

By the year 1914, there were over 700 Cretans in Chicopee, the majority of whom hailed from the Province of Hania, Crete. They marveled at their newly adopted and hospitable country and soon began to make plans to organize to better serve their interests. The upshot was that most of them stayed and eventually became American citizens.

Following the Balkan War and during the First World War, more than 50 young Cretans served in the United States Armed Forces.

Many other Cretans returned to their native land and served in the Greek Army.

On April 16, 1916, the Cretans of Chicopee presented a theatrical production entitled "Exosis Othonos" for philanthropic endeavors with great success.

Later that year a five-member committee was appointed to enroll members and thus organize the Cretan Community Association.

In 1918, the City of Chicopee invited the Greeks of the City to take part in the Fourth of July parade. The enrolled members, now 150 strong, called a meeting and voted to take part in the celebration. At this meeting a committee was appointed to run the elections of new officers and the first Board of Directors was elected of the Pancretan Society "Minos," also known as the Pancretan Union in America.

After the By-Laws were drawn up and approved, the Society, from then on, operated and functioned as a philanthropic and patriotic group. Ever since then, the American as well as the Greek Press has repeatedly described the good work accomplished by the Cretan Society. The City of Chicopee became known as "Creticopolis."

In the year 1922, the Cretan Society "Minos" founded an afternoon Greek School for the purpose of teaching the Greek language. With the aid of many projects, it was able to maintain and operate it properly.

At this time the Cretan Society had many members in other cities, such as Detroit, Cleveland, Akron, Brooklyn, Albany, New Haven, Hartford, Southbridge and in other parts of Western Massachusetts.

The Society assisted the efforts of the Greek War Relief by contributing monies and clothing for the refugees of Asia Minor. Through the unselfish and generous contribution of the Pancretan Association, health centers were established in Crete; the Venizellon Pancretan Sanitorium; the Rethymnon General Hospital; and the Canea General Hospital. Through the years the Cretan Brotherhood of Minos-Crete have contri-

buted more than \$28,000 for the fulfillment of these worthwhile causes and many thousands of dollars more to other charities.

Our local Cretan Society played an important role in the establishment of the American Pancretan Union in 1929. Mr. Erinakis was sent as representative of our association to convey the decisions of our members and contribute his efforts towards uniting the Cretans in America. In 1929 when the various Cretan Fraternities united, establishing the Pancretan Union, our Association was one of the first to join and remains so to this day, drawing its membership from Western Massachusetts. Our representatives to the First National Conference in Chicago had a big part in giving the English name to our National Organization. Since then our group has been known as the Cretan Brotherhood, "Minos" Chapter of the Pancretan Union in America.

In the year 1944, the members decided to move the center of our organization to Springfield, Massachusetts, where a Charter was also acquired. This was done because most of the members had relocated in this area.

In the year 1946, all the Cretans of the city were united into one Society known as the Cretan Association "Minos-Crete", Springfield, Massachusetts, a member of the Pancretan Association of America.

In 1947, the Association purchased the property on 37 Carew St. and after remodeling the buildings, the offices were moved there. The Minos-Crete Chapter was the first among Chapters to acquire its own club and property.

After 48 years of fruitful progress, our Brotherhood in Springfield has been given the chance to extend a warm greeting to our fellow Cretans, delegates and friends at the 19th Biennial National Pancretan Convention. Your Host Chapters, Minos-Crete and Proodos, hope your stay in our city a most enjoyable one.

CRETAN LADIES' SOCIETY, "PROODOS"

"Proodos", as we are known today, has an illustrious past with many of the Cretan Ladies of this area having played an important role in its formation. With headquarters at 37 Carew St. in Springfield, we are the product of the merger between the Chicopee Cretan Ladies Society "Ariadne" and the Springfield "Proodos." This merger took place on April 8, 1955 due to a Cretan population shift to Springfield.

Under the able guidance and inspiration of the past-presidents, this union brought

about the fulfillment of many of the dreams of the Cretans . . . in helping the people of Crete.

Our women assisted in the establishments of health centers in Crete: The Venizellon Pancretan Sanatorium and The General Hospitals of Canea and Rethymnon. Through the cooperation of the Greek War Relief, contributions were sent to aid the War Orphans and Refugees of Crete and many other benevolences among them the Institution for the Blind.

Here, in Springfield, we assisted in the beautification of our church, The St. George Greek Orthodox Memorial Church. To promote the future growth of our community, "Proodos" was the first Greek organization in this area to sponsor a benefit for the St. George Building Fund.

On June 1, 1960, "Proodos" became a member of the Pancretan Association of America, thus enabling us, six years later, to be your convention host.

In tracing the history before the merger of 1955, we note the following:

Many years after the establishment of the Men's Cretan Organization "Minos" in Chicopee, the Cretan Ladies of this area decided to unite to better their way of life in their adopted country, to perpetuate their traditions and to help the less fortunate among them. Thus, on June 29, 1931 a committee was formed to enroll members and the first meeting was held on August 1, 1931. In order to perpetuate the Greek tongue and Orthodox religion among our children, the Council assisted in the first afternoon Greek School that was founded in Western Massachusetts.

Also, during the depression years, help was extended to our needy countrymen in various ways.

A few years later, in near-by Springfield, this same Cretan spirit of endeavor was aroused . . . the need for closer ties among themselves. Therefore, on Jan. 28, 1934, the Cretan Ladies Society of Springfield "Proodos" was founded.

At their first meeting the council elected as Officers; Mrs. K. Lionakis (Pres.), Miss M. Louvitakis (V. Pres.); Mrs. J. Metzidakis (Sec.) and Mrs. G. Cavros (Treas.).

Constitution and By-Laws were compiled to which we adhere to this day with the exception of new amendments.

The Cretan Ladies carried on the vigorous traditions of their Cretan past, thus creating the Cretan Ladies' Societies that merged to form our "Proodos" of today.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us come before His presence with thanksgiving.—Psalm 95: 2.

Let Thy presence be revealed to us, our Father, as in this quiet moment of prayer we wait upon Thee.

Strengthen us by Thy spirit that no trouble may overcome us, no difficulty may overwhelm us, no duty may overtax us, but may we now and always be equal to every experience, ready for every responsibility, and adequate for every activity. Help us to be more positive in our thinking, to look increasingly on the bright side of life, to be awake to the good everywhere present, and to be ever grateful for Thy gifts to us and for the love which surrounds us all our lives.

This day help us to live our faith, to rejoice in Thy presence, to maintain an attitude of good will toward all Thy children, to learn to forget ourselves, and to serve our Nation and our people faithfully and well. Take Thou Thy rightful place in our hearts—for in Thee alone is peace and joy and life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 10327. An act to require operators of ocean cruises by water between the United

States, its possessions and territories, and foreign countries to file evidence of financial security and other information.

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

S. 3158. An act to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; and

S. 3418. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964 AMENDMENTS

Mr. PATMAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3700) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

EXPANSION OF THE PURCHASING AUTHORITY OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. PATMAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3688) to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction.

AMENDING TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE—MAILING PRIVILEGES OF ARMED FORCES AND OVERSEAS PERSONNEL

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13448) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes, together with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORRISON, DULSKI, and CORBETT.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT—COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Committee on Agriculture, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1966.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
The Speaker,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on August 19, 1966, considered and unanimously approved the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication and referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

WATERSHED, STATE, AND EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

Batavia Kill, New York, 2583, 89th Congress.
Caney Bayou, Arkansas, 2583, 89th Congress.
Chicod Creek, North Carolina, 2583, 89th Congress.
Cocodrie-Grand Louis, Louisiana, 2583, 89th Congress.
Crow Creek, Tennessee and Alabama, 2583, 89th Congress.
Dane Ridge, Iowa, 2583, 89th Congress.
Dead River, New Hampshire, 2583, 89th Congress.
Deer Creek, Iowa, 2583, 89th Congress.
Dry Creek, Mississippi, 2583, 89th Congress.
Duralde-Des Cannes, Louisiana, 2583, 89th Congress.
Durgens Creek, Missouri, 2583, 89th Congress.
Dutchman Creek, North Carolina, 2583, 89th Congress.

East Side Green River, Washington, 2583, 89th Congress.

Fox Creek, Kentucky, Kentucky, 2583, 89th Congress.

Fort Pierce Farms Drainage District, Florida, 2583, 89th Congress.

Gant Creek, Iowa, 2583, 89th Congress.

Holliday Creek, Mississippi, 2583, 89th Congress.

Home Cypress Bayou, Mississippi, 2583, 89th Congress.

Irish Creek, Kansas, 2583, 89th Congress.

Kona, Hawaii, Hawaii, 2583, 89th Congress.

Lewis-Hunsacker Creek, Tennessee, 2583, 89th Congress.

Little Contentnea Creek, North Carolina, 2583, 89th Congress.

Little Yadkin River, North Carolina, 2583, 89th Congress.

Lower Amazon and Flat Creek, Oregon, 2583, 89th Congress.

Mission Creek, Nebr. & Kansas, 2583, 89th Congress.

North Black Vermillion, Kansas, 2583, 89th Congress.

North Fork of Ozan Creek, Arkansas, 2583, 89th Congress.

Norwalk River, Connecticut, 2583, 89th Congress.

Otter Creek, Oklahoma, 2583, 89th Congress.

Palatlakaha River, Florida, 2583, 89th Congress.

Seven Mile Creek, Illinois, 2583, 89th Congress.

Spring Creek, Nebraska, 2583, 89th Congress.

Upper Buffalo Creek, West Virginia, 2583, 89th Congress.

West Side Green River, Washington, 2583, 89th Congress.

White River Backwater, Arkansas, 2583, 89th Congress.

Willow Creek, Missouri, 2583, 89th Congress.

