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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask the Senator's permission to withdraw a point of order which I previously made. The Senator from New York is correct.

Mr. JA VITS. Mr. President, reserving a reasonable ground for an amendment this way, and the basis upon which I am proposing it is not with any thought that we 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. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order with respect to convening at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow be rescinded, and that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.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. JA VITS. 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

CONFIRMATION

Executive confirmation confirmed by the Senate August 11, 1966:

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Paul A. Miller, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and approves the following: Members EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, CHAMIO, 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.

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 on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate today. I have been advised that the request has been made with the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. SPARANO.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUNDARY 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 that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate today. I have been advised that the request has been made with the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. SPARANO.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and approves the following:

Members EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, CHAMIO, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, RHODES of Arizona, and BOW.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and approves the following:

Members EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, CHAMIO, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, RHODES of Arizona, and BOW.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and approves the following:

Members EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, CHAMIO, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, RHODES of Arizona, and BOW.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and approves the following:

Members EVINS of Tennessee, BOLAND, SHIPLEY, CHAMIO, MAHON, JONAS, MINSHALL, RHODES of Arizona, and BOW.
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 property devised to the beneficiary under the will.

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 surviving spouse, but to the person who made the disclaimer, and inserting in lieu thereof "from the decedent to his surviving spouse".

The 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 the marital deduction for estate tax purposes) is amended to read as follows:

(a) section 2056(d) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the 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 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"; (b) the amendment made by this Act shall be applicable to estates of decedents dying after January 1, 1965; (c) the amendment made by this Act shall not be applicable to estates of decedents dying after January 1, 1966."

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 gentleman from Georgia, one of the great Members of this body.

Mrs. Edward Eugene Cox, whose husband represented the Second District of Georgia in Congress, 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 was 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 Gene Cox and 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.

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 flight 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.

Gene Cox and Mrs. Cox were close and successful together toward the advancement of many national origins blending successfully. The Order of Ahepa, a great organization, the Order of Ahepa, on the occasion of its 44th Supreme Convention on August 14 to 20, being held in Washington, D.C., 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 objectives. Her sister still resides in southwest Georgia and of my family is extended to all the family. Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I thank my colleagues 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 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 objectives. In the hope of Americanizing responsibility, the Order of Ahepa stands as an object lesson in successful cooperation.

I am particularly familiar with the effectiveness and alumni 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, by their hard work and great sacrifices, 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 110th Congress (H. Res. 1014) 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:

"§ 901. Purpose.

§ 902. Definitions.

§ 903. Reorganization plans.

§ 904. Additional contents of reorganization plans.

§ 905. Limitations on powers.

§ 906. Effect of reorganization 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. Transmittal of resolutions.

§ 910. Reference of reorganization to committee.

§ 911. Discharge of committee considering resolution.

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

§ 913. Decision by Senate on motion to postpone or proceed.

§ 910. 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 by the more effective management of the executive branch and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the judicial 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 this chapter and that the purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under this chapter not more speedily than by the enactment of specific legislation.

§ 902. Definitions

For the purposes of this chapter—

(1) "agency" means—

(A) an Executive agency or part thereof;

(B) an office or officer in the civil service of another agency or 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; or

(3) the coordination or consolidation 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 coordination or consolidation 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, or may not have, or on the taking effect of the reorganization plan will not have, any functions, it 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 tag to Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that the action necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 901(a) of this title.

(b) The plan 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 or part of a function under the plan the necessity for the exercise of the function and the reduction of expenditures (itemized so far as practicable) that would be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the plan.

§ 904. Additional contents of reorganization plans

(a) The President shall include in each reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 903 of this title—

(1) a change, in such case of the name of an agency affected by a reorganization and the title of its head; and

(2) the name of an agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head.

(3) 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 each case of the head, the term of office may not be fixed at more than 4 years, the pay may not be at a rate in excess of 5 times the rate of pay applicable to comparable officers in the executive branch, and, if the appointment is not made in the executive branch, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may appoint the governor of the District of Columbia or part thereof, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes.

(b) the government of the District of Columbia, it may be by the Board of Commissioners or other body created by Congress as the government of that government designated in the plan;

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

(4) may 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 functions which shall be affected by 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 reorganization plans

(a) No 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 provided by law at time of its creation 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 specifically authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to Congress;

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

(6) transferring to or consolidating with another a function, or part of a function, of the District of Columbia or all the functions thereof which are subject to this chapter, or abol-
lishing that government or all those functions by Congress

"(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 provided under subsection (c) of this section, a reorganization plan is effective at the end of the first 60-day period beginning on the date 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 with respect to the plan which has been referred to a committee; debate on the 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 (a) all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee; (b) the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, may make the resolutions effective at a time later than the date on which the plan otherwise is effective.

§ 911. Discharge of committee considering resolution

(a) If the committee to which a resolution referred has not reported it at the end of 10 calendar days after its introduction, it is in order to move to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution. The motion is highly privileged and is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) The motion to discharge may be made only by an individual favoring the resolution, is highly privileged (except that it may not be made in the case of resolutions described by section 909 of this title), and is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

(c) On motion to discharge the motion is not in order if the committee has been discharged by Congress.

§ 912. Procedure after report or discharge of committee

(a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged, it is in order to move to discharge the committee and to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. The motion is highly privileged and is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) Discharge shall be limited to not more than ten hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and opposing the resolution. An amendment to or motion to recommit, the resolution for reconsideration is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to. The motion to reconsider is 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 of a resolution, or the consideration of a resolution, with respect to a reorganization plan, and motions to reconsider any decision of the Committee of the Whole or the House, shall be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to, in the same manner as in the case of any other vote of either House.

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

"Sections 908-913 of this title are enacted by Congress.
Page 328, line 1, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)"
Page 328, strike out lines 3 to 16, inclusive.
Page 328, line 29, strike out "commissioner" and insert "Commissioner".
Page 329, line 30, strike out "commissioners" and insert "Commissioners".
Page 329, strike out all between lines 28 and 29 and insert:

"1916. Unauthorized employment and disposition of lapsed appropriations.

1917. Interference with civil service examination and appointment.

1918. Dishonesty or perjury and gross neglect in the performance of official duties.

1919. False statement to obtain unemployment compensation.

1920. False or withheld report concerning 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 Federal employees' compensation.

Page 806, line 89, strike out "2101(e)" and insert "2101(f)."

Page 305, strike out all between lines 28 and 30 over line 30 of page 308.

Page 307, line 20, strike out "1920" and insert "1921."

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

Page 307, line 35, strike out "1922 and insert "1919."

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

Page 308, line 17, strike out "1924 and insert "1928."

Page 309, line 16, after "appoint" insert "in the Department of Justice".

Page 309, 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 persons."-

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

"1937. 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. Such an appropriation is specifically for the purpose of the Attorney General, the Attorney General's office 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 5315-5417."

Page 330, line 3, strike out "2117(a)" and insert "2117(b).

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, 1946."

Page 335, line 21, strike out "extant and insert "extender."

Page 337, in the fifth column of the table in the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh lines following "1930 strike out ", (f) as applicable to sections 1501(a) and 1507(a) of the Social Security Act."

Page 361, in the table after the first line following "1983" which reads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 10</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 363, in the table in the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh lines following "1960" strike out ", (f) as applicable to sections 1501(a) and 1507(a) of the Social Security Act."

Page 363, in the table after the third line following "1946" which reads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 363, in the table in the fifth line following "1964" strike out "July 2" and insert "Mar. 26."

Page 366, in the table after "1966" insert:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>69-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. TUCK (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Senate amendments be done 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 effect 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 merely 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. ORRILL) 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. 11996) to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes. After general debate, the chairman from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be empowered to call the second and third, and any amendments made in the Senate, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill.

Resolved, 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. 11996) to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes. After general debate, the chairman from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be empowered to call the second and third, and any amendments made in the Senate, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. 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 the consideration of any amendments 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
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.

Mr. GOODELL. 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. 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-McCaughy & Associates, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW; Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall, 1725 1st 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 through general located in Washington, D.C., were known." It also found "matters which may not be in the Government's best interest."

Mr. GOODELL, 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 7, 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, and the engineering services division of ConAm was established in November 1964, 2

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, but 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 erroneous fiscal policies and its stubborn refusal to discontinue the fatal habit of deficit financing.

Mr. Speaker, this situation was highlighted yesterday when Pannie 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 5 1/4-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.
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 contract specifications chosen?

What connection was there between ConAm 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, 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 is 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:


Transmitted with this report is the Unitary States Grantee Directory for Fiscal Year 1965.

The educational and cultural programs of our Government are conducted in a world so interdependent that it confronts us with new environments. 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 a 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 human 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 629 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]
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, 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.

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 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.

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.

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 such election, and the correspondence received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with 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.

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

(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 504, chapter 120, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session, referred to as the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.
(d) Any statute or legislative act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or election 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.

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 if the committee so directs, or in deciding such controversies 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 finds that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or unimportant. All hearings before the committee shall be held in 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, shall have the power to hold 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 the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such depositions as may be necessary.

Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such committee.

The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statute in connection with any such campaign, 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.

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

That said committee is authorized and directed to investigate reports whenever, in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest would be 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 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 had been excluded because of the democratic process. When the Mississippi challenge was dismissed, a number of those who opposed the challenge agreed 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 as may be necessary.

Investigate and report to the House . . . with respect to . . . (6) Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives as may be necessary.

In short, the committee is empowered to make investigations in anticipation of a challenge similar to the elections 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 and Investigations has the power 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 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 use 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 this political system. 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 body.

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.

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 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 in the 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 on pending campaign finance 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 prevents many good men from offering and remaining in public office purely and simply by a lack of funds or an unwillingness to subject themselves to those who would put up the money.

This committee, with its forthcoming report, would indeed “aid the House 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 299, 89th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, the following Members: Mr. O'NEILL, of Massachusetts, chairman; Mr. SMITH, of Iowa; Mr. DAVIS, of Georgia; Mr. DEVINE, of Ohio; and Mr. GODDLE, 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 on the State of the Union (H. Res. 14559) 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 in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the amendments thereto. The bill may then be put to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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 for an open hearing with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 14559, 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 previous programs made possible with Federal aid in our highway system, the rapid growth pace of our population and economy has outstripped our planning.

For 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 Highway Programs. The Federal-Aid Highway Act in 1956 authorized the use of Federal aid for the interstate program and the A-B-C program. Congress increased some of the existing highway-related excise taxes and levied some new ones. It earmarked the revenue from 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.

By the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, Congress authorized the Federal-aid 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 for Federal 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 of the Federal Interstate Highway System and increase the total authorization for the program by $8,921,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 14359, so that we may vote to extend the authorization for the Interstate Highway System as required.

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 appropriation, 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. 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 are necessary 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? If that purpose is never designed to handle?

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

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 safer 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 motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KRUZYNSKI. 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 with Mr. Rosteckowski 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. Kruzyński) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Gramm) will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Kruzyński).

Mr. KRUZYNSKI. 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 an amendment 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 Interstate Highway System was born.

Since 1956, and the highway construction program in the world's history.

Today, 10 years later, more than half of the Interstate System is open to traffic. All the legislative purposes are proceeding steadily toward the completion of the system.

Since the 1956 act was passed, it has been amended several times. This was the need apparent. I am personally very proud of the fact that the House Committee on Public Works has always approached these amendments from a bipartisan 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 1966 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. By the time the estimate was 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 Systems has increased from July 1, 1956, through the completion of the system is $51.223 billion. Of this, the Federal share is $46.921 billion and the State's share is $6.302 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 hoped 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 construction of a Federal-Aid primary system, exclusive of Interstate highways and the Federal-aid secondary system, including 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 managed by the State highway agencies.

The bill authorizes $243 million for fiscal year 1968 and $250 million for fiscal year 1969 to carry out the Highway Beautification Act of 1966. Certain amendments in the Highways Beautification Act are proposed which will have the effect of making the act more workable. In drafting this legislation, the committee confirmed 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, $45 million for national parks roads and trails, $1 million for national forest roads and $41 million for Indian reservation roads and bridges.

One of the major problems in the construction of our 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 system, is 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 my friend from Illinois.

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 not yet been approved or have 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 of highway does the gentleman not think that we might well have dispensed for the time being with the beautification program and thereby save something 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.

The highway program is indispensable. We hope the Congress, even though it authorized the program 2 years ago—or a year ago—could change its mind under the circumstances and costs at present, we can see some daylight insofar as fin-
loss, and the committee believes that inadequate appropriations which result in the Bureau of Public Roads' losing money on its basic resources is neither sound management nor a contribution to a balanced budget.

Sections 1 and 8 of the reported bill make it clear that construction beautification funds must come from the general fund, not from the highway trust fund, and contain authorizations for 1965 and 1966 of $80 million for scenic control, $48 million for junkyard control, and $235 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. This is projected to be subject to change without amending that statute.

Section 9 of the reported bill is identical with H.R. 6790, passed unanimously by the Senate, 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.

Adverse 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 of Transportation, such payments 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 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 of, highway construction assistance programs for these two valuable and important territorial possessions of the United States. Development of both territories requires an adequate and safe highway system. It is presently the 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 if enacted into law would not 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 legislation.

There is considerable interest, in numerous sections of the country, relative to the possibility of adding additional mileage to the Interstate System and highway system in general.

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 1955 the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads were directed to study the highway needs of the Nation to be submitted to the Congress by January 1968 on what the future highway needs of the Nation will be beyond the present program. This report will 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. Are 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 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, but which included increased mileage on the Interstate System. For some time we have difficulty in even getting the Bureau to agree to request that the States have an opportunity to submit 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 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 of Public Roads.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, am I 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 specific request of the 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. 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 in the January 1968 report to the Congress as well. The decision can be made then by Congress relating 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 before we can seek reimbursement for existing highways. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Kluczyński) 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 $509.1 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, 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. Kluczyński), 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. Kluczyński), that he told us that the Interstate System was, roughly, one-half complete. And, the report also indicates that work has either started 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 been so, 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. Kluczyński), 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 he feels the beginning of the Interstate System was the full or partial contribution 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 to date of the Interstate System contributed to the Interstate System?

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 that fiscal year in which such allocations 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 the States and proprietors can first be assured starting in fiscal year 1968. In addition, planning and programming 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 skyscrapers; is there?

Mr. CRAMER. I say to the gentleman that we have discussed that subject once before here today. There is nothing in this 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 Congress 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 1969 estimates which are in excess of a $10 billion increase. With the other increased cost factors, the system will not be completed until 1972 and only then if the money 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 that the audit teams working in the Public Works Committee on State roads and highways are trying to provide 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 another committee. Mr. HALL. The Committee on Public Works does not have the authority to provide the money. 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, while there seems to be, on the one hand, a fight to change the constitution of the Nation, and to keep faith with the motorists by finishing it at least by 1973 than the administration wants, but the public wants, Federal expenditures, supposedly to try to fight inflation. But this is not an in which the cuts ought to come. Mr. HALL. It is very embarrassing for more taxes to be put into the trust fund when we are in the middle of the program. 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 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 funds to a sure and certain program. As far as this program, whatsoever that the cost of that program would be paid for by transfer of the 1 percent excise taxes. I am pleased 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 addition, 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 relations to 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 middle of shoulders across long bridges where traffic volumes require, more traffic lanes, additional interchanges, and design of safe and attractive environment.

There are continuing pressures to add ramps to simple grade separation structures, to convert them into interchanges with thousands of cars using 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 is the same in the entire Interstate System, in the 1960 estimate, is 1.1 miles in urban areas and 4.4 miles in rural areas. As communities grow, urban areas expand, and 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 means that every lane 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, 1973, and only tentative 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 as nearly completed 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 annually at least $630 million. Further, 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 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 will be spread over the maximum number of years remaining for completion of the system and thereby avoid peaks and valleys in the program, which is costly and places severe strain upon State highway departments and the construction industry. After thorough deliberation, the committee has recommended 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 from $19.584 billion under existing law to $24.505 billion, or a 1965 increase of $4.921 billion over the fiscal years 1968 through 1972, for completion of the Interstate System in 1973.

Based on testimony presented at the hearings, the committee has determined that the best estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System is $51,223 billion, or 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 at its present level—$1.1 billion in 1965 and 1966, and $1.2 billion in 1967 and 1968—and authorized additional funds for the Interstate System in 1965.

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 Federal-aid highway fund, under existing law, will exceed estimated expenditures for the Federal-aid highway program—assuming continuation of the present authorization 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 require a new, or additional, appropriation, under present tax laws, of approximately $8 billion.

There are several financing methods available to the Committee on Ways and Means to provide the $8 billion. The first, under existing law, is an additional appropriation from the alcohol excise tax. The committee recommended that one dollar of the 1-percent excise tax on gasoline now being considered by the Congress be appropriated to the highway trust fund, to be used only for highway construction, for such purpose; the extent to which funds shall be used, and other questions involved, are subject to the determination of the Congress. The committee recommends that the one dollar be appropriated to the highway trust fund, to be used only for highway construction, for such purpose, upon approval of the Congress.

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 submit a report herewith 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 making advance right-of-way acquisition, including the possible creation of special funds, either revolving or non-revolving, 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 and holding lands, 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 improvements that are rapidly being developed for residential subdivisions, shopping centers, and industrial parks. The few remaining empty lots in cities are disappearing, and new commercial buildings are being razed to make way for new multi-story 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 that were unforeseen when the right-of-way was purchased. The few remaining lots in cities are disappearing, and new commercial buildings are being razed to make way for new multi-story 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 that were unforeseen when the right-of-way was purchased.

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 two 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 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 87 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 upturn. 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 for the traveler, greater demands for automobiles, petroleum products, tires, motels, restaurants, and the vast portion of the economy devoted to recreation and tourism. Indeed, 82 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 tiny 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 killed in traffic accidents each year alone if they had been required to make their trip over inadequately designed highways.

And the primary 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 our highways safer.

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 federations 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. This legislation authorizes funds for the next two 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 Rural Development Act of 1962, which was first conceived 50 years ago, has been a landmark in the federations 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. This legislation authorizes funds for the next two 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 committee intends that the study and relocation study authorized by Section 315 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 be concluded by January 10, 1967.

The committee believes that the study and relocation study authorized by Section 315 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 should be concluded by January 10, 1967.

The committee believes that the study and relocation study authorized by Section 315 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 should be concluded by January 10, 1967.

The committee believes that the study and relocation study authorized by Section 315 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 should be concluded by January 10, 1967.
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employment in my congressional district. As solid evidence of the impact of the timber industry, 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. I also want to extend my support for the development of the National Forests, which I believe should be developed to serve all our needs. For full multiple use, a road system should be constructed to meet these intermingled uses.

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 provided to meet these needs. Public Law 88-657 provided the framework under which this road system can be systematically developed with each land owner being able to use his land under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service for forest access roads, to provide for multiple use access for recreation use during the last calendar year.

It is unfortunate that we are losing valuable timber and other resources as fast as is possible to accelerate the completion of the Interstate Highway System as close to "on schedule" as is possible.

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. These are all our citizens 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 for this program.

Mr. CRAGER. 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. HARRA]. I should like to address the questions to him.

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

I would also like to express my support for section 9 of this bill, which provides for a regulatory program 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.
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 urbanized areas, is the deciding factor? 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 on the basis of a rigid formula set forth in title 23 of the United States Code.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

I have a further question. In conversational discussions of Districts and the Ohio Department of Highways, I am informed that Ohio has always used every available Federal dollar authorized under Mr. Arends 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 to it?

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 all the funds allocated to it. I do know that certainly Ohio has not failed to take advantage of them. But to the contrary, there has been very vigorous and intensive activity under the Federal 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. The gentleman asked 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 whether they will be built, and how the State raises the additional 50 percent. The Federal Government does not instigate any sort of 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 true. Ohio is that correct?

Mr. HARSHA. If the gentleman will yield further, this is the situation in Ohio. There is some variation in other underwriting States, but the Federal Government is not concerned with where the State gets the second 50 percent of the allocation of funds. In Ohio it is my understanding that the State contributes 25 percent and the Federal Government is 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 long as that State is not deprived of Federal funds for the completion of interstate highways, which Ohio has carried out the highway program, having spent $1,176.4 million, as of March 31.

I am informed that Ohio has always used funds for the completion of interstate highways, and that Ohio or any other State failed to take advantage of whatever State and Federal funds were available to it. 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 President has proposed an additional amount 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 money on projects where a saving can be made of several million dollars without a hardship being worked on anyone.

What 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.

The need for 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 and Buildings Department of Public Works and Buildings 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 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 the primary responsibility for 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 need which is the determining factor rather than 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 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 over that of the Federal Bureau of Roads 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 have an additional responsibility. Our Governor was critical of the Congress for approving I-55, an interstate highway from St. Louis to Chicago. 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 by Route I-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 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 some 300 miles. The cost to the Federal Government is enormous.

I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the time nor place to argue the relative merits of what has been proposed for the 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 going to be a political one. The question to be resolved, whether to approve or disapprove the change proposed by the Governor for the merger of I-55 and I-65 in Illinois, is going to be made solely on a political basis 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 in the Roosevelt Room of the Executive Office Building by the White House.

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

Here we go to the Commissioner of Federal Highways and 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 that is of such great importance. I hope you will believe that this whole matter has been placed in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. 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.
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be done in every State of the United States of America. It is wrong and is as wrong as can be when we recall that the original concept of our Interstate Highway System was to be.

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

Mr. ARENSD. 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 funds needed to complete improvements so that they can let contracts in the time to get the job done.

Mr. ARENSD. 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. ARENSD. 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, has great 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 motorways.

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 informed the Honorable F. L. S. Lorenzo, 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 fiscal year 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 States may get on with the important job of highway construction.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may desire to raise sufficient funds at the local level on behalf of the States, and as much as I may be able to do to make the Interstate System federized, 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 my committee and its chairmen and recommendations give thought to this problem.

This fine committee, in the studies that it generally makes, I am sure will give great attention to recommending for 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 on our highways each 8 seconds. As to that I don't know but an increase of 3% million people each year adds to highway needs, I know.

I again commend my friends on the committee—for the 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 of 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 was asked, 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. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 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 think 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, legislation which became law in 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...
Mr. Buchanan. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of Birmingham, Ala., the largest urban area in the State, I support H.R. 14339, the highway bill now pending before the House.

This bill includes funds for the A-B-C Federal-Aid Highway 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 $3,381,000 specifically for the construction of urban roads in the State of Alabama for fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

Under the A-B-C program, the plans for urban road construction and improvement developed at the local level must be adopted by the 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-user funds, 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 projection of the future.

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 in the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 assure the availability of funds for any urban road development and improvement which may be submitted by the State to the Federal aid program.
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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, as the Senate refers to dominate 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.

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 contractors 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 allocations are.

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 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 and the 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, these 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 industry. They have been 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 placed upon timber operators who work the forest service lands does not get built, and opportunities are lost for developing and protecting natural resources. But, if financing provisions are adequate, then cooperative financing arrangements involving private investment, and the timber operators can be established.

Intensive management of secondary and tertiary 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 in a year merely from the thinning of secondary-growth stands and salvage cuts in other stands. In the face of growing pressures to export our 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 yet taken up 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. LOVR. Mr. Chairman, while I listened with interest to the colloquy between my colleagues from Ohio [Mr. Bow and Mr. Hansen] 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 with 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. The ratings and there were there by created a hazard. I had had complaints from residents and businessmen, not only about the inconvenience, but also the money lost by business. I feel sure this was an accident in building with greater efficiency. I feel that the intent to keep the road open to traffic, the length of the paving plans on the other side of Dorothy Lane was most unreasonable.

In response to my letter to the Bureau of Public Roads, Mr. Rex M. Whitten, 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 the paving plans on the other 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 new procedure through review and issuance of 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 inconvenience and financial losses to businesses.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will join 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. DUMMER. 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 its entirety 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 SEC. 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966".

Revision of Authorization of Appropriations ...

Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, including necessary bridge or road facilities, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in the plan for the Interstate System, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization herefore made for that year, the additional sum of $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization herefore made for that year, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization herefore made for that year, the additional sum of $2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the additional sum of $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the additional sum of $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the additional sum of $2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, the additional sum of $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, the additional sum of $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978, the additional sum of $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1979.
year ending June 30, 1969, the additional sum of $4,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the additional sum of $5,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the additional sum of $4,500,000,000 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, 133, 136, 137, or any provision of law relating to highway safety enacted after May 1, 1966.

AUTHORIZATION OF USE ESTIMATE FOR
APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS
Sec. 3. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make the apportionment for the fiscal year 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 Number 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 “fiscal year ending June 30, 1972” and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the words “fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(b) The introductory phrase and the second and third sentences of section 106(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 106(b)(5) is further amended by striking “June 30, 1971,” at the end of the penultimate sentence and inserting in lieu thereof “fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.”

FOUR-LANE 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 lanes from the main traveled way of the Interstate System.”

AUTHORIZED
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 in such amount as is necessary and desirable, the services of private engineering firms, subject to requirements prescribed by the Secretary.”

year ending June 30, 1969, the additional sum of $4,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

For state and local highways, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress not later than January 10, 1967, together with his recommendations.

SEC. 16. Transportation De~artment.

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 making the provisions of this subsection applicable to the State of Alaska, the Secretary shall make such additional grants as shall be necessary to provide funds for the purpose of developing the Alaska highway system.”
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, as added by the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI), and as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "shortly after June 30" the following new subsection:

"(r) The Secretary may permit the participation of interstate funds apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section to the extent of 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 the purpose of meeting the financial requirements to complete the Interstate System which it has a responsibility to construct, and the Secretary shall determine by the Secretary after consultation with the Congress of the amount of funds to be substituted for the purpose of meeting the financial requirements to complete the Interstate System which it has a responsibility to construct."

This amendment is offered with the understanding that it will not increase the amount of funds to be appropriated for the construction of toll bridges, tunnels, or roads on the Interstate System.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity 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 highway. 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 across this bridge, and it costs us $7.50 for a round trip.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit the States to use part of their allocations of funds to pay the tolls on the bonds so that these new facilities can 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. But I am 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 fee, 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 way we build 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 $40 million for bridges on the Interstate System. Right now the lower part of Michigan last a breke when 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. When we used to build these facilities they were not 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 Tolloway. 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 are building an interstate 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 there 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, I ask the unanimous consent that the bill may be considered without motion before the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLEVENGER) 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 relative 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 there before the 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 a bill 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, which has been the time to appear so we could give proper consideration to any recommendations he might have.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Has the President made any such proposal? I am sure that he is not.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I cannot speak for him.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. The gentleman from Alabama is certainly one of the most 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 others States that have toll roads built into the Interstate 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. Mr. Chairman, 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 appportionment, interstate appportionment, and use them to pay for toll roads and bridges.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, that means that if we should destroy the Interstate System, which is already constructed on a toll road basis, or authorizing new mileage to States in my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask 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 before Congress since 1944. Without exception there has never been a State that petitioned the Congress to change the formula of payment of reimbursable obligations that is now used.

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 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 funds of the State highway departments, or to those roads that probably will be utilized in the Interstate System in the future.

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 affecting constituents in every one of the congressional districts of the United States, because as Americans are traveling more, the 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 over $800 million which has never been reimbursed for that expenditure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Kuczyrszewski), and the chairmen 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 some weeks of hearings on, rather, held many weeks of hearings. These hearings are not printed yet.

But, Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Florida is right.
floor of the House, and I am hopeful that when the hearings are printed out that of this will emerge legislation that will provide a permanent solution to this most vexing problem.

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to believe that this will have to come after 1973. But I believe that the 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 and the gentleman from Missouri in carrying this idea across a log of continuing legislation.

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 spent the largest proportion of their money to have roads and bridges built; now they are suffering for their energy and their investment.

Mr. Chairman. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was not moved.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEVELAND

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVELAND: On page 20, after line 12, add the following new section:

"§ 101. Preservation of Parklands: "

"§ 101. 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 protect Federal, State, and local government 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 any body can object to this statement of policy, and 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 general than my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 26, 1966, commencing at page 17630, the record of the Senate in which Senator Yarborough has made a statement concerning this 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 believe 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 alignment 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 alleged 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 tenement's amendment or the subject itself, I hope that the Committee of the Whole will vote it down. 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 New York 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 State of New York 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 the amendment does. The committee does not have to study it. It is a statement of policy on an important issue that has certainly important. And I believe 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 alignment 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.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. The State will reject the amendment.

Mr. GRAY. 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 the States are receiv ing and has been receiving its fair share of all Federal highway moneys appropriated by the Congress?

Mr. KLUCZINSKI. You mean the State of Georgia, Mr. HAGAN.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. The State of Georgia.

Mr. KLUCZINSKI. 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 on 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. Senator Russell remembers that $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 should undertake to extend the system.

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas just what took place in 1944, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Department of the Army, and the direction of Interstate Highway Director, Mr. Greer, we were given the designation of the roads.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Greer, the head engineer of Texas, is the best in the business, we think.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That was included in the act of 1956 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 1966. 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 can. Certainly we hope to provide to Lubbock, Texas, 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 prior to that time, because we have to have a leadtime for rights-of-way and plans and financial obligations.

Mr. MAHON. 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 the able gentleman 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 its 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.

Mr. MAHON. The 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 and the Ways and Means Committee to cooperate with the appropriations committee 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 that 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 done.

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 from the first three sections on page 15, the authorization for the beautification program for fiscal 1968 and 1969. Let me make it clear at the outset that I have been informed the administration did not request these beautification grants. 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 beautification 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 cost 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 you can authorize expenditures 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 the President has ever 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. I think you will all 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 is deferred in the first instance by the administration. It simply defers it to next year, when the fiscal situation facing this country may be more favorable. Furthermore, the amount 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 deferring 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 was specifically mentioned by the President in his budgetary requests. He may make it clear at the outset that I have been informed the administration did not request these beautification grants. 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 beautification 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 cost 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 you can authorize expenditures 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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire is making a political speech which has nothing to do with the legislation now pending before this Committee 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.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of the gentleman from New Hampshire 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 amendments.

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 remind it 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 New Hampshire (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 this Committee 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. 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 day to have the President 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 the Senate. 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 market 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 51/2 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 those who control this country from borrowing money to pay for its needs, and I am going to vote to pay current bills and not to go into debt.

When appropriation bills are presented on the floor, the argument is made that the Government does not have the money to pay current bills. I feel we now have reached the point where there are serious inflationary pressures, and we should urge Congress to not exceed its 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 perjury, but it is a fact 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 the Congress is doing nothing about 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 willing to do so, but I have tried to remain on this 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 and 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 eke out that kind 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 $483 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 record there is some very pertinent language:

Since 1963 there has been a consistent 21/2 percent-a-year increase in construction costs that we are authorized. The fact is that the Government does not have any money to pay current bills.

So these are pertinent arguments, not narrow partisan political arguments, and I do hope that the Committee will vote 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 obligatory authority.

Then, we have the 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 $86 million increase in the landscaping section, section (c) of section 8, there is a $15 million increase in 1968 and a $30 million increase in 1969. We will have the other thing, the junkyard section, section (a). 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 imperative and in the national interest that Highway System is such that it is

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 for billboard and junkyard removal, 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, in my State—and perhaps in other States—we have already undertook, as a consequence of the procurement of the money that was in the trust fund this year, that money would take in 1968 to, first, take care of the billboards, second, take care of the junkyards, and third, provide for general beautification purposes.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Those provisions were drafted to make certain beautification or safety will not come out of the fund and appear in other sections. That remains in the language of the bill and is not stricken by the amendment of the gentleman. There is no authorization for putting in 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 wish to say 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 the President's budget. Our basic money to take would be in 1968 as to, first, take care of the billboards, second, take care of the junkyards, and third, provide for general beautification purposes.

Mr. SWEENEY. I refuse to yield. The gentleman is not answering my question. I asked the question. I had no answer.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I refuse to yield further. The gentleman is not answering the question. I asked the gentleman again, where is there evidence in the record that $80 million is needed in 1966, 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 in 1966 and 1967. They ask in their amendment that that money 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 fund and appear in other sections. That remains in the language of the bill and is not stricken by the amendment of the gentleman. There is no authorization for putting in 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.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Those provisions were drafted to make certain beautification or safety will not come out of the fund and appear in other sections. That remains in the language of the bill and is not stricken by the amendment of the gentleman. There is no authorization for putting in 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 wish to say 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 the President's budget. Our basic money to take would be in 1968 as to, first, take care of the billboards, second, take care of the junkyards, and third, provide for general beautification purposes.

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 the authorization. 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 yield further to the gentleman.
Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. 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 on the bill setting forth my objections to this particular provision in an otherwise very fine piece of legislation. However, as my colleague from New Hampshire indicated, my sick 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, I did not request the sum set forth in this legislation for highway beautification.

This provision in the bill authorizes the expenditure of some $193 million and begins 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 continual increase in the cost of living 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 all-time high and has also created a lack of available funds. The results of this activity are reflected in the terms of a multiple of America, the small businessmen, and the home builders, are encountering in trying to find adequate funds with which to meet their 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. CRANZE) there were—aye 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:

"SEC. 14(a) The Governor of a State may elect to have any funds appropriated to such State after the due 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 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 to the objective 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. Mr. Chairman, 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 State to use the funds apportioned under the Federal-aid highway program for the purposes of mass transportation if he so desires. It does not compel 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 purposes as well as highways in order to achieve a balanced transportation system.

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 putting in the amount of money committed to the highway programs.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCHINSKI) 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 financial 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 major centers; and the problem of mass transportation cannot be ignored any longer.

The need for more mass transportation and the need to find a way to get back at least 10.5 billion dollars that the Highway Act of 1966's would be at least 10.9 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 $376 million in Federal aid, and even this small amount was spread over 3 years, whereas only 10.5 billion dollars of Federal 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.

The stiffness 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, 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 part of the system. Through these terms, we have poured billions of Federal tax dollars into highways since 1956-10 years ago. Yet we have had only limited funds available for mass transportation—and those only since 1952 and 1957.

The amendment which I proposed is similar to my bill, H.R. 12852, and legislation introduced by our colleague from New York (Mr. Bingman) and Senator Dole. It would give 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 following 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 have toll men to toll routes in the Interstate Highway System?

Mr. GROSS. I believe that is what was said.

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 taken toll roads into the Interstate System, we do have at this time, in some states, designated roads as tolls 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. 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 programs are set up 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. 10120, which reads.

...is it there? I am afraid I could not make out the number of the authority to use a portion of the huge amounts of Federal aid now going into superhighway construction for mass transit purposes.

I would like to ask the gentleman to respond to the demonstration of the need for some form of local government, creation of a balanced transportation system requires it. At the same time, Senator Tydings introduced a companion bill in the Senate, S. 3339.

...and thereafter Representatives Ashley (H.R. 10170), Farestine (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 10, page 12, 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, it is of even greater importance within the city limits. This presents a problem of movement of people to and from work, school, residences, and service facilities in a congested city.

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 $325 million. Whatever sum will emerge from the Congress, the disparity between this amount and what the 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 further and constantly 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 taxes to meet these pressures grows more urgent.

I regret to report that various pressure groups have done much to attempt to distort the meaning and impact of my proposal. Some of these groups still assert that the proposal is aimed at preventing any further construction of highways; an assertion which is untrue. Most of our proposals are 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 federal needs dictated at any given time.

I also would call attention to a serious misleading statement of fact on that page. The report is stated that the earmark statement that has distorted 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 federally subsidized road. Some people 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 usually pay less than 30 percent of the cost. If equivalent subsidies were paid to subway and bus riders such as those of the Federal Expressway, we would have to pay the subway and bus riders to get on these conveyances.

As we buy gasoline we contribute to this fund, regardless of whether our travels are along city streets or non-subsidized 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 as it is, that the equalizing of highway users with all who pay the automotive and gasoline taxes should stop.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that hearings be held on this very important subject. This inadequate 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 the need for more roads and the daily commuter to mass transit.

It is incongruous 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 obliged to finance large sums to highway construction which might otherwise be availble for mass transit. My proposal would give to 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 such review be made by 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. PALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PALLON. 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. 14160, the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1966.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comment. My point is that I think 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 the Committee had had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14359) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highway improvements in accordance with title II 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 ordered to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was ordered to the House of Representatives for its information.
Mr. Estes of Texas was recognized as the gentle- man from New York at yeas and nays.

Mr. Van Deventer with Mr. Boggs with Mr. Schisler with Mr. Gordon with Mr. Corman with Mr. Powell with Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Kupferman. Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Moore with Mr. Williams with Mr. Rees with Mr. Tuten.

Mr. Miller of Ohio with Mr. Dunn with Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Kupferman. Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Moore with Mr. Williams with Mr. Rees with Mr. Tuten.

Mr. Miller of Ohio with Mr. Dunn with Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Kupferman. Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Moore with Mr. Williams with Mr. Rees with Mr. Tuten.

Mr. Miller of Ohio with Mr. Dunn with Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Kupferman. Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Moore with Mr. Williams with Mr. Rees with Mr. Tuten.

Mr. Miller of Ohio with Mr. Dunn with Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Kupferman. Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Moore with Mr. Williams with Mr. Rees with Mr. Tuten.

Mr. Miller of Ohio with Mr. Dunn with Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Kupferman. Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Moore with Mr. Williams with Mr. Rees with Mr. Tuten.

Mr. Miller of Ohio with Mr. Dunn with Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Kupferman. Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Moore with Mr. Williams with Mr. Rees with Mr. Tuten.
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. Bowl). 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 to take from the Speaker's desk 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, for other purposes, and ask for his 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

SEC. 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 1966, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATIONS OF USE OF COST ESTIMATE FOR APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS"

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make arrangements for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968 and 1969, of the sums authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, respectively, for the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966.

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Sec. 4. (a) Subsection (b) of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following:

Such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act may be expended in any one fiscal year to carry out this section except that if in any one fiscal year the amount of such sums which are not expended in any one fiscal year shall be in addition to the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section in any one fiscal year shall be available for expenditure in any one fiscal year to carry out this section except that if in any one fiscal year the amount of such sums which are not expended in any one fiscal year shall be in addition to the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section in any one fiscal year shall be available for expenditure in any one fiscal year.

(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 practicable.

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, 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 $1,700,000,000 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 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, $935,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $385,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(3) For public lands highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, $190,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $85,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(4) For Indian reservation roads and trails, $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(5) For public lands development roads and trails, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(6) For park roads and trails, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $40,000,000 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 $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

ALASKAN ASSISTANCE

Sec. 6. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 116, funds made available to the Secretary of Commerce in this section of the United States Code, may be expended by the State of Alaska for maintenance of Federal-aid highways.

(b) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code are amended by inserting after the second sentence the following:

For Indian reservation roads and trails, $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.
State highway departments, and other affected 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 engineering and reestablishment of persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations to be displaced by constructing new 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 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, shall be 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.

SOIL EROSION CONTROL

Sec. 12. Section 109 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection to read 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 the adverse ecological impact of 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 after the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

"§ 137. Preservation of park lands.

It is hereby declared to be the national policy of the United States to provide that in any project in which the Secretary shall undertake to construct a Federal-aid highway system, the acquisition of park lands or other lands and fee simple interests, the use of which shall be in the public interest, shall be chargeable to the highway trust fund; and

(b) Any person who shall be displaced by 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 the adverse ecological impact of the proposed excavations and construction.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WRIGHT: Strike out all after the first sentence of the Senate bill, S. 3135, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill, H.R. 14359, as passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill, S. 3135, 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 CONFERENCE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill, S. 3135, 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.

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 Conference: Messrs. FALCON, KLCZYNJSKI, BLATNIK, JONES OF ALABAMA, CLARK, CHAMBERS, HASHE, 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 FMNA borrowing authority;

H.R. 16897, providing for the collection, compilation, publication, and sale of standard reference data;

H.R. 15566, amending Great Salt Lake Resettlement Act;

H.R. 16114, correction of certain employment inequities with respect to premium compensation;

H.R. 16099, authorizing a study of facilities and services for visitors to the Nation's Capital;

H.R. 15024, amendment to Public Buildings Act of 1958;

H.R. 11355, the Chaminual 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;

H.R. 16116, International Conference on Water for Peace;

H.R. 15559, 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. 10330, Philippine hospitalization and medical care; and

H.R. 13676, 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. 14610, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966—open rule, 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 13226, 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. 13390, Highway Safety Act of 1966—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 air 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 ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPELLING 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 AUTHORIZED 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 bilingial 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, 15, 16, 17, and November 27, 28, 29, 1966, 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 charge 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.

AUTHORIZED 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" by that committee during the Eighty-eighth 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.

AUTHORIZED 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 781 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 781
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 four hundred and fifty 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
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. 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 shall be printed, of which seven thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies 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 for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balances shall be distributed as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing.

One hundred and sixty-one thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed, of which fifty-one thousand seven hundred and sixty-five 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.

The 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. 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 shall be printed, of which seven thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies for the use of the Senate and one hundred and ninety thousand five hundred and fifty copies for the use of the 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.

One hundred and sixty-one thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed, of which fifty-one thousand seven hundred and sixty-five 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.

The 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. 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 shall be printed, of which seven thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies for the use of the Senate and one hundred and ninety thousand five hundred and fifty copies for the use of the 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.

One hundred and sixty-one thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed, of which fifty-one thousand seven hundred and sixty-five 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.

The 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. 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 shall be printed, of which seven thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies for the use of the Senate and one hundred and ninety thousand five hundred and fifty copies for the use of the 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.

One hundred and sixty-one thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed, of which fifty-one thousand seven hundred and sixty-five 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.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR MR. FARBESTEIN:

I have your letter of August 3 indicating your 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:

HON. LEONARD FARBESTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Farbestein:

I have your letter of August 3 indicating your intention to introduce this 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.
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.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to take a close look at 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 simply 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 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. Allowing the 7-percent deduction from their income tax given to corporations for investment in plant and equipment. This deduction of about $52 billion, of which 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 election. 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 core rose 4 percent, at an annual rate. Most authorities expect the index to rise again this month, making it the 10th straight month of 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 home-building 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 method of coping with inflationary pressures. In theory such guideposts—which suggest that wages should not increase by more than 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 unions 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.

Sincerely yours,

OEVILLE L. FREEMAN.
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 reduce Government spending or to thoroughly investigate fiscal—C那就是, tax—policies designed to cope with inflation, we are going to be in serious trouble. Already there has been urging Congress to act for over a year, and with the wage-price guidelines 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 and 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 scale, to help help the private businessman. In effect, the investment tax credit law allows businesses to reduce their income tax up to 7 percent of their yearly investment. This is 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 $18 billion above 2 years ago, and this has the same inflationary impact as an increase of $18 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, so a lag in demand, it can impact on the economy much larger than the sum of the investment alone. Investment has remained high during this period, 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 is an economic policy; it is not, however, a 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 get away from the economic pressure, because he does not make that much profit; he cannot command prime interest rates, because he is small.

Money has a way 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 can cope with 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 counter 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 wage-price guidelines now in shreds, perhaps we can get down to business.

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 wage-price guidelines now in shreds, perhaps we can get down to business.

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, wages and prices increased until this year. Now that these guidelines are out the window, inflation will be likely to accelerate.

If we fail to act now, we fail to meet our economic 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 to choose their responsibilities. To do anything else is simply unacceptable.

BRIEFLY, MY BILL WOULD:

First. Authorize the unapportioned balance of the Capper-Cramton Act of 1930 sufficient legislative authority from the National Capital Planning Commission to the Potomac River Parkway in Prince Georges County.

Second. Transfer land acquisition authority to the National Capital Planning Commission from the House Appropriations Committee.

Third. Delineate a shoreline route for the Potomac 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. They refused to negotiate, to accept the bill in Congress, in the State and in the Parkway in Prince Georges County. Therefore, we must go back to the authorizing committees with a new authorization before we again attempt to get any necessary appropriations from Congress.

Third. There has been such a dispute about the alignment 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 one 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, the Congress, the people 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 land holdings, their vendetta against everyone who backs the parkway, their provincialism and their own selfish interests.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make this 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 National Capital Planning Commission 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 years living in their homes. These 29 property owners were still not satisfied. They refused to negotiate, to accept the compromise route that evolved from a compromise 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, it means I 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 sure that every member of 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 88th 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 and the Capitol 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 with truth and in defense of the splendid work 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 amicable 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 parkway will be run down and the parkland fast enough in the county because that body does not use the powers of condemnation.

I think the introduction of my bill will then have the introduction of my 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 better prospect on this new bill. In my new bill I am offering a new approach to accomplish a long-time objective. I believe that this legislation will provide means for 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, today it was my privilege and pleasure to meet a young person 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 to attend the 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 Board of Trade and the Ministry of the Island of Education of Ghana.

Miss Asare was born June 6, 1947, at Adukrom, Kwawpin Ghana. After finishing Adukrom Primary School to the 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 advanced 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. Nevertheless, it is possible to capture its essence in one neat phrase, one can say that democracy rests on a trinity of Liberty, Equality, and Security.

The latter two fall easily into line but how can one and the same system be one which is based on Liberty 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, Equality, and Security 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 their talents whatever these are. What is equally worthy of respect on account of their dignity as human beings.

All through 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 has been more fully realized till today there is hardly a corner of the world which is not in love with freedom. America is no exception, nor is Ghana. The very fact that a National Park bill has been submitted in our schools shows that the youth were wide awake but applying the moral too too slowly.

The trouble about democracy is that it is something which has to mature over a long period of time; otherwise it will wither. No one will deny that the battle-cry of the French Revolutionaries was "Liberty, Property, Equality." It was the fanatic pursuit of their ideals their cry was turned into "License, Fraternity, Inequality." The quest for liberty, fraternity, equality must be a patient one and the leader of a democratic government must be prepared for any 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."

And to try to make everyone follow the party line just because one thinks it the best way is to invite disaster that have already seen here in Ghana. There must be a democratic approach. A leader must be willing to see his party realized. There must be give and take and it is here that Africans have an advantage over most of the developed countries 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 idea. The eighty-per cent illiterate population soon tired of the forced "guidance." They were not willing to be led by the nose forever. This goes to show that perhaps what democracy was not practicable in a country like Ghana were all wrong. They seemed to forget what our party says that democracy was not practicable in a country like Ghana were all wrong. They seemed to forget what our party says that democracy must be seen to be wise and good under dictatorship. What folly! Any man who despises slavery or any race that he has learned to swim will indeed wait forever and never learn.

We Africans must 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 a problem, the secondary school one of the girls whose parents were dead. All the relations met together and discussed how they were going to do this. It was finally decided that three of the undies 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 them the linkage and the necessary agreement they considered that out of loyalty to the family and respect for the head their promises must be kept. This being the
normal family's way of dealing with problems it should not be hard to get people to understand democracy.

Besides, they are already familiar with democratic government, though not consciously so. Each generation and each family, but his ultimate selection to community headship depends upon the clear recognition and employment of the above 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 most tellingly of all, locally, 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 is a man of much and deep importance. But his present position is anomalous. Both his rights and duties are ill-defined. Furthermore, the central government has lost a great deal of self-respect. I think that it is the duty of any democratic government to restore the position of the 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 artificial ones 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 art, art or industry is the trade keyword 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 varied educational opportunities. In general the economic problem is not an easy one, 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 effect is directed to work or craft. There is a danger that the educational system is being professionalized, 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 them later. At the moment I want to point out that those whose ideas of freedom have been so blunted that they may have to be shaken out of the mental 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 whomever they please and to leave.

They have a right to education, a just wage, free time, consultation with their employers. There is no need of a greater number I think, whose ideas on freedom need to be corrected. They are the people who criticize everything destructively but refuse to be educated. They are not exercising liberty here, but taking liberties, which is entirely different.

Among those who are against and against them are many of our young students. Since democracy is a way of walking and not of talking, we must have opportunities to develop it. There is already the prefectoral 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 by an example. 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 said they were not really interested in 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 them in order to preserve society. Freedom is a common aim; and to have a solid, lasting society there should be rules and some basic standards. Freedom should be learned is that we are what we are today because of our neighbours, their personalities and the influence of all the things we have ever met. The student 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 doors and windows 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 trying to give me a full scholarship whilst I am sitting in the library enjoying the breeze. The head of my school, acting in my school, acting in his capacity as head of the school, stepped up to me and said, 'You are at liberty to express any views that you may have but you have no right to criticize the government if it is taking action that you do not like.'

To conclude, we know that only love, goodwill, friendship and spiritual togetherness can secure the spiritual and emotional well-being of the nation. Above all, I feel strongly that as far as we Ghanaans 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 thoughts 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 in the first 1,000 days, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin." a

*Books consulted for ideas but not quoted directly.

"My Hope for America," President Lyndon B. Johnson.

"The Quest for Order," Fred G. Burke.


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 a minute, to review 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 Report on 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 is pages 1825-1830 of the August 10 Record. Let me urge you to read it in its entirety, but I will quote to you now few excerpts which compel me to ask again that the Congress take the 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 set out to accomplish their deceptions in signs and objectives in Europe, Asia, South America and elsewhere.

Continuing the report says:

Special moves of an undisclosed and voluntary interview shown to the jury presented Earl 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 and a confederate 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 Snyder, previously living and residing a large part of their time outside of Cleveland are currently moving 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 to end the menacing situations which certainly exist in our other big cities.

*Adrian Hastings in his article "The Second Rebirth of the New Blackfrarians, March 1966."
The major cities of the Nation are under threat of future blood baths. The Department of Justice, I am sorry to say, appears to believe this threat is believed to be due to the vacuum in the area 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 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. 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 occasional recent district or national issues on the whole, heartened 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 gin in this country or in any foreign country. To this I must answer that I do not own, 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 incomes and financial obligations, whether real estate or personal. This I did in order to be free of the influence of the financial world.

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 house 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 retained the income which we received from the sale of the home at 1105 Villisilaw 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 these homes and we have no other real estate holdings.

Our daughter, Tolise, has a 1960 Rambler, and Royston drives a 1965 Karmann Ghia Volkswagen; Mrs. Gathings rides in a 1954 Packard, 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., with the West Midlands 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 for real estate.

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 expenses, are: Congressional Azon subscription, $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 $2,469.87 in interest on debts. We are gradually paying off our debts by making monthly installments. By this method I paid my debts over the years and I have no outstanding balance left.

I trust that my people have placed their confidence in me with honesty, with integrity, and with the utmost devotion to the best interests of the people of the First Congressional District of Arkansas and for our beloved Nation as a whole.

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. There is 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 Democratic 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 dux any question of higher consumer prices if you possibly can.

Statements of this nature are typical of the statements by the 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 80 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 banker, and other middlemen do not really make as large a profit as might at first be assumed. Most of their mark-up 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 the price tag is more than 10 times what the wholesale farmer gets.

Because here are 101 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 earnings. While I was watching our wallet pocket the hidden tax has been emptying our coin purse. And again 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 dropped because surplus corn was dumped on the market. In addition, he left the farm.

I thought 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 doing it so long that you buy milk, too.

There are 206 separate transactions involved in getting a quart of milk from the pasture to your breakfast table. And 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 it for so long.

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 $1.78 for it. Two and one-half cents per loaf of bread.

But when flour mill added its fraction for manufacturing costs—a mill just cuts off one sixth of the loaf of bread has suddenly doubled. It comes out of the mill costing 5 cents. Not the mill, the 2½, but only a minute fraction of a penny for itself.

But the mill is required to pay. Now the tax is on the mill.

The mill has to add on seven Federal taxes and eight separate State taxes.

The railroad which hauled the finished flour—most of the trail gets hot—keeps only a tiny fraction of a penny for its services—but it adds on 3 pennies to pay five Federal taxes and eight State taxes in every State through which the shipment passed.

In this case there were three. Just three—

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 a dollar and 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 retraced 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 101 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 a fraction of our income. It’s worth that to live in America.

But that’s a lie and a delusion. The tax man is—

But that’s a lie and a delusion. The tax man is—

But that’s a lie and a delusion. The tax man is—

Well I went back to the farmer. I decided to start all over again, but working the problem the other way. This research went faster this time because I knew the direction.

I figured 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 doing it so long that you buy milk, too.

There are 206 separate transactions involved in getting a quart of milk from the pasture to your breakfast table. And 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 it for so long.

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—

Well, I’ve heard that question repeated so often that I’ve stopped listening to it. But suddenly I decided the one way to silence that nagging question—nobody had tried—it was to find the answer.

Well, with my limited staff we started playing detective.

For the wheat in a loaf of bread the farmer gets 2½ cents.

But you paid 38 cents. You are both being robbed by somebody. Who?

I figured back 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 for 24 cents?”

Well, with my limited staff we started playing detective.
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 be 10 mil. 33 1/3 mil. 10 mil. Don't rush to 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.
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Federal employees. How long will these illegal campaign fund solicitations be permitted to continue in defiance of pubic 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 employees.

Case did not identify the Congressman, 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 employee 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 seen, met, or written to Congressman (blank)."

Case said such solicitation makes 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. It is a loophole that has been increasingly exploited."

Sen. John J. Williams, R-Del., charged to the Senate that an "organized shakedown is going on" in the Johnson administration to force Federal employees 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 employees 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 investigate and recommend solutions 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 recently. In my capacity as the excepted service have gone unpunished, and the classified employee involved was merely permitted to retire.

I believe the Hatch Act is being destroyed. The Hatch Act is a story reporting 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 the Johnson 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 employees who incurred the excepted service have gone unpunished, and the classified employee involved was merely permitted to retire.

I believe the Hatch Act is being destroyed. The Hatch Act is a story reporting that the Johnson administration has set the pattern and waved the green light to permit the widespread arm-twisting of

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 and because cane 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 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 in Maine is $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 $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 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 which agreed to a loan of $6,931,300. 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 refining and processing sugar, completely changing the character of the operation, and offering no further inducement to Maine farmers. Although the beet sugar 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 transport 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 refining 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 transported 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 refined 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 Bos- ton refineries. It would appear that 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 businessmen 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 provided you 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., falls 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 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.

The Governor’s speech 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 the first elected Democratic chief executive.

I include his speech in the Record at this point:

GOV. JOHN A. BURNS SPEAKS ON 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 was both wholesome and well-ballooned with the common roots from whence you and I spring. Moreover, it serves as a very real challenge to the leadership of this country 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 of millions of us. They represent a world capable of abundant production for all. This very simple supper, then, might warm our hearts and make all we are capable of to improve the lot of mankind in our global community.

In a very real sense, this thought represents the substance 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 throughout the general prosperity. Total employment was up to 270,000 even before school was out this year. This figure is up from 1962's 190,000. 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 15 per cent over the comparable quarters of 1962. 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 not only from the legislative acts but also 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 these 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 discord that has been a phase of the longer period has been of no significance whatever.

The list of what can be called “labor legislation” enacted since 1962 is quite substantial. Additionally, organized labor is well represented in the various 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 or any other amount to gains in wages, hours and working conditions alone? Is Labor's stake solely in the bargaining table? In political patronage? In public 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 as that of any other citizen of this State—be he a truckdriver, a longshoreman, a housewife, a merchant, a physician, a teacher, 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 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 classrooms.

Labor's stake in Hawaii is in better cities for all our citizens to live in; in eliminating slum conditions; in unlightening that breeds unlightness; in rehabilitating and assisting those who have been left behind in the rapid pace of modern society; in enlightened management; in the provision 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. It is your concern for your community—your community 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 a part of the thinking of our National Administration today.

You have a stake, too, in making our Islands better land better 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 Pacific. We already have a figure more prominently than ever in this shifting interest. We are favored by geography, by history, by the common sense and by the rich heritages of all the peoples we serve.

In these all things in which labor has a stake, perhaps the fundamental building block 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 fellow citizens, to 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,” and what it represented, was against Hawaii's government. There were fears that “radical” changes were to be expected in our society. You have answered 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 eschew entirely the direct approach when a heavy hand is necessary, I find it necessary to be effective to use persuasion and to look for the rational avenue that is nearly always available in any circumstance.

The singular fact that we meet this evening in a hall named for a great American, who enunciated those principles so long championed. In speaking of labor's real stake in Hawaii, I am reminded of Thomas Jefferson, who said, "Each individual must be prepared to exercise dominant control of his own affairs."

"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 law must protect, and to violate which would be oppression."

That day when some were more equal than others, Hawaii is, through the work that you of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. have done over the years that this is so, a great achievement toward the foundation for the constructive works ahead. What you have achieved will pale in comparison with what you can do for the citizens of Hawaii, as the center for commercial and cultural interchange in the Pacific.

You have a stake, too, in making our Islands better land better 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.

We are one people, and we will move toward our destiny as one.

It has been a pleasure being with you this evening, to make this appearance and the many courtesies you have extended me in the past. My association with your officers and committees and 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.

Ma ha lo.

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. President John F. Kennedy's 1961 State of the Union message on transportation referred to the opening of the West by providing land-grant incentives for rail transportation. In the early 1960s, the construction of the Panama Canal under the leadership of President Theodore Roosevelt promoted our vital sea transportation. And in his final budget message to Congress, President Eisenhower stated: "A Department of Transportation should be established so that all our transportation systems and modes of transportation plus ships and airplanes under the Department do not have adequate representation. The proposed transfer of aviation accident investigations to the National Transportation Safety Board do not have adequate representation. The proposed transfer of the Maritime Administration to the new Department would perpetuate the present trouble-ridden management of this 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 NTSB should remain independent. In the event the CAB's Bureau of Safety is transferred to the new Department, as contemplated by the proposed legislation, it should return to the totally unsatisfactory arrangement that existed prior to 1966. At that time, CAB was responsible for collecting air transportation statistics from industry representatives, government personnel and outside observers, and conducting its own investigations of air transportation accidents under the Federal Aviation Act. Under this Act, an independent Federal Aviation Agency was established to regulate air transportation. The CAB was not part of this agency. This Act, 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 and the prevention of aviation disasters. Establishment of these two but independent bodies, aviation has prospered and air safety has advanced. These advancements would be lost if some important functions are brought together again within a new Department.

2. To date, the Department has raised with respect to the problem created by aircraft noise, and no one in government has assumed direct responsibility for this action. This important problem should receive immediate and continuing attention within the 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 a new project or one under way or another. He could impose his standards of investment on other agencies of government who administer grants encouraged by Congress. This section should be stricken from the bill.

4. The Administration bill would leave the urban mass transportation functions 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 be transferred to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. 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 the Merchant Marine. At the close of World War II, this country had a Merchant Marine fleet of over 5,000 vessels and over 500,000 active U.S. flag ships. Today there are only 1,000, including those reactivated for the Viet Nam War. A place among the world's major shipbuilding nations while Russia has risen from 12th to 7th place. 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 failed to provide. We urge the Committee to take steps to correct this disastrous situation."

Although faced with this major crisis, the proposed bill does nothing more than transfer the problem to a new Department. There is nothing in the bill that reflects a sense of the urgency of the situation. We need a comprehensive effort. Moreover, there is no indication that the functions of the Maritime Administration will even be handled by the Department. We urge the Committee to take steps to correct this disastrous situation. The present plights of the American Merchant Marine demands action. Fortunately, 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. Youngs] 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, executive director of the National Railroad Piggyback Association in Montreal, Canada. 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, 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 and would like to know 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 spurred by bold thinking, pioneering enterprisers, and dynamic organizations. Containerization is one of the greatest innovations in transportation of this era, but the finest of tools is wasted if not used properly. Concentrated study—the pooling of knowledge and experience—a coordinated approach to piggybacking's problems—will help to insure the ultimate success and spread the complete public acceptance of this endeavor which so intimately involves the industries and the future of transportation on this Continent.

It came to me quite a few years ago that containerization is a challenge to the piggybacking, not only offered the key to most of the problems that were besetting the railroads, but a challenge to all of the railroads. My brightest promise for making available to the users of transportation the best that each mode in the kaleidoscopic complex of transportation...
tion had to offer. I knew the history of the early efforts to coordinate the service of different classes of motor carriers. Some of the containerization. The sectionalized canal boats which were piggybacked over the rail ports of call. The 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 Chicago North Shore and Milwaukee Railway in 1926. Ten years later, in 1936, the Great Western and Keeshin Motor Express started a piggyback operation. Those were just the preliminary experiments. They were much more than a curiosity. It was and is known to the public that piggybacking, the subject of the decision went on to say:

"Division sheet No. F 317-3, used in connection with the transportation and the "common carriers' related tariffs, provides that the New Haven will accept as compensation for its service the charges per trailer set forth in the division sheet." (229 I.C.C. 98.)

The New Haven wanted to know whether such service was connecting carrier service or substitute service. The Commission answered that point out that in an earlier case, Substituted Freight Service, decided in 1939, it had found that substituted service consists of a combination of line-haul movements by rail and motor, it is in legal effect a joint service, and thereupon it may be termed "piggybacking." (229 I.C.C. 682.) The Commission added that in that earlier case, "the Commission's report, which represented certain problems in the publication of tariffs, it had indicated that "that replaced carriers might confer with representatives of our Bureau of Traffic to work out a simplified form of tariff publication." And, 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 prior approval to the Piggyback Service of Office 1 conditioned on a certain form of tariff publication.

As I have related, 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 TOFC service, and thus included the same rates and level as the going motor carrier rates. It was not until 1968 that the railroads published Piggyback rates on the basis of a flat amount per car, and thus inaugurated Plans III and IV.

We have had on the past eight years. Piggybacking has demonstrated its practical worth, proved its acceptability to the public, and showed the most vigorous of many other arrangements for piggybacking. As long ago)
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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 ambiguous phrase because it describes what happens under Plan I, but it is not a term that is used or described in the statute. It was coined out of whole cloth. As I have indicated, the 1939 Substituted Freight Service case, the Commission said that "the substitution of rail service for motor service." Having drawn no court challenge to this conclusion, the Commission assumed the legal standing of Plan I in its succeeding cases. In the first Red Ball case, in 1950, the Commission said that:

"Substitution by motor carrier 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 would fit the situation and all parties concerned." (29 M.C.C. 75).

Passing over the fact that the Commission did not cite any evidence to support the foregoing conclusions, I am not going to go into the findings, if correct, were irrelevant to the issue, which was the lawfulness of the substituted service. The Supreme Court 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, would be a desirable source of revenues for the rail carriers and on the whole would fit the situation, and all parties concerned.

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 ton-mileage that each carrier would haul. Under Plan I there are no "connecting" carriers. The only carrier known to the shipper is the motor carrier. The bill of lading does not carry the name of the carrier. The freight is charged five dollars per hundred. The motor carrier handles individual shipments whereas the railroad handles multiple shippers.

Every shipment must be handled pursuant to a bill-of-lading contract. The bill of lading is a contract between the shipper and the consignee. Under Plan I if a carrier knows the shipper he is the shipper. 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 a joint service. The publication of the rates is published under Plan I. The public has been given the right to the use of piggyback service, but he has no right to demand it. The law does not fit the circumstances under which circumstances he will put his trailers on the railroad.

I 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 has been authorized under both the joint-rate and the certificate or alternate-route alternative sections of the Act, and the Commission has held 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 the transportation practice statutory sanction.

The law is not elastic—it cannot be pulled and tugged and stretched to fit the exigencies of the occasion. That leads me to ask: "If it is believed that Plan I is a desirable method of operation, why does not Congress authorize its operation?"

Doesn't the fact that there has been such much litigation, so many conflicting decisions, and so many differing interpretations of the law, indicate that the law, as it is written, was not designed to cover Plan I?" 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 part of the law. To meet new situations or to clarify provisions that are unclear. Why does the Commission not actually change the law?

Now, laying aside the question of the statutory authority for Plan I, let me pose another question: "Is it not the fact that for the continuous and substitute railway service under Plan I, at what point will their certificate of convenience and necessity be found? When must the commission, in the exercise of its statutory duty, revoke the certificate?"

While you are thinking about that one let me pose another: "Is it not the case of Canton Railroad v. Ann Arbor Railroad. It is as follows: "A joint rate over the lines of two or more carriers and is made . . . by arrangement or agreement between such carriers and not evidence of an agreement of attorney." (173 I.C.C. 283).

In order to have a through route and a joint rate the routes of two or more carriers

In the Red Ball case the Commission approved a Plan I operation even though it said, in its decision, that the motor carrier
carrier planned to put all of its traffic on the railroads.

In short, it is entirely possible, consistent with the Commission’s decisions, for a certified motor common carrier to conduct operations on an entire section of its certificate, without ever putting a truck on the highway or leaving the city streets. And yet, by simply putting a motor vehicle on the highway, it could only be authorized to provide transportation “by motor vehicle” and “upon the highways.” Certification of a common carrier 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 1938 the Commission said that where a common carrier by motor vehicle “substantially abandons a route or portion thereof” the Commission may only be authorized to provide transportation “by motor vehicle” and “upon the highways.” Could a motor carrier put one truck a week on a highway for the high point and give all of the rest of its traffic to a railroad? I think not. I respectfully suggest this aspect of the problem. It may be that the Commission said that where a common carrier planned to put all of its traffic on the railroad had all-rail rates to Chicago and St. Paul, for example, intermediate points that were higher than rail rates structure.

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 principal project was to prevent destructive competition. Numerous efforts to repeal Section 4 or render it nugatory have failed. But I respectfully suggest that when the Commission considers Section 4 is being nullified by the manner in which relief is granted.

Let me ask another question: “Assuming that Plan I is a joint rate arrangement on the protest of competing motor carriers, 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 Commission first considered the Fourth Section question, in connection with the Keeshin-Great Western arrangement in 1938. The present-day rail carriers pointed out two kinds of violations of Section 4 which were inherent in the operation. First, between the principal points, 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 route was more or less equivalent to St. Paul which were lower than the Plan I rate from Chicago to St. Paul.

The Commission ruled that no violation of competitive test was involved. In the Chicago and St. Paul rate comparison, the railroad had all-rail rates to intermediate points because a “like kind of property” was not involved. Thus rates were not the basis used to determine whether a carrier should be in. The Commission did observe the Fourth Section when they established Plan I, insofar as any conflict with their own rates is concerned. And, as I said, the railroad had all-rail rates to intermediate points, which were lower than the Plan I rate from Chicago to St. Paul. uncerimonal.

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 route. Certification is required for the fact that the “Commission “after investigation” and “in special cases,” may authorize rates different from the published rates. The plan 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 railroad 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 the incre lntal charges paid by the motor carrier to the railroad between the involved points. That was to enable the Commission or anyone else could determine what the rail Plan I charges to motor carriers were.

In recent years the Fourth Section applica tions have been silent regarding the charges assessed by the Railroads. Consequently, no one knows what the motor carriers are paying and no one can say if the given movement. Obviously, Plan I operations are capable of producing destructive competition, particularly if motor carriers to the railroads are the determinative factor in the competitive situation. I do not understand 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 railroad, 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 if it has no effect and should apply to all rates to which the railroad decides charges or not at all. If it is the prevailing view that the Fourth Section has outlived its usefulness and should be abolished by an Act of Congress and not by administration interpretation.

And I ask another question: “Assuming that Plan I is a joint rate arrangement does not sound policy require that control be exercised 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 forwards 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:

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-arrangement that under Plan I nobody had shown that the “division arrangements” under Plan I were unlawful.

The Commission said that in the future it would no longer consider previously published “divisions” were being used as “a shield for improper activities” it would decide whether a rule should be prescribed.

In essence, the purpose of rules of law and of administrative rules is to insure that improper activities can be detected and stopped. In the Plan I case the Commission may be clothed at any given time, everyone knows, and the Commission has recognized, that the operations have a competitive impact on other carriers that is entirely different from the impact of conventional through service and arrangements.

The Commission entertained complaints in the early Great Western case about the level of some rates and the need of 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. 493). Indeed, the Commission said that the so-called “competitive effect” of Plan I on other carriers was “one of the principal factors to be considered.”

The Commission has prescribed a 15 percent circuit 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, but is there is any limitation, but how about the railroad industry and the forwarding industry? Are these two kinds of violations of Section 4, to obtain their line-haul transportation at less cost than we are assessed for the same service. I could cite specific instances of Plan I charges so low that a motor carrier could load a trailer with high grade commodities and obtain his pay load and have the other trailer left over to ride free. With this situation the competition provides for the hauling of empty trailers 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.

Insofar as forwards are concerned we maintain that when motor carriers purchase the plan I arrangements from the railroads, and limit their own physical operations to the gathering, assembly, and breakbulk and distribution of the freight, they are, in fact and in law, functioning as freight forwards. 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 a rate which is less than we are assessed for the same service.

As the Commission said in the NATA case ”there is a physical railroad transportation service provided by the railroads under Plans I, III, and V, is identical.” When motor carriers seek to act as freight forwards—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 original rate? It is the same general nature; in each case it is tendered by a common carrier; it moves in the same kind of property; it is tendered in the same train. The published charges which the 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 railroads must combat 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 setting 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 railroads to smooth "peak" hauling (and to haul-back empties, too) during heaviest traffic periods.

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 tractor-trailers pulling multiple trailer units, possibly over highways especially constructed for trucks. The long-distance trucker can remain competitive without purchasing his own line-haul transportation from the railroads, and suchegasus is still the backbone of the motor truck industry. Almost a third of the annual freight haulage is less than 100 miles. Ninety percent of the motor carriers have average hauls less than 500 miles.

The short-haul trucker is only the trucker who would be economically advantaged by making a true joint rate with a railroad for a specified movement. Rail joint rates are the result of a truck line and a railroad which parallel each other the whole distance simultaneously. Why does not the industry solve the concentrated kind of problem that is the combining of 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. It is a railroad development, not aacers and an economic fulcrum piggybacking, intelligently exploited, can work wonders.

I think it would be worthwhile to explore what I call the "union station" concept of piggybacking. If the trains on certain key routes could bring to bear on the problems that are as much a railroad development, concentrating medium and an economic fulcrum piggybacking, intelligently exploited, can work wonders.

I think it would be worthwhile to explore what I call the "union station" concept of piggybacking. If the trains on certain key routes could bring to bear on the problems that are as much a railroad development, concentrating medium and an economic fulcrum piggybacking, intelligently exploited, can work wonders.

The long-distance trucker can remain competitive without purchasing his own line-haul transportation from the railroads, and suchegasus is still the backbone of the motor truck industry. Almost a third of the annual freight haulage is less than 100 miles. Ninety percent of the motor carriers have average hauls less than 500 miles.

The short-haul trucker is only the trucker who would be economically advantaged by making a true joint rate with a railroad for a specified movement. Rail joint rates are the result of a truck line and a railroad which parallel each other the whole distance simultaneously. Why does not the industry solve the concentrated kind of problem that is the combining of 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. It is a railroad development, not aacers and an economic fulcrum piggybacking, intelligently exploited, can work wonders.

I think it would be worthwhile to explore what I call the "union station" concept of piggybacking. If the trains on certain key routes could bring to bear on the problems that are as much a railroad development, concentrating medium and an economic fulcrum piggybacking, intelligently exploited, can work wonders.

The long-distance trucker can remain competitive without purchasing his own line-haul transportation from the railroads, and suchegasus is still the backbone of the motor truck industry. Almost a third of the annual freight haulage is less than 100 miles. Ninety percent of the motor carriers have average hauls less than 500 miles.

The short-haul trucker is only the trucker who would be economically advantaged by making a true joint rate with a railroad for a specified movement. Rail joint rates are the result of a truck line and a railroad which parallel each other the whole distance simultaneously. Why does not the industry solve the concentrated kind of problem that is the combining of 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.
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 have them printed in the Timber Tax Journal.

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, 1966. I am including these remarks in the hope of developing a dialogue 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 means by which the Federal government uses the tools of taxation in the 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 prove my point by 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, revenues would increase... I ask unanimous consent that the present level of tax rates lowers the collectability factor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and have them printed an article in the Timber Tax Journal, volume II, No. 1, 1966. I am including these remarks in the hope of developing a dialogue 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 means by which the Federal government uses the tools of taxation in the 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 prove my point by 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, revenues would increase... I ask unanimous consent that 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... I ask unanimous consent that 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... I ask unanimous consent that the present level of tax rates lowers the collectability factor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and have them printed an article in the Timber Tax Journal, volume II, No. 1, 1966. I am including these remarks in the hope of developing a dialogue 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 means by which the Federal government uses the tools of taxation in the 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 prove my point by 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, revenues would increase...
The reason for pushing for accelerated depreciation or accelerated depletion arises not so much from the desire to speed up 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 because the capital investment 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 businessmen keeping one set of books, the realistic books, not a second set of books, a set which must be kept by businessmen in order to keep up 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 . . . the capital gains tax. Economic wisdom has been developed as the result of this differential, because I believe there are no economic considerations between what we call ordinary income and capital gains income. But also a great deal of economic wisdom has developed because of tax consequences.

Again I place the onus not on the practicing economist . . . because he is a realist . . . he is searching for economic truth. Indeed I believe that the search for research truth, the disciplines are such that he might go broke. His books are going to be his best judgment of what his discipline does to the realities. It is his second set of books which are apt to record fairy stories . . . the books which . . . the tax collector 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, rates that are lower for the capital gains than the spread of 25 percent to 47 percent or 25 percent to 70 percent, let alone 90 percent to 47 percent which has been proposed as a part of a various predication because what to him is equity to others on the outside is a preferential treatment. To the tax collector and economic and political theorists 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, 37½ percent, percent, percentage depletion allowance, which in 1920 might well have reflected the state of geological knowledge, the availability of oil, the state of development of the oil industry, and other costs, might now be too great or too little to reflect the true economic cost of replacing the oil and the production of 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 them in respect to money invested in the forest industry in 1964 continue to the economic realities of 1966? Has our experience with the tax system as it is actually and not as it is written down in the tax code of what is return of capital and what is capital gain and what ordinary income more accurately reflects economic realities prior to that time? I would state rather unequivocally that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. What has happened since 1964?

Has it grown strong and healthy? Has it enlarged our tax base so that with lower rates we are extracting more federal revenues? Has the tax differential arisen from an increase of forestry wealth? Are good conservation practices encouraged as opposed to being demeaned by the tax favoritism or penalty? All of these questions I think can be answered in the affirmative clearly revealing that our tax system is working with economic truth in this field of endeavor. I hope we keep them in conformity.

I would like to be more specific that I uttered generally. To many outside the forest industry what you seem economic reality, 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 forefoot, willingly subsidize your industry or any economic endeavor because in the process of state subsidy they know they have embarked upon the certain road of equal- ership, 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 and treat you as you treat them in the process of state subsidy. I am for depreciation and honest economic measure. In other words, I am for businesses keeping one set of books . . . the realistic books . . . not a second set of books . . . a set which must be kept by businesses in order to keep up with economic development in a dynamic economy.

What was the issue? Well, first, the issue was a question of whether 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 the 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 mistakes made when a stimulus happens when a stimulus, a shot in the arm, wears off? You are apt to need or want another one soon. There is no way to change an operation. The new economists argued that aggregate demand needed boosting up ... and that Federal income tax cut 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 was not 10 or 15 percent, I would wash out a great deal of the increased total demand which otherwise would come from the tax cuts.

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 tax revenue, and sold the bonds to the private sector, then the private sector would not have "12 billion increased purchasing power there would be an additional 12 billion addition to aggregate demand." He agreed and responded that he thought the Federal deficit should be increased. But I responded by saying I thought this would increase the money and credit within the system and that we needed a stabilized economic growth warranted. He responded by saying, "The unutilized plant capacity and unemployment and the lack 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 bold the capital gains rates as is. In this way one could hope to see all rates considerably reduced, because in spite of the recent tax rate reductions I am convinced that our rates are still consider- ably beyond the point of diminishing returns.

We would collect more revenues from a lower rate because the higher rates are impeding the economic growth of the country our economic wealth and activities. Lower the rates and the base increases, so does the in- cidence of tax collection and the tax rate is enlarged.

This, by the way, was the economic theory that the President's Council of Economic Advisors so loudly heralded by the new economists that we needed to increase aggregate demand through increased Federal spending. I must prostrate oneself 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!" But it is not the case. This is certainly produced increased economic activity, of which a great deal was wealth." It is important to realize that although the new economists were not absolutely right, they lost their war in the Executive Branch of the Government. It is true President Johnson was able to get through Congress to divert attention from what he was really doing. But this is there for anyone to see. It is new history.

What was the issue? Well, first, the issue was a question of whether 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 the 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 mistakes made when a stimulus happens when a stimulus, a shot in the arm, wears off? You are apt to need or want another one soon. There is no way to change an operation. The new economists argued that aggregate demand needed boosting up ... and that Federal income tax cut 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 was not 10 or 15 percent, I would wash out a great deal of the increased total demand which otherwise would come from the tax cuts.

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 tax revenue, and sold the bonds to the private sector, then the private sector would not have "12 billion increased purchasing power there would be an additional 12 billion addition to aggregate demand." He agreed and responded that he thought the Federal deficit should be increased. But I responded by saying I thought this would increase the money and credit within the system and that we needed a stabilized economic growth warranted. He responded by saying, "The unutilized plant capacity and unemployment and the lack 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 as is. In this way one could hope to see all rates considerably reduced, because in spite of the recent tax rate reductions I am convinced that our rates are still consider- ably beyond the point of diminishing returns.

We would collect more revenues from a lower rate because the higher rates are impeding the economic growth of the country our economic wealth and activities. Lower the rates and the base increases, so does the in- cidence of tax collection and the tax rate is enlarged.
lowering these rates somewhat in increased economic activity would enlarge the Federal tax base and so enable us to balance the budget. But in fiscal year 1966, namely this June 30. On the approach, we feel if Dr. Heller's theory were followed and expenditures were permitted to go up to $104 billion last fiscal year and then this $119 billion for fiscal year 1965, the benefits would be more than outweighed by the damage resulting from the inflationary pressure we feel would be let loose.

The rest is recorded history, but largely unwritten history. The President has, since that time given fiscal year 1965, power to spend the Congress has given him. He has $200 billion power to spend for the fiscal year of the Federal government. In his Budget Message, January of 1965, he has $100 billion for fiscal year 1965, which just ended last June 30, the expenditures were held to $96.5-$1.5 billion below our suggestions for him.

Yes, the tax cut of 1964 proved to be a resounding economic success, on the basis of classical economics and tax theory. Why do so many remain fooled? Partly because of the boasting of the new economists. But this would not have happened and we feel the lack of understanding in Congress, in the news media and performance generally among the people, about the difference between expenditure and the inflation process of the Federal government. Each year the country's attention is directed to the expenditure process and the inflation process of the Federal government. The new economists are boasting of the new economists and cutting back on expenditures. I certainly hope so. I can assure you that if he is not cutting back on his expenditures, I for one will listen and cut back his expenditures, I for one will listen 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 economists' way of describing the cause of the inflation we are experiencing—the new economists are suggesting the only way to increase taxes is to increase the Federal debt.

We can dampen aggregate demand just as effectively by increasing the Federal debt as by increasing Federal taxes. If this 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. He knows that the going is rough, 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 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 lifetimes. There are many things which we will, like Moses, have to content ourselves with observing from afar, taking the satisfaction that we have done our best, and the self-discipline which 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. Skuhravy] 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. SKURBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to our beloved Republican national committeeman, Sam Mellinger, of Kansas, who departed this life on August 10, 1966.

The statue of a man is measured always by the services to his fellow man, by the purposes to which he has given his life, by the spirit, by the soul, by his industry, Measured, too, by his industry, integrity, honor, and his allegiances. And by his ability 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 1948 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 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, Jerome:

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, he went to the West or California where the smarter boys go who get to thinking they are too big for their pants and too busy for their little town. So Sam Mellinger came back to Emporia, to build his career. Like my father, he cared about politics and public affairs. Like my father, Sam is a Republican National Committeeman of this state, the only other Emporian to hold this job, who, with all the others 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; people like that don't want or need it. So don't waste your pity on Sam; don't waste your pity on them; people like that don't want or need it. As Sam says, "This country of Kansas, instead of leaving for the East or West, or carrying on a dispensation of no small importance to Kansas, has stayed here. It was rough when he worked his way through school carrying Gazettes, and through high school jerking sods in the big corn beans, 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 father's 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, it was rough in the 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, or, what's 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 it.

What matters is that Sam—flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, blood of our blood—has come back home. Of that you can be proud and glad.

W.L.W.

PIGHT TO SAVE SMALL WATERSHED PROGRAM HAS JUST BEGUN

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mr. Snow be permitted to 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, 1965, the Bureau of the Budget transmitted to the Congress its report 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 301 of the Flood Control Act as amended, Public Law 566, and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10565 of January 20, 1956. The Bureau of the Budget also transmitted to the Congress for referral to the Committee on Public Works an even larger number of watershed work plans for its consideration.

This transmission of watershed work plans was subsequently subjoined to 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 single 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 amending 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 rejecting the budget transmitted to him by the Secretary of the Army and to the Congress through President Kennedy, and as an entire year even under the recently announced "Jones procedure"; therefore, the views of the President ran counter to the Constitution of the United States.

In signing the bill, the President said that the provisions of section 201(a) "would have the effect of curtailing the Caroline 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 five score 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 disturbing 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 National Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, the Flood Control Act, Public Law 566, were also administered without complaint by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, until the present occupant of the House and Senate Committees on Public Works.

What the President did in his strong statement at the 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 taking "action which usurps the authority which Congress has by law retained" over the administration of the 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 views of the President ran counter to the Constitution of the United States.

Under the 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 Act, the President might have had objection to President Johnson's objections. 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, 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. The President has the power of a 41,486,600 single purpose floodwater storage structure through fiscal year 1966.

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. Congress may either accept or reject 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 our well respected institutions of higher education, the authors concluded by overwhealmgly 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, this requirement in section 2 of the Act which was one of the first to suffer.

Since its enactment in 1954 during the 83rd 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. By carrying out the act, the Federal Government would be continuing the efforts of the States and counties, and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, flood prevention and control districts, and many of the 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 Watershed 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 contained in section 2 of the Act.

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 4,936,584 single purpose floodwater storage projects. These 729 projects encompass a drainage area of an astounding 84,124,800 acres. Furthermore, some 2,562 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 and delay that was imposed on 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 watershed office of the Department of Agriculture has done an outstanding job of administering this highly important program. The President promised not to send any more watershed work plans to Congress after 1966.

Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson finally released his grip of these watershed projects, primarily because of congressional pressure, and finally had the Bureau of the Budget transmit the plans to the Congress during 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 in 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 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 the 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 transmitting the plans 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 the belief that this provision represents an unwarranted encroachment on the authority of the Executive. However, the President has given clear expression of his views of the need for revision of this procedure and he has therefore directed that no similar action be taken under that procedure after this session.

Accordingly, legislation will be transmitted to this Congress which will remove the present authorization procedure for watershed protection projects with one which in
our view would provide opportunity for congressional review of project plans without preventing action so that 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 this session. That, I think, will not transmit any to the Congress thereafter because, as I understand it, this is the middle round of those 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 believe 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 "repe­nance" 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 uniting 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, Mr. Eberle, does not express any interest in seeing at least a small voluntary national service corps set up at this time, there is no commitment to the proposal in his article. This is the Chairman's position 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. It is written not only to the American people but to the American student body. Its value, I believe, is that it is the work of an experienced writer and editor. Writing in The Texas Observer, he conceded that a draft for civilian service seems, at first glance, an invasion of political rights. But he believes that the military program because it is "a mission dedicated to peace and freedom and raising living standards. It could spell a political and economic generation more prosperous than the last. Our colleges and universities are rapidly becoming institutions of higher segregation and have long since been held apart from adults in the real world." All young people, he argued, should be "able to be involved in solving the technological, economic and moral mess we have got ourselves into.

As I understand it, according to 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 overseas 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 for the United States. This meeting became the National Service Club in New York. Everyone present supported the idea of such a program but the meeting produced no agreement about how to go about putting it into effect. Subsequently, Mr. Eberle and a small ad hoc committee submitted 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 given 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 lottery and his service to be selected by lottery whenever the armed services might need him.

A point 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 young people into entering the Armed Forces to meet the manpower requirements. Though this may be so, most of the young people I have talked to regard three years or more specied 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 services. And how, others asked, could military service be considered "equality of sacrifice" compared with risking one's life in Vietnam?

Peter P. Nicholson, President of Notre Dame, a staunch advocate of universal service, also objects to the time differential. "One year non-military service of longer duration," he said, "is not equitable 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, many young people are becoming an instrument for correcting "inequalities" in the draft. There are only 14,000 volunteers in its ranks; in 1965, 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 draft. A few hundred campers, mostly untrained 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 enterprises that could fill the bills of those few thousand. There are too many of us who believe that necessity ends, we should be ready to absorb the large numbers of men and women that a national service program would provide. At the same time, it will be difficult to live with preoccupation with money. It also seems evident that the whole concept will be badly skewed if—in the midst of the great emergency—one tries to make some popular one to boot—we conceive a national service as primarily a solution to the inequalities of the draft.

This does not mean, however, that it is too easy 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 time comes, 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 statistic is this: the War Department's 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 workers needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The jobs</th>
<th>Time (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical institutions and health</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational institutions</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National beautification</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare and home care</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public protection</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban renewal and sanitation</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could much of this work be done by members of a national service corps? And would their presence be accepted by organized labor?

But 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 Peace Corps, where he encountered both of these counts, was strongly affirmative. He is convinced that an immense amount of useful work could be done by national service corps men and women with a minimum of training; that we would, in establishing such a service, create a new career opportunity—"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 and decline of physical fitness.

"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 when the labor movement was at its peak. They would have a legitimate beef—if for instance—New York City, because of its financial troubles, fired some Parks Department employees and replaced them with corpsmen. But I don't see anything of the sort happening in a time of full employment. And the case is not going to be made that there are too many of us out of work sofabulous 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 presently being done in the nation 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 the prime age in modern industry and government agencies and institutions which are, at the present time, desperately short-handed.

This is especially true in our only state-run domestic peace corps—the Commonwealth Service Corps founded in Massachusetts in 1953 by the late Senator John F. Kennedy. In an initial survey conducted which this corps was being planned, it was discovered that private and public local 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 receive 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; some are foremen for the train. Some run an information and referral service for welfare recipients; others work in schools and conduct study halls for teenagers. The Commonwealth Corps is largely supported by Pennsylvania's National Guard and is operated by the National Service Corps. They receive up to $12 a month for services, to disparage the Army way—but the same is true in universities and industry. The armed forces do a remarkable job of training and of fitting round pegs into round holes. The corpsmen do a marvelous job of training and of making square pegs fit well into round holes. The corpsmen are fierce and effective in their command of the tiny national manpower advisory commission, says: "On the basis of observa­tions of the Israel defense forces over the past century, there is no hesitancy in saying that the armed forces' record in personnel-handling is as successful in the United States. And some misinformation was cast upon the public in the aftermath of the famous case of the "red scare." I have no hesitancy in saying that the armed forces' record in personnel-handling is as successful in the United States as it has ever been. And some of the information was cast upon the public in the aftermath of the famous case of the 'green scare.'

Furthermore, thousands of young men have acquired useful civilian vocation in the military. They have learned the basics of citizenship; the armed forces do not maintain follow-up records to prove the point. However, a still unpublished study conducted by the Department of Education, Health 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 group of men who had not had military service. The superiority in earnings of the ex-soldiers was characterized as "fantastic." Some one who participated in this study.

Although the armed forces no longer ac­cept illiterates, they now insist that girls and women a minimum of training; that we would, in establishing such a service, create a new career opportunity—"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 and decline of physical fitness.

"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 when the labor movement was at its peak. They would have a legitimate beef—if for instance—New York City, because of its financial troubles, fired some Parks Department employees and replaced them with corpsmen. But I don't see anything of the sort happening in a time of full employment. And the case is not going to be made that there are too many of us out of work.
Recent reports of rising world food prices and their impact on the poor have ignited a debate on how best to address global hunger. The use of U.S. grain exports to alleviate food shortages is a contentious issue. Some worry that diverting crops to non-food uses could exacerbate domestic food security, while others advocate for increased international aid to support food security initiatives. The U.S. government is considering various strategies, including emergency food aid and longer-term agricultural development programs, to combat hunger around the world. While progress has been made, particularly in countries like Vietnam and Bangladesh, where food production has increased significantly, more sustained efforts are needed to ensure lasting solutions to hunger.
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PAO Director-General Binay Rajan Sen: ...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 it, if not necessarily within his politics. "If there should be a famine, it will be the result of our failure," warns the Rockefeller's president. "And abroad," says Stanford Professor Karl Brannet, former director of its Food Research Institute. Plant Pathologist J. George Har-...
The food-rich West has enough conven- 
tional 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 
freedom—and power—on its people. Without 
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 gentle­ 
man 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 Con­ 
gress to send to my constituents in the 20th 
Congressional District of Illinois an 
an annual questionnaire on major issues 
fac ing our Nation on the foreign and 
domestic fronts. The results have been 
very helpful and enlightening, as I have 
thus received the opinions and addi­ 
tional 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.

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

MAJORITY LEADER'S CHART INSER­ 
TION REVEALS HIGH-LEVEL 
ADMINISTRATION CONCERN OVER 
INFLATION

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, 
I ask unanimous consent that the gentle­ 
man from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleve­ 
land] may extend his remarks at this 
point in the Record and include extraneous 
matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to 
the insertion of the gentleman from 
Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I was 
fascinated to read the little chart intro­ 
duced into the Record yesterday by the 
distinguished majority leader purporting 
that the U.S. figures to be worse than those of 
our allies. I am surprised that our relative position is not 
far greater than the majority leader's 
chart reveals.

What is really interesting, however, is 
that the fact that he put the chart in the 
Record at all. Is it a sign that the Demo­ 
cratic leadership is acknowledging at 
last that the inflation issue is a real one? Did he do it to help congressional can­ 
didates 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 revealing. The little chart is merely dropped into the Record and allowed to lie there, gleaming from the front page, enticing us to explain its precise meaning.

I choose to believe that it represents the well-founded, deep concern felt in the highest administration circles over the living standards of life in the District of Columbia. 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 kind of ally will haul us up if we go under?

We are not impressed by the majority leader's chart. We are impressed, however, 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 statement 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 lack of a public college 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. I and many of my 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 District. 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 the District of Columbia has no 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 interested in the problems 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 it 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 moment and 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 this session.

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 degree; but primarily it would be oriented toward vocational training, thus training those badly needed skilled technicians and semi-professionals.

The college would absorb the present District of Columbia Teachers College. It would be tuition-free for District residents; nonresidents would be required to pay tuition based on cost.

The bill would authorize all necessary appropriations to carry out the act; furthermore, $30 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, $20 million; the 2-year college, $8 million.

The bill would substantially agree with the recommendations made by the President's Committee on 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 students, our families, and our society we 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. KUPPERMAN) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KUPPERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in New York City, I have witnessed, in the recent past, three unconscionable strikes which caused great inconvenience and have 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 a telegram from the President 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 his 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. What will you do something constructive in this field?

Obviously this administration does not want to antagonize those in the labor movement, and in 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
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The agreement, which also requires continued production in the event of a combined strike or lockout, is in the consumer's interest.

The Authors League proposal was commended upon by Forbes magazine and 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 agreement is between the Dunbar Furniture Corporation, 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 42d St., New York. The signers will be Harold D. Sprunger, president of the 47-year-old family-owned company, and Sal B. Hoffmann, president.

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 fund over a 13-week period.

FUND GOES TO CHARITY

If there is no settlement at the end of the 12 weeks, Dunbar and its 275 employees plan to make the strike a Long Island-wide charity project.

The agreement calls for both sides to settle in the first six weeks and continue bargaining during the next three weeks, the contributions by the company and the employees continuing. If the parties reach an agreement during the next three weeks, the contributions by the company and the employees continuing. If the parties reach an agreement during the next three weeks, the contributions by the company and the employees continuing. If the parties reach an agreement during the next three weeks, the contributions by the company and the employees continuing.
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A SUBSTITUTE FOR TRANSIT STRIKES
(From an open letter to Mayor John V. Lindsay, New York City)

We would like to propose a moral (and practical) equivalent to the strike weapon in the area of public services—the "strike-work" arrangement, as has been practiced in New York and the two recent citywide newspaper strikes vividly demonstrate that we need new ways to prevent and settle compulsory bargaining disputes.

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 arrangements in which they each bring to bear on the other by a strike a weapon that is an essential factor.

Obviously, the traditional aim of a strike or lockout is to impose economic injury on the opposition in order to bring it to terms. By striking, the employees put economic pressure on the employers. By refusing to accept the union's offer, the employer brings economic pressure on the striking employees and by businesses that normally work with the employees.

We think 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.


This agreement provides that if on the expiration of the 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 on a "figure" arrangement.

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 not negotiated within a specified period, the escrow funds are returned to both sides. If it has not been negotiated by that time, a settlement by both sides is forfeited and paid to designated charities.

The money forfeited under such an agreement would be lost as irretrievably to both labor and management, as would the wages and operating income lost by both in an actual strike. When this contract was signed, the parties had added their names to 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 assured that the same economic incentives to bargain with each other, but we would have avoided the irretrievable injury to the public and the loss 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.

ELIZABETH JANEWAY, President, Authors League of America, Inc.
SHELDON KAPK, Counsel.

First broached during the previous New York City newspaper strike by Irwin Karp, Esquire, in a letter to the Saturday Review, the idea of 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 traditional 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 strike often results in the most means of applying this pressure. It hurts not only the belligerents, but everyone else. The publishers and printers apply the same pressure more discriminately (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, the public out of the middle in this type of dispute, would be an essential factor.

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 the strip mine land. 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 acids, acid drainage, and injury to public health and safety.

The present efforts to rehabilitate old surface-mined areas are inadequate. Development (to adjust to the demands of the public and 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 in our communities and rural areas affected.

The principal benefits to come from the action proposed in the bill are offsite and for the general welfare, rather than economic gain of the belligerents. 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 lands ready 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 make a valuable contribution to 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 exist. 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-mined 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 lands damaged 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 given in the past. Most of these lands are not applicable to nonagricultural and are privately owned. Therefore, authorities provided for in existing Federal law 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 the Federal Government to rehabilitate old surface-mined areas. This is the area that do not come under State laws requiring reclamation. They are the spoils that have remained untreated because of the lack of available funds. Most of these lands have been denuded and there is no federal authority to fill this void by authorizing the Federal Government to rehabilitate old surface-mined areas.

The legislation I propose would provide an authorization of $50 million for the restoration and rehabilitation of 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 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 89th Congress.

Mr. SWEENEY. 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 conservation of the national resources and in 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 been sterilized.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has accurately appraised the problem and has said the bounty 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.

The solution of these problems on older mined sites will require considerably more Federal attention than has been given in the past.

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 use.

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 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 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 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 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 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.
in our State is not moving forward as it ought to.

Mr. SWEENY. 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. FRAZER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter. The Speaker agreed.

Mr. SWEENY. 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 the Seaway approached its predicted full capacity operation.

Especially now, when the seaway's capital investment will not only cover its own maintenance and operating costs by the number of House seats allotted to that State, but also repay the total amount of the original investment.

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 its 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 Seaway Corporation could also issue debentures 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 TO REINVIGORATE 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 agreed.

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.

An 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. WARROR] 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 disdained ordinance. But what excuse can there be for us, who have in our hands the power 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 Warror, 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 Administration's proposal for 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 federal campaigns, provide a small tax credit, rather than a deduction, for contributions or expenditures for candidates or party committees, and would prohibit or severely penalize the use of campaign contributions in the purchase of television time. Each of us to some degree bears the onus of that failure.
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In Texas. It cost me a little over $10,000. But the same total amount of time, on exactly the same project, 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 was much more than I had anticipated, but I was aware of it the moment I signed the note for $68,000, for which I signed personal notes to pay off creditors, mostly for debts of which I had no knowledge. It took me two and a half years to retire the notes.

Perhaps I know something about the necessity that he faced. In 1961, I made an unsuccessful run for the U.S. Senate from Texas. But the same total and shouts a name or a singing commercial public is entitled to know them. It's their off.
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and turn the clear, clean spotlight of public

and say: "There lies the future President of

the United States"?

We have tarnished the dream.

And where does it leave the innocent 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 lob­

bys, with congressional candidates as the

beneficiaries. One Washington-based lobby­
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 in the campaign party brochures.

Among others who have bought these ads are eleven of the nation's top 25

companies, such as airlines, whose business ac­

tivities are directly regulated by the govern­

ment.

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?

Of must it be contrary to all we have

professed—we really are creating two

classes of citizen-stockholders in our De­

ocracy—common stock and preferred

stock.

In a more subtle way, the flattering allure

of an exclusive chance to visit socially with

the President is, I believe, the incentive for

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

legislate the President's Club, which

pegs at $10,000, whose members are to

enjoy the additional boon of an invitation to

the White House. The motives of the

White House people behind this rather

small thing as this should have become

necessary. I am not specifically criticizing those who

organize and manage the various campaigns who respond to them. But I am criticizing the rather commonly accepted practices

which encourage some minimum 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 straining the breadth 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

the law and any conviction that we have

the duty to do so.

(1) First, the President has asked us to

business to "the President's Club" which

shredded the realm of campaign financing and turn the clear, clean spotlight of public awareness upon it. The President is to be

recorded for his bold leadership.

His Election Reform Act of 1966 would re­

quire every gift and every expenditure of $100 and more, whether taken or given, 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 false theory that the activities of the small contributor are innocuous, or perhaps

unaware of their activities in his behalf and, like Pontius Pilate, can simply wash his hands of them.

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 Congress­

ional and Senatorial candidates, in comply­

ing with the letter of the law, have been literally forced to evade the spirit of the law.

(2) To minimize the financial dependence

upon the mammoth "party" the Presi­

dent proposes that an absolute maximum of $5,000 should be established as the amount which any individual in his behalf may lawfully contribute to any one campaign.

The present law purports to impose such a limit, but it is blithely evaded by the mul­
titude of "committee" under the interest of the same candidate, thus allowing the in­
dividual with a desire to buy himself a law­
maker to contribute $5,000 to each such com­
mittee. 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 practice—whether directly to the candi­
date or to any committee—will be allowed. But the amount is still too much. A dependence by any candidate upon $6,000 contributions is not only extremely unhealthy and po­
tentially 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 law. And this can be done.

I am not thinking of no justification for failing to adopt this provision.

The most important feature of the Administration bill is that

which would broaden the base of political contributions by encouraging hundreds of thousands of people to take advantage of the 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—were to contribute $50 each, they would soon have the Congressmen's salaries for a two-year term. There seems something oddingly incongruous about the House of Representatives, 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 abstinence—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 expenditure. I do not pretend to know how much should be the deductible amount, but by making still smaller contributions still more attractive to the average citizen. If we really want to retain a 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 $50 for any citizen who had contributed that much to the campaign of his chosen party or candidate.

It is my personal feeling that, in our system of political office, that he should solicit $5 each from 5,000 people, rather than $50 from each of five contributors. If he would take in $25,000 in the latter range—unless he is a pure philanthropist—is likely to expect something commensurate in return. But nobody who joins a party committee to the simple work of making a party primary and a like sum for the general election. In New York and California, the lid would figure at a few hundred dollars. Even the large contributors and all contestants honoring the same law, this should be enough. The large contributors should be expected to do their part. It is my opinion, that a certain minimum amount of $25,000 raise and $25,000 more spending to no more than $100 be specified for any Senate candidacy. Therefore, I have undertaken to set the ceilings at multiples of $30,000, with the two major political parties. Nobody knows the political life could be elevated by deliberate ceilings and a fresh look at the contributions of up to a total of $100 be specifically deductible from income taxes as a stimulus to widespread popular financial support of candidates. This is the reason for the workability of the entire program. In fact, I'd like to make it even stronger—not by reducing the deductible amount, but by eliminating the ceiling altogether. I am a firm enough in the legislative integrity to respond to Mississippi Senator and Representative than they do in the body as a whole. This fact is borne out clearly by many opinion sampling. The human tendency is to mistrust the unknown, to doubt the unfamiliar. A mandatory public airing of Individual Congressional finances, therefore, by the simple expedient of displacing the mist of mystery, would remove the laughably low and totally meaningless statute on the books. The increasing emphasis upon the quantity of shouting contests, reminiscent of the public's interest in theory would also have the effect of minimizing the public's interest in theory would become sufficiently hypothesized.
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runs alarmingly counter to the American experiment in self-government. From the very beginning, we have demonstrated a healthy mistrust of the concentration of too much power in the hands of too few. But directly juxtaposed to this constitutional expansion of the electorate and our democratising of the ballot is the insidious encroachment of circumstances which make 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 the Bridge Canyon Dam in the Grand Canyon Park Act (40 Stat. 1175), it is worth looking at the act.

The conclusion of any fair-minded 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 Bridge Canyon Dam 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 the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project.

This is the provision that the proponents of the Bridge Canyon Dam now wish and have 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 purposes of the Grand Canyon National Park Act, 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.

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 be inconsistent with the primary purposes of the park.

Mr. HAYDEN. The provision contained in the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the use of 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, to divert water from the river and store the storage of water. If that can be done without disturbing the primary purposes of the park, Congress has authority in this bill to do so.

(Emphasis added.)

So, first, the question is raised whether the Bridge Canyon Dam would be “consistent with the primary purposes” of the Grand Canyon National Park Act.

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 a great natural beauty. It would obscure important geological features. It would wipe out the habitats of plants and wildlife in the canyon.

Any 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. So 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 the purposes of the Grand Canyon National Park Act. It is explained 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. Ronning] may ex-
tend his remarks at this point in the Recoa 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 Recoa a speech delivered by my dear friend, Mr. Mario T. Noto before the Federal Court Clerks' Association's 35th 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 35th Annual Conference of the Federal Court Clerks' Association. It is a genuine and sincere pleasure to be permitted to participate in this memorable event. As the leader of 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 always been attracted into associations. We do this for good reason. Ironically, Alexis de Tocqueville perceived this trait among Americans as early as 1835 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 reflections of the desires and 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, recognize the part that these new citizens and officers who, as part of our Judiciary system, give unstintingly of themselves in joining our Service to assist aliens to become citizens. It is the acquisitive act of citizenship that is indispensable and of inestimable worth.

No person with reason can deny or even cast doubts 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 is difficult to exaggerate its value and importance. By many it is regarded as the highest hope of civilized man." This right, by judicial definition, is a privilege that is enjoyed by all citizens. And the sacred worth of American citizenship is no less in value today than it was in the days of the Constitution. In fact, it is today incapable of measurement. And since our nation declared itself independent, it has continuously spiraled in worth. So long as God continues to endow this nation of ours with the inheritance of the tremen-
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 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 of the House to know that these two items of 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, and the other is a memorandum from the American Stock Exchange, American Stock Exchange and other leading exchanges.

I am sure that when the Members of the House have an opportunity to study them they will once again agree with me that this project is economically absurd--this is true of the Dickey-Lincoln School project in the West--and for the reasons I have given before we appropriate any further funds for it. It is quite plain to me that when a project of this kind is opposed by segment of society, the Assistant Secretary 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 conservation basis, then, in my opinion, the Members of this House are entitled to considerably more information than we have received from Federal agencies.

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 that the whole project is economically absurd—this however does not preclude development. A legislative battle should precede any final implementation. While a development may be considered a "threat," the impact upon private utility investment within New England is so great that the threat should not be significantly injurious."

The outlook for utility operations is excellent with atomic energy "a truly remarkable development" and the favorable economies of the utility industry are finally beginning to be realized in New England. Power-pooling is leading to the installation of larger and larger units in New England with an impressive impact upon operations.

The outlook for utility operations is excellent with atomic energy "a truly remarkable development" and the favorable economies of the utility industry are finally beginning to be realized in New England. Power-pooling is leading to the installation of larger and larger units in New England with an impressive impact upon operations. New England's power pool has been a model for the industry where we make our living.

Mr. CLARK, stating that he wishes to keep the Members of the House fully informed on the status of this project, entered into the Congressional Record, August 8, the last of an article written by Mr. Raymond Moley and 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. Tuttle], wrote a 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. Tupfer and myself to the publishers of Newsweek.

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 by the Rivers and Harbors Bill with an appropriation of $500,000 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 and that the sentiment of the people in Maine who visited Washington, D.C. and said it "was a fine opportunity to visit but a long way from everything."

Mr. Moley lauds the 19 private power companies of New England for their plan for development over the next 10 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 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 water and do not 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 come from developments of Federal hydroelectric power.

Sincerely,

MAINE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

DURHAM, 2ND DISTRICT

STANLEY R. TUPFER

REPUBLICAN, FIRST DISTRICT

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 by the Rivers and Harbors Bill with an appropriation of $500,000 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 and that the sentiment of the people in Maine who visited Washington, D.C. and said it "was a fine opportunity to visit but a long way from everything."

Mr. Moley lauds the 19 private power companies of New England for their plan for development over the next 10 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 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 water and do not 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 come from developments of Federal hydroelectric power.

Sincerely,

MAINE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

DURHAM, 2ND DISTRICT

STANLEY R. TUPFER

REPUBLICAN, FIRST DISTRICT

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 by the Rivers and Harbors Bill with an appropriation of $500,000 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 and that the sentiment of the people in Maine who visited Washington, D.C. and said it "was a fine opportunity to visit but a long way from everything."

Mr. Moley lauds the 19 private power companies of New England for their plan for development over the next 10 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 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 water and do not 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 come from developments of Federal hydroelectric power.

Sincerely,

MAINE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

DURHAM, 2ND DISTRICT

STANLEY R. TUPFER

REPUBLICAN, FIRST DISTRICT
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 produce here today 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 and domestic 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—order 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 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. The purpose of this legislation is to discover and eliminate, 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, too much industrial development, 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 do the right thing—that is necessary—a clean water supply—with what is useful—an attractive, unspoiled system of waterways—with what is beautiful—a clean, safe stream.

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 Delaware, the Ohio, the Mississippi—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. If we want to make the Charles 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 of 1965 is further 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, in the case where 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, may if in the judgment of the Secretary advisable, in cooperation with the appropriate authorities, establish such boundaries as necessary to prevent such pollution and pollution control and on other navigable waters of the United States, and shall report the results thereof to the Congress."
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of such study, together with recommendations for an effective program to control the dumping of hazardous waste from boats and vessels on such waters, to the Congress no later than July 1, 1967.

(2) The Secretary shall appoint, in accordance with section 3 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by amendments made by the Water Resources Development Act of 1965, 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 Solomons, and the Coast Guard is operating, owners and operators of Great Lakes vessels, and such other persons as the Secretary may select. The 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 Admiration of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 (28 U.S.C. 733–739) 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.

(b) "refuse" includes garbage, damage, and other trash.

(4) The Secretary is authorized to make loans, grants, or contracts with State and local government bodies, the political subdivisions of the States, or agencies and the Secretary shall, on such basis as he determines, make loans to such State and local government bodies, the political subdivisions of the States, or agencies and the Secretary shall make loans to such State and local government bodies, the political subdivisions of the States, or agencies and the Secretary shall 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 industrial 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 systems or the treatment or control of industrial wastes and for the purpose of those paragraphs of sections 3648 and 3700 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 $300,000,000 of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary;

(3) No grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring proper and efficient operation of the described improvements or facilities for a period to be determined by the Secretary, 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 or agencies as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as other considerations;

(c) Subsection (b) of section 8 is amended by inserting after "(3) No grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring proper and efficient operation of the described improvements or facilities for a period of not less than 30 years" the following sentence: "and shall mature within such period 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 other considerations.";

(d) Subsection (e) of section 8 is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "The provisions of this section shall not apply to projects in such State which have been approved under this section other than for purposes described in section 7 of such Act, as amended by Acts approved prior to July 1, 1972, to the extent that assistance is available from any other Federal source not required to be appropriated for such purposes," and (e) For the purposes of this section there are authorized to be appropriated:—

(1) Subsection (a), (b), and (c) of section 8 are amended by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof: "The provisions of this section shall not apply to projects in such State which have been approved under this section other than for purposes described in section 7 of such Act, as amended by Acts approved prior to July 1, 1972, to the extent that assistance is available from any other Federal source not required to be appropriated for such purposes, and (2) Such loans may be made only to the extent that State water pollution control agencies have been certified by the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of section 7, that such State has an adequate State water pollution control agency and that such State water pollution control agency 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 other considerations.

Sec. 8. The Secretary is authorized to —

(1) 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 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 of the described improvements or facilities for a period of not less than 30 years following 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 be made only to the extent that the State, municipality, or agency determines that such funds are necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection but not to exceed a total of $250,000,000. No loan made pursuant to this subsection shall be made with respect to any project shall exceed an amount equal to 10 per centum of such total; and

(2) Sec. 9. Section 10(d) of such Act is amended by inserting after the last sentence therein the following:

"In the receipt of reports, surveys, or studies from any duly constituted International agency, there shall be provided for the purposes of this section such funds as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection to the extent appropriate to the requirements for the purposes of the subsection (a) of this section which en danger the health or welfare of persons in a State, and the Secretary of State shall make such funds at the Secretar y of State requests he be able to do so. The International agency shall be the Department of State of the United States and the International agency shall be the Secretary of State in which such discharge
or discharges originate and to the interstate water pollution control agency, if any, and shall have authority to develop a planning agency or agencies, if in his judgment the effect of such pollution on the legitimate uses of the water 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 the foreign country shall vote at the conclusion of the conference and any further proceeding resulting from such conference, have all rights, duties, and responsibilities with respect to any such planning agency. This paragraph shall apply only to a foreign country which the Secretary determines has given the United States essentially the same right 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 thereby.

Sec. 10. Section 10(d)(2) is amended to insert after the first sentence thereof the following: "In order to reclaim, restore, or abate water pollution control 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 in effect within the river basin as 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 disposal of such pollution, which will encourage both municipal and industrial use of such treatment system; and (C) shall be based on such facilities or other means to prevent or reduce such discharges as may be necessary to implement the plan."

Sec. 12. Such Act is further amended by redesignating sections 12 through 16 as sections 9 through 13, redesignating section 14(a) as section 9, redesignating section 15(b) as section 10, redesignating section 17 as section 11, and redesignating section 18 as section 12 thereof the following new sections 12 and 13:

"Sec. 12. In order to reclaim, restore, and maintain the natural waters of the Nation through the preparation and development of a comprehensive, coordinated, basin-wide 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 or upon determination 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 in effect within the river basin as 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 disposal of such pollution, which will encourage both municipal and industrial use of such treatment system; and (C) shall be based on such facilities or other means to prevent or reduce such discharges 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, the Interstate Wildlife Agency, the International commission, and each local agency covered by the plan or portion thereof. Each planning agency 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) Upon receipt of a proposed comprehensive pollution control and abatement plan or portion thereof from a planning agency, the Secretary shall transmit it to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of the Interior, or the Federal agencies responsible for the appropriate planning agency, for review.

"(e) Subsections (g)(7) and 14(d) and (e) above are hereby amended, and are made applicable to any grant made by the Secretary pursuant to this section.

"(f) Subsections (g)(7) and 14(d) and (e) above are hereby amended, 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 under this Act shall be approved, after three years following the date of designation of a planning agency, unless such project is in accordance with an approved plan as provided in subsection (d)(3).

"(h)(1) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (b), the Secretary is authorized to pay such expenses of a planning agency as are necessary to implement the provisions of the plan. Each planning agency shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Secretary, who shall include such budget in the annual budget of the Federal Government.

"(i) There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary

"(j) Provided, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture prescribed by law for failure of any person to file a report as required by such a report. After such conference has been held, the Secretary shall require such additional reports as he shall deem necessary in such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Department of Justice within a reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary or any person required to file any report. Any such report shall be confidential for the purposes of section 1005 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(k) 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 $50 for each such failure. In any suit for the recovery of such fine, the United States shall have a lien on the personal property of such person until the fine is paid."

"Provided, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture prescribed by law for failure of any person to file a report as required by such a report. After such conference has been held, the Secretary shall require such additional reports as he shall deem necessary in such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Department of Justice within a reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary or any person required to file any report. Any such report shall be confidential for the purposes of section 1005 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(1) Provided, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture prescribed by law for failure of any person to file a report as required by such a report. After such conference has been held, the Secretary shall require such additional reports as he shall deem necessary in such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Department of Justice within a reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary or any person required to file any report. Any such report shall be confidential for the purposes of section 1005 of title 18 of the United States Code.
to carry out the provisions of this section, which sums shall be available until expended.

(1) For the purposes of this section—

(1) the term 'planning agency' includes, but is not limited to, interstate agencies, or commissions established pursuant to an agreement or compact approved by the Congress.

(2) the term 'local, State, or interstate agencies' includes State, county, municipal, joint board, or other political subdivision of a State, public corporations, public agencies and institutions, and political subdivisions or municipalities of American or other 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 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, including the protection, acquisition, alteration, removal, improvement, or extension of treatment works; and the 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.

(5) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize, modify, or establish any interstate compact or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint board, joint commission, or joint board, 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 Secretary, in cooperation with the Congress, shall furnish to Congress with the information necessary for authorization of appropriations for fiscal years after June 30, 1972, the Secretary, in cooperation with State water pollution control agencies and other water pollution control agencies, shall make a preliminary assessment 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 estimates and such comprehensive study of such cost for the five-year period beginning July 1, 1968, no later than January 1, 1972, and to be updated every two years thereafter.

SEC. 13. Section 13 of the Act of March 3, 1969, (33 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 Commerce finds that it is consistent with the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 465) . . ."

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. As 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; and 'owner' or 'operator' means an employee of a vessel; any owner, operator, officer, or employee of a shore installation or terminal facility, or agency, or employee of the United States.

(c) 'terminal facility' means any pier, wharf, dock, or similar facility 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) 'discharge' means any accidental, negligent, willful, negligent, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, or other release of oil; and

(e) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 3. (a) Except in case of emergency, it is unlawful for any person to discharge any uncontrolled oil, into or upon the coastal, interstate, or 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;

(b) Any person discharging or permitting the discharge of oil from any 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 of the United States.

(c) The Secretary may prescribe regulations which—

(1) permit the discharge of oil from boats or vessels in harbors or ports for the purpose of unloading or in cases of emergency;

(2) require, or permit, the unloading of oil on or contiguous to boats or vessels, shore installations, and terminal facilities;

(3) require the removal or cost of removal, or both, of oil from the interstate or navigable waters of the United States.

"(a) As used in this section the term 'oil pollution' means any discharge of oil from any vessel, or any activity related to the removal of oil from any vessel. . . ."

"Sec. 4. As used in this Act, unless the context otherwise requires—

(1) the term 'pollution' means any discharge of oil from any vessel, . . ."

"(b) Any person or operator of a shore installation, or terminal facility, or agency, or employee of the United States from which oil is discharged in violation of section 3(a) of this Act shall be liable for a penalty not to exceed $10,000. . . ."

"(c) The owner or operator of a shore installation, or terminal facility, or agency, or employee of the United States from which oil is discharged in violation of section 3(a) of this Act shall be liable for a penalty not to exceed $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 promulgated under section 5(c) of this Act shall, if there is a fine imposed under such section, be liable for a penalty not more than triple such fine and imprisonment for each offense.

"Sec. 5. The Commandant of the Coast Guard may, subject to the provisions of section 6 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by sections 1 and 2, suspend of issue to an agent, or any other person, or any vessel, a license issued to the master or other licensed officer of any boat or vessel found violating the provisions 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, as now or hereafter established, or as hereafter created by the United States, 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 by 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 enforce and carry into effect the provisions of this Act, and to which effect the President, or the Secretary of the Army, or the Commandant of the Coast Guard, or any officer of the United States, may make rules and regulations therefor, which shall not be construed as repealing, modifying, or amending any existing law; and in cases of crimes against the United States, or by the President, or the Secretary of the Army, or the Commandant of the Coast Guard, or any other officer of the United States, the District attorney, or the United States attorney, may institute proceedings under the provisions of this Act, and to which effect the President, or the Secretary of the Army, or the Commandant of the Coast Guard, or any other officer of the United States, may make rules and regulations therefor. And in cases of crimes against the United States, the District attorney, or the United States attorney, may institute proceedings under the provisions of this Act, and to which effect the President, or the Secretary of the Army, or the Commandant of the Coast Guard, or any other officer of the United States, may make rules and regulations therefor.

"Sec. 7. This Act shall be in addition to and may be invoked with all other laws for the preservation and protection of interstate or navigable waters and shall not preclude, or in any manner, affect, 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 the point of order, the Reconcile and Include extraneous matter.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKY. Mr. Speaker, despite the efforts of some circles in this country to play down the reality of the 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 displayed unmistakably 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 play the right role in the deceptive policy of peaceful coexistence being relentlessly pursued by Moscow and its Red syndicate. A heavy moral burden rests on our leadership to sustain the momentum of all those supporting our 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 totalitarianism 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 House 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:

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."


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 Red Rule."


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 Communism led through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Russia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Italy-Ural, Serbia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossacks, Croatia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and enslaved other peoples, the burden rests on our leadership to sustain throughout the week emphasis was put on the need for a Special House Committee. our participation in the event.

There, whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in totalitarianism constitute a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war still.

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 voice passed Public Law 89-90 establishing the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe each week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing our 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 Captain Nations Week, the week of July 17, 1966 be observed as Captive Nations Week in Pittsburgh, and call upon the citizenry of this City to observe this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of enslaved 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, which is 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 WELL HASTEN PEOPLES' 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 Communist "are nothing but Communists." "In many ways, they have also manifested their profound interest in Dr. Sun Yat-sen's republicanism, the very essence and spirit of the traditional Chinese civilization and culture," he said. "Such a change of loyalty constitutes a direct threat to the very survival and existence of the free forces of the Chinese Communists to resort to terrorist measures," Yen said.

Yen was today quoted as saying: "A Captive Nations Week" mass rally held in the Taipei City Hall on July 29.

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. The time is ripe to call all the freedom-loving peoples to destroy the common enemy.

Assessing 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.""
Both the White House and the State Department believe there are better ways of dealing with Communist nations than making invectives with them. The current U.S. policy is to take advantage of the growing autonomy of the various Communist nations—wherever possible.

This "building bridges" policy calls for a gradual increase in commerce and cultural exchanges in the hope of weaning the peoples of these nations away from their totalitarianism. The long-range hope is that the liberal, less doctrinaire forces in these countries will come to see that freedom is better than life under the autocratic system. This policy, of course, involves making our policies in the United States and our administration more realistic, kind of experience to provide. Former President Johnson, in his proclamation issued special proclamations urging the American people to lend their support to the cause of the captive nations everywhere.

President Johnson, in his proclamation issued special proclamations urging the American people to lend their support to the cause of the captive nations everywhere.

Captive Nations Week was sponsored by the National Captive Nations Committee, headed by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, President of the National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC). The NCNC is a country made up of the Czechs and Slovaks, among others, 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 1968 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.

Captive Nations Week 1968 THE IRON CURTAIN CAN BE OVER

The observances last year were described by Mikhail Suslov, a Soviet spokesman, as "foggy and murky" but "positive victory in the Cold War." The celebration was announced on the occasion of the Captive Nations Week in 1967 by Dr. Dobriansky, a member of the Congress Committee on Human Rights, and the United States, issued a special Pastoral Letter on the occasion of the Captive Nations Week.

PASTORAL LETTER BY UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC

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 programs were organized and dedicated prayers and Mayors urging their respective citizens to observe Captive Nations Week and thus support the captive nations. Representatives of the U.S. Senators and Congressmen, all Governors and Mayors active 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 pamphlet, Freedom’s Hope, a reprint of a Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky’s article from The Ukrainian Quarterly (Vol. XXII, No. 3, 1965), were placed in the UCCA office in New York and the National Captive Nations Committee office in Washington. Recipients of the pamphlet were all U.S. Congressional Representatives, all Governors and Mayors, all foreign missions to the U.N. and major U.S. newspapers, radio and TV stations throughout the country.

ARCHPASTORAL APPEAL OF THE MOST REV. AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O.S.B.M., ARCHBISHOP AND METROPOLITAN OF PHILADELPHIA, ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1966

Throughout the course of mankind’s history, the captive peoples have lived in diverse ways. We read of the woes of war which many of you have personally endured; epidemics; mass murder; hunger and despair. For us, however, such evils have passed. But another evil exists in our day and age which has stretched out its red tentacles 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 and has been instrumental in their liberation. The joint resolution of Congress, ratified by both the House and Senate on July 17, 1969 sanctioned the President of the United States to issue an annual proclamation designating the week of July 10-16 as Captive Nations Week so that the United States may show its concern for the captive peoples in Central Europe, in Asia, and in other parts of the world. The 1966 resolution was signed, July 8, the date of the Declaration of Independence.

We trust that Captive Nations Week will stir consciences to works of mercy and help to liberation of the Ukrainian and other captive peoples from the shackles of communism. It has been said, “religion is the opium of the people.” We believe that the Communist parodies of religion have been responsible for the crime in Cuba, who do not demand their right to return to their homes? Why does the government not permit them to return to their homes? Why does the Communist regime, through its agents, cause unrest and strife? Why does the Communist underground nurture animosity and dissension among the people? And the continuous assault upon the Ukrainian Catholic Church and her leadership, especially here in the United States?

Captive Nations Week should be but one answer, and that is because the communist system is essentially evil. Our Divine Savior said that the Kingdom of Heaven is good fruit (Mt. 6, 18). Even though the communist regime has recently opened its doors to tourist in which they are permitted to see and not to see. They have no real opportunity to see a true picture of a country because they are restrained and prevented from obtaining an objective evaluation of conditions as they are in the free world. Let us pray that the U.S. representatives have their part about the evil of communism and have reaffirmed the position that communism is anathema, because of Divine laws and Christian morality. It depriveth 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 has been said, “religion is the opium of the people.” We believe that the Communist parodies of religion have been responsible for the crime in Cuba, who do not demand their right to return to their homes? Why does the government not permit them to return to their homes? Why does the government not permit them to return to their homes? Why does the Communist regime, through its agents, cause unrest and strife? Why does the Communist underground nurture animosity and dissension among the people? And the continuous assault upon the Ukrainian Catholic Church and her leadership, especially here in the United States?

Captive Nations Week should be but one answer, and that is because the communist system is essentially evil. Our Divine Savior said that the Kingdom of Heaven is good fruit (Mt. 6, 18). Even though the communist regime has recently opened its doors to tourist in which they are permitted to see and not to see. They have no real opportunity to see a true picture of a country because they are restrained and prevented from obtaining an objective evaluation of conditions as they are in the free world. Let us pray that the U.S. representatives have their part about the evil of communism and have reaffirmed the position that communism is anathema, because of Divine laws and Christian morality. It depriveth 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 has been said, “religion is the opium of the people.” We believe that the Communist parodies of religion have been responsible for the crime in Cuba, who do not demand their right to return to their homes? Why does the government not permit them to return to their homes? Why does the government not permit them to return to their homes? Why does the Communist regime, through its agents, cause unrest and strife? Why does the Communist underground nurture animosity and dissension among the people? And the continuous assault upon the Ukrainian Catholic Church and her leadership, especially here in the United States?

Captive Nations Week should be but one answer, and that is because the communist system is essentially evil. Our Divine Savior said that the Kingdom of Heaven is good fruit (Mt. 6, 18). Even though the communist regime has recently opened its doors to tourist in which they are permitted to see and not to see. They have no real opportunity to see a true picture of a country because they are restrained and prevented from obtaining an objective evaluation of conditions as they are in the free world. Let us pray that the U.S. representatives have their part about the evil of communism and have reaffirmed the position that communism is anathema, because of Divine laws and Christian morality. It depriveth 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 has been said, “religion is the opium of the people.” We believe that the Communist parodies of religion have been responsible for the crime in Cuba, who do not demand their right to return to their homes? Why does the government not permit them to return to their homes? Why does the government not permit them to return to their homes? Why does the Communist regime, through its agents, cause unrest and strife? Why does the Communist underground nurture animosity and dissension among the people? And the continuous assault upon the Ukrainian Catholic Church and her leadership, especially here in the United States?

Captive Nations Week should be but one answer, and that is because the communist system is essentially evil. Our Divine Savior said that the Kingdom of Heaven is good fruit (Mt. 6, 18). Even though the communist regime has recently opened its doors to tourist in which they are permitted to see and not to see. They have no real opportunity to see a true picture of a country because they are restrained and prevented from obtaining an objective evaluation of conditions as they are in the free world. Let us pray that the U.S. representatives have their part about the evil of communism and have reaffirmed the position that communism is anathema, because of Divine laws and Christian morality. It depriveth men of human rights and the very dignity of humanity.
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Captive Nations Week should be but one answer, and that is because the communist system is essentially evil. Our Divine Savior said that the Kingdom of Heaven is good fruit (Mt. 6, 18). Even though the communist regime has recently opened its doors to tourist in which they are permitted to see and not to see. They have no real opportunity to see a true picture of a country because they are restrained and prevented from obtaining an objective evaluation of conditions as they are in the free world. Let us pray that the U.S. representatives have their part about the evil of communism and have reaffirmed the position that communism is anathema, because of Divine laws and Christian morality. It depriveth men of human rights and the very dignity of humanity.
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and specialists on the problem taking part. Those participating in the discussion, entitled "Evolution of the Red Empire," were Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, and President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee (UCC); and Mr. Robert L. Carter, also President of the National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC). Dr. Dobriansky and Mr. Carter were called to the Chair of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization Policy, and Mr. Carter, David H. Bell, and Wallace Fanning were the moderators.

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 member of the Soviet Presidium, Mikhail Suslov, had this to say: "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogy of the imperialistic chicenfeet"! in the United States when he supports an act of Congress directed toward the eventual freedom of these nations. In that the Resolution has produced this unprecedented scare in Russia's Kremlin over this entire period. How is it possible, National Week Resolution? to effect 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. XXXII, 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 United States position toward the captive nations-a much of the Free World. These dominant trends are, in part, the logical consequences of the so-called "peaceful co-existence," which is nothing but a confidence trick. The trend is also a product of the Red agitation for peace and that is the so-called "imperialistic chicenfeet"! in the United States when he supports an act of Congress directed toward the eventual freedom of these nations. In that the Resolution has produced this unprecedented scare in Russia's Kremlin over this entire period. How is it possible, National Week Resolution? to effect 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.

When this writer wrote the Captive Nations Week Resolution in June, 1959, little did he appreciate the extent to which elements in the united nations and in the Free world have come to recognize the vital role played by the Red Empire in the current international situation. In 1959, the combined Red military forces of the world, including the forces under the command of the Red regime of China and the Red forces in Korea, were estimated to be about 20 million men. The Red Empire is now known to have an estimated 30 million men under arms, and this force is being steadily increased by the Red regime of China and the Red forces in Korea. The Red Empire is now known to have an estimated 30 million men under arms, and this force is being steadily increased by the Red regime of China and the Red forces in Korea. The Red Empire is now known to have an estimated 30 million men under arms, and this force is being steadily increased by the Red regime of China and the Red forces in Korea.
Whereas, it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples, through an appropriate celebration, (1) the realization of the fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their national and individual 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 June 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-ended clause as concerns the enumeration of captive nations. In 1959, after a year of disputes, the entire House members who had offered the first opportunity to consider the measure, the writer found it necessary to insert such a clause in order to allow for new captive nations, such as Cuba in 1960, and to gradually familiarize many segments of our own people until such time as freedom and independence had to be combated.

Perspective is the usual, lack ing quality in the thinking of those who dry mythical distinctions between "fat" and "lean" Communists, "liberal" and "doctrinaire" Com munists, the "so-called" and the "real" Communists, and between "pragmatic" and "orthodox" Communists. Other devices were also employed then in the attempt to combat the thinking of those who draw mythical distinctions between "fat" and "lean" Communists, which in the U.S.S.R., propels such change.

A second basic issue is the formulation of a sensitive liberal policy as the best guarantor of a long, deep, and interminable string of guerrilla wars. This policy, with its almost exclusive emphasis on popular activity and its purely military engagement, was not sufficiently understood in the 50's, and, with the emerging discourse on "containment" today, not to speak of further Communist takeover tomorrow, it stands as the real and winning alternative to the policy ofpatched containment or so-called liberalization. The fruits of containment are well known: from the evident fact that the Red Syndicate leaped into power in 1949-50, a year or two later than expected; from the invasion of Cuba in 1960, and the intractable war in Vietnam today, into Cuba in our Hemisphere, into the Middle East, into Africa and Asia. All this through ideological, political, and military 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 Soviet Union (2) and the San Francisco Treaty, which should have been honestly portrayed to our people.

The Unitary Reality of Captive Nations

Through all the foggy and murky talk about "containment," "maintaining bridges of understanding" (with whom?), "detente with the Russians," and similar figments of the confused and distorted universal reality that cannot be beclouded by these illusions and exercises in self-deception— the captive nations stand in the straight path. These are the people who constitute the captive nations. They are in the 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 their unrepresentative Red regimes. The latter can always win elections in their own free territories, which will always confront us with syndicated action aimed at the subversion of the peoples held today in slavery. These latter are in great measure a repetition of those committed in yesteryear. Real, progressive change in the policies of containment, of war, and action. An ever-broadening knowledge of all the captive nations, particularly those of Eastern Europe, which may change the face of the world for a more secure peace, expanded freedom, and positive victory in the Cold War.

**Country and people and year of Communist domination—Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland China</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vietnam</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**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 about the need for and priority of freedom and independence for all the captive nations. Given the same course of U.S.! foreign policy and the pathetic mistakes being made today, it is the roll call of Red success, primarily in the United States of America, and the clear spaws of the Red imperio-colonialist totalitarians.

The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in helping us to think clearly and responsibly about the need for and priority of freedom and independence for all the captive nations.

The mistakes being made today, both in the U.S.S.R., and other myopic measures, are the result of a long and macho history of psycho-political warfare training. The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in enabling us to think clearly and responsibly about the need for and priority of freedom and independence for all the captive nations.

The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in enabling us to think clearly and responsibly about the need for and priority of freedom and independence for all the captive nations.

The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in enabling us to think clearly and responsibly about the need for and priority of freedom and independence for all the captive nations.

The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in enabling us to think clearly and responsibly about the need for and priority of freedom and independence for all the captive nations.

The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in enabling us to think clearly and responsibly about the need for and priority of freedom and independence for all the captive nations.

The ABC's of Captive Nations Week go a long way in enabling us to think clearly and responsibly about the need for and priority of freedom and independence for all the captive nations.
Nations Week Proclamation for July 8 to coincide with the anniversary of the ringing of the Liberty Bell, and with the commemoration of our Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia July 8, 1776.

To the Congress of the United States of America:

In recognition of the 216th anniversary of the signing of the United States Constitution, and the 232nd anniversary of the adoption of the United States Declaration of Independence, I recommend that, in accordance with Public Law 86-90, a public observance of our Nation’s birthday be observed throughout the United States during the week of June 28 to July 5.

Wishing to observe the 216th anniversary of the signing of the United States Constitution, and the 232nd anniversary of the adoption of the United States Declaration of Independence during the week of June 28 to July 5, and do hereby urge all of the people of the United States to commemorate the occasion with appropriate public observances.

August 11, 1966

John F. Kennedy
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, and not the producer, 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 conditions 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 year, 1965 and estimated 1966 and 1967

[In millions of dollars]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs which clearly provide benefits to consumers and the general public</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1966 estimate</th>
<th>1967 estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign use</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,114</td>
<td>$994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency farm relief to friendly peoples (title II, Public Law 480)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations of commodities acquired by CCC, International Wheat Agreement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of industrial materials to supplemental stockpile</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term supply contracts (title IV, Public Law 480)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations of dairy products to armed services and others</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,985</td>
<td>$2,033</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food distribution programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities distributed to the needy and others</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food stamp plan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special milk program</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>$235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;EA and FHA repayable loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;EA loans</td>
<td>$243</td>
<td>$243</td>
<td>$243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHA loans</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$486</td>
<td>$486</td>
<td>$486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-range programs for the improvement of agricultural and natural resources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>$323</td>
<td>$323</td>
<td>$323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and forestry roads</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and animal disease and pest control</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>$725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | $2,339 | $2,339 | $2,339 |

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 conditions of the American farmer today.
PAYMENT TO INFORMERS BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FOLSTON] 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. FOLSTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, every person in America has a legal obligation to report to the proper authorities any scene or suspected act of crime, crime, crime—under 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 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 accusation in public as 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 reveal his identity. Furthermore, the informer's identity is carefully protected by the Government.

The reporting of crime, committed or suspected, by an honest and conscientious citizen 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 norm of this cornerstone. Therefore, the possibility of reward for reporting known or suspected tax evasion is alien to our American system of justice and is unnecessary.

In the year 1961, the Internal Revenue Service recovered $12 million in taxes through information received from informants. In that same year, only 4.6 percent all this is an actual recovery of which these people were entitled to claim their honorarium or reward.

In recent years the Congress has appropriated millions of dollars to purchase electronic computing equipment 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 practice which serves as an instrument for the collection of taxes.

It is time because this method is repugnant to our American philosophy of equal justice under the 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 $100,000 on an 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 being on development at the White House. It is now, of course, the White House and especially a chat with the President of the United States is a
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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 the President.

The President is aware that he has other critics who argue that he should have ordered a halt to the bombing raids earlier this year, the Viet Cong went on killing Americans
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I was told that President Lyndon B.

JOHNSON believes that U.S. commitments in South

Viet Nam are just and necessary; that Americans

are fighting to preserve their freedom and the
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Two uncommon events connected with pic­

ture, but we know from experience with those

who've rated a Star picture that it's usually

A new day, the Viet Cong went on killing Ameri­

icans remember that the Communists have

written letters to each of the 75 service men from the

letter to each of the 75 service men from the

of Sen. Johnson. Johnson also supported

Eisenhower on the SEATO treaty.

But the President also insists that it was necessary to wait

for the right weather conditions and select

days 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 be­

lieves 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 Le·banon, he had the full support

of Sen. Johnson, who also supported

Eisenhower on the SEATO treaty.

President Johnson also likes to quote an­

other maxim, "If you have the facts, few Ameri­

icans 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
	as a peace corps member, or in free­
dom, either in municipal or state affairs, or as
	a member of the Peace Corps, the Job Corps,
	or as an apprentice in Congress.

Freedom is a priceless heritage, the Presi­
dent says, and as long as he is President, it will never be lost through default.
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(To a correspondent for the White House and to talk with the Presi­
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It was a detailed interview and

discussion which President Johnson
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had. I think they will be especially

interested in the obviously very favorable

story by the editor and the city editor

of a smalltown New York State news­
daily. It was a once-in-a lifetime for
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for sure is that you've already seen it. In

is apt to happen to any of us when there's

Public—that's us.
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	or as an apprentice in Congress.

Freedom is a priceless heritage, the Presi­
dent says, and as long as he is President, it will never be lost through default.
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 23 on the corner of E and 14th Streets in Washington, D.C. Howard and I had just missed our bus, and we wound up at a bus stop on the opposite side of the street. We had planned to walk over to the White House at about this time. I wasn't going inside on those other occasions.
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When you think about it, it's a point to consider. After all, we were going to meet with the President and ask him a job on earth who has a tremendous daily schedule to fill and was going— as we know— on a three-state tour the next day.

We received our answers quickly and easily.

Another aide

The door opened again and once more an apostle of the President 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 after the interview.

Bob said he was sorry, there was still a little delay so we all sat down at the table and waited there.

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 overdue because the building was falling apart.

He said that Truman restored the building without the benefit of a blueprints for his controversial balcony which caused more of a scene than Romeo and Juliet ever managed.

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 Seating

But what we wanted to know was how the interview would be conducted.

In connection with this, he told us that our interviews followed 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 the subjects he wanted to avoid.

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 been known to turn down a request for another question."

Fleming obviously has a rigorous schedule but 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. whom we met were somewhat in awe of his round him, that work for and with him, are would want to take but the people that sur­

The reason," he laughed, "is that as soon as CBS and NBC saw that truck they would want more, although it was only going to be a routine newscast program. They would never believe that story. So then we would tell the White House that your truck was on the lawn and the wire services 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 not doing our job. So what would happen? The wire men would all go running back to their typewriters and write leads like "An air of tension surrounded the White House today"—the newspapers would print it—and the stock mar­

kett 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 is it. We make a mad dash across the hall. Two Secret Service men still stood down at the end. We went into a room that ran into Watson's office. It was blue with bright blue furnishings. In it were Watson, his secretary and another aide. Then we took center.

We had asked Fleming about taking pictures and he said he would find out. Normally it was not. 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 said something. We marched out the door and across the grounds to a TV camera truck on the grounds.

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 tennensen, excitement. I don't believe any one 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 climactic moment. This was a moment that one could not imagine. This was a moment of proumdess and a moment of drama—a moment I will have for as long 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 sec­n­duend 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 was out.

We shook hands and I said "Mr. Presi­dent, I'm very proud to meet you." He shook hands with me. 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 had a Texas drawl.

He wore a neat, well tailored dark green suit with a very light green shirt and dark blue 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 famous gardens of the White House.

The room is circular, at least 30 feet across, with an ornamental frieze running around it about an inch above the floor.

There were colorful pictures of the John­son family arranged on the wall at one end near a fireplace and on the wall near his desk was a bronze bust of the President.

There were two enclosed teletype machines set against a wall and, higher up, a three­screen television unit.

Follow the Leader

The President led the way out of the room and back down that same, short hallway. As we crossed from one office to another we wore Doors I hadn't noticed.

He stopped short, I was following and we crossed the hallway to Howard's office. The President suggested a drink and we all agreed to this and he noted that there was no problem of the man being drunk while working that he was a Dr. Pepper man himself.

"Whatever the President drinks is good for me," I said, and he nodded 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 feeling Fleming picked up and placed behind him 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 favor­ete room for the President.

On the wall near me was a large frame containing formal and informal photos of five presidents. It contained Eish­ower, Truman, Roosevelt and Hoover.

During his talk with us, the President made mention 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 this man who stepped up and took control of a country shaken by one of the great tragedies of our history.

By that time, the drinks arrived and I sipped on it. Dr. Pepper isn't bad and I may make it the official drink for our Port Jervis Correspondents.

The President has a genial, homey way of putting his guests at ease.

He sat back in his chair when he first put down his hands behind his head and said "Let's talk."

I told him about the point of our visit—about our small town's desire to have the President speak to average people in small towns. He was interested. He nodded. I went on to explain about Port Jervis and he was interested, -is there was a hand about issues such as Viet Nam; how small
town America was concerned but how small town America gave him their support, a support that is hard to explain, but often provides the necessary power 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 freedom and liberty." But when he talked about men like Hanoi 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 room. It was, I think, a far-faster than any other meeting, and it became obvious that if we wanted to get all our questions answered, we would have needed at least 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 handed it to us: a book. 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 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; the clock showed the short hour. 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 an hour and a half in this place. 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, "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.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs testimony in support of my bill, H.R. 13731, to provide for Hudson River resources development.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs testimony in support of my bill, H.R. 13731, to provide for Hudson River resources development.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 13731

Mr. Chairman, most of us who know and depend on the Hudson River have become increasingly aware that something basic must be done to preserve it. The Hudson is one of the world's most important bodies of water, rich in history and invaluable in commerce. It has a rare range of beauty as it flows some 315 miles from its headwaters to its mouth and remains a valuable highway for transportation. It has an honorable and long-lasting heritage of which we all should be proud.

The past in itself presents no major problems. It is the future for which we are concerned. The problem which requires 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 Pollution Control Board and the New York State Department of Health have given close attention to the problem in all its 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 Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare reported at length on the pollution problem of the Hudson River and its tributaries in September 1966. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior has made a comprehensive study to determine the steps to be taken.

Congress has examined the situation, particularly during the 89th Congress. A number of hearings have been held. The Hudson hearings on the last fall and obtained the testimony of many local people. This year, Mr. Shutts of the Interior, under the Hudson, 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 problems. We are now fully aware of the dimensions of the problems. How to approach those problems, what steps to take, how to develop a comprehensive program, 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 preparing and proposing a program of legislative action in preserving the defined Hudson in any manner or form, including Federal 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 January 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 enacting into law.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized in Section 4 to represent the United States in the negotiations that the Federal Government is required to report periodically to the Congress and the President.

Section 5 outlines six points for the Secretary. General guidelines for comprehensive recommendations. They are the need to encourage all beneficial uses of the land and water resources of the River; to encourage and support local and State autonomy and initiative in planning and acting compatible with development and pollution to abate water pollution; to abate water pollution while developing water resources for beneficial use; the need to preserve, enhance and rehabilitate the scenic beauty and the need to provide opportunities for educational and historic sites and the need to protect and enhance fish and wildlife and other natural resources.

2) That the States of New York and New Jersey are authorized to work on joint program to develop, preserve and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores.

(W)hat we need not, in proposed legislation, examine is whether the detail just sketched has been done to date. That they are concerned and actively in motion, working—is the important point.

3) That New York and New Jersey have requested the aid and participation of the Federal Government to develop a joint program and it is in the best interests of all that the Federal Government lend a helping hand, especially since both 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 conjunctly 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 favor the Compact approach; I am convinced that the Interstate Compact approach. There are those who think that New York State ought to take the lead in largely or entirely 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 with a plan for pointing a fast-studying study commission. Even some who favor the Compact approach see no reason for speeding up 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 benevolent. It is evident 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. It includes a comprehensive program of resource development in the area. After careful consideration of the area, the interior, and the States of New York and New Jersey in preparing and proposing a program of legislative action in preserving the defined Hudson River area. It includes a comprehensive program of resource development in the area.

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.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized in Section 4 to represent the United States in the negotiations that the Federal Government is required to report periodically to the Congress and the President.

Section 5 outlines six points for the Secretary. General guidelines for comprehensive recommendations. They are the need to encourage all beneficial uses of the land and water resources of the River; to encourage and support local and State autonomy and initiative in planning and acting compatible with development and pollution to abate water pollution; to abate water pollution while developing water resources for beneficial use; the need to preserve, enhance and rehabilitate the scenic beauty and the need to provide opportunities for educational and historic sites and the need to protect and enhance fish and wildlife and other natural resources.

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.)
It should be noticed 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 are called upon to make recommendations or actions which could unfavorably affect or alter the resources of the Riverway during the period and before Congress shall have received the recommendations and has had time to act, shall cooperate with the Secretary regarding his recommendations and any approval and any appropriate action should be taken 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 construction of the proposed legislation should be sooner completed. In addition the President, by Executive order, has the authority to dispose of any or all provisions when in the national interest.

To summarize, there is great need for joint and proper legislation 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, the service, wonderful for recreation, industry and good living.

We have studied the problems long enough; it is time to activate our plans. H.R. 7261 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 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 Research 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. Congress recently learned they are unable to do in a few words: "What is Dent trying to 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, they run $300 million a behind using the valuation method that adds a false 25 percent to our export value. For instance, the Japanese export $1 billion in 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 c.i.f. or f.o.b., the trade balance on Japanese exports to the United States to be $2.98 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 fact that the export 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 other countries are depleting our gold reserves constantly. France alone has caused us to go from a high of $170 million to a low of $30 million a month.

The next new set of figures in the Japanese propaganda book gives this illustration to prove how much we are boggling 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 purchased $10.90 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 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 those used to be American consumers in other countries such as Central and South America, Europe, Australia, and Asian markets.

The Japanese are a few 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 techniques.

And then we read this:

Japanese steelmakers have paid substantial amounts of money in royalties to U.S. steel producers and steel mill machinery makers for technological 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 necessarily 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—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 century, it is beginning to be understood that free trade is a commercial venture.

It is a fact that free trade is being promoted 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 Research 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 compelling demands of the States for tax revenue and of the national interest in unhampered commerce prompted the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to consider the problem from the viewpoint of intergovernmental relations.
Together with the gentlewomen from New Jersey (Mrs. Dwyer) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Furman), 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.

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 limitation against interference with the free flow of commerce among the States.

Mr. Speaker, this subject requires our thoughtful consideration. It takes on increasing importance year by year as the revenue pressures upon State governments and businesses drive them into higher and higher tax rate levels.

In the view of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the basic conflict posed by the operation 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 decision making and a large degree of State autonomy in tax policy.

In the Commission’s judgment, these conflicting objectives—unimpeded commerce and State tax autonomy—are equally important and must be reconciled with appropriate recognition of both, without needless sacrifice of either.

Accelerating trends in business activity and State and local expenditures are 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 revenue 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 income among multistate firms who fall within their respective taxing jurisdiction?

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 corporate 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 burdensome and unduly discriminatory. The Commission also rejects the more extreme decentralization positions in the light of the evidence that State and local tax burden is a tax practice 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 concludes 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 that the Congress not abridge the States' freedom to offer alternative methods for determining the taxable income of interstate firms 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 taxation.

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 to promote 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 2,500 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 is opposed to local sales cannot be determined with precision, there is widespread agreement that substantial portion of sales tax collections comes from strictly local—intrastate—transactions. Most of the problems in this area can therefore be solved 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-State firms doing business within their boundaries. The text of the Commission recommendations reads as follows: 1

The Commission concludes that State income taxes are not the proper form for a manner compatible with the free flow of interstate commerce requires standardized jurisdiction and apportionment to maximize taxpayer certainty and minimize compliance reporting burdens. While views on whether to return to the jurisdiction over interstate firms vary widely, the guidelines prescribed by PL 86-272 have in large measure stabilized this issue.

1. Congressional action was 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' latitude 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 (experience since its original promulgation in 1957) to govern the reporting of income by multistate firms and to place a ceiling on the percentage of their income that may be taxed by a State. Such action will allow States to determine their policies and to offer alternative methods for determining the taxable income of interstate firms 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 taxation.

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 to promote 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 2,500 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 is opposed to local sales cannot be determined with precision, there is widespread agreement that substantial portion of sales tax collections comes from strictly local—intrastate—transactions. Most of the problems in this area can therefore be solved 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-State firms doing business within their boundaries. The text of the Commission recommendations reads as follows: 1

The Commission concludes that State income taxes are not the proper form for a manner compatible with the free flow of interstate commerce requires standardized jurisdiction and apportionment to maximize taxpayer certainty and minimize compliance reporting burdens. While views on whether to return to the jurisdiction over interstate firms vary widely, the guidelines prescribed by PL 86-272 have in large measure stabilized this issue.
LEGISLATION TO ADJUST STATUS OF CUBAN REFUGEES—PART II

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 Recess 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 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 Recess, for the attention of my colleagues, the testimony of Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach before the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, delivered on June 8, 1966, before a Subcommittee to consider the legislation proposed for the adjustment of status of Cuban refugees along the lines of the preference now contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act. The other members of the immediate family of these refugees would be given preference in adjusting their status. The Attorney General further advised the Subcommittee that he would explore the matter carefully. If, when the matter is examined, the Treasury Department would be in a position to quality for employment in all areas of the nation. If that be the position, I do not think there is any reason for the Secretary of the Treasury to oppose the proposal to allow Cuban refugees to apply for permanent resident status.

The Select Commission is expected to supply valuable data in the long-anticipated field of immigration from other nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Our implementation of the law is still undergoing refinement. We can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we will give our proposals due consideration. The Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, created by the 1965 Act, held its first hearing 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 it will not be until July 1, 1966—there is no numerical limitation on immigration from the independent countries of this hemisphere, from Europe, Asia, and Africa—natives of Western Hemisphere countries in the United States may not acquire permanent resident status, and obtain an immigrant visa from a United States Consul abroad.

When applied for by 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 residence. 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 residence required to get citizenship.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service reports there are nearly 165,000 Cubans in the United States without permanent resident status. Many of these refugees have not yet been able to adjust their status because of the time required to acquire the necessary documents. Many have not yet been able to reach the United States or to acquire the necessary documents.

The Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, created by the 1965 Act, held its first hearing 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.

Favoring our implementation of the law is still undergoing refinement. We can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we will give our proposals due consideration. The Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, created by the 1965 Act, held its first hearing 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 it will not be until July 1, 1966—there is no numerical limitation on immigration from the independent countries of this hemisphere, from Europe, Asia, and Africa—natives of Western Hemisphere countries in the United States may not acquire permanent resident status, and obtain an immigrant visa from a United States Consul abroad.

When applied for by 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 residence. 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 residence required to get citizenship.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service reports there are nearly 165,000 Cubans in the United States without permanent resident status. Many of these refugees have not yet been able to adjust their status because of the time required to acquire the necessary documents. Many have not yet been able to reach the United States or to acquire the necessary documents.

Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach before the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, created by the 1965 Act, held its first hearing 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 it will not be until July 1, 1966—there is no numerical limitation on immigration from the independent countries of this hemisphere, from Europe, Asia, and Africa—natives of Western Hemisphere countries in the United States may not acquire permanent resident status, and obtain an immigrant visa from a United States Consul abroad.

When applied for by 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 residence. 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 residence required to get citizenship.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service reports there are nearly 165,000 Cubans in the United States without permanent resident status. Many of these refugees have not yet been able to adjust their status because of the time required to acquire the necessary documents. Many have not yet been able to reach the United States or to acquire the necessary documents.

Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach before the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, created by the 1965 Act, held its first hearing 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 it will not be until July 1, 1966—there is no numerical limitation on immigration from the independent countries of this hemisphere, from Europe, Asia, and Africa—natives of Western Hemisphere countries in the United States may not acquire permanent resident status, and obtain an immigrant visa from a United States Consul abroad.

When applied for by 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 residence. 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 residence required to get citizenship.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service reports there are nearly 165,000 Cubans in the United States without permanent resident status. Many of these refugees have not yet been able to adjust their status because of the time required to acquire the necessary documents. Many have not yet been able to reach the United States or to acquire the necessary documents.

Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach before the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, created by the 1965 Act, held its first hearing 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 it will not be until July 1, 1966—there is no numerical limitation on immigration from the independent countries of this hemisphere, from Europe, Asia, and Africa—natives of Western Hemisphere countries in the United States may not acquire permanent resident status, and obtain an immigrant visa from a United States Consul abroad.

When applied for by 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 residence. 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 residence required to get citizenship.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service reports there are nearly 165,000 Cubans in the United States without permanent resident status. Many of these refugees have not yet been able to adjust their status because of the time required to acquire the necessary documents. Many have not yet been able to reach the United States or to acquire the necessary documents.

Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach before the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration, created by the 1965 Act, held its first hearing 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 it will not be until July 1, 1966—there is no numerical limitation on immigration from the independent countries of this hemisphere, from Europe, Asia, and Africa—natives of Western Hemisphere countries in the United States may not acquire permanent resident status, and obtain an immigrant visa from a United States Consul abroad.

When applied for by 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 residence. 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 residence required to get citizenship.
Dear Colonel Moseley under date of July 31, 1966, and copy of the letter, which was read at the retirement ceremony honoring Colonel Moseley, so clearly indicate the type of man that Colonel Moseley is. It is with exceptional significance 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 during the years of his 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,

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 career 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 overall mission of the Army Medical Service.

With the extraordinary spirit of dedication which characterized your entire career, once again you unreservedly applied your professional distinction and dedication to serve in a position of such vital importance to the accomplishment of the important missions of the Army Medical Service. Consistent with the requirements of this application, you unhesitatingly fulfilled your professional and executive talents to the tasks at hand which brought about numerous advancements. Your recommendations regarding the assignment and selection 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 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 professional military officer, you molded a willing, exceptionally proficient staff of military personnel. You worked harmoniously with the best interests of the Army uppermost in their minds. Thus, you have contributed in a meaningful and significant way to the continued successful operation of my Office.

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 extend my sincerest wishes to Nida and you for continued happiness and success in the future.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH D. HEATON,
Lieutenant General,
The Surgeon General.

MARTIN COUNTY GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida (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. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the Members of this House of the many significant and enduring contributions 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 100 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 H.E.W.

On June 30 I had approval being withheld because a complaint had been lodged against this hospital. When I inquired of H.E.W., who had registered the complaint and what the nature of the complaint was, I could not find that the complaint was not considered valid and therefore, had been dismissed. On July 8 this hospital was advised that the complaint had been withdrawn 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 H.E.W. 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, I was unprepared for, was that the hospital had not complied with the requirements.

In answer to my question of what the requirement was, I was told that the requirement was not going to be used 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 then 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 complaints, even if true, have absolutely no bearing whatever 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 be so shortsighted as to overlook 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 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 doing their utmost to serve the well-being of sick people in all 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 ask unanimous consent that the Members of this House will join me in protesting these unreasonable and unrealistic demands of governmental agencies while the health and well-being of sick people are at stake.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. McGrath) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BERLIN WALL ERECTIO

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.

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.

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.

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 out to those who accept its de
drivation, and enslavement of Soviet communism. East Berliners were fleeing into the western sectors of the city in numbers which left no doubt that, when 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 an 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 that evil is good.

But this does not lead us far. These newly independent peoples of Africa have displayed their distrust of communism. In Southeast Asia, the Vietnamese have rid themselves of leaders who sought to further involve them with communism. 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 the amendment to 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 the 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 $100 per month on a full-time basis, $85 per month on a three-quarter time basis, and $50 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 also provides for on-the-job 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 the 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 herebefore 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. BRADENAS (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.

Mr. TOMPSET.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. STANTON.

Mr. BRADENAS.

Mr. SCHISLER.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. SCHRABLOK.

Mr. RYAN.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the 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

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

2693. 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, pursuant of the Army to the Committee on Government Operations.

2694. 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. 11806, a bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Agency and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1833). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCCULLOCH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 16668. A bill to amend the act of June 10, 1944, in order to clarify the corporation name of George Washington University, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PHILLIP: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 16806. 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. 16997. A bill to provide for the compilation, evaluation, 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. House Concurrent Resolution 666. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1839 by the Committee on Puerto Rico as Senate documents; with amendment (Rept. No. 1837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 67. Concurrent resolution authorizing 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. 1838). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. 1839). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 279. 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 of the same; with amendment (Rept. No. 1839). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 879. Resolution authorizing printing for 2000 additional copies of part I of "United States-South African Relations" for use by the Committee on Foreign Affairs as Senate documents; with amendment (Rept. No. 1840). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent 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 293. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Isthmian Canal Policy: The Panama Canal Zone—Panama Canal Sovereignty, Panama Canal Modernization, New Canal," a compilation of addresses by Congressmen; with amendment (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 872. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Report No. 1839 by the Committee on Education and Labor on the International Education Act of 1966 (Rept. No. 1845). Ordered to be printed.


Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 18881, 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. 16964. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the lower Colorado River Basin project, including certain reimbursed moving expenses; 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. HAYS. H.R. 16884. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO. H.R. 16885. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY. H.R. 16896. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY. H.R. 16897. 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. BUCHANAN. H.R. 16898. 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. STRATTON. H.R. 16899. 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. SCHISLER. H.R. 16900. A bill to stabilize prices of food staples, to provide for an investigation of the stability of prices of food staples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PINO. H.R. 16901. 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. 16902. 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. RUTLEDGE of Tennessee. H.R. 16908. A bill to prohibit the payment by the Internal Revenue of informers' fees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCHA. H.R. 16904. A bill to prohibit from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY. H.R. 16905. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California. H.R. 16906. 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. 16907. 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. 16908. A bill to further the completion of George Washington Memorial Parkway in Prince Georges County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MINNIS. H.R. 16909. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for door delivery service, and for other purposes; to the Committee 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. OTTINORI. H.R. 17002. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUIEBUSH. 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 in-school, out-of-school 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 amounts payable as compensation, 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. PINO. H.R. 17006. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a tem-
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Corps Week, and wishes today's youngsters every success in the continuation of drum corps as a colorful youth activity.
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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 flag in the American Revolution. Today, we are reminded of the struggle for independence.

It is with pride that I see today's youth devoting their time and energy 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 belong 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 Thunderbirds, and Toreadors, of Seattle, Wash. Seattle's recent "music in motion" competition provided a colorful contest and exciting events belonging to the drum corps 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.
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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 me in that commendation.
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Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 1169, Authorizing an International Conference on Water for Peace.
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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 Wilkin & Jenkins Construction Co., Inc., to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 17016. A bill for the relief of Domingo Annable, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 17017. A bill for the relief of Dr. Laslo Turcsik, to the Committee on the Judiciary.
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Congressman Horton Applauds Red Creek Newspaper for Service Gesture