honor the enslaved half of the world."

"We must," he said, "emphasize again the things that must be done if the long list of captive nations—from Cuba to Hungary to Ukraine to North Viet Nam—is not to be extended and if our sins of omission today are not to result in unnecessary sacrifices of American life and treasure tomorrow."

Chief theme of the special week, Dr. Newman believes, is "the building of bridges of understanding with the captive nations—the people themselves, rather than with the illegitimate regimes that hold them in bondage and politico-economic slavery."

"The Academy of Freedom at HPC is rapidly becoming a symbol of a bridge of understanding that can be one link in the mutual struggle for freedom—their freedom regional and ours preserved," opines Dr. Newman.

"To believe," Dr. Newman said, "that by arriving at understandings with the Communist rulers we shall be furthering the freedom of the captive nations is not only an illusion but also an affront to common political sense."

"In addition," he opined that, "our wishful thinking about the early end of the Cold War—in itself a striking achievement of Moscow's peaceful coexistence policy—has blinded us to the realities of the Red Empire and has exposed us to further illusions about mellowed Communists in Moscow and Warsaw, independent Communists in Bucharest and Belgrade, and the growing nationalism among satellite Communist regimes."

The Captive Nations Week has great educational value, thinks Dr. Newman: "Its observance clearly outlines the perfidy, deception, and longrun dangers of Moscow's peaceful coexistence strategy. This strategy has four dimensions: (1) to lull the West into a state of confusion, friction and demoralization (2) with this advantage of a breather, to consolidate the Communist empire through necessary economic changes, the elimination of all remaining resistance, the suppression of patriotic bourgeois nationalism and the strict maintenance of totalitarian power in the various Communist parties within the Soviet orbit (3) to pursue wars of liberation, in the underdeveloped areas of the free world, and (4) to strive to attain a scientific breakthrough in military and space technology that would facilitate a political blackmail of the West into surrender.

L.B.J. SIGNS CAPTIVE NATIONS PROCLAMATION

President Lyndon B. Johnson timed the signing of the nation's eighth Captive

Nations Week Proclamation for July 8 to coincide with the anniversary of the ringing of the Liberty Bell and the public announcement of our Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia July 8, 1776.

In his proclamation, President Johnson stated that the Congress authorizes the President to issue a Captive Nations Week proclamation each year "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world".

The proclamation declares that "it remains an essential purpose and a fundamental policy of the United States of America to sustain these principles (of national independence and human liberty) and to encourage their realization by all people."

Lest we forget, Public Law 86–90 lists the captive nations as "Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Viet Nam and others." To this list can be added Cuba and Russia herself, the first nation of the world to be captured by the Communists.

Captive Nations Week proclamations have been issued since 1959 by Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Hairenik Weekly, July 7, 1966]

Captive Nations Week

The New England Committee for Captive Nations has released some highly illuminating data on Soviet imperialism (see elsewhere in this issue) which should be made the basis of deep thought and commensurate action during the captive nations week observances this season—July 17–23—in keeping with the President's Proclamation for 1966.

It turns up that the monumental fraud which is called the "Soviet Union" is not a Russian ethnic entity as the concept of nationhood generally is understood, but it is a congerie of once-independent but recently Soviet-enslaved nationalities forcibly held within the Soviet orbit.

This artificially-held imperialistic monstrosity includes such one time independent countries as Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Estonia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Caucasus, Siberia, Turkestan, Ukraine and White Ruthenia. This is the so-called Soviet Union proper which, in essence, is not a union, for union or confederation implies a voluntary merger on the part of constituent elements, but is a despotism of the first order.

But, outside of the limits of this ethnological and political fraud, the Soviet Union wields a power over vast stretches of the globe which, not even Great Britain, in the classic days when "the sun never set on England's frontiers" could ever boast to command.

This vast satellite empire of captives includes Albania, Bulgaria, China (mainland), Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Tibet, and latterly, Cuba.

Another revealing fact which, in the confusion of minds, apparently has managed to escape the attention of the general public, is that "there are in the USSR today only 96,000,000 Russians as against their 119,000,000 non-Russian captives," a grim statistical reality which belies the very nature and the character of the vaunted ethnic solidarity.

This Machiavellian spawn which struts and frets across the globe, believe it or not, contains the staggering total of 820,000,000 people—almost one quarter of the world's population, ruled by the elite of a minority force.

The New England Committee for Captive Nations reveals that, "by actual count, there are 126 different and distinct nationalities in the Soviet Union. . .While the British, French, Belgian and Dutch empires have all but vanished, the Soviet empire continues to grow. The USSR emerged from World War II with a gain of 262,000 square miles with 22,000,000's of people."

"What emerges then," the Committee continues in conclusion, "is the picture of the Greatest Colonial Empire in history and a classic example of the forcible dominance of a majority by a minority."

These are staggering figures and facts which, although known to the historian, should be made the property of the rank and file of the population of the world in order to gain a clear idea of the enormity of the evil which has spawned and grown into incontrollable proportions demanding serious attention of the governments and the peoples of the world who are interested in the promotion of human justice and the preservation of the peace.

Captive Nations Week, on the other hand, has been observed for a number of years, and the question which haunts us is, what progress have we made in the direction of attaining our goal? If these annual observances shall have any meaning at all, we should see some concrete results and the effort should produce some tangible indications of a growing progress that we are making a breach in the Soviet wall.

In the name of social justice and the right to self-determination of nations the Soviet wrought havoc with the Western powers and practically liquidated the so-called colonial nations, demanding freedom and independence to peoples who were hardly prepared for either of these blessings and who were a thousand times better off under colonial rule.

It was high time that we united and turned the tables on the Soviet, the greatest fraud of the twentieth century, and brought about her complete liquidation.

And isn't it time the United States Government were to encourage the formation of the long-delayed "Special Committee on Captive Nations," so that facts, such as adduced by the New England Committee, would become readily available to the general public?

[July 16, 3 P.M., in front of the Soviet Headquarters, center of the international Communist conspiracy and Russian imperialism in the U.S.A.]

An Appeal to All Loyal and Anti-Communist Americans

From 16 to 23 July, we are celebrating in the United States The Week of Captive Nations which are victims of Communist Russian imperialism. Soviet Russia, which spent large amounts of money to help eliminate Western-European colonialism in Asia and Africa, is today the biggest colonial empire in existence. This empire, hiding behind communist ideology, dominates and controls 33 nationalities of different religious, cultural, ethnic, linguistic and historical backgrounds. These peoples, known as "Non-Russians" inside the Soviet Union and as "the Satellites" in Eastern Europe, have been subjugated by force of Russian arms and are controlled from Communist Moscow.

It is imperative that all Americans protest the practices of the Soviet imperialists and call for the self-determination of the peoples now under its heel.

We urge your participation in the demonstration to protest Soviet Imperialism, which will gather in front of the Soviet Embassy, 136 East 67th Street, on July 16 at 3 p.m.

Coexistence is permanent war. No national or international problems can be solved as long as Communist H.Q. in Moscow is not destroyed, and all nations liberated.

Anti-Communist International.

Anti-Communists of the World, Unite! Captive Nations Fight For Liberation Together!

[July 16, 3 p.m., 136 East 67 Street, New York]

In Front of the Soviet Headquarters Center of the International Communist Conspiracy and Russian Imperialism in the U.S.A.

Mass Demonstration and Manifestation.

People of all Captive Nations and Genuine anti-Communists of the United States will make this date Historic!

The United Committee of all Captive Nations.

All Cuban Front.

American Anti-Communists.

Anti-Communist International.

For information contact our 16th July phone service OXford 7–5895 from 8:45 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday to Friday. During the weekends call: GR 5–4789. Mail Address: P.O. Box 1095, New York, N.Y. 10017.

Coexistence is permanent war. No national or international problems can be solved as long as Communist H.Q. in Moscow is not destroyed, and all nations liberated.

Captive Nations Fight for Liberation Together!—Anti-Communists of the World, Unite!

ANTI-COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Why the Anti-Communist International?

Because the Communist conspiracy to enslave the world is an international organization, with headquarters in Moscow.

Because this international conspiracy wishes to isolate the United States as a special "capitalist and imperialist foe" and then bury it; by promoting internal dissensions and dividing our leaders.

Because no serious opposition has yet arisen to curb Communism in either the United States or other parts of the world.

Because national differences still resist a united anti-Communist policy.

Because now is the time for anti-Communist forces all over the world to act—not debate co-existence with or how to combat Communism, but to destroy it.

What is the ACI?

The ACI is a group of dedicated anti-Communists all over the world actually aware of what must be done now to bury Communism before it buries the rest of the world.

What the ACI is doing—

Uniting individual anti-Communists and groups into a vital and aggressive international force to eliminate communism in all forms.

Providing anti-Communist answers to political, economic, and moral questions in all parts of the world.

Furnishing a positive anti-Communist idea and background for peoples behind the Iron Curtain to overthrow the tyranny of Communism.

WHAT THE ACI MEANS TO AMERICA

Anti-Communists all over the world know that co-existence is non-existent. All look to the people of America to use the resources and intelligence that made them world-leaders for help in checking and overthrowing Communism.

Through the ACI, we are taking the advantage of psychological warfare away from the Communists and turning it against them. As the ACI gains strength, other fronts will be opened.

The first step is the anti-Communist international conference for liberation of the captive nations, to build the instruments like, liberty money, militias, and the economics social political programs.

Join the A.C.I.—be a card-carrying A.C.I. Man be a helper here or in any part in the world your help and actions will bring the everlasting peace, will free the budgets of all nations to solve the problems, like poverty, illiteracy, diseases and undevelopment communism and their H. Q. in Moscow must be destroyed, to solve this problems.

Anti-Communist International, P.O. Box 4956, Miami, Fla., P.O. Box, 1095 N.Y. 10017.

Coexistence is permanent war. No national or international problems can be solved as long as Communist H.Q. in Moscow is not destroyed.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Tims, July 21, 1966]

A NOBLE CAUSE LOST?

By proclamation of President Johnson, this is Captive Nations Week. It has become an annual custom in this country to memorialize the countries of Eastern Europe occupied for many years by the Soviet Union or ruled as Soviet satrapies.

Each of those countries is represented in the United States by a large number of refugees and other immigrants, most of whom are now well into middle age. All lament the lost liberties of their martyred nations. Organized into nostalgic and emotional associations, they call on Congress to pass resolutions supporting the eventual liberation of the captive nations; they ask editors to remind the public of the crimes committed against liberty by the Soviet government, and they sponsor special religious and cultural activities in commemoration of the glory and independence long gone.

In the judgment of those who are not emotionally involved, all this seems futile. The captive nations—Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and the rest—were never rich or powerful. Throughout medieval and modern history they were always buffer states, each now a province of one mighty neighbor, perhaps for a few years a dependent princedom, then seized by the neighbor on the other side and subjugated as a prize for one of his lieutenants. It is astonishing that they nurtured so tenacious a culture of their own.

In the long view of history, it seems the captive nations are undergoing a change of masters. In our time it is the Soviet Union that wields the power. Tomorrow it may be some other conqueror. In any event, tears and anger spent on assailing and reviling the occupier are wasted for he cannot be ousted.

That is the objective, realistic attitude. And yet, and yet. . . .

During World War II, the German panzer divisions and air force delivered most of Europe to the oppression of the Gestapo, the quislings and the coldly efficient administrators from Berlin. The lamp of liberty flickered out. Today, the Nazi idology is the property of a few scattered crackpots, the party hierarchy is dead except for pitiable Hess in his lonely cell in Spandau Prison, and there is a whole generation of Europeans born in freedom.

Ireland was occupied for seven centuries by the mighty English, and today Ireland is a free republic. The existence of Israel is the realization of an impossibility.

Who is to say what hurricanes of change may blow across Europe next year or next decade?

No realistic thinker on this date would invest a penny in the chance of revival of any of the captive nations. But love and patriotism don't ask for logic. They survive in songs, in national costumes, in folk dances, in monuments of literature. The names of the heroes are passed down from parents to children, and if the accents change and the old languages fall into disuse, the heartbeat at least is constant.

Let the Americans who came from the captive nations celebrate their old flags and revive their feelings of outrage. Some day, some time now beyond estimate, the dreams may become reality.

To call the roll: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Romania—a succession of names in which there is the thunder of drums and the whisper of hope.

CULVER INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO SHOW THAT AMERICAN TAXPAYERS ARE NOT SUBSIDIZING THE FARMER

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which will make it clear that the bulk of the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture provide benefits to the consumer, businessman, and the general public, and are not directed to subsidizing the American farmer.

The objective of this measure is to achieve a greater understanding of the role of government in agriculture among the general public, and to hopefully help clarify the apparent misunderstanding among certain administration spokesmen about the economic condition of the American farmer today.

I find it extremely disturbing to read in the Nation's urban newspapers suggestions that the taxpayers are paying a subsidy of $7 billion each year to the American farmer, and feel that those of us who represent the 50 districts which make up the farm bloc in the House of Representatives have a responsibility to attempt to correct this false impression.

The Department of Agriculture's budget expenditures for fiscal year 1965 were slightly over $7 billion, but of that total only 36 percent was spent primarily for the stabilization of farm income. The remainder, amounting to more than $4.6 billion was spent on programs which clearly benefit American men, women, and children in every State of the Union and every sector of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I include an analysis of these expenditures in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Budget expenditures fiscal years, 1965 and estimated 1966 and 1967

[In millions of dollars]

	1965	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Programs which clearly provide benefits to consumers, businessmen, and the general public:			
Programs having foreign relations and defense aspects:			
Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies (title I, Public Law 480)	1,293	1,114	994
Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples (title II, Public Law 480)	147	286	283
Donations of commodities acquired by CCC	211	206	200
International Wheat Agreement	35	75	3
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	41	34	41
Long-term supply contracts (title IV, Public Law 480)	200	301	262
Donations of dairy products to armed services and others	41	17	17
Total	1,968	2,033	1,800
Food distribution programs:			
Commodities distributed to the needy and others	393	373	268
Food stamp plan	34	89	133
School lunch program	179	186	168
Special milk program	87	89	37
Total	693	737	606
REA and FHA repayable loans:			
REA loans	381	181	184
FHA loans	247	37	−76
Sale of participation certificates in FHA direct loans			−549
Salaries and expenses for above programs	53	61	63
Total	681	279	−378
Long-range programs for the improvement of agricultural and natural resources:			
Forestry	323	362	352
Agricultural and forestry research	192	238	221
Plant and animal disease and pest control	68	76	68
Soil and water resource protection and development	214	276	294

	1965	1966 estimate	1967 estimate
Programs which clearly, etc—Continued			
Long-range, etc—Continued			
Agricultural conservation program	253	276	247
Cooperative agricultural extension work	85	90	90
Inspection and other marketing service for agricultural commodities	76	80	23
Other	86	90	103
Total	1,297	1,488	1,398
Grand total	4,639	4,537	3,426
Other programs which are predominantly for stabilization of farm income, but which also benefit others:			
CCC price-support and related programs:			
CCC loan, purchase, export, and related programs	−369	−445	−903
Storage, handling, and transportation expenses	422	332	315
Interest expense, net	442	270	291
Acreage diversion payments:			
Feed grains	914	829	655
Wheat	33	35	20
Cotton		112	237
Price-support payments:			
Feed grains	282	412	695
Cotton	51	58	496
Cotton equalization payments	435	331	
National Wool Act program	20	35	44
Total	2,230	1,969	1,850
Cropland adjustment program, adjustment payments			135
Conservation reserve program	194	148	140
Sugar Act program	92	94	85
Salaries and expenses for above programs	143	141	162
Total	2,659	2,352	2,372
Grand total	7,298	6,889	5,798

This compilation of information from the Department of Agriculture clearly shows the truth about their budget, and demonstrates that two-thirds of every dollar spent goes for food for peace and agricultural exports, nutrition and consumer research, school lunch and special milk programs, food inspections, the food stamp program, and long-range projects for improvement of agricultural and natural resources.

Clearly these funds are spent for the general public; yet, because they are included in the budget of the Department of Agriculture, they are charged to the American farmer.

There is no question that these programs benefit the farmer as well as the general public. So do the programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Veterans' Administration, and the Office of Emergency Planning. But these benefits to the farmer are incidental to the main purpose of these programs.

If we can demonstrate that two-thirds of the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture benefit urban areas just as much as they do the farmer, then we should be able to reduce the resentment of the taxpayer who now seems to think that he is contributing to a $7 billion subsidy for the farmer, who makes up only 8 percent of the total population.

In a truer sense, it can be said that the American farmer is subsidizing the rest of the economy, because, in spite of his increased efficiency and amazing productivity, his income is still only 65 percent of the nonfarm income. If farm prices had increased at the same rate as nonfarm prices, then the farmer would be receiving an additional $7.6 billion—and not from the American Government, but from the American consumer.

It is important to note as well that farmers as a group spend more than $30 billion a year to meet their production requirements, and purchase another $12 billion in consumer items.

I think that we owe the American farmer adequate recognition of his real role in the Nation's economy, as we owe urban taxpayers a better understanding of our farm programs and the benefits they receive from them.

The measure which I have introduced today will help us do this, by requiring the Department of Agriculture and the Budget Bureau to distinguish clearly between expenditures primarily for the purpose of stabilization of farm income, and those which provide benefits to the consumer, businessman, and the general public.

I hope my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join in support of this measure and urge its prompt consideration in committee and on the floor of the House.

PAYMENT TO INFORMERS BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, every person in America has a legal obligation to report to the proper authorities any scene or suspected act of wrongdoing. This is an accepted practice under our system of government, a practice which is carried out by most citizens without thought of financial reimbursement or reward.

There are, of course, extreme cases where known or suspected felons are at large in society and considered to be of such potential danger to society that rewards are posted for information leading to their whereabouts and apprehension. There are, as I say, extreme cases.

There are other cases, however, whereby the Federal Government encourages citizens to literally snoop on their neighbors and associates for financial consideration.

I refer to the section of the Internal Revenue Code which permits the IRS to pay up to 10 percent of the amount recovered from persons who have evaded taxes by persons who have informed on them.

This insidious practice is contrary to our democratic concept of equal justice before law. No taxpayer is safe from this type of harassment. Professional informers are known to pick names at random from telephone books in hopes of coming up with a lucky find which will bring reward.

Indeed, the accused does not even have the right to face his accuser as he would in any other circumstance. In Roman times when human beings were thrown to wild animals for public amusement and rule of law provided little of the equity we enjoy, the accused tax evader enjoyed far greater protection than in this country today.

The Roman informer had to make his accusations in public and he was liable to the same penalties as the accused if his charges did not stick. The Internal Revenue Service does not require an informer to face his accused. Furthermore, the informer's identity is carefully protected by the Government.

The reporting of crime, committed or suspected, by an honest and conscientious citizenry is a cornerstone of law enforcement in this country.

The reporting of crime, committed or suspected, without expectation of reward but for reason of the public interest and safety is the mortar of this cornerstone.

Therefore, the possibility of reward for reporting known or suspected tax evasion is alien to our American system of justice. Nor is it necessary.

In the year 1961, the Internal Revenue Service recovered $12 million in taxes through information received from informants. In that same year, only 4.4 percent of all informants bothered to claim their honorarium or reward.

In recent years the Congress has appropriated millions of dollars to purchase electronic computing equipment to enable the Internal Revenue Service to audit tax returns more rapidly and more thoroughly. Indeed, the IRS has warned taxpayers that the chances of an audit are growing greater each year.

Therefore, it seems to me that it is time to eliminate the paid informer as an instrument for the collection of taxes.

It is time because this method is repugnant to our American philosophy of equal justice under law.

It is time because this practice has been demonstrated as not essential to recovery of evaded taxes.

It is time because the Internal Revenue Service now has the equipment to more thoroughly examine returns, locate discrepancies, and uncover fraud.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which will eliminate the authority of the Internal Revenue Service to pay informers to snoop on their neighbors and associates. This bill would also end the practice of permitting judges to grant rewards to persons who inform on agents and employees of the Internal Revenue Service. Under present authority, a presiding judge may impose a fine of up to $10,000 on such agent or employee convicted of crime involving his conduct in office and designate that a portion of this fine be paid the informer as a reward.

Mr. Speaker, the informer is becoming more and more a threat to individual liberty in this Nation. Electronic eavesdropping and snooping devices threaten the privacy of the home today as never before.

We can diminish this threat by removing the profit motive. Enactment of this bill would be a small but significant step in this direction.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON MAKES A WARM AND FAVORABLE PERSONAL IMPRESSION ON TWO UPSTATE NEW YORK NEWSPAPER EDITORS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we who are privileged to serve in this House have all had the opportunity, I suppose, to visit the White House, and to talk on a relatively informal basis with the former Congressman who now serves as President of the United States. We know the warm and cordial hospitality that is always extended to us on these occasions, whether it is a reception, a formal dinner, the signing of a bill, or a briefing on developments in Vietnam. In fact during the administrations of both President Kennedy and President Johnson, Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress on both sides of the political aisle have had the opportunity of visiting the White House so often that perhaps we sometimes tend to forget that for the average citizen a visit to the White House and especially a chat with the President of the United States is a

pretty unusual, dramatic, and certainly most memorable event.

I saw a story in the Oneonta Daily Star of Oneonta, N.Y., in my district the other day, Mr. Speaker, which reminded me forcefully of just what it means to people to have an opportunity to visit the White House and to talk with the President. It was a detailed interview and story by the editor and the city editor of a smalltown New York State newspaper, the Port Jervis Union-Gazette.

I think Members may find it interesting to read this moving personal account. I think they will be especially interested in the obviously very favorable impression which President Johnson made on these two newspaper executives during a relaxed 40-minute interview in the White House executive wing. I am sure we have all experienced this same warmth and courtesy to which they refer, and have felt something of the same thrill which they report so candidly. But their account is valuable because it shows clearly that the President is a much more warm and human person than some of the press dispatches which occasionally originate from the regular Washington press corps would suggest.

The story these editors have written will help to remind us all of the personal impression made by the man who perhaps more than any other individual in this world carries the heavy burden for insuring the continued preservation of freedom.

I include at this point not only the two articles in question from the Oneonta Star of August 8, and also an editorial from the same paper for the same day:

VISIT WITH PRESIDENT HELPS HIM COME ALIVE

Two uncommon events connected with pictures can be big things in the life of John Q. Public—that's us.

One is seeing our own picture in the paper. It's apt to happen to any of us when there's a daily local paper around such as The Star but we know from experience with those who've rated a Star picture that it's usually an event.

"Hey! I saw your picture in the paper," a friend will holler across the street. You just smile and wave back because one thing for sure is that you've already seen it. In fact you were among the first—and most critical—of the viewers.

Number two is seeing a person in the flesh that you've seen in picture many times. This is apt to be a pleasant surprise as well as a thrill because there's life and an obvious dimension in a real person that a flat picture can't catch.

The thrill and the impact of a real life big wheel came in spades to a pair of Ottaway Group newsmen the other day when their request for a personal interview with President Johnson was suddenly granted.

We share their enthusiasm with the report that Star readers share today and we only wish we could have shared the experience of the personal appearance that their enterprise produced. It was a once-in-a lifetime for any of us.

ADVICE FOR HOME FRONT: WRITE THE BOYS AND GET UNITED

(NOTE.—This is the story of a private and unique interview with President Johnson by two smalltown newsmen—Dan Dwyer, editor, and Howard MacDonald, city editor, of the Port Jervis Union-Gazette. Like The Star, the Port Jervis paper is one of eight in the Ottaway group.)

(By Daniel J. Dwyer and Howard M. MacDonald)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—President Lyndon B. Johnson believes that U.S. commitments in South Viet Nam are just and necessary; that the U.S. will achieve its goal of peace and independence there, and that Americans should show more active support for the men who are fighting there.

These and other views emerged from our two-hour visit to the White House on July 22.

It is hard not to be impressed with Mr. Johnson.

Despite his folksy, friendly, chatty manner, he leaves no doubt that he is the most informed man in Washington: he can tell you the voting record, without any hesitation, of an obscure first term Congressman, for example.

He leaves the impression that he is a man who pays close attention to the most minor details: he can point out that before ordering the bombing raids on areas near Hanoi and Haiphong, he made sure that British and Russian ships were out of the areas, and that plans were operationally so foolproof that, as it turned out, only one civilian was killed.

The President believes that most Americans support the U.S. attitude towards North Viet Nam. He points out that a recent poll showed that 56 per cent of the electorate support the President—and that this would be a landslide in any election.

He is disturbed by some of the recent criticisms about his policies in Viet Nam, partly because he is convinced, as are GIs who write him at the rate of 50 to 100 per week, that the policy of appeasement would have disastrous consequences for the nation and the world, but also because he feels that such criticisms are unfair to, and hurt, the fighting men in Viet Nam.

The most important thing Americans can do to show their support for the men in Viet Nam, he believes, is to write letters to every serviceman, particularly those in Viet Nam, and thank them for the excellent job they are doing in preserving freedom.

If the President had his way, every resident in the Port Jervis area would write a letter to each of the 75 service men from the area whom they know and let them know how they appreciate what they are doing.

The President firmly believes that nothing boosts a soldier's morale more than a letter from home.

Second, President Johnson would have people stand up and be counted when they support our national policy in Viet Nam. As he sees it, the issue is simply whether we are going to allow any people to use force to provoke aggression.

Third, the President would have all Americans remember that the Communists have never taken over a government by election, but always through force—and that it sometimes becomes necessary to counter that force to preserve freedom.

President Johnson cannot understand those who disagree with U.S. involvement in Viet Nam. He believes that they can be placed under three headings: Communists, pacifists who generally believe that all war is wrong, or well-intentioned people who do not have the right information.

The President believes there can be no doubt of the eventual outcome: we will win. But he is critical of those who say we are aggressors, that we are war mongers.

It is not the President who is holding up peace in Viet Nam, he says. He has made numerous peace overtures, but points out that none have been accepted. When he ordered a halt to bombing raids earlier this year, the Viet Cong went on killing American servicemen, he notes.

He says emphatically that the U.S. will readily accept any opportunity to talk peace with North Viet Nam.

As proof of his determination to bring peace to that troubled area, he says that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is ready to go anywhere at any time at an hour's notice to sit down and talk with anyone.

The President is aware that he has other critics who argue that he should have ordered bombing of oil depots near Hanoi and Haiphong sooner. He explains the timing by pointing out that there were factors causing the delay which were not known to the public.

He cites that it was necessary for both Russian and British ships to be out of the port of Hanoi, and to wait for both Russian and Chinese diplomats to be out of Hanoi to avoid any international incidents or embarrassments.

He also insists that it was necessary to wait for the right weather conditions and select targets away from the cities so that only military installations were hit.

The President is disturbed that some are making Viet Nam a political issue. He believes in the old maxim, "Politics stops at the water's edge." It is a maxim he says he scrupulously observed during his years as Democratic Senate majority leader during the Eisenhower years.

When President Eisenhower sent U.S. troops into Lebanon, he had the full support of Sen. Johnson. Johnson also supported Eisenhower on the SEATO treaty.

President Johnson also likes to quote another old maxim, one which very few Americans would challenge: "The most precious thing we have is our freedom."

The President added this advice for young Americans:

Seek some form of public service for a year or two as a priceless apprenticeship in freedom, either in municipal or state affairs, or as a member of the Peace Corps, the Job Corps, the Teachers Corps, or as an apprentice in Congress.

Freedom is a priceless heritage, the President says, and as long as he is President, it will never be lost through default.

LONG TRAIL TO L.B.J.—THE BIG STORY WAS GETTING THERE

(By Dan Dwyer)

I had to admire the cool and efficient manner in which Howard MacDonald said to the taxi driver "To the northwest gate of the White House, please."

It was only a four-block ride, slowed by the late Friday afternoon Washington traffic and the fare was 80 cents—but it was a much longer trip than that.

It was a journey from one world to another; from Port Jervis to the inner office of the President of the United States. It was a journey most people never make at all. Howard and I were lucky ones.

The taxi ride was the culmination of a letter written six weeks prior to that eventful Friday, July 22. The letter, to Bill Moyers, presidential press secretary, asked for a personal interview with President Johnson. All it cost was a five cent stamp.

As the weeks went by, and no reply, we gradually forgot it. When somebody in the office did bring it up, the inevitable answer was "No news is good news."

Then on July 21, around noon, the phone rang. The press secretary's secretary said that if we could be at the White House the next afternoon at 5:30, the president would see us. We were to use the northwest gate.

I said that MacDonald, who is city editor, and I would be there.

I got up and walked around the office. I was elated. So was the rest of the staff. Howard was not there but was in Middletown where we have another office, I called him up and said, "Howard, guess where you're going to be tomorrow night at 5:30?"

He had visions of a late night assignment. "Where?", he said wonderingly.

"At the White House."

"What!"

It wasn't the word but the way he said it. He was happy as a bee in a clover patch.

That's how we wound up at 5:12 p.m. on July 22 on the corner of E and 12th Streets in Washington, and why Howard made his short but, to us, dramatic statement to the cab driver.

AT THE GATE

The taxi approached the White House from the back, went a block and turned right and then right again. It slowed down and stopped. The address is 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

I've been in Washington before. I've seen the White House before. But it was different this time. I wasn't going inside on those other occasions.

It sits on 18 acres of lawns and gardens and was originally built in 1793 and then rebuilt in 1815 after the British burned it the year before. The main structure—170 feet long and four stories high—is picturesque and imposing and its colonnaded, Ionic entrance is a familiar sight from pictures and postcards.

There are wings on the east and west sides, including the executive offices, which are on the western end. A semi-circular drive borders the front and swings from one corner to the other.

A total of 34 presidents, including LBJ, have occupied the White House, dating back to John Adams. It and the Capitol building are the acknowledged symbols of American democracy. No one approaches and views it without a feeling of pride and respect for their country and since this nation began small boys have expressed the desire to eventually grow up to be President and live there.

The northwest gate is just what it says. It is at the northwest corner, flanked by two, huge, stone pillars. There is a gate that was open when we dismounted from the taxi and approached.

We were loaded down for this invasion. Howard carried a 35 mm camera and I lugged a 2½x2½ camera with a strobe flashgun. He also had a roll of our newspapers which we wanted to give to the president. We both had enough note paper to write a history of the United States.

We had no idea of what we could or couldn't do and in view of the 1963 assassination of President Kennedy, we envisioned all kinds of security measures would be employed.

Both of us had covered the visit of President Kennedy to Milford, Pennsylvania, in September, 1963 and saw how the secret service men operated there, so we figured the White House must be tight as a drum.

SECRET SECURITY

The difference is, however, when a President is out among people—thousands of people—the guards are at a disadvantage but in the White House they can control everything. When we left, two hours later, we realized we did not fully know what security measures had been employed. We know what we saw but there must have been much more than was not visible—and nobody tells what they are. They only smile, so you can just guess.

Inside the gate was a small building with windows on three sides. The door was open and one of the two armed guards who watched us get out of the taxi and walk into the grounds, came out. He was most courteous and asked our names and became even more courteous after he found them on his list. That was a trait we found in all the people we encountered during our visit.

It was quiet and shady on the driveway. I found myself looking at the other guard. He had a telephone in his hand, already telling the next check point we were coming. There is a network of telephones to and from all security points.

Although he now knew we were coming, we had to repeat our story to the next guard. Probably because for a brief 10 seconds we were out of sight of the two points when we rounded a corner. The second point was outside the grounds again and down a side thoroughfare.

This guard showed us which door to enter. It was a white, solid door that swung outward. We went inside. A man stood there, solid and efficient. The telephones had been working again. He invited us to go down a short hall to a desk. Behind the desk, seated, was another guard and another stood behind him.

WHO ARE WE?

We told our appointment story again and he checked his list. It came out as we said. But he had one further request—identification.

This could have been a problem for while we had several membership cards in various organizations, neither of us had anything with our pictures on it. Howard and I had discussed this possibility on the way down but decided to cross that bridge when we came to it. After all, how many people carry identification cards with their picture on it. Then again, how many people want to get in to see the President?

But oddly enough, our driver's license was sufficient.

We were still carrying the cameras, which were in cases, the flashgun, the roll of papers and the notebooks. There was no attempt made to check any of this equipment—or us.

This leads to two observations.

One is that there is a way such a checkout is made and this is based on a remark made by a press aide we talked to later on upstairs. We told him about the papers we wanted to give the President and asked if there were any restrictions.

Howard noted that in 1963 at Milford, President Kennedy could not accept gifts because they were not inspected first by the Secret Service.

Our friend—Robert Fleming, deputy press secretary—smiled when Howard said this and then said it was perfectly all right to give the newspapers to the President. He added, "the Secret Service wouldn't let them in here now if it wasn't all right."

The other observation on the personal non-check procedure is that the guards are aware that most people—such as us—are there legitimately to see the President and it just would not be proper if everyone were subjected to a personal search.

MUST BE AVAILABLE

The Secret Service and the White House guards are entrusted with the President's safety and would probably like to have him in a bullet-proof glass cage if they had their way—but this is a democracy and our Presidents are known to tolerate only so much barrier between them and the people.

For this reason, the Secret Service has some limitations but definitely imposes more than meets the naked eye of the ordinary visitor to the White House.

The pace of our entry quickened for the next few minutes. The telephone went into operation and in a very short time a tall, grey haired man appeared and took us in tow.

An elevator door opened and we stepped in and then, on the next floor, out again. There was a long, white hallway ahead of us. Several closed doors led off of it. But it was open at the end and appeared to veer to the left. There was a bench down part way.

Two men stood at the open end, looking toward us. You've seen men like them in newspaper photos and on television, always close by the President. Well dressed, well groomed—but so efficient looking. The Secret Service.

I had the feeling we were getting close to where we wanted to go—to the man we wanted to see. There was an atmosphere about that hall; there was a bit of tension in the air and, casual though I tried to be, in me. I didn't know until later that where we stood in the hall was about 20 feet from the President's office.

ROOM FOR WAITING

We walked halfway down the carpeted passage way. Our guide stopped in front of a door. There was a sign on it—In Use. He opened the door and asked us to wait in there. He went out.

We had no idea where we were—if this was where we would meet the President, or what.

It was a long room, maybe 30 feet, with rounded ends. On the floor, fitting the contour of the room was a soft, red carpet. It was the kind you sink down in.

There were three doors, one at each end and the one we entered. Two flags flanked the far end. One was the American flag, the other the President's flag. There was a fire place and two easy chairs and a lighted floor lamp and the presence of the flags lent support to the supposition that this was where we would have our interview.

I looked around hurriedly for I did not know how much time we had. It was now a little past 5:30.

In the center was a large, long table. It obviously went back in years in the history of this place. There were seven chairs around it, a dish of fresh flowers as a centerpiece.

I walked swiftly around the room, taking notes on the pictures on the walls, on the other furnishings.

Dominating an end and a side wall were two huge canvases by Frederick Remington, the master of western scenes. The other walls held Ancient Seaport by Max Bohm and Storm Tide by Robert Henri.

There was a ship model under glass, a framed Thomas Jefferson letter and a glass covered instrument from the first U.S. manned space flight.

On another table, also under glass, was a 55-piece figurine reproduction of the U.S. Marine Band, cira 1880.

This much I noted when the door opened.

BEHIND SCHEDULE

"I'm Marvin Watson," he said. After we introduced ourselves, Watson said there was going to be a short delay as the President was behind in his schedule.

"Time", I said, "is something we have plenty of." But he was actually apologetic because we would have to wait for the President of the United States. That was the type of courteous, concerned people we met in the White House.

Watson, who turned out to be the President's appointments secretary wanted to know a little about Port Jervis. We told him the size and where it was and he laughed.

"I come from a smaller town than you", he said. "Dangerfield, Texas. Population 4,500."

From his soft drawl, I already figured he was from Texas. LBJ favors home state boys.

Watson, average build with a tanned complexion, gave us a brief history of the room. It was called the Fish Room because one of President Roosevelt's friends had once given him a huge sailfish, which wound up on "the wall right over there, I believe", our new friend noted.

"Then President Truman had an aquarium in here but all that departed when Eisenhower came in. Only the name remains."

Watson chatted a few more minutes and left.

Howard and I talked together, planning the procedure we would follow. We realized we knew very little of what would take place. In fact, aside from calling the President "Mr. President," we knew nothing. We were convinced about how long the interview would be and, another important point, how would we know when it was over.

When you think about it, it's a point to consider. After all, we were going to meet with the man with the most responsible job on earth who has a tremendous daily schedule to fill and was going—as we know—on a three-state tour the next morning.

We received our answers quicky and easily.

ANOTHER AIDE

The door opened again and once more an apology. This time it was Bob Fleming, the deputy press secretary, who was to accompany us to the interview, sit in on it, and then iron out any difficulties we might have afterwards.

Bob said he was sorry, there was still a little delay so we all sat down at the table and talked.

He told us he was former ABC news bureau head in Washington and originally came from Madison, Wisconsin. So we told him a little bit about Port Jervis. (Everybody in the White House knew something about Port Jervis by the time we left).

He entertained us with historical data on the White House, centering on the renovation job carried out by President Truman, which he said was long needed because the building was falling apart.

He said that Truman restored the building without changing the appearance—except for his controversial balcony which caused more of a scene than Romeo and Juliet ever mustered.

Fleming noted that steel beams had been placed in the walls and that by this and other ways, it was completely rebuilt. He seemed to know all about the place.

LAST BRIEFING

But what we wanted to know was how the interview would be conducted.

In connection with this, he told us that our letter appealed to the press secretary's office because of the reference to small towns. (In the letter, it was pointed out that we felt our newspaper represented an average American small community and we believed the President did not have enough contact with newspapers such as The Union-Gazette).

For that reason the interview was recommended and the President concurred.

Fleming said the President would answer any question but most of the time he would steer around to the subjects he wanted to talk about.

He also said the President would indicate when his time was about up but we could get a few minutes after that "because I've never seen him turn down a request for another question."

Fleming obviously has a rigorous schedule but he gave the impression that, while he was tired and didn't have much home life, he was dedicated to the President. I believe that could be said of all the people we met. The President asks a great deal of his aides. He calls for more than the average person would want to take but the people that surround him, that work for and with him, are not average.

They show deference to his wishes and all whom we met were somewhat in awe of his power and responsibility, but it was more than that, for the President has an inborn type of personality or persuasive magnetism about him that inspires these people to accomplish more than they would do under ordinary circumstances.

WHITE HOUSE IMAGE

But back to Fleming. In speaking of the White House, he reflected on the fact that the mood of the nation is often set by even small events that happen there.

"For that reason", he said, "we must be careful of our image."

To illustrate that, he remarked that recently ABC had requested permission to bring a TV camera truck on the grounds to make a background scene for one of their correspondents. As an old ABC man, he could see their point but turned it down.

"The reason," he laughed, "is that as soon as CBS and NBC saw that truck they would want the same privilege although it was only going to be a routine newcast program. They would never believe that story. So then we would have three television trucks on the lawn and the wire services men would come running up to find out what was going on.

"Our story would never satisfy them, they'd think we were holding back news and that television had received a tip. So what would happen? The wire men would all go running back to their typewriters and write leads like "An air of tension surrounds the White House today"—the newspapers would print it—and the stock market would drop 10 points."

He laughed again. "That's how it goes around here. The smallest move can start a rumor about the White House."

LAST MOVE

Just then the door opened and a girl came in. She said something to Bob and he stood up. So did we.

"He's ready now", he said. This was it.

We marched out the door and across the hall. The two Secret Service men still stood down at the end. We went into a room that turned out to be Watson's office. It was blue with bright blue furnishings. In it were Watson, his secretary and another man. We made six and it look crowded.

We had asked Fleming about taking pictures and he said he would find out. Normally it wasn't done but this was a normal meeting for the President. Finally it was decided that we wouldn't take the photos but the White House photographer would do it, instead.

That was all right. He was a small Japanese who was introduced but whose name I still don't know.

We paused in Watson's office about a minute while this was decided and then somebody took our cameras and said they would be in the Fish Room, to be picked up when we left.

Then a buzzer sounded, Watson picked up a phone, listened for a few seconds, said "Yes, sir" and hung up. He motioned to Fleming who went to another door in the room and asked us to follow.

There was a short hallway. About 10 feet ahead was an open door. We walked through it.

In Watson's office, you could feel the undercurrent in the air—that you were near something big—that you were close to greatness and power and somehow were touching upon the history of our country.

THE GREAT MAN

When we went through the door, I felt tenseness, excitement. I don't believe anyone can walk into that great, circular room—see those flags, the massive desk but most of all, the man—and not have that same aura of feeling.

This was a climatic moment. This was a moment I had thought about but could not imagine. This was a moment of proudness and a moment of drama—a moment I will have for as many years as I live.

Inside the room, there was only one way to look. The desk led your eye to the flags behind it and—further back, seated at a second desk—Lyndon Baines Johnson, 36th President of the United States.

The President was looking at some documents. Then he stood up, picked them up in his arms and strode over to the main desk. He laid them down. He came our way. Bob Fleming, off to one side, introduced us.

We shook hands and I said "Mr. President, I'm very proud to meet you."

President Johnson is not a small man. He is a big man. He is at least three inches over my six feet, with broad shoulders and big hands.

He looked very familiar. The lines that etch his eyes in his photographs were there, showing through a tanned complexion. He has darkish hair, grey on the sides.

He wore a neat, well tailored dark green suit with a very light green shirt and matching tie.

His Texas drawl came out right away as he suggested we go to a smaller, more comfortable room.

I glanced around the office and out the windows—seven, I recall—which reveal the famed rose garden outside on the grounds.

The room is circular, at least 30 feet across, with an ornamental frieze running around it about 10 feet up on the walls.

There were colored pictures of the Johnson family arranged on the wall at one end near a fireplace and on a table near his desk was a bronze bust of the President.

There were two enclosed teletype machines set against a wall and, higher up, a three-screen television unit.

FOLLOW THE LEADER

The President led the way out of the room and back down that same, short hallway. Across from each other were doors I hadn't noticed.

He stopped short, I was following and we collided. Howard brought up against me. The President suggested a drink and we all agreed to this and he noted that there was a choice of Dr. Pepper or coke, remarking that he was a Dr. Pepper man himself.

"Whatever the President drinks is good enough for me" I said, as he knocked on one door and this head appeared and he ordered the four sodas.

Then we went into the other door, the President leading again, and he sat down in a green, reclining chair. We—Howard and I—sat on a sofa couch to the left and facing him. Fleming picked a straight-backed chair out of the way near the door.

The little photographer, who had followed us into the office and back into this room, stepped on a floor button. The room flooded with additional light and he shot several pictures. He moved off the button and the lights returned to normal. He left.

It was a room without windows, at least heavy, green drapes completely covered the wall where they would be located. It was also a small room, about 10x12 feet, very comfortable looking and apparently a favorite room for the President.

On the wall near me was a large frame containing formal and informal photos of the past five presidents—Kennedy, Eisenhower, Truman, Roosevelt and Hoover.

During his talk with us, the President made note of the fact that he had been in Congress—in the House and Senate—while four of the five were in office.

TIME TO TALK

We had a series of questions to ask the President, prepared ahead of time and sufficient to take up a half hour. As Howard asked the questions, we both took notes but I also took time to watch and observe this man who stepped in and took control of a country shaken by one of the great tragedies of the century.

By that time, the drinks arrived and I sipped on it. Dr. Pepper isn't half bad and I may make it the official drink for our Port Jervis paper.

The President has a genial, homey way of putting his guests at ease.

He leaned back in his chair, when we first sat down put his hands behind his head and said "Let's talk."

I told him about the point of our visit—that we had questions raised by average people in small towns. He was interested. He nodded. I went on to explain about Port Jervis, where it was and how people here feel about issues such as Viet Nam; how small

town America was concerned but how small town America gave him their support although sometimes things are difficult to understand.

Then he picked up the conversation. He discussed Viet Nam and as he talked he gestured with his hands. When he listened, it was usually with his face and cheek resting on one of the hands with the elbow on the arm of the chair.

POWERFUL IMPRESSION

The man gives the impression that he enjoys being President—that he was born for it—that he is more than capable of handling any crisis that comes up for this country.

He talked, expounding the points he wanted to make and his voice was soft when he mentioned our men dying in Viet Nam and when he touched on America's history with such phrases as "the most priceless thing we have is our freedom and liberty".

But when he talked about men like Ho Chi Minh and issues such as Viet Nam, criticism that goes too far and might have an effect on our fighting men's morale, the voice gets an edge in it.

It was an engaging 40 minutes we spent in this little green room. It went fast, too fast, and it became obvious that if we wanted to get all our questions answered, we would have needed another three hours. And that wasn't going to happen.

When it was over, the President stood up and mentioned he had a gift for us. He fumbled in a drawer in a small desk near Fleming and produced two 11x14 parchments, engraved with quotations.

Mine contained words by Abraham Lincoln; Howard's was a statement by Harold MacMillan. They are prophetic; they deal with doing what you feel is right.

We all shook hands again and then we were moving. I looked back from Watson's office. The broad shoulders were emerging into the lighted room at the opposite end of the short hall. The President was already going back to other work. I have no fear that he can handle whatever job comes up.

WE WALK OUT

There was another short chat with Fleming and then we went outside and, with special permission, shot a few pictures on the grounds. Then we walked down the long drive to the front. The guards nodded and smiled as we went by. The one had a phone in his hand. They knew we were coming.

I looked at my watch. It was 7:20. We had spent two hours in there. Two hours that I told my children about and will probably tell their children about someday. As I said, it happens to only a few. We were lucky.

Howard and I were elated over the whole episode. I know we were smiling as we walked down Pennsylvania Avenue toward the business section of Washington.

"It's time to eat," I said, and we picked out an expensive looking restaurant.

But Howard disappointed me. He started to order spaghetti and meatballs.

"No," I said, "not that. This is a filet mignon night." And so it was.

HUDSON RIVER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to submit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs testimony in support of my bill, H.R. 13731, to provide for Hudson River resources development.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 13731

Mr. Chairman, most of us who know and depend upon the Hudson River have become increasingly aware that something basic must be done to preserve it. The Hudson is one of America's truly great rivers: rich in history and invaluable in commerce. It has a rare range of beauty as it flows some 315 miles from the slopes of the Adirondacks southward and toward the Atlantic Ocean. The scenic Hudson Highlands, the unique Manhattan skyline, the Palisades, are just a small portion of its wealth. Its heritage includes West Point, Hyde Park, Storm King Mountain, Dutch patroons, Revolutionary War battle sites, Fulton's steamboat, Washington Irving's literature and the Hudson School of artists. It was, with its tributaries, a major route for colonial settlement. It was, and remains, a valuable highway for transportation. It has an honorable and fascinating—an American—heritage, of which we all should be proud.

The past in itself presents no major problems. It is the present and the future which require careful planning and immediate remedial steps. Comprehensive conservation steps must be undertaken promptly.

We already have more than enough studies and reports. The basic information needed is available. The New York State Water Pollution Control Board and the New York State Department of Health have given close attention to several unfavorable aspects. The New York State Conservation Department is aware of some of the problems that have emerged. A number of interested private groups have studied and reported. The Federal Government also has not been oblivious to the developing crisis, for the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare reported at length on the pollution problem of the Hudson River and its tributaries in September 1965. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior has made a comprehensive study of other aspects.

Congress has examined the situation, particularly during the 89th Congress. A subcommittee of this Committee held hearings on the Hudson last fall and obtained the testimony of many local people. This year, officials of the Department of the Interior, and some of the Members from the Hudson River area, testified at hearings held in Washington late in July.

Informed opinion, not only in New York and New Jersey but also in Washington, has been brought to focus upon the Hudson River and its pressing problems. We are now fully aware of the dimensions of the problems. How to approach those problems, what machinery to use in necessary remedial steps, and what time schedule may be practicable still remain unsettled.

On March 16th of this year, I introduced H.R. 13731. It is a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey in a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from independent Federal action until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on the program.

The first section of my bill makes these three findings:

1) That the several resources of the Hudson are of immense value to all our citizens. (This is self-evident.)

2) That the States of New York and New Jersey are presently working toward a joint program to develop, preserve and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores. (We need not, in proposed legislation, examine in detail just exactly what has been done to date. That they are concerned and actively in motion, working—is the important fact.)

3) That New York and New Jersey have requested the aid and participation of the Federal Government in their efforts to develop a joint program and it is in the best interests of all that the Federal Government lend all possible aid and assistance to the States and their local agencies in developing their proposals for cooperative action.

New York and New Jersey are in the process of developing what is generally referred to as an Interstate Compact on the Hudson. That being the case and time being of the essence, my bill, H.R. 13731, proceeds on the assumption that there are major advantages in combining both State and Federal resources, these being conjointly brought into the picture at this stage rather than later when it would be too late. I am well aware that there are those who disagree. Some do not favor the Interstate Compact approach. There are those who think that New York State ought to proceed largely or wholly on her own to remedy the situation; that New Jersey has only a small portion of the frontage, and not much can be done about those few miles. Others want to proceed more slowly by appointing a fact-finding study commission. Even some who favor the Compact approach see no reason for speeding up to the process. They would wait for the States to develop a compact; only then would they come to Washington for approval. The Federal Government, where it has helped other states in projects such as these, has been truly beneficial. I strongly urge that the Federal Government act as an official working partner in this program.

There are some 105 bills in this Congress at the present time that provide for better conservation in the Hudson River area. The sentiment of our colleagues in this area is strong and demands action.

Section 3 of my bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the Governors of the States of New York and New Jersey in preparing and proposing a program of legislative action in preserving the defined Hudson River area. Recommendations regarding legislation necessary and desirable to achieve the purposes are to be submitted to the Congress and the States at the earliest possible time, but no later than March 1, 1967. This time limit will give the Federal Government and the States a chance to join their efforts and agree upon the most effective approach.

My bill takes into account the fact that comprehensive studies have already accumulated, and that it is now high time to put these recommendations into bill form for enactment into law.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized in Section 4 to represent the United States in the negotiations with the States and is required to report periodically to the Congress and the President.

Section 5 outlines six points for the Secretary's general guidance in making recommendations. They are the need to encourage all beneficial uses of the land and water resources of the Riverway; the need to encourage and support local and State autonomy and initiative in planning and acting consistent with development; the need to abate water pollution while developing water resources for beneficial use; the need to preserve, enhance and rehabilitate the scenic beauty; the need to preserve, enhance and develop archeological and historic sites and the need to protect and enhance fish and wildlife and other natural resources.

It should be noted that the Secretary is to be guided by, but not limited to, the above considerations in making recommendations.

Section 6 provides that the Secretary of the Interior serve as a "coordinator" of plans, programs, projects, grants, licenses or applications for licenses for a period as long as three years after enactment of the proposed legislation. The Federal departments, agencies and commissions, in order to avoid decisions or actions which could unfavorably affect or alter the resources of the Riverway during the negotiations and before Congress shall have received the recommendations and has had time to act, shall cooperate with the Secretary regarding his recommendations and plans. His approval would be required during that period for planning or projection within the Federal-aid highway system to be located within one mile of the mean high water line of the navigable portion of the Hudson. Any authorizing or licensing of construction by the Secretary of the Army and the Atomic Energy Commission of projects within that zone would also require the approval of the Secretary; and the Federal Power Commission would be directed not to issue any license for any project within that zone within the three-year period, unless the conservation purposes of the proposed legislation should be sooner achieved. In addition the President, by Executive order, has the power to suspend any or all provisions when in the national interest.

To summarize, there is great need for joint and positive action by the Federal and State governments to conserve the resources of this River. It was a beautiful River, and it can and must be cleaned up and preserved for future generations of Americans, not only New Yorkers. Eradication of pollution, blight and decay will initiate the rejuvenation of a larger area, wonderful for recreation, industry and good living.

We have studied the problems long enough; it is time to activate our plans. H.R. 13731 will serve as that necessary and desirable next step.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to submit my views to your Committee.

CONGRESSMAN DENT WARNS HOUSE OF BARRAGE OF PROPAGANDA FROM EXPORT-IMPORT GROUP AND ESPECIALLY FROM JAPANESE INFORMATION CENTER ON EVE OF NEW HEARINGS ON IMPACT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS ON U.S. JOBS

Mr. GIBBONS. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, history is repeating in the drive to kill any reasonable approach to the serious problem of import impact upon jobs in the United States.

The latest so-called Japanese information put out by one of the numerous Japanese trade lobbyists, Stephen Robin, is really a masterpiece of doubletalk.

It starts out with a startling disclosure that the United States has a $2 billion trade surplus over Japan. Casual readers would immediately want to know "What is DENT trying to do, kill our balance-of-trade deal?" of course not. You learn if you read further that the balance claimed covers the past decade and that in the last year of Japanese trading with the United States we ran $360 million behind using the valuation method that adds a false 25 percent to our export value. For instance, the Japanese exported to the United States $2.86 billion f.o.b. and imported from the United States $2.04 billion c.i.f. If both import and export value were figured on the same basis, either f.o.b. or c.i.f., the trade balance would show Japanese exports to the United States to be $2.95 billion giving the United States a deficit trade balance of $910 million. This means that even if we could believe the figures given by the Japanese propagandists the U.S. Treasury lost $901 million gold in foreign exchange.

This may explain to some of us why we are a debtor nation in spite of the claims of our Government commerce statisticians that we are selling $4 to $6 billion more a year than we are buying from foreign sources.

It is a peculiar set of economics that sells more than it buys and the seller goes broke by running out of money.

While we are supposed to be selling more than we are buying the French and others are depleting our gold reserve constantly. France alone has caused us to go from a high of $170 million to a low of $30 million a month.

The next antic set of figures in the Japanese propaganda book gives this illustration to prove how much we are benefitting and the Japanese are suffering.

In 1965, the United States-Japan trade reached a peak of $4.4 billion, nearly three times the volume of a decade ago. In that single year—1965—every American purchased $12.33 worth of imports from Japan. But every Japanese bought $20.83 worth of American products, almost twice as much per capita.

This is called the shell game. The Japanese are dealing with about 200 million U.S. citizens while we are dealing with about 65 million Japanese citizens.

The sorry but true situation is that all of our American citizens are potential customers of Japanese products which are sold over every retail counter in the United States. But few, if any, Japanese are customers of ours since they buy almost exclusively raw materials, machinery, pulp and logs for reprocessing, and coke, coal, and iron ore with other minerals that are used to make the products for American consumers, Japanese consumers, and what used to be American consumers in other countries such as Central and South America, Europe, Australia, and Asian markets.

The Japanese are clever people but their candor is refreshing. In one place in the propaganda book they say:

Japan is quick to acknowledge a great deal of help from United States in introducing technological steelmaking techniques.

And then we read this:

Japan steelmakers have paid substantial amounts of money in royalties to U.S. steel producers and steel mill machinery makers for technical know-how and licensing agreements.

The clever mind of the Japanese wants you to know that while we as a nation helped Japan they also point out that it was paid for in royalties and licensing fees.

They also imply that their exporting business is profitable to certain individuals and certain corporations and therefore, a necessity for the U.S. economy.

The best claim of all is the one where they boldly state:

In 1965 Japan's purchases in the United States were responsible for about 200,000 American jobs.

They forgot to tell how many jobs it cost the United States in the glass, rubber, steel, electronics, toy, plywood, textile and hundreds of consumer goods industries to keep the 200,000—if true—workers busy digging coal, harvesting wheat and cotton, mining iron ore, or making high-priced tools and machinery for the Japanese workshop. For every job we get from trade we lose at least three in the U.S. economy.

While free trade is still being promoted under a theory developed in the 18th and 19th centuries our Nation is being sopped dry because of the economic realities of the 20th century. Facts are displaced by old worn out doubletalk of world peace and friendship to be achieved through the avenue of free trade forgetting that trade is a commercial venture and is motivated by the same profit motive that causes wars and breaks the peace.

STATE TAXATION OF MULTISTATE FIRMS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, State taxation of those of our corporations that operate in two or more States has been a matter of major interest to the Congress since 1959. In enacting Public Law 86–272 the Congress registered concern over possible interference of State tax practices with the free flow of trade and commerce among the States. It directed appropriate committees of the two Houses to make full and complete studies of "all matters pertaining to the taxation by the States of income derived within the States from the conduct of business activities which are exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce or which are a part of interstate commerce." It was the intent of Congress in making this assignment to explore the need for legislation to guide State tax practices into channels consistent with the national interest in orderly economic development.

The competing demands of the States for tax revenue and of the national interest in unhampered commerce prompted the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to consider this group of problems from the viewpoint of intergovernmental relations.

Together with the gentlewomen from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], I have the honor of being a member of this Commission. In view of the likelihood that legislation on this subject will be coming before this House, the findings and recommendations of the Advisory Commission, reflecting as they do the views of public officials from all levels of Government, may be helpful to the members.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the recommendations of the Commission represent a careful balancing of the interest of the States in preserving maximum freedom in the exercise of their taxing powers and the interests of the Congress and the executive branch in heeding the constitutional mandate against interference with the free flow of commerce among the States.

Mr. Speaker, this subject requires our thoughful consideration. It takes on increasing importance year by year as the revenue pressures upon State governments push them into higher and higher tax rate levels.

In the view of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the basic issue posed by State taxation of multistate firms in both the income and sales tax fields is a reconciliation and balancing of two competing national objectives:

First. The economic objective of facilitating the free flow of commerce among the States by minimizing State tax impediments to interstate business operations through the exercise of some degree of Federal control and regulation; and

Second. The political objective embraced in the concept of federalism with its emphasis on decentralized political decisionmaking and a large degree of State autonomy in tax policy.

In the Commission's judgment, these conflicting objectives—unimpeded commerce and federalism—are equally important and must be reconciled with appropriate recognition of both, without needless sacrifice of either.

Accelerating trends in business activity and State-local finances place increasing urgency on the reconciliation of these conflicting objectives. The economy is becoming progressively more interdependent and a rising share of business activity involves firms operating across State lines, making them ever more sensitive to diversities in State and local tax practices. Simultaneously, State and local expenditures are rising at nearly twice the rate of national economic growth and the attendant revenue pressures are obliging State and local governments to increase taxing levels. In their efforts to both maximize revenues and attract new businesses, they are understandably reaching out for out-of-State firms doing business within their boundaries.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX ISSUE

The 38 State corporate income taxes now imposed produce approximately $2 billion annually. Payments by multistate firms account for approximately 60 percent of this total. In the corporation income area, the Commission identified three basic issues requiring resolution:

1. What are the proper limits of State jurisdiction to tax the net income of multistate firms?

2. What rules should the States use to divide up the income of the multistate firms who fall within their respective taxing jurisdictions?

3. To what extent, if any, does the administration of these rules require Federal administrative surveillance?

The Commission considered a variety of alternative policy positions in the light of the two controlling economic and political objectives. An extreme centralization position would optimize the economic objective of unimpeded interstate commerce by calling for Federal monopoly of this revenue source. At the other extreme, maximum decentralization would optimize the federalism objective by opposing any Federal regulation of State corporation income tax practices.

The Commission rejects the more extreme centralizing positions in the absence of persuasive evidence that State and local tax practices are in fact burdening interstate operations unduly. The Commission also rejects the more extreme decentralization positions in the light of the evidence that State and local tax practices do represent a burden of sufficient magnitude and potential difficulty to warrant a measure of congressional regulation.

With respect to the jurisdictional issue, it is the view of the Commission that the limits placed on State jurisdiction by the Congress in 1959—Public Law 86–272—have gone a long way toward creating nationwide stability and certainty. Therefore, the Commission recommends against any change in jurisdictional policy already prescribed by the Congress at this time.

On the apportionment issue, the Commission recommends that the Congress mandate the employment of the three-factor formula—property, payroll, and sales—developed nearly 10 years ago by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, both to govern the reporting of income by multistate firms and to serve as a limit on the percentage of their income that may be taxed by a State. The Commission recommends also that the Congress not abridge the States' freedom to offer interstate firms alternative methods for determining their taxable income so long as these alternatives do not result in the taxability of a larger share of such firms' incomes than would be taxable under the uniform three-factor formula.

With respect to the administrative issue, the Commission rejects the idea of Federal surveillance over the operation of the uniform apportionment formula. It recommends instead that the Governors develop machinery, possibly through an interstate compact, to insure that the apportionment formula is consistently interpreted by all the States and to resolve such competing tax claims as may arise.

The text of the Commission recommendation reads as follows: [1]

The Commission concludes that State income taxation of interstate firms in a manner compatible with the free flow of interstate commerce requires standardized jurisdictional and apportionment limitations to maximize taxpayer certainty and minimize compliance reporting burdens. While viewpoints on the proper limits of State taxing jurisdiction over interstate firms vary widely, the guidelines prescribed by PL 86–272 have in large measure stabilized this issue.

Congressional action, however, is required to regularize and limit State practices with respect to the apportionment of income of interstate firms. The Commission believes that these apportionment limitations can be formulated so as to preserve the States' latitudes for shaping their tax practices to accord with their respective policy objectives. Therefore, the Commission recommends to the Congress that it prescribe State use of the three-factor property, payroll, and sales apportionment formula developed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (updated to reflect experience since its original promulgation in 1957) to govern the reporting of income by multistate firms and to serve as a limitation on the percentage of their income that may be taxed by a State. Such action will allow each State to determine its own tax policies and to offer alternative methods for determining the taxable income of interstate businesses, but will place a ceiling on the amount of income that is taxed by any State. Congressional action along these lines will obviate the need for Federal administrative surveillance of State tax practices.

Since interpretations of the formula will be required and some interstate disputes are likely to arise, the Commission recommends to the Governors Conference that the States proceed expeditiously to develop machinery, possibly through an interstate compact, for handling competing State tax claims.

In the Commission's view, this approach reconciles the competing economic and political objectives. It would ease substantially the compliance burdens of interstate firms and protect them from malapportionment possibilities, without abridging unduly the States' freedom to shape their income tax policies so as to promote their own economic development objectives. Moreover, the three-factor NCCUSL apportionment formula proposed for nationwide promulgation by the Congress, already enjoys strong State support.

SALES TAX ISSUE

Forty-two States, the District of Columbia, and some 2,300 local governments, located for the most part in 3 States, now levy sales and use taxes producing about $9 billion a year. While the revenue contribution of interstate as opposed to local sales cannot be determined with precision, there is widespread agreement that the lion's share of sales tax collections comes from strictly local—intrastate—transactions. Most of the problems in this area can therefore be handled by the States themselves.

The Commission concludes that States should act to safeguard the fairness and productivity of sales and use taxes and ease compliance obligations of—out-of-

[1] Secretary Robert C. Weaver, State Senator C. George DeStefano and Mrs. Adelaide Walters dissented.

State—vendors. The Commission recommends therefore that States:

First. Credit their taxpayers for sales and use taxes paid to other States;

Second. Eliminate charges for audit of multistate firms; and

Third. Exchange audit and other information with one another.

The Commission further recommends that States collaborate in developing a program for facilitating the collection of use taxes on commodities purchased from out-of-State vendors excluded under present practice. This recommendation is designed to bring about concerted State action to solve the tax evasion problem posed by mail-order business.

There remains, however, a need for Congress to assist the States in one troublesome but integral aspect of sales taxation. An existing Supreme Court decision—Miller Bros. Co. against Maryland—presently denies States the right to impose the use tax against the out-of-State vendor delivering merchandise to households within the State. In the interest of fortifying the State's ability to accord equal tax treatment to all purchasers within their borders, the Commission recommends that:

Congress explicitly authorize States and localities to require use tax collection by out-of-state vendors regularly delivering taxable items to households within the taxing jurisdiction.

In the view of the Commission, the legislative measures here proposed for the Congress and the States will optimize the national objectives calling for both the free flow of commerce and a viable role for the States in our Federal system.

LEGISLATION TO ADJUST STATUS OF CUBAN REFUGEES—PART II

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called attention to the bill I introduced on May 23, 1966, to permit Cuban refugees to adjust their status and become permanent residents of this country, if they so desire. I am pleased to note that yesterday, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], followed me in introducing similar legislation. My bill would permit retroactive adjustment as of the date of last entry. His bill, I am glad to note, contains this provision.

Mr. Speaker, with permission, I wish to insert in the RECORD, for the attention of my colleagues, the testimony of Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach before my Immigration Subcommittee this morning. The Attorney General strongly supports my bill and favors the retroactive provision.

I commend the Attorney General for having given thought to the implementation of this legislation, which would recommend a system of priorities for adjustment of status of Cuban refugees along the lines of the preference now contained in the Immigration and Naturalization Act. Parents, spouses, and other members of the immediate family would be given preference in adjusting their status. The Attorney General further advised the subcommittee that he would explore the matter carefully, should Congress pass my bill, so that no undue financial burden on Cuban refugees would result. The Attorney General's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO ADJUST THE STATUS OF CUBAN REFUGEES TO PERMANENT RESIDENTS, AUGUST 11, 1966

Thank you for the opportunity of appearing in support of a legislative proposal marked by both compassion and practicality.

This is my first appearance before you since March 4, 1965 when we discussed the bill which later became the Immigration Act of 1965. I welcome this opportunity to express my appreciation and admiration for the work of your Subcommittee in drafting that historic legislation.

I can report that the legislation is meeting the national needs and humane purposes for which it was intended. While abolishing the discriminatory national origins system, it is permitting families to reunite and allowing entry of persons with skills of importance to our nation.

Our implementation of the law is still undergoing refinement. Should we conclude that amendments are needed to attain maximum effectiveness, I am confident that you will give our proposals due consideration.

The Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigation, created by the 1965 Act, held its first meeting last week under the chairmanship of former Census Bureau Director Richard Scammon. The Commission is expected to supply valuable data in the long-neglected field of immigration from other nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Pending completion of the Commission study—and at least until July 1, 1968—there is no numerical limitation on immigration from the independent countries of this hemisphere. However—unlike Europeans, Asians and Africans—natives of Western Hemisphere countries in the United States may not acquire permanent residence unless they depart and obtain an immigrant visa from a United States Consul abroad.

When applied to the native of Cuba, this provision becomes an often-insurmountable barrier to citizenship.

For he may not return to his homeland for the documentation necessary for permanent residency. The difficulties and expense of his traveling to another country for this documentation severely limit the number of Cubans who have been able to commence the five-year permanent residency required to petition for United States citizenship.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service reports there are nearly 165,000 Cubans in the United States without permanent residence status. Of these, 36,000 have arrived since resumption of direct airlifts from Cuba last December 1 under the policy which President Johnson enunciated upon signing the 1965 Act. They, along with 81,000 others, are here on parole. Another 47,000 were admitted on nonimmigrant visas issued by United States Consuls before their withdrawal from Cuba on January 3, 1961.

To permit removal of the restrictions placed upon these refugees by their lack of permanent residency will be to benefit them and the United States. This country can well use the services of the skilled and professionally-trained Cuban who is currently prevented from practicing his profession. Attainment of permanent residency by more Cuban refugees would reduce our Government's expenditures on their behalf and aid in their resettlement by enhancing their position to qualify for employment in all areas of the nation.

Mr. Chairman, I endorse the proposal to allow Cuban refugees to apply for permanent resident status.

I am pleased to observe that all bills before you to accomplish this would make the adjustment discretionary and voluntary rather than automatic.

Whether the permanent residency proposed for these refugees would be rolled back to the date of their entry or begun upon adjustment of their status is a matter which I will leave for Congressional determination.

In any event, allowing the Cuban to acquire permanent residence and the promise of eventual citizenship will enrich his life and ours—whether he plans to remain here forever or return to a Cuba freed from tyranny.

Such legislation would be a humane postscript to the message formulated by our government and voiced by the President when he said to the people of Cuba that "those who seek refuge here in America will find it."

COL. CHARLES H. MOSELEY, M.C., RETIRES FROM ARMY

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GETTYS] 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, the highest noncombat award authorized by Congress for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service in a position of great responsibility was given to Col. Charles H. Moseley, M.C., on his retirement on July 31 as director of personnel and training at the Army Surgeon General's Office. Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, the Army Surgeon General, presented him the Distinguished Service Medal. The Army Medical Service Bronze Medallion, for 30 years of faithful service, was also presented by General Heaton before an assembled group of friends.

Colonel Moseley was born and reared in Anderson, S.C. He obtained his A.B. degree from Wofford College at Spartanburg and taught and coached in the high school at Rock Hill, where I was one of his students and football team aspirants. After 3 years he went on to the Medical School at Vanderbilt University and was awarded his medical degree in 1935.

Colonel Moseley has accepted a position in Chicago as director of the department of governmental medical programs with the American Medical Association. Mrs. Moseley is the former Miss Nida DePass, of Rock Hill, S.C. They have one son, Charles H., Jr., a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy. He is now doing graduate work in nuclear engineering at Princeton University under a fellowship awarded by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure that I insert in the RECORD at this

point a letter written by General Heaton to Colonel Moseley under date of July 31, 1966. The contents of the letter, which was read at the retirement ceremony honoring Colonel Moseley, so clearly indicate the type of man that Colonel Moseley is that I request permission to have the letter printed in the RECORD in order that all of us may be inspired by the example of this distinguished medical man. Colonel Moseley has contributed much to his fellow countrymen during his years of service with the U.S. Army. Good luck and Godspeed to him.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1966.

Col. CHARLES H. MOSELEY,
Director, Personnel and Training, Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: As your distinguished military carrer draws to a close, I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep personal appreciation for the many significant and lasting contributions you have made to the Army Medical Service over the years, especially for the invaluable assistance you have given me while serving here in my Office as the Director of Personnel and Training.

We were, indeed, fortunate to have a man of your professional distinction and experience to serve in a position of such vital importance to the accomplishment of the overall mission of the Army Medical Service. Consistent with the extraordinary spirit of dedication which characterized your entire career, once again you unreservedly applied your professional and executive talents to the tasks at hand which brought about numerous advancements. Your recommendations regarding proper utilization and distribution of personnel resources and your facility in monitoring legislative measures affecting medical service personnel enabled this Office to meet with success in providing medical support to military personnel, particularly during periods of crisis in the Dominican Republic and in Vietnam.

Through your conscientious attention to duty, understanding of the aims and problems of the Army Medical Service, and competence as a professsional military officer, you molded a willing, exceptionally proficient staff within your Directorate that worked harmoniously with the best interests of the Army uppermost in their minds. Thus, you have contributed in a most memorable and significant way to the continued successful operation of my Office.

As you depart to assume new responsibilities as Director of the Department of Governmental Medical Programs with the American Medical Association, I want to assure you that you will be long remembered as one of the most effective and productive Directors of Personnel and Training.

Once again, may I offer my heartfelt thanks for the loyal and dedicated support you have given me throughout these years, and Sara Hill joins in warmest wishes to Nida and you for continued happiness and success in the future.

Sincerely,

LEONARD D. HEATON,
Lieutenant General,
The Surgeon General.

MARTIN COUNTY GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the Members of this House some of the confusing and perplexing requirements that exist between the citizens of this Nation and those who are arbitrarily making policy and guidelines from the many departments of this Government.

I refer specifically to the case of the Martin County General Hospital located in Williamston, N.C. This is a hospital of approximately 50-bed capacity. It serves a wide area of rural people of both races. I am convinced that they have made every effort to comply with the decrees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to qualify for medicare approval.

Here is the tragic and ridiculous story of their experience with HEW.

On June 30 I was notified that approval was being withheld because a complaint had been lodged against this hospital. When I inquired of HEW, who had registered the complaint and what the nature of the complaint might be, I was told that the compaint was not considered valid and therefore, had been dismissed. On July 8 this hospital was advised that the complaint had been withdawn and that approval in all probability would be forthcoming.

When I attempted to find the reason for nonapproval, I was told that a team of inspectors would be sent to this hospital to make a final report. This was done on August 3. Today, August 10, I have been advised by a Mrs. Rose Brock, compliance officer of the HEW Department, that approval was being denied. In answer to my question of what the noncompliance might be, I was given the following answer:

First that the waiting rooms in the hospital had not been totally integrated. This, the administrator of the hospital vigorously denies. And the second reason was that the hospital was not uniformly referring to all people with the title of "Mr. and Mrs." This requirement startled me to the degree that I then asked again if I had heard correctly and was again informed that the failure to use the title "Mr. or Mrs." was a violation of the guidelines. I might add that both of these compaints, even if true have absolutely no bearing whatsoever on the quality of medical treatment being received by members of all races.

It is difficult for me to comprehend how anybody or any department could deprive elderly people who are otherwise eligible for medicare of these rights and privileges for the reason of the failure to use "Mr. and Mrs." in connection with the operation of this, or any other hospital. I can only conclude that it is just another chapter in the dangerous depths to which bureaucracy has come in imposing their will on those persons and institutions dedicated to public service, in many cases without valid reason or justification.

This, of course, is a direct distortion of the purpose of Martin County General or any other hospital that purpose is, and should be, to provide medical service and treatment to the sick and injured, and for that purpose only.

I hope the Members of this House will join with me in protesting these unreasonable and unrealistic demands of governmental agencies while the health and well-being of sick people are at stake.

I am convinced that Congress enacted the medicare bill for the purpose of providing care for our elder citizens and for this purpose only.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BERLIN WALL ERECTION

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCGRATH] 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago tomorrow, the Russians gave literally concrete evidence to the entire world of the fruits communism holds for the peoples in its grasp. During the nights of August 12 and 13, 1961, the Soviets erected a barrier across the previous sector boundary which separated the Soviet area of responsibility from those of the United States, British and French occupation forces in the former German capital of Berlin. Within a few weeks the original barbed-wire barrier was replaced by a wall of concrete blocks surmounted by barbed wire, and this monument to Soviet rule stands today as a symbol of all that is inherently evil in communism.

The Berlin Wall was not erected to keep oppressed, deprived, and enslaved peoples of the United States, British, and French zones of Berlin from pushing their way into the warmth of Soviet beneficence. On the contrary, it was erected to halt the unending defection of literally thousands of Soviet gone Berliners from escaping the oppression, deprivation, and enslavement of Soviet communism. East Berliners were fleeing into the western sectors of the city in numbers which left no doubt that, when placed side by side, communism cannot compete with democracy in the minds and hearts of people left free to choose.

For 5 full years, the Russians have maintained this ugly symbol of their police state. Their minions have slain East Berliners who, despite the physical barrier placed in their path, still prefer to seek a way into West Berlin under the threat of death rather than to live under the puppet government the Soviets have placed in power in East Berlin. And still they come—not in thousands any more, since their bodies cannot overcome the height of the Berlin wall and their legs cannot outdistance the East Berlin policemen's bullets, but in ones and twos.

Despite the deprivations inside the Berlin wall, despite the necessity for the wall to keep the East Berliners enslaved, despite the obvious symbolism of the wall as a barrier to freedom, the Soviets continue to characterize democracy as the evil in society and dare to paint communism as paradise. Yes, Mr. Speaker, de-

spite the evidence of tyranny and oppression inherent in the wall, the Soviet "double-think" process still dares claim that good is evil and their evil is good.

But the world is not fooled. Those newly independent peoples of Africa have displayed their distrust of communism. In southeast Asia, the Indonesians have rid themselves of leaders who sought to further involve them with communism. In South Vietnam a people who are weary after 20 years of incessant warfare are still battling valiantly to keep communism from overcoming their land. In South America, distrust of communism and its spokesmen is seen ever more frequently in national elections. In Europe, communism is at its lowest postwar ebb.

Mr. Speaker, the Berlin wall stands for the world to behold as a true symbol of the meaning of communism—imprisonment behind barriers imposed by Moscow. While the free world sympathizes with the East Berliners sealed into their Communist prison by the wall, on this, the fifth anniversary of its erection, we recognize it for what it actually is—an "advertisement" of the fruits of communism.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SCHISLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, commonly referred to as the cold war GI bill. My bill would increase the rates of financial assistance under the veterans educational assistance program and broaden that program to provide for assistance in on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training.

Under existing law a cold war veteran receives only $100 per month if he is pursuing a course of education on a full-time basis, $75 per month on a three-quarter-time basis, and $50 per month on a half-time basis. Under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act the child of a veteran who died from a service-connected disability or who is totally disabled from a service-connected cause may receive education assistance at the rate of $130 per month on a full-time basis, $95 per month on a three-quarter basis, and $60 per month on a half-time basis. It does not seem reasonable that we should have two educational assistance programs operated by the Veterans' Administration under which a cold war veteran and the child of a veteran deceased or totally disabled from service-connected cause receive different amounts of financial assistance.

My bill would increase the rates of assistance to a cold war veteran without dependents so that they would be identical to the assistance now payable under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act. Under existing law cold war veterans with one dependent receive assistance at the monthly rate of $125 for a full-time course, $95 for a three-quarter-time course, and $65 for a half-time course. My bill would increase these rates to $155, $115, and $75. The existing rates for a cold war veteran with two or more dependents would be increased from $150, $115, and $75, to $180, $135, and $90.

Since the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act was enacted in 1956, the cost for tuition and required fees have increased approximately 50 percent and the costs of living have increased approximately 18 percent. Probably these costs will continue to increase and if we do not increase the rates of financial assistance to cold war veterans, the purpose of the legislation will be defeated because many veterans will be financially unable to take advantage of it.

The World War II and Korean GI bills provided for on-the-job training. This program has proved very successful in the past and I think it is only proper that the same assistance should be extended to veterans of the cold war. In fact, the need for such training increases as the increasing complexity of our technology requires greater skills and technical knowledge. Many industries already have job training programs in existence and with financial assistance such as provided to World War II and Korean conflict veterans, many cold war veterans will take advantage of this type of training with benefit not only to themselves but also with benefits to the entire economy through the provision of highly skilled workers so essential in modern production.

My bill also provides for on-the-farm training on substantially the same basis as the World War II and Korean conflict veterans received under previous GI bills. It seems to me that cold war veterans should have the same opportunity as the World War II and Korean conflict veterans to prepare themselves for a career or occupation of their choosing. Those who prefer to remain on the farm should not be penalized and denied training because of that fact.

It is well known that there is a critical shortage of qualified airline pilots. With continuous increase in air travel this shortage will become more critical in the future and I think it is very important that we have a program to cope with this critical shortage. I have provided in my bill that cold war veterans may receive assistance for flight training and I believe that will not only benefit the veterans who desire to pursue aviation as a career, but will also be of significant benefit to the general public.

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. SCHISLER (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS), for 1 hour, on August 15; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Dow (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS), for 15 minutes, on August 15; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROYBAL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY.
Mr. STANTON.
Mr. TUPPER.
Mr. BUCHANAN.
Mr. MORSE.
Mr. SAYLOR.
Mr. HORTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TENZER.
Mr. ZABLOCKI.
Mr. RYAN.
Mr. HAGAN of Georgia in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10284. An act to provide that the Federal office building under construction in Fort Worth, Tex., shall be named the "Fritz Garland Lanham Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Fritz Garland Lanham, a Representative from the State of Texas from 1919 to 1947.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 15, 1966, 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:

2638. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of reporting of taxable income and tax withholdings of military personnel, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2639. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that certain public lands are held in trust by the United States for the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular 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. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 967. Resolution providing for the consideration of 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 (Rept. No. 1833). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 16863. A bill to amend the act of June 10, 1844, in order to clarify the corporate name of Georgetown University, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 16306. A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DADDARIO: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 16897. A bill to provide for the collection, compilation, critical evalution, publication, and sale of standard reference data (Rept. No. 1836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 82. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of the hearings of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico as Senate documents; with amendment (Rept. No. 1837). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 666. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print, "A study of Federal Credit Programs"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1838). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 791. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a report on U.S. policy toward Asia by the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, together with hearings thereon held by that subcommittee, and of additional copies thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 1839). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 879. Resolution for printing 2,000 additional copies of part I of "United States-South African Relations" for use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; with amendment (Rept. No. 1840). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 939. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 1841). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 98. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol" (Rept. No. 1842). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 925. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions, Canal Zone—Panama Canal Sovereignty, Panama Canal Modernization, New Canal," a compilation of addresses by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania (Rept. No. 1843). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 872. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law 89-97, 89th Congress, the "Social Security Amendments of 1965" (Rept. No. 1844). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 887. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1539 by the Committee on Education and Labor on the International Education Act of 1966 (Rept. No. 1845). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 891. Resolution providing for the printing of certain proceedings in the House Committee on the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1846). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 946. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1568 of the 89th Congress (Rept. No. 1847). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 13881, an act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1848). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4671. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 16984. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 16985. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 16986. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 16987. A bill to amend title 10, United State Code, to provide for an American Hero Award medal to be awarded to the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lose their lives as a direct result of injuries or disease incurred in armed conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 16988. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 16989. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a separate accounting of funds requested for the Department of Agriculture for programs and activities that primarily stabilize farm income and those that primarily benefit consumers, businessmen, and the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 16990. A bill to stabilize prices of food staples, to provide for an investigation of food prices by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16991. A bill to authorize a national medal in commemoration of the designation of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 16992. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 16993. A bill to prohibit the payment by the Internal Revenue of informers' fees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 16994. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 16995. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 16996. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain airplane parts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 16997. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 16998. A bill to further the completion of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Prince Georges County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 16999. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for door delivery service, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 17000. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish six centers to provide facilities for conducting research into the motivations and behavioral patterns of persons who have been convicted of crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 17001. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide city delivery mail service on a door delivery service basis for postal patrons receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 17002. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 17003. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for an American Hero Award medal to be awarded to the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lose their lives as a direct result of injuries or disease incurred in armed conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 17004. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the rates of financial assistance under the veterans' educational assistance program of that title and to broaden that program to provide for assistance in on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 17005. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase by 10 percent the amount of retirement, annuity, and endowment payments excluded from income for the purpose of determining the eligibility of an individual for pension under that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 17006. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a tem-

porary period for a graduated reduction or elimination of the investment credit based on the number of employees of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN ANDREWS:

H.R. 17007. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 17008. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing a memorial to John F. Kennedy in or near the Mount Rushmore National Memorial, S. Dak.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 17009. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 17010. A bill to amend section 401(b) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to remove certain minimum population requirements applicable to Indian reservations and lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 17011. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 17012. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 17013. A bill to provide for the restoration and rehabilitation of lands damaged by surface or strip mining; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.J. Res. 1268. Joint resolution providing for Federal participation in the construction of an addition to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library as a memorial to Eleanor Roosevelt; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.J. Res. 1269. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the second week of November 1966 as National Date Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. Con. Res. 976. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRALEY:

H. Con. Res. 977. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam be treated in accordance with the Geneva conventions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 978. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 979. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 17014. A bill for the relief of Wilkinson & Jenkins Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 17015. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Intili; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17016. A bill for the relief of Domenico Annibale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 17017. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lazlo Tarnoi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Drum Corps Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call the Congress' attention to the forthcoming celebration of National Drum Corps Week in America, August 20 to 27. The art of drum and bugle corps is in the best of American traditions, in the spirit of our colonial forefathers, who rallied around the Spirit of '76 for inspiration and strength in their struggle for independence.

It is with pride that I see today's youth devoting their time and energies to this fine and patriotic activity. Over 1 million Americans in neighborhoods and communities across the Nation will mark their participation in local drum and bugle corps this week.

The corps' motto is "Pageantry and patriotism on the march." The stirring emotional response of today's youth to the colors and rhythms and disciplinary skills which belonging to the drum corps invokes, provides a truly worthwhile activity for today's young people.

I am especially proud of the fine performance of the corps from my own district, the Shamrocks, Thunderbirds, and Toreadors, of Seattle, Wash. Seattle's recent "music in motion" competition provided a colorful contest and exciting evening for participants and onlookers alike. It is in honor of this worthwhile community activity that the Nation commemorates National Drum Corps Week, and wishes today's youngsters every success in the continuation of drum corps as a colorful youth activity.

Congressman Horton Applauds Red Creek Newspaper for Service Gesture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a program announced recently by the operators of a newspaper in my congressional district, the Red Creek Herald in Red Creek, N.Y.

Its publisher, Anthony G. Palermo and its managing editor, Ted L. Miller, have offered to send free copies of the newspaper to local servicemen stationed in Vietnam.

This generous and thoughtful action deserves public commendation. Too many times our thoughts on the war in that country have centered only on our policies and actions in pursuing this conflict. In many cases, we have overlooked the human aspects, the effects which service in a far distant area can have on a young man.

Regular news from home, concerning people, places, and events which are known to him can be a most welcome event to the bone-weary soldier who feels a million miles from familiar surroundings.

Thrust into a strange oriental atmosphere, fighting a war on terrain unfamiliar and always threatening, a young soldier yearns for things which remind him of home.

Again, I commend Mr. Palermo and Mr. Miller for their action. I am sure that their readers, and the servicemen who will receive the Red Creek Herald in the near future, join with me in that commendation.

House Joint Resolution 1169, Authorizing an International Conference on Water for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 11, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 1169 would enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in Washington next year.

No resource in this world is more highly prized than water. In the Middle East it is a continuing and basic cause of international strife. Today in Nebraska whole areas are submerged by floods. Yet, as I pointed out only recently to the House, the Northeast has entered its sixth consecutive year of drought.

I have introduced H.R. 10244, which would establish a Federal Water Commission to coordinate our national water resource development. I have stressed the need for a comprehensive, overall effort to attempt to solve our Nation's water problems. This same principle applies internationally as well. Planning