Beardsley, California, 1532, 89th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the reckless spending under the poverty program has become a matter of common concern. Yet it appears that demand for realism in this area continue to be unheeded. There is, of course, one sure cure and that is to cut down on the amount of money appropriated for the program. These cuts I have supported, and I find continuing justification for my votes. Nevertheless, it is disturbing to me that any program of the Government would

make itself so vulnerable to charges of needless and reckless spending.

For instance, I am advised by the Honorable Thomas Beasley, a distinguished Florida jurist, that on July 15, 1966, a bus load of people were sent to Pensacola under the Great Society program at the expense of the taxpayers, on which occasion money was provided them for shopping purposes. It was said that this was to give them the opportunity to buy something they had never owned before and that this would enrich their lives. Most people can think of a lot of things which they have never owned, and which might enrich their lives, but they do not expect the Government to pay for them.

Judge Beasley also states that on July 28, 1966, 130 people were sent to Tallahassee from Walton County on buses under the same program, where they remained overnight. The records show that hotel bills and all expenses of the trip were paid with Federal money. There were a number of adults who made the trip as chaperones and they were paid \$1.50 per hour for the trip.

It would appear that much closer supervision and much stricter standards are going to be necessary if the poverty program is to achieve its avowed purpose of helping people who need help to find a way to rise above poverty.

MANPOWER PROGRAM OF SECRETARY McNAMARA

Mr. CABELL. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, the proposal made yesterday by Secretary McNamara before the VFW on our manpower program was the most realistic and constructive of any advanced to date.

During a period when the very flower of our young manhood has been uprooted from homes and families, hundreds of thousands of able-bodied young men have been left to roam the streets. Many of these have been in the forefront of the riots, burning and looting throughout the country.

Through elimination of minor technicalities and intensive specialized training, these men can be taught and trained to discharge their obligation to their Nation. Not only will this be accomplished, but they will be equipped mentally and physically to take their places in society on their return from their military tour.

Efforts, however sincere, to rehabilitate these young men, through Job Corps Centers, have not only failed, but have induced a distorted outlook as to their obligations to society in the minds of these boys.

I would be the last man in the House to advocate loading our Armed Forces with great numbers of deprived and semidelinquents. But with our vastly expanded forces, reasonable numbers of

such can be absorbed without diluting the caliber and morale of their units.

And, most importantly of all, these men would be subjected to a type of discipline which they so sorely need, and which has been so sorely lacking in past efforts at training and rehabilitation.

I commend the Secretary on his proposal, and pledge my wholehearted support toward implementing the most sensible program advanced thus far in the solution of a national problem.

PROMOTION OF HEALTH AND SAFETY IN METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINERAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8989) to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POWELL, HOLLAND, DENT, PUCINSKI, DANIELS, O'HARA of Michigan, AYRES, QUIE, and ASHBROOK.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next the International Finance Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PRESIDENT IS WELCOME IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. STEED. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the lame-duck Republican Governor of Oklahoma sent an insulting and discourteous telegram to the President of the United States asking the President to cancel a planned trip to Oklahoma. This shamed and shocked all Oklahoma. We want the world to know that the President of the United States, whoever he may be, will always be an honored and welcome visitor in Oklahoma, our ill-mannered Governor to the contrary notwithstanding.

VISIT OF PRESIDENT TO OKLAHOMA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe quite a few Oklahomans would join in sending our Governor an elementary book on good manners today—whatever their political application.

I am proud of the fact that the president of Oklahoma Northeast, Inc., an organization of chambers of commerce in all 16 counties of the Second Congressional District, last night sent our President a telegram joining the Oklahoma ordinance work authority and our congressional delegation in inviting the President to visit Oklahoma.

Most Oklahomans are united in their spirit of hospitality and would not deny that hospitality to the Nation's Chief Executive at any time.

Notwithstanding our Governor's discourtesy, I understand our President in his Oklahoma visit Friday is inviting the Governor and the entire Oklahoma congressional delegation—Democrats and Republicans alike—to join him during his visit.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague. I have found no disinclination on the part of the Governor of Oklahoma to go into any county which he desires to go into, despite the fact that he is a lameduck, and that this is an election year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman. I agree wholeheartedly with him.

RIOTS IN WASHINGTON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I read an article in the Washington Post this morning relative to the rock-throwing riot that occurred in Northeast Washington on Monday night. Capt. Vernon Culpepper, of the Washington Police Department, was quoted as saying:

The biggest contributing factor was the heat (85 degrees), the humidity (87 percent), and the fact that the youths live in hot, crowded public housing where sometimes you have as many roaches as people, in some of those places.

I should just like to point out that when this public housing was built it did not come equipped with roaches.

We cannot do anything about the heat and the humidity, but the people who live in this housing, which was new when they moved into it, can do something about the sanitary conditions.

Probably what this city needs, instead of a lot of people apologizing for riots, is an administrator of public housing such as we have in my district, who inspects it periodically. If the people do not keep it in proper shape, they find somewhere else to live.

I do not know what the people who go around apologizing want us to do next. I suppose they would like to get Congress to get a detail to go out and clean up for them. I for one am not going to volunteer.

REPRESENTATIVE ICHORD SPEAKS ON ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the Members received in their mail printed material from SANE in which my name, and alleged statements that I made, have received prominent attention. The material states:

In a radio interview broadcast by the American Broadcasting Company on August 12 one of the committee's more "liberal" members, Representative RICHARD ICHORD of Missouri, linked the hearings to antiwar "demonstrations" and made the unprovable assertion that such demonstrations lengthened the war.

I do not have a tape of that interview, Mr. Speaker, but since I was not quoted directly by SANE, I am certain that no statement I made was in error.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that the hearings just completed by the committee were not aimed at legitimate dissent. I may not agree with any particular demonstration but as long as it is a lawful exercise of freedom of assembly protected by the first amendment I will defend it as a legal right. However, the act of raising money, blood, and supplies for the Vietcong now killing the flower of our youth in Vietnam is not legitimate dissent.

The bill as reported by the full committee today contains no provision that has even the most remote connection to any right guaranteed a person under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, such as freedom of speech, freedom of thought, and so forth.

I introduced in the committee amendments to remove any language that could possibly be criticized as violating the first amendment guarantees and these amendments were accepted by unanimous vote.

It has been the position of the Department of Justice that the present Department regulations and statutory legislation are sufficient to control and prohibit aid by certain American citizens to the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. But standing out like a "sore thumb" in the Department's argument is the fact that certain "hard core" Communist groups have sent money to a Czechoslovakian bank on two occasions to aid the Vietcong and there have been no prosecutions—and a decision has been made not to prosecute. The record of the hearings will show that under questioning, by me during the hearing, the Department has specifically admitted that under the present law any individual or group of individuals can repeatedly solicit and collect funds and blood for the

use of the Vietcong, the North Vietnamese, or any American enemy and there is no violation of law until there is an actual transmission. The present law is absolutely ineffectual as an examination of the statutes and the record of the Department clearly reveals. Under the present law there is no effective way of prohibiting transmission once the money has been raised. H.R. 12047 will effectively stop such activity in the very beginning by prescribing criminal penalties for the process of soliciting and collecting. I urge and I think I can safely predict the overwhelming passage of this legislation when it reaches the floor.

RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BILL SHOULD NOW BE BURIED

Mr. DAGUE. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House held preliminary funeral services for S. 2934, the rural community development district bill.

Although not being privy to the reasons why the bill was suddenly removed from consideration by the House yesterday, I strongly suspect the main reason was simply that there are not enough votes in the House to pass it.

Strong bipartisan opposition has been in evidence since this bill was reported by the Committee on Agriculture on June 25 by a slim four-vote margin. The bill did not clear the Rules Committee until July 25 and then reportedly by a one-vote margin. It was then scheduled for floor action last week and then postponed until yesterday, when it was postponed again for what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] described as "good and sufficient reasons."

Yesterday the Committee on Appropriations also filed its conference report on H.R. 14596, the fiscal year 1967 Agriculture Department appropriation bill. In its report on this bill—House Report No. 1867—the conferees agreed to provide \$637,000 for the Rural Community Development Service instead of the \$2.5 million proposed by the Senate and the \$3.4 million proposed by the administration. The conference report goes on to state:

Expansion of this agency has not been approved by Congress.

Certainly these two actions yesterday—the House postponement of S. 2934 and the Appropriations Committee conference report—should be a clear message to the administration that the House does not and will not approve of the duplicating, overlapping, unnecessary, inflationary, bureaucracy-building rural community development legislation incorporated in S. 2934.

I take this occasion then to sincerely urge the leadership of the House to let S. 2934 rest in peace until next year.

IS THIS THE COUP DE GRACE?

Mr. MONAGAN. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to give the House notice of the hearings which the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property of the House Committee on Government Operations is presently conducting.

With these hearings, our subcommittee is trying to evaluate the accomplishments and effectiveness of the donable surplus property program of our Government. Under this vast program, Federal personal property which the Government no longer needs may be donated to qualified educational, public health, and civil defense agencies and organizations.

The magnitude of this program is reflected in the fact that in fiscal year 1966 more than \$429 million in acquisition costs of property was approved for donation to the various eligible donees. It is safe to say that very few educational and public health institutions of significance in the country do not benefit from this program, and it is certain that many vocational and training facilities would be unable to conduct their present programs without the assistance of this donated property.

For this reason, and also because the Congress has frequently asserted its desire to keep this program vigorous and viable, the subcommittee has been greatly disturbed to learn of a recently declared policy change by the Department of Defense which generates approximately 90 percent of the donable property. This change bids fair to gravely restrict, if not strangle, the donable property program. The policy being changed concerns the use of the so-called exchange/sale authority of the Federal Property Act. Under this change, which by the way, the General Services Administration's new Governmentwide regulations on exchange/sale authority did not require the Defense Department to make, the Department will no longer make the bulk of its property available for donation prior to processing it for exchange/sale. There is much evidence that under the new DOD procedure, many common-use items which have been the backbone of the donable program will be sold or exchanged rather than donated to public institutions.

Testimony already received at the hearings of the Special Subcommittee demonstrates that many types of property which will now be sold or exchanged by the Department of Defense but which are needed by donee institutions, may bring less than a 10- or 15-percent return to the Government. When it is realized that in fiscal year 1965 expenses of sale of military surplus property amounted to 72.5 percent of the gross amount recovered, the desirability of this procedure must be seriously questioned.

It is true that hearings on the donation program have not been concluded and that information developed to date must continue to be evaluated. But it did seem to be desirable that the importance of these questions to institutions located in the districts of every Member of Congress, did warrant some notice to my colleagues in the House.

I hope that Members will reflect on these remarks and follow these hearings so that they can give the subcommittee the benefit of any suggestions, or advice, that they may have.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 237]

Adams	Hagan, Ga.	Purcell
Ashley	Halleck	Reid, N.Y.
Baring	Hansen, Iowa	Resnick
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Rivers, Alaska
Brook	Hathaway	Rooney, N.Y.
Cahill	Helstoski	Roudebush
Callaway	Horton	St. Onge
Celler	Irwin	Scheuer
Cohelan	Karth	Schisler
Conable	King, N.Y.	Schmidhauser
Conte	Landrum	Scott
Conyers	Long, Md.	Senner
Craley	Love	Sickles
Davis, Ga.	McCarthy	Stratton
Denton	McEwen	Sweeney
Diggs	McMillan	Thomas
Duncan, Oreg.	Martin, Ala.	Toll
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	Tuten
Flynt	May	Ullman
Ford,	Morrison	Walker, Miss.
William D.	Murray	White, Idaho
Fulton, Tenn.	O'Brien	Willis
Gialmo	Pepper	Wolff
Greigg	Pike	Zablocki
Grider	Poage	
Griffiths	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 357 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 15941, the Department of Defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION FOR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in

order any day next week to consider a joint resolution making continuing appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1867)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14596) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 13, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 32, 34, 43, 46, 47, and 51.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 30, 33, 36, 37, 39, 41, 44, 50, 52, and 54; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$123,402,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,169,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,580,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$80,263,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$51,113,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$58,740,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,132,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,511,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$51,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$165,855,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,218,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,502,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,412,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "of which \$30,000,000 shall be placed in reserve to be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the current fiscal year under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly development of the rural electrification program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "of which \$15,000,000 shall be placed in reserve to be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during the current fiscal year under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly development of the rural telephone program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "of which \$25,000,000 shall be placed in reserve to be used only to the extent required during the current fiscal year under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly conduct of the loan program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,446,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 25 and 31.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
W. R. HULL, JR.,
THOMAS G. MORRIS,
GEORGE MAHON,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,
FRANK T. BOW.

Managers on the Part of the House.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE Agricultural Research Service

Amendments Nos. 1 through 4—Research: Appropriate \$123,402,500 instead of \$120,673,000 as proposed by the House and \$123,844,600 as proposed by the Senate.

The amount agreed to includes \$11,169,000 for planning and construction of facilities instead of \$10,619,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,869,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House includes: Southern Piedmont Research Center, \$175,000; feasibility study at Rapid City, S. Dak., \$25,000; laboratory-office facilities at

Canal Point, Fla., \$100,000; and modernization of greenhouses at Beltsville, Md., \$250,000.

The amount provided also includes increases of \$356,600 for staffing research facilities and \$2,644,000 for acceleration of research activities listed on pages 6 and 7 of the Senate report. The proposed Senate reduction of \$1,435,600 for research activities was reduced to \$821,100 by the conferees to provide for the retention of the following research facilities: Sheep breeding, Fort Wingate, N. Mex., \$83,900; swine research, Miles City, Mont., \$25,300; brucellosis research, St. Paul, Minn., \$5,400; flax research, Brawley, Calif., \$35,000, and Brookings, S. Dak., \$21,500; cotton research, Brawley, Calif., \$10,800; corn borer research, Ankeny, Iowa, \$79,900; insect research, Brownsville, Tex., \$22,000; soil and water conservation and engineering research, Auburn, Ala., \$20,000; wind damage research, Blacksburg, Va., \$2,000; wheat research, Peoria, Ill., \$303,700.

The conferees agreed to the Senate language limiting future budget estimates for transfers from section 32 for research to \$15,000,000.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriate \$80,263,900 instead of \$76,764,000 as proposed by the House and \$81,498,200 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminate Senate language authorizing the use of \$100,000 for planning. The increase includes an additional \$2,047,000 for fire ant eradication and three-fourths of the amount for each project added by the Senate, except for the \$100,000 for planning at Clifton, N.J. The conferees expect that the full \$5,350,000 included for the fire ant eradication program and the funds added for the pink bollworm and bollweevil outbreak in California will be fully matched by funds from State and local sources.

Amendment No. 7—Special foreign currency program: Appropriates \$4,500,000 instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Cooperative State Research Service

Amendments Nos. 8 through 11—Payments and expenses: Appropriate \$58,740,000 instead of \$55,227,000 as proposed by the House and \$60,740,000 as proposed by the Senate, including increases of \$3,000,000 for Hatch Act pay adjustments, \$500,000 for cooperative forestry research, and \$13,000 for administration.

Extension Service

Amendments Nos. 12 through 14—Payments to States and Puerto Rico: Appropriate \$78,917,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$75,917,500 as proposed by the House. The increase of \$3,000,000 is provided for pay adjustments needed to keep salaries in line with those in Federal and other related activities.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 15—Watershed protection: Appropriates \$70,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$67,020,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill includes \$980,000 for river basin surveys and \$2,000,000 for work on Public Law 566 watersheds. The conferees also are in agreement that new planning starts should be restored to 100 in fiscal year 1967 and that new construction starts should be increased above 80 to the extent necessitated by the increase in construction funds included in the bill.

Amendment No. 16—Great Plains conservation program: Appropriates \$18,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$16,112,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17—Resource conservation and development: Appropriates \$4,574,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,347,000 as proposed by the House.

Economic Research Service

Amendment No. 18—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$12,132,000 instead of \$12,032,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,182,000

as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes \$50,000 for research in Appalachia, and \$50,000 for studies of rural income and conditions.

Statistical Reporting Service

Amendment No. 19—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$13,511,750 instead of \$13,272,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,575,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes \$121,500 for farm employment and wage data; \$10,000 for estimates of mushroom production; \$40,000 for reporting service in Nevada; \$26,250 for Hawaii estimates; and \$42,000 for estimates on cut flowers.

Consumer and Marketing Service

Amendment No. 20—Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs: Appropriates \$83,881,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$82,757,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22—Special milk program: Provides a total of \$104,000,000 instead of \$103,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$105,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount agreed to, \$51,000,000 is provided by direct appropriation and \$53,000,000 is provided by transfer from section 32 as originally proposed by the House.

As a result of action by the conferees, an additional \$146,000,000 in section 32 funds will be returned to the Treasury. Further, funds available to section 32 will be sufficient to cover all program operations required by basic law in fiscal year 1967 and will provide a carryover balance of \$300,000,000 into next year as permitted by law.

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24—School lunch program: Appropriate \$165,855,000 instead of \$157,000,000 as provided by the House and \$169,500,000 as provided by the Senate. The amount agreed to will provide an average 5 cents per meal for 3,235.4 million lunches expected to be served in the coming school year.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Food stamp program: Provide a total of \$140,000,000, of which \$110,000,000 is by direct appropriation and \$30,000,000 is from unused prior year balances. The conferees have omitted from the bill the language included in Senate amendment No. 26 prohibiting the use of section 32 funds to finance this program in the future since such prohibition appears in the basic act. Those responsible for planning and financing this program should take account of this in the future.

Foreign Agricultural Service

Amendment No. 27—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$21,218,500 instead of \$21,088,000 as proposed by the House and \$21,349,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

Amendments Nos. 28 and 29—Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Appropriate \$128,558,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$130,424,500 as proposed by the Senate and authorizes a transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation of \$75,803,600 as proposed by the House instead of \$77,545,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31—Appalachian region conservation program: Appropriate \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,200,000 as proposed by the House and provides for the use of up to \$1,375,000 of prior year balances.

Amendment No. 32—Cropland conversion program: Appropriates \$7,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33—Cropland adjustment program: Appropriates \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$90,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Rural Community Development Service

Amendment No. 34—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$637,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. Expansion of this agency has not been approved by the Congress.

Packers and Stockyards Act

Amendment No. 35—Appropriates \$2,502,000 instead of \$2,400,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,604,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Information

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$1,851,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,826,000 as proposed by the House and increase the amount available for the Yearbook of Agriculture.

National Agricultural Library

Amendment No. 38—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,412,500 instead of \$2,147,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,501,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendments Nos. 39 through 42—Loan authorizations: Authorize electrification loans of \$375,000,000 and telephone loans of \$117,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and reinstate contingency reserves in the amounts of \$30,000,000 for electrification loans and \$15,000,000 for telephone loans.

Amendment No. 43—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$12,202,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$12,302,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Farmers Home Administration

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45—Direct loan account: Authorizes loans of \$350,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$300,000,000 as proposed by the House, and reinstate contingency reserve in the amount of \$25,000,000. The additional funds are to meet the ever expanding need for operating loans.

Amendment No. 46—Rural housing for domestic farm labor: Reinstates House language limiting financial assistance under this program to "public nonprofit organizations".

Amendment No. 47—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$51,057,000 as proposed by the House, including \$400,000 for rural community development work in the field, instead of \$51,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The purpose of the Farmers Home Administration and its predecessor agencies since the 1930's has been (1) to enable rural people with financial difficulties to get a new start in farming or to expand their existing operations to improve their economic position, and (2) through close personal contact and supervision to enable borrowers who have no other source of credit to learn the fundamentals of successful financial management so as to improve their financial position and eventually return them to other regular sources of credit. This close contact with borrowers has resulted in an outstanding repayment record by FHA borrowers. Under present conditions, this close supervision of borrowers may become even more important to the success of this program.

The managers on the part of the House agree that the Department should study the possibility of reducing administrative costs in this agency through simplifying billing and collection procedures. They recognize that follow-up advice and assistance is necessary for some borrowers, while for others direct billing and collection of repayments may be feasible, particularly in view of the recent purchase of a computer by this agency. The Department is encouraged to carefully review this situation and take steps to reduce costs but at the same time take care to maintain the continued excellent repayment record of FHA borrowers. The Department should also carefully review the results of the dispersal of appraisal activities to county offices to be

sure that the interests of both the borrower and the Government are adequately protected.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49—Administrative and operating expenses: Appropriate \$8,446,000 instead of \$8,342,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,546,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorize the use of premium income for administrative and operating expenses in the amount of \$4,100,000 instead of \$4,150,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendments Nos. 50 and 51—Reimbursement for net realized losses: Appropriate \$3,555,855,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,500,000,000 as proposed by the House, and restores House language which prohibits Public Law 480 sales to nations which supply or transport goods to North Vietnam.

Amendment No. 52—International Wheat Agreement: Eliminates a separate appropriation for this purpose as proposed by the Senate. Wheat export payments will be financed in the future by the Commodity Credit Corporation under its commodity export authority and reimbursement will be included as a part of the annual reimbursement to the Corporation's capital funds.

Farm Credit Administration

The conferees have agreed that language on page 63 of the Senate committee report relating to retirement credit is a nullity.

National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber

Amendment No. 53—Expenses: Appropriate \$475,000 instead of \$350,000 as proposed by the House and \$600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Provisions

Amendment No. 54—Section 501: Authorizes the replacement of 434 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 421 as proposed by the House.

- JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
- WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
- W. R. HULL, JR.,
- THOMAS G. MORRIS,
- GEORGE MAHON,
- ROBERT H. MICHEL,
- ODIN LANGEN,
- FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege today of submitting the conference report on the bill H.R. 14596. I am pleased to say that we were able to agree with the Senate in one afternoon and the conference report I submit to you has been agreed to by all the conferees, including Congressmen WHITTEN, NATCHER, HULL, MORRIS, MAHON, MICHEL, LANGEN, and Bow on the House side, and Senators HOLLAND, RUSSELL, ELLENDER, YOUNG, and MUNDT on the Senate side.

Mr. Speaker, I have quite a bit of pride in this conference report, for it represents the action of the Congress in the true spirit of the Constitution. The Constitution, you know, provides for three divisions of the Government: the executive, the judicial, and the legislative. Insofar as those of us in the House are concerned, we are "Representatives" in the Congress. No one can appoint us. We must be elected by the people. This leaves us with the obligation of representing truly the interests of the people.

Members will recall that in the original budget submission, drastic cuts were

recommended for the school lunch program, the special milk program, the watershed programs, some 94 research facilities through the country, control and eradication of various insects and diseases, including fire ant, phony peach, and peach mosaic, soybean cyst nematode, sweetpotato weevil, barberry, golden nematode, gypsy moth, witchweed, brucellosis, and scabies, research at the State experiment stations, the Extension Service, the REA, the ACP, and many other programs. The budget, in turn, recommended large increases in funds to be handled at the discretion of the Secretary.

Members of your Subcommittee on Appropriations considered these recommendations by the executive department, as we should. After consideration, we differed with the budget and put the money back where it has been through the years and where it has contributed so much toward maintaining and restoring the natural resources of our Nation, toward feeding our people, and toward making a market for our industry and labor, including making possible the highest standard of living ever known in history. As a result, the American people spend a smaller percentage for food and clothing; fewer of them have to till the soil, leaving more than 92 percent who are free to provide these other things.

Mr. Speaker, truly this is a case of the legislative body reasserting its right as it should. I am proud to submit this report to you here today.

Mr. Speaker, I have served on the Appropriations Committee for many years. In fact, only 2 Members have served on the 50-man Appropriations Committee longer than I, Chairman GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, and MIKE KIRWAN, of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, as you know it is my privilege to also serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, which provides funds for the Atomic Energy Commission, the TVA, with its water control and power program for its region, and for every river and harbor in the United States.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, with all the problems we have today, it is a great privilege to stand here and lead the fight to look after the development and protection of our resources at home, including the public health, for it is on these things that all else depends.

We have in this conference report restored and increased the following programs of the Department:

RESEARCH	
Facilities proposed for elimination or reduction—Amount restored	\$4,580,200
Other increases	10,842,300
Total	15,422,500
DISEASE AND PEST CONTROL	
Programs proposed for elimination or reduction—Amount restored	7,803,100
Other increases added	2,712,800
Total	10,515,900

STATE EXPERIMENT STATIONS	
Hatch Act funds and grants for facilities—Amount restored	\$10,245,000
Other increases (net)	755,000
Total	11,000,000

EXTENSION SERVICE	
Proposed budget shift of \$10,000,000 from formula to non-formula distribution; not approved by Congress—Additional funds provided	3,000,000

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE	
Watershed planning: New planning starts restored to 100. Watershed protection: New construction starts restored to 80 or more. Funds restored and increased by	3,441,000
Great plains conservation funds increased by	2,388,000

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE	
Special milk program: Funds restored to \$104,000,000, of which \$51,000,000 is provided by direct appropriation and \$53,000,000 by transfer from sec. 32—Increase over budget of	83,000,000
School lunch program: Funds restored to \$165,855,000, an increase over budget of	27,855,000

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM	
The proposed budget cut in next year's program announcement from \$220,000,000 to \$100,000,000 (plus administrative costs of \$30,000,000) was restored by Congress to previous level of \$220,000,000—Increase over budget of	120,000,000

Reductions in less essential programs and other adjustments have made it possible to make these restorations and other essential increases and still remain below total appropriations recommended in the 1967 budget by \$28,347,850. In addition, \$146 million of section 32 funds will be returned to the Treasury based on conference action.

In addition, the following restorations and increases in loan authorizations have been included in this bill to meet clearly demonstrated and well justified additional needs for loan funds:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION	
Budget proposed \$220,000,000 for electrification loans; bill contains total of \$375,000,000, an increase of	\$155,000,000

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION	
Bill increases authorization for operating loans from \$300,000,000 to \$350,000,000, an increase of	50,000,000

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the watershed program of this Nation is one of the finest steps we have ever taken toward leaving a rich country for our children and our children's children. I am proud that this subcommittee some years ago provided \$5 million over the President's budget in order to set up 62 pilot watersheds to show the value of this program to the people of the United States.

As our domestic needs for food and fiber increase, and as our world commit-

ments grow, the budget recommends that we give less financial support to that segment of our economy which is the very basis for our personal well-being and the key to our national prosperity and international strength. The budget proposals would have seriously damaged American agriculture, which is the key segment in the Nation's partnership of agriculture, industry, and labor.

If the committee and the Congress were to have followed the recommendations of the 1967 budget for the Department of Agriculture, our whole economy would be endangered, as would our international commitments. If such a policy as the administration advocates were followed for only a few years, the United States would likely be a food deficit country instead of one of abundance.

Mr. Speaker, this committee has a long record of support for rural development. It has recognized the benefits to the Nation from programs to enable people to stay on the land instead of moving into the already overcrowded towns and cities, or to return to the land, while working in towns and cities. It has realized that, if the usual conveniences were made available in nonurban areas more and more people would be attracted to live in such areas. The committee has recognized, too, the dispersion of many activities which makes rural development essential. For many years it has supported adequate funds for rural electrification, rural telephones, housing and development loans, and loans for water, recreation, drainage and other special community facilities. It has also supported efforts to encourage industrial development to provide supplemental income in rural areas.

The committee believes, however, that such programs have been handled effectively in the past through the regular established agencies of the Department, which have been working successfully with rural people through the years. These old-line agencies have the funds, qualified technicians, and established field offices to meet the needs of rural areas. They can function more effectively if additional layers of supervision are not added between Washington and the rural areas to be served.

For example, the Farmers Home Administration has been in existence for 20 years. Its predecessor agencies, the Farm Security Administration and the Resettlement Administration go back to the mid-1930's. During this period, it has made an outstanding record of service to farmers and rural communities. It makes hundreds of millions of dollars of direct and insured loans and grants each year for nearly every phase of farm and rural community life.

Action of the Department in hiring employees under regular agencies and assigning them to the RCDS program was never approved and efforts to set up a nationwide group responsible to the Secretary in this bill has been denied. Existing farm agencies can well do the job. The conferees have agreed to continue for 1 year the force in Washington to assimilate information from the various agencies and departments of Government now engaged in this program. For this purpose, \$637,000 is provided. In addition, the bill carries an extra \$400,000 for the Farmers Home Administration, that it may assign State employees to coordinate and help with rural development work through its existing field

offices. Also, other agencies of the Department will cooperate in the rural development program as it affects their activities.

Rural development work has meant much to my own State where to date, 182 small towns and rural areas in 64 Mississippi counties have developed special projects for central water systems, totaling more than \$20 million, since a loan program financed by the Farmers Home Administration began less than 4 years ago.

We are making the fastest progress of any other State toward complete coverage of our rural areas with modern water systems so essential to better living standards and more prosperity for all.

Fifty-three new Mississippi rural water systems built since 1962 already are in operation, 38 others are under construction, and 65 more have been approved for early construction.

Modern water systems are important because they assure a constant supply of clean water in the homes of farm and rural dwellers who comprise a major segment of our working force and provide room for the people in our overcrowded towns and cities.

Mississippi's economic and social progress is getting a substantial boost through this program of FHA-insured water systems becoming available to more and more rural people in the State.

The bill as presented to you today in this conference report provides total appropriations of \$6,994,590,150, which are \$28,347,850 below those proposed in the 1967 budget. The following table presents the final figures for the various titles of the bill and comparisons with final conference action:

Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1967

Item	1966 appropriation	1967 budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1966 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I, general activities	\$1,697,649,500	\$1,669,890,000	\$1,616,876,000	\$1,788,840,300	\$1,719,355,150	+\$21,705,650	+\$49,465,150	+\$102,479,150	-\$69,485,150
Title II, credit agencies	188,563,000	98,002,000	93,459,000	93,502,000	93,459,000	-95,104,000	-4,543,000	0	-43,000
Title III, corporations	4,493,736,000	5,254,401,000	5,165,342,000	5,181,401,000	5,181,301,000	+687,565,000	-73,100,000	+15,959,000	-100,000
Title IV, related agencies	1,500,000	645,000	350,000	600,000	475,000	-1,025,000	-170,000	+125,000	-125,000
Grand total, appropriations	6,381,448,500	7,022,938,000	6,876,027,000	7,064,343,300	6,994,590,150	+613,141,650	-28,347,850	² +118,563,150	-69,753,150
Loan authorization ³	837,000,000	702,100,000	852,000,000	932,000,000	932,000,000	+95,000,000	+229,900,000	+80,000,000	0

¹ Includes supplemental request of \$300,000 to Consumer and Marketing Service, consumer protective, marketing and regulatory programs for expenses pursuant to the Cotton Research and Promotion Act (Public Law 89-502).

² As result of conference action, an additional \$146,000,000 of sec. 32 funds will be returned to the Treasury.

³ These are loans supported by collateral and will be repaid in full with interest.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as I know, this conference agreement meets the problems of agriculture in the best way that we know how. We are pleased to be able to work this situation out to the benefit of all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly concur with the views expressed by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. WHITTEN]. As he pointed out, we were confronted with a real problem in trying to take care of these phony budget figures which came up here for the popular on-going programs, such as research and extension service, conservation, land-grant col-

leges, school lunch, school milk, and REA programs. We discussed all this at some length when the bill was here on the floor of this House and I am glad to say that the Senate when they considered the measure, obviously felt pretty much the same way we did and so our conference report reflects this general feeling and accord. Obviously, there were compromises on specific figures, such as splitting the \$2 million difference in the school milk program. A conference is giving and taking by both sides and while I would like to have seen the House stand pat on some of the figures, and giving in to the Senate, on others, we have come up with a fairly acceptable compromise, and I shall support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that overall our conference report is \$28,347,850 below the President's budget in direct appropriations. However, it is \$229,900,000 over the President's budget in loan authorizations. This loan authorization increase comes in three main categories: \$155 million in the rural electric field; \$32 million in rural telephones; and \$50 million in operating loans under the Farmers Home Administration. Bear in mind that these are figures over and above the loan authorization requests in the budget. It does not mean they are over that much for the 1966 appropriations. As a matter of fact, the rural electric loan authorization is \$10 million over 1966. Telephone is \$20 million over, and these farm operating loans are \$50 million over 1966.

These figures offset by a few minor items, gives us our overall total of \$229,-900,000 of loan authorizations over the President's budget. The Senate figure on rural electric cooperative loans and rural telephone loans were both accepted by the majority of the conferees, but not this one.

I might point out while on this subject, Mr. Speaker, that several Members of the House have asked me whether the conferees agreed to the statements which appear at pages 47 and 48 in Senate Report No. 1370, which accompanied the agriculture appropriation bill for fiscal 1967, relating to the policy for making REA loans for power generation and transmission. It will be recalled that both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, in their reports on the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1964, set forth specific directions to be complied with by the REA Administrator before approving loans for power generation and transmission. The minor differences between these reports were resolved in a statement in the House conference report on the fiscal 1964 bill, and this was concurred in by the Senate managers at that time. During the meeting of the conferees on the pending agriculture appropriation bill, H.R. 14596, there was

discussion of the statements I have referred to, which appear in Senate Report No. 1370. The managers on the part of the House did not concur in the language of the Senate report. Accordingly, the result is no action by the Congress, and the directions to the REA Administrator, as set forth in the several reports already referred to on the fiscal 1964 appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, have not been changed or modified. These directions remain in effect.

The chairman has made reference to several of the items which in the House-passed bill were to be funded by the use of section 32 funds, but which now will be funded with direct appropriations by virtue of the conference action. Frankly, I am glad to see these figures out in the open, such as the \$110 million of direct appropriations for the food stamp program. I should point out that there is also \$30 million reappropriated from this past fiscal year, giving us a total for the current fiscal year of \$140 million.

There is a significant change in the figures for the cropland adjustment program. We agreed upon \$50 million, a \$40 million reduction from the House-passed bill, and this now leaves us with a figure of \$100 million less than the budget request for this program.

We went along with the Senate's higher figure for restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation and this will now clean up the deficiencies of all past years with the exception of 1961, which shows a deficiency of \$1,057 million. Money appropriated for this purpose, as most of you know, is in the main to make up for the losses sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation in making its sales of surplus commodities abroad for local currencies.

Mr. Speaker, during the hearings on the original House bill and here on the floor in general debate, I pointed out that the Department had a total of nearly 30,000 vehicles as of June 20, 1965, of which about 2,600 were passenger cars and nearly 300 were station wagons and buses, and that the General Accounting Office indicated that additional vehicles were not needed. While we did accept the Senate figure to replace 434 passenger motor vehicles, as against the 421 in the House bill, we can claim some credit for the disallowance of 77 new cars requested by the Department.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to update the table of U.S. Department of Agriculture employees which I had included with my remarks of last April. In summary, the Department has the staggering total of 271,164 persons on the payroll in one fashion or another:

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Employees and other personnel assisting with Department programs as of June 30, fiscal years 1956-65 and estimated 1966 and 1967

Fiscal year	USDA employees				Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service county committees						
	(Excluding Forest Service)		Forest Service		Total	Full-time county office employees	Part-time ¹			Average annual employment	Cooperative extension service ²
	Perma-nent full-time	Other	Perma-nent full-time	Other			County office employees	County commit-tees	Community commit-tees		
1956.....	48,195	17,187	9,480	14,536	89,398	(3)	(3)	9,165	82,809	21,215	13,784
1957.....	51,881	17,782	10,531	15,804	95,998	(3)	(3)	9,143	79,709	26,688	14,115
1958.....	53,345	19,470	12,219	16,105	101,139	(3)	(3)	9,165	82,335	28,529	13,807
1959.....	55,013	14,033	13,359	14,815	97,220	(3)	(3)	8,862	81,555	25,569	13,500
1960.....	54,647	12,913	14,761	16,373	98,694	(3)	(3)	9,168	81,612	21,206	14,548
1961.....	57,963	11,308	13,342	19,944	102,557	14,577	(3)	9,171	80,138	22,246	13,596
1962.....	57,028	14,835	17,476	21,172	110,511	15,754	(3)	9,183	80,001	26,078	13,722
1963.....	58,644	14,819	18,863	20,612	112,488	16,194	(3)	9,195	79,995	27,297	13,858
1964.....	58,507	11,069	18,550	20,582	108,476	15,408	412	9,195	79,356	24,182	14,833
1965.....	60,331	12,438	19,666	20,582	113,017	15,339	381	9,186	77,415	23,836	15,104
1966 estimated.....	62,825	12,021	21,550	20,379	116,775	15,242	348	9,186	75,693	24,462	15,100
1967 estimated.....	63,673	11,517	22,577	20,333	118,100	15,242	348	9,186	75,693	23,923	15,100

¹ In addition to regular part-time county office employees and county and community committeemen, informal employees with no regular tour of duty are appointed for temporary periods when needed. They are on call and are paid only when they actually work. As of June 30, 1965, there were 38,920 such employees on the rolls. However, historical data are not maintained for this type of employee.

² Includes State directors, assistant directors, management officers, statewide and area specialists, county supervisors, county home economics and 4-H Club agents.

³ Data on number of employees not available.

⁴ Employment at June 30, 1965, was distributed among following areas of service:

Forestry (exclusive of research).....	37,316
Soil and water resource protection and development.....	19,248
Agriculture and forestry research.....	12,076

Inspection and other marketing service for agricultural commodities.....	11,955
REA and FHA loan programs.....	10,338
Plant and animal disease and pest control.....	6,019
Price-support and other farm income stabilization programs.....	4,995
Crop and livestock estimates and other statistical and economic research services.....	3,130
Crop insurance program.....	1,336
Domestic food distribution.....	560
Foreign assistance programs.....	320
Other.....	5,724
Total.....	113,017

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] whether or not the net effect of the conference report is to increase potential spending over the President's budget when you include regular obligation authority and the additional loan authorization?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out by my able colleague, we are above the budget submitted by the President with reference to the ceiling that is imposed each year on the authorized loans which may be made by agencies of the Department. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], a member of the subcommittee, mentioned these loans which the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers Home Administration make. Those loans are made based upon collateral. They are secured

by collateral, may I say, and they are repaid, with interest.

Mr. Speaker, through the years many folk have tried to raise the question as to whether or not this is justified. It is my judgment, in view of the present inflation, the increased cost of operations in the field of agriculture, and the drive which has been going on recently which has decreased the availability of outside financing, that the committee was thoroughly justified and I believe acted wisely in lifting these loan ceilings.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat, the dollar amount of appropriations for

the regular continuing programs is approximately \$28 million below the budget. The total amount that will be loaned and eventually repaid is as the gentleman from Michigan states.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and members of the subcommittee and the conferees for restoring the obligational authority which is necessary to supply adequately the funds for the school lunch program and for the school milk program and other programs where the President did make reductions when he submitted his budget to the Congress of the United States in January.

But, is it not fair to say that when you combine the obligational authority in the regular part of the bill and the loan authorization, the potential is there for more expenditures in fiscal year 1967 than what the President recommended at the time he submitted his budget?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan that we are all prone to express ourselves as we see fit. However, as the gentleman from Michigan says, the bill before us will provide taking out of the Treasury more dollars for lending purposes than were provided for in the budget submitted by the President. But, as has been pointed out, those dollars will be taken out and loaned for various purposes and will be repaid. In my judgment they represent a sound investment.

The sum total in dollars that would be withdrawn from the Treasury may be more than the Bureau of the Budget recommended. But it is in a good cause and they will be repaid. Personally through the years I have never felt it proper to consider loans that a bank makes, where they will get repayment plus interest, in the same way that the operating costs of the bank are considered. They are two separate things and we have so classified them. I think our report and supporting tables which will appear as part of my statement here makes it quite clear what each of them are.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the manner in which the gentleman from Mississippi has stated the situation.

Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between obligation authority which eventually becomes an expenditure and a loan authorization because loans will eventually be repaid for the projects or the programs that are involved.

But looking at the fiscal year 1967, from the point of view of expenditure, we would have to concede that the expenditures under the conference report potentially and probably will be greater than the budget submitted by the President.

Mr. WHITTEN. I caught, of course, in the gentleman's statement the word "potentially." I will have to agree that potentially that could be true. But may I point out that this is an increase in the

loan authorization. It is not really an obligation authority—although that is one way of describing it. That money is not actually withdrawn from the Treasury until the loan is made and the notes are signed and the obligation on the part of the borrower is incurred. But potentially I would have to say that the gentleman could be correct.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and also to state that I think the minority leader's analysis of this is correct.

When we compare apples with apples and oranges with oranges, I must say that this does remain beyond the President's budget. I voted against the House bill because of this very reason.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask if these figures are not correct, the total figure in the House bill was \$6.876 billion; the Senate bill was \$7.064 billion. This conference report before us has a figure of \$6.994 billion. Am I correct in those figures?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is correct. I wish to point out again that \$146 million under section 32 will be returned to the Treasury under the conference report, as compared with what would have been returned to the Treasury under the House bill.

Mr. CURTIS. But I think it is accurate to state that the House bill which was \$6.8 billion has now been increased under this report to \$6.994 billion. I would observe that far from doing what the President has suggested that the Congress do, of staying within the budget, we are again going out of the budget.

Mr. WHITTEN. With reference to the figures that the gentleman is quoting he should match against the increase over the House figure fact that \$146 million will return to the Treasury under this conference report. So that the larger figure the gentleman quoted would have to be reduced by this \$146 million to be comparable.

Mr. CURTIS. I think I was giving the net figure. In other words, if you include this \$140 million, you would go well over the \$7 billion. It would go well over the \$7 billion and be right back at the Senate figure.

Here is the other comment I wanted to make. I think it is most important in these conference reports in these critical periods of fiscal problems in the administration, to give us these aggregate figures—the net figures so that we know what we are talking about. One cannot get this data that I was just setting forth in the RECORD on the net figures from the conference report.

I have noticed that other conference reports are singularly lacking in this kind of information. Let us not try to kid the Members here. Let us lay it out on the table. If this Congress wants to continue doing what it is obviously going to do—continue in these expenditures beyond the President's budget, let the leadership of this Congress bear the brunt of it. I certainly will not vote for it.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that today's RECORD carries the printed conference report which follows the standard form. To me it is quite plain as to what has been done. I have tried to make it plain to my colleagues.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I could not find it in the conference report, but I am informed that the Senate accepted the language of a restrictive amendment as to the funds for the Public Law 480 program in the motion of recommitment by the House. As I understand it, the conference report does not adhere exactly to the language as adopted by the House in this respect. The amendment related to a prohibition of aid under the concessional sales authority in Public Law 480 to any country that trades with North Vietnam.

As I understand, the Senate version of the appropriation bill did add a clause which would permit the President to set aside this prohibition if he determined it to be in the national interest. I should like to ask the gentleman whether the House language was accepted in the conference.

Mr. WHITTEN. The conferees on the part of the House supported the gentleman's language in the first instance, and the Senate receded, accepting the House language in the conference.

Mr. FINDLEY. I should like to congratulate the conferees on holding fast on that language. To me, even though it may be somewhat symbolic, and perhaps would not affect too many countries, it certainly shows the determination of the House of Representatives to shut off aid to any country that does trade with North Vietnam.

I should like to ask the gentleman also a question about amendments Nos. 48 and 49, which have to do with Federal crop insurance. I notice that the amount authorized that can be paid from premium income for administrative and operating expenses was reduced, which came as a surprise to me. I would appreciate it if the gentleman could clarify why this change was made and why the appropriation was increased by about \$100,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. As the gentleman knows, conferences are composed of two groups that have differences of viewpoint on two different bills. The gentleman is correct. The amount of premium income to be used for administrative and operating expenses is smaller than that required in the House bill, but it is larger than that required in the Senate bill. The difference between \$4,100,000 and \$4,150,000 is not one of the major differences between the two bodies in relation to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 326, nays 27, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

YEAS—326

Abbott	de la Garza	Henderson
Abernethy	Dent	Herlong
Adair	Derwinski	Hicks
Addabbo	Devine	Hollifield
Albert	Diggs	Holland
Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	Horton
Anderson, Tenn.	Dole	Howard
Andrews, George W.	Donohue	Hull
Andrews, Glenn	Dorn	Hungate
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dow	Huot
Annunzio	Dowdy	Hutchinson
Arends	Downing	Ichord
Ashbrook	Dulski	Irwin
Ashmore	Duncan, Oreg.	Jarman
Aspinall	Duncan, Tenn.	Jennings
Ayres	Dwyer	Joelson
Bandstra	Dyal	Johnson, Calif.
Barrett	Edmondson	Johnson, Okla.
Bates	Edwards, Ala.	Johnson, Pa.
Battin	Edwards, Calif.	Jonas
Beckworth	Edwards, La.	Jones, Ala.
Belcher	Ellsworth	Jones, Mo.
Bennett	Evans, Colo.	Jones, N.C.
Berry	Everett	Karsten
Betts	Fallon	Kastenmeier
Blatnik	Farnsley	Kee
Bolling	Farnum	Keith
Bolton	Fascell	King, Calif.
Bow	Feighan	King, Utah
Bray	Fisher	Kluczynski
Brooks	Flood	Kornegay
Broomfield	Fogarty	Krebs
Brown, Calif.	Foley	Kunkel
Broyhill, N.C.	Fountain	Laird
Broyhill, Va.	Fraser	Langen
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Burke	Friedel	Leggett
Burleson	Fulton, Tenn.	Lennon
Burton, Calif.	Fuqua	Lipscomb
Burton, Utah	Gallagher	Long, La.
Byrne, Pa.	Garmatz	Long, Md.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gathings	McCulloch
Cabell	Gibbons	McDade
Callan	Gilligan	McDowell
Carter	Gonzalez	McFall
Casey	Grabowski	McGrath
Cederberg	Gray	McVicker
Chamberlain	Green, Oreg.	MacGregor
Chelf	Green, Pa.	Machen
Clark	Grelgg	Mackay
Clausen, Don H.	Grider	Mackie
Clawson, Del	Gross	Madden
Cleveland	Gubser	Mahon
Clevenger	Gurney	Mailliard
Colmer	Hagen, Calif.	Marsh
Cooley	Haley	Martin, Nebr.
Corbett	Hall	Mathias
Culver	Halpern	Matsunaga
Cunningham	Hamilton	Matthews
Curtin	Hanna	May
Daddario	Hansen, Idaho	Meeds
Dague	Hardy	Michel
Daniels	Harsha	Miller
Davis, Wis.	Harvey, Ind.	Mills
Dawson	Harvey, Mich.	Minish
	Hawkins	Mink
	Hays	Mize
	Hébert	Moeller
	Hechler	Monagan
	Helstoski	Moore

Moorhead	Reuss	Sullivan
Morgan	Rhodes, Ariz.	Talcott
Morris	Rhodes, Pa.	Taylor
Morse	Rivers, S.C.	Teague, Calif.
Morton	Roberts	Teague, Tex.
Mosher	Robison	Thompson, N.J.
Moss	Rodino	Thompson, Tex.
Murphy, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.	Thomson, Wis.
Natcher	Rogers, Tex.	Todd
Nedzi	Ronan	Trimble
Nelsen	Ronealio	Tuck
Nix	Rooney, Pa.	Tunney
O'Hara, Ill.	Rosenthal	Tupper
O'Konski	Rostenkowski	Udall
Olsen, Mont.	Roush	Ullman
Olson, Minn.	Roybal	Van Deerlin
O'Neal, Ga.	Ryan	Vanik
O'Neill, Mass.	Satterfield	Vigorito
Passman	St Germain	Vivian
Pelly	Schneebell	Waggonner
Pepper	Schweiker	Walde
Perkins	Secrest	Walker, N. Mex.
Philbin	Selden	Watkins
Pickle	Shibley	Watson
Pirnie	Shriver	Watts
Poage	Sickles	Weltner
Poff	Sikes	Whalley
Pool	Sisk	White, Tex.
Powell	Skubitz	Whitener
Price	Slack	Whitten
Pucinski	Smith, Iowa	Widnall
Purcell	Smith, N.Y.	Williams
Qule	Smith, Va.	Wilson
Quillen	Springer	Charles H.
Race	Stafford	Wright
Randall	Staggers	Wyatt
Redlin	Stalbaum	Yates
Rees	Stanton	Young
Reid, Ill.	Steed	Younger
Reifel	Stephens	
Reinecke	Stubblefield	

NAYS—27

Bell	Findley	Minshall
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Fino	Ottinger
Cameron	Ford, Gerald R.	Patten
Clancy	Fulton, Pa.	Reid, N.Y.
Collier	Goodell	Rogers, Fla.
Corman	Grover	Rumsfeld
Curtis	Hosmer	Smith, Calif.
Dickinson	Jacobs	Utt
Erlenborn	Kupferman	Wydler
	McClory	

NOT VOTING—79

Adams	Gialmo	O'Hara, Mich.
Ashley	Gilbert	Patman
Baring	Griffiths	Pike
Bingham	Hagan, Ga.	Resnick
Boggs	Halleck	Rivers, Alaska
Boland	Hanley	Rooney, N.Y.
Brademas	Hansen, Iowa	Roudebush
Brock	Hansen, Wash.	St. Onge
Cahill	Hathaway	Saylor
Callaway	Karth	Scheuer
Carey	Kelly	Schisler
Celler	Keogh	Schmidhauser
Cohelan	King, N.Y.	Scott
Conable	Kirwan	Senner
Conte	Landrum	Stratton
Conyers	Love	Sweeney
Craley	McCarthy	Tenzer
Cramer	McEwen	Thomas
Delaney	McMillan	Toll
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald	Tuten
Denton	Martin, Ala.	Walker, Miss.
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	White, Idaho
Farbstein	Morrison	Willis
Flynt	Multer	Wilson, Bob
Ford	Murphy, N.Y.	Wolf
William D. Gettys	Murray	Zablocki
	O'Brien	

So the conference report was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Boggs with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Conte.
 Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Bob Wilson.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Conable.
 Mr. Multer with Mr. King of New York.
 Mr. Gialmo with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
 Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
 Mr. Wolf with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. William D. Ford.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Resnick.
 Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Willis.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mrs. Kelly.
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. McCarthy.
 Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. O'Brien.
 Mr. Pike with Mr. Patman.
 Mr. Hanley with Mr. McMillan.
 Mr. Craley with Mr. Ashley.
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. Adams.
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. Morrison.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Tuten.
 Mr. Stratton with Mrs. Thomas.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Flynt.
 Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
 Mr. Schisler with Mr. Scheuer.
 Mr. Senner with Mr. Scott.
 Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Baring.
 Mr. Karth with Mr. Denton.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Toll.
 Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Sweeney.
 Mr. Love with Mr. Boland.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLLIER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. McCLODY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: On page 17, line 23, after "1964" strike out "\$150,000,000"; and

On page 18, strike out all of lines 1 and 2 and insert "\$110,000,000, and in addition \$30,000,000 appropriated under this head in Public Law 89-316, approved November 2, 1965, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 24, line 25: "and in addition \$1,375,000 appropriated under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the conference report and the several amendments was laid on the table.

TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3005) to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce accidents in-

volving motor vehicles and to reduce the deaths and injuries occurring in such accidents, together with House amendments thereto, and insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, FRIEDEL, MACDONALD, MOSS, DINGELL, ROGERS of Florida, SPRINGER, YOUNGER, and DEVINE.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13298) to amend the Organic Act of Guam in order to authorize the legislature thereof to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts, 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, line 10, after "members" insert ", to be known as senators."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "bill," and insert "Act."

Page 3, line 8, after "provision," insert "the method of electing."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "bill." and insert "Act."

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman from Colorado would explain to the House the purport of the amendments.

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman from California will yield? As the gentleman heard, when the amendments were read, three of them are purely clerical. The other one has to do with the nomenclature used for the members of the Guam Legislature. In the Virgin Islands we have a similar body there known as the senate, and the members of the other body thought that the members of the Guam Legislature should be designated as senators also. I know of no objection to this suggestion.

Mr. HOSMER. I recall when the original bill pertaining to the Virgin Islands was before the Territories Subcommittee, I was the one who offered the amendment to change the designation of their legislators to that of senators. The basis for that was the fact that they were paid little in money and they deserved some other kind of reward, and the title seemed to fit the bill. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATIONS OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3034) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1865)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the Bill (S. 3034) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized—

"(a) to perform such additional analysis and studies as may be required on the following proposals which are pending before the Congress:

"Region 1

"Chief Joseph Dam project, Chelan division, Manson unit, along Lake Chelan in north-central Washington;

"Columbia Basin project, third powerplant, on the Columbia River at Grand Coulee Dam in Washington;

"Rogue River Basin project, Merlin division, on Jumpoff Joe Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon;

"Tualatin project, first phase, on the Tualatin River, near the city of Portland, Oregon;

"Walla Walla project, Touchet division, on the Touchet River in southeastern Washington;

"Yakima project, Kennewick division extension, near the mouth of the Yakima River in south-central Washington.

"Region 3

"Lower Colorado River Basin project, in the Lower Colorado River Basin in Arizona, California, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah.

"Region 5

"Canton project on the Canadian River below the existing Canton Reservoir in northwestern Oklahoma;

"Columbus Bend project on the Lower Colorado River Basin in Texas;

"Palmetto Bend project on the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers in Texas.

"Region 7

"Missouri River Basin project, Midstate division, on the north side of the Platte River in central Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, North Loup division, on the North Loup and Loup Rivers in east-central Nebraska; and

"(b) to complete his analysis and studies and to prepare and process reports on the

following proposals, which he anticipates will be completed or substantially completed on or before June 30, 1966:

"Region 1

"Challis project, Challis Creek division, on Challis Creek in southern Idaho;

"Rathdrum Prairie project, Prairie division, East Green-acres unit in Idaho, along the Idaho-Washington State line east of Spokane, Washington;

"Rogue River Basin project, Illinois Valley division, on the Illinois River, a tributary of the Rogue River, in southwestern Oregon;

"Southwest Idaho water development project, Mountain Home division, in the Snake River Basin near the cities of Boise and Mountain Home, Idaho;

"Umpqua River project, Olalla division, on Olalla and Lookingglass Creeks in the south Umpqua Basin in southwestern Oregon;

"Upper Snake River project; upper Star Valley division, on Salt River and Cow Creek, near the town of Afton, Wyoming;

"Willamette River project, Monmouth-Dallas Division, on the west side of the Willamette River in the vicinity of Monmouth and Dallas, Oregon;

"Willamette River project, Red Prairie division, along the South Yamhill River near the town of Sheridan, Oregon;

"Yakima project, Bumping Lake enlargement, on Bumping River in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

"Region 2

"Central Valley project, Cosumnes River division, initial phase, in and adjacent to the Cosumnes River Basin east of Sacramento, California;

"Central Valley project, Delta division, peripheral canal, in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in California;

"Central Valley project, Delta division, Kellogg unit, south of the city of Antioch, California;

"Central Valley project, east side division, initial phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

"Central Valley project, Sacramento River division, West Sacramento canal unit, on the west side of the Sacramento River Valley and in the Putah Creek Basin in California;

"Central Valley project, San Felipe division, in the Santa Clara and Pajaro River Basins in the central coastal area of California;

"Sespe Creek project, on the Santa Clara River and tributaries in southern California;

"Walker River project on the Walker River in west-central California and east-central Nevada.

"Region 4

"Bear River project, first phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho.

"Region 5

"Chikaskia project on the Chikaskia River in south-central Kansas and north-central Oklahoma;

"Cuero project on the Guadalupe River in south-central Texas;

"Liberty Bottoms project on the Red River below Denison Dam in south-central Oklahoma;

"San Luis Valley project, Closed Basin division, in the Rio Grande Basin in south-central Colorado.

"Region 6

"Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit (exclusive of Mitchell area), involving the diversion of water from the existing Oahe Reservoir into the James River Valley;

"Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Tower, Greenwood,

and Yankton units, on the Missouri River in southeastern South Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Wagner unit on the Missouri River in the vicinity of Fort Randall Dam in southeastern South Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, Jefferson and Whitehall units on the Big Hole and Jefferson Rivers above Canyon Ferry Dam in southwestern Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, Three-Forks division, West Bench unit, on the Big Hole River in southwestern Montana near the town of Dillon;

"Missouri River Basin project, White division, Pine Ridge unit, on the White River in southwestern South Dakota.

"Region 7

"Mirage Flats project on the upper Niobrara River near Hay Springs, Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, Cedar Rapids division, on the Cedar and Loup Rivers near Spalding, Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, lower Niobrara division, O'Neill unit, on the lower Niobrara River in north-central Nebraska,

"Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Ellis unit, on Big Creek in west-central Kansas;

"Missouri River Basin project, South Platte division, Narrows Unit, on the South Platte River near Fort Morgan, Colorado.

"Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized to continue feasibility studies on the following proposals, which are presently under study and which will require further study:

"Region 1

"Burnt River project, Dark Canyon division, on the Burnt River in west-central Oregon;

"Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Okanogan unit, on the Okanogan River in north-central Washington;

"Deschutes project, Central division, in the Deschutes and Crooked River Basins in central Oregon;

"Flathead River project, encompassing the Flathead River Basin in northwestern Montana;

"Grand Ronde project on the Grande Ronde River in northeastern Oregon;

"Rogue River Basin project, Applegate Valley division, on Applegate Creek, a tributary of the Rogue River, near the city of Grants Pass, Oregon;

"Rogue River Basin project, Medford division, on the Rogue River in the vicinity of the town of Medford, Oregon;

"Southwest Idaho water development project, Garden Valley division, along the Payette River and in the general vicinity of Boise, Idaho;

"Southwest Idaho water development project, Welser River division, in the Welser River Basin in Idaho;

"Umatilla Basin project, encompassing the Umatilla River Basin, centering near the town of Pendleton, Oregon;

"Upper Snake River project, American Falls Dam replacement on the Snake River near the city of American Falls, Idaho;

"Upper Snake River project, Lynn Crandall division, on the Snake River below Fallsades Dam in southern Idaho;

"Upper Snake River project, Salmon Falls division, south of the Snake River, near the city of Twin Falls, Idaho;

"Upper Snake River project, Snake Plains recharge division, encompassing the Snake River Plains area north of the Snake River in southern Idaho;

"Walla Walla project, Marcus Whitman and Milton-Freewater divisions, in the Walla Walla River Basin in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington;

"Willamette River project, Carlton division, on the Yamhill River in northwestern Oregon;

"Willamette River project, Molalla division, on the Molalla and Pudding Rivers in northwestern Oregon;

"Yakima project, Ahtanum unit, on Ahtanum Creek in the Yakima River Basin in Washington.

"Region 2

"Central Valley project, American River division, Placerville Ridge unit, between the South Fork American River and the North Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

"Central Valley project, American River division, Pleasant Oaks unit, between the South Fork American River and the North Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

"Central Valley project, Cosumnes River division, Fair Play unit, on the Middle Fork Cosumnes River east of Sacramento, California;

"Central Valley project, East Side division, ultimate phase, on the east side of the San Joaquin Valley from the American River on the north to the foothills of the Tehachapi Mountains south of the Kern River;

"Central Valley project, Pit River division, Allen Camp unit, on the Pit River northeast of Redding, California;

"Central Valley project, Stanislaus River division, Sonora-Keystone unit, on the Stanislaus River in the general vicinity of Sonora, California;

"Lompoc project on the lower Santa Ynez River in southern California;

"North Coast project, Eel River division, English Ridge unit, on the upper Eel River and in the Putah Creek and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California.

"North Coast project, Eel River division, Knights Valley unit in the Russian River Basin and adjacent areas north of San Francisco Bay, California;

"North Coast project, Eel River division, ultimate phase, in the Eel River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

"North Coast project, Lower Klamath River division, in the lower Klamath River Basin in northwestern California with facilities for the diversion of excess water into the Central Valley Basin;

"North Coast project, Lower Trinity River division (exclusive of Paskenta-Newville Reservoir), encompassing that portion of the Trinity River Basin below the existing Lewiston Dam of the Central Valley project, the upper portion of the Mad and Van Duzen Rivers and the west side tributaries of the Sacramento River in California;

"North Coast project, lower Trinity River division, Paskenta-Newville Dam and Reservoir on Stony and Thomes Creeks in the Sacramento River Basin in California;

"Ventura River project extension in the Ventura River Basin near Ventura, California;

"Washoe project, Hope Valley division, on the Carson River in California and Nevada;

"Washoe project, Newlands extension division, on the lower Carson River near the city of Fallon, Nevada.

"Region 3

"Black River-Springerville-Saint Johns project on the Black River and Little Colorado River near Springerville and Saint Johns, Arizona;

"Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Coachella division, on the Coachella Canal in southern California;

"Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, Imperial division, on the All-American Canal and the Imperial Valley distribution system in southern California;

"Flagstaff-Williams project, near the cities of Flagstaff and Williams, Arizona;

"Kingman project, on the Colorado River and near the city of Kingman, Arizona;

"Moapa Valley pumping project in the Muddy River Basin in southern Nevada;

"San Pedro-Santa Cruz project in the San Pedro and Santa Cruz River Basins in southeastern Arizona;

"Upper Gila River project on the Gila River and its tributaries in western New Mexico and eastern Arizona.

"Region 4

"Bear River project, second phase, on the Bear River and its tributaries in north-central Utah and southeastern Idaho;

"Central Utah project, ultimate phase, Uintah unit, on the Whiterock and Uinta Rivers in northeastern Utah.

"Region 5

"Brantley project on the Pecos River upstream from Carlsbad, New Mexico;

"Cibolo project on Cibolo Creek in the San Antonio River Basin in Texas;

"Eastern New Mexico water supply project in northeastern New Mexico;

"Nueces River project on Frio River in the Nueces River Basin in the vicinity of Corpus Christi, Texas;

"Portales project near the town of Portales in eastern New Mexico;

"Rio Grande water salvage project, New Mexico division, on the Rio Grande River between the Colorado-New Mexico State line, and the existing Caballo Reservoir;

"Texas Basins project, encompassing the gulf coastal streams of Texas extending from the Sabine River on the north to the Rio Grande on the south.

"Region 6

"Missouri River Basin project, Big Horn Basin division, Shoshone extension unit, Polecat Bench area, in northwestern Wyoming near the city of Powell;

"Missouri River Basin project, Cannonball division, Mott unit, on the Cannonball River in southwestern North Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, Helena-Great Falls division, Fort Benton unit, on the Missouri River in north-central Montana near the town of Fort Benton;

"Missouri River Basin project, Musselshell division, Lower Musselshell unit, on the lower reaches of the Musselshell River near the town of Mosby, Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, Powder division, Kaycee unit, on the Middle Fork and main stem of the Powder River in northeastern Wyoming;

"Missouri River Basin project, Marias division, Marias-Milk unit, in the Marias and Milk River Basins in north-central Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Pollock-Herred unit, on the Missouri River in north-central South Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, Sun-Teton division, Sun-Teton unit, on the Sun and Teton Rivers in the vicinity of Great Falls, Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Billings pump unit, at the city of Billings, Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, Yellowstone division, Cracker Box and Stipek units, along the Yellowstone River near the town of Glendive, Montana;

"Region 7

"Missouri River Basin project, Blue division, Little Blue unit, along the Little Blue River in south-central Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, Blue division, Sunbeam unit, on the West Fork of the Big Blue River in southeastern Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, Laramie division, Wheatland unit, on the Laramie River in southeastern Wyoming;

"Missouri River Basin project, Mount Evans division, Upper South Platte unit, on

the South Platte River near the city of Denver, Colorado;

"Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, La Prele unit, on La Prele Creek, near the town of Douglas, Wyoming.

"Alaska

"Lake Grace project on Grace Creek on Revillagigedo Island, Alaska;

"Takatz Creek project on Takatz Creek on Baranof Island near Sitka, Alaska.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary is authorized to engage in feasibility studies on the following proposals:

"Region 1

"Umpqua River project, Azalea division on Cow Creek, a tributary of the Umpqua River in southwestern Oregon;

"Chehalis River project, Adna division, in the Upper Chehalis River Basin near the cities of Centralia and Chehalis, Washington;

"Upper Owyhee project, Jordan Valley division, on Jordan Creek in the Upper Owyhee River Basin in southeastern Oregon and southwestern Idaho;

"Upper Snake River project, Big Wood division, in southern Idaho in the Big Wood River Basin near the towns of Ketchum and Sun Valley;

"Upper Snake River project, Oakley Fan division, south of the Snake River near Burley, Idaho;

"Tualatin project, second phase, in the Tualatin River Basin twenty miles west of Portland, Oregon;

"Southwest Idaho Water Development project, Bruneau division in the vicinity of Bruneau in southwest Idaho;

"Chief Joseph Dam project, Okanogan-Similkameen division, Oroville-Tonasket unit, Washington.

"Region 2

"North Coast project, Eureka division, encompassing the lower reaches of the Mad, Van Duzen, and Eel Rivers in northwestern California;

"Lake Tahoe project in the Lake Tahoe Basin in eastern California and western Nevada and the American River Basin in California.

"Region 3

"Boulder Canyon project, All-American Canal system water salvage, East Mesa unit on the East Mesa of the Imperial Valley in southern California;

"Mojave River project in the Mojave River Basin in southern California;

"Morongo-Yucca-Upper Coachella Valley project in Riverside County, California;

"Santa Margarita project on the Santa Margarita River in southern California.

"Region 4

"Colorado River Basin, power peaking capacity, in the Colorado River Basin in Arizona, Colorado, and Utah, and in the eastern part of Bonneville Basin along the Wasatch Mountains in Utah;

"Price River project, Price River Basin in eastern Utah.

"Region 5

"Mimbres project in the Mimbres River Basin in southwestern New Mexico.

"Region 6

"Missouri River Basin project, James division, Oahe unit, Mitchell section, near the city of Mitchell, South Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota pumping division, Horsehead Flats and Winona units on the east side of the Missouri River in the general vicinity of Linton, North Dakota;

"Missouri River Basin project, Lower Bighorn division, Hardin unit on the Bighorn River near Hardin, Montana;

"Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota pumping division, Grass Rope and Fort Thompson units on the Missouri River in the

vicinity of the towns of Lower Brule and Fort Thompson, South Dakota.

"Region 7

"Missouri River Basin project, Bostwick division, Scandia unit, near the town of Belleville in north-central Kansas;

"Missouri River Basin project, Oregon Trail division, Glendo inundated water rights irrigation unit, near Glendo Reservoir in eastern Wyoming;

"Missouri River Basin project, Smoky Hill division, Kanopolis unit on the Smoky Hill River below the existing Kanopolis Dam in central Kansas;

"Missouri River Basin project, Elkhorn division, Highland unit, on the Upper Elkhorn River in northeastern Nebraska;

"Missouri River Basin project, Solomon division, Glen Elder irrigation unit, on the Solomon River in the vicinity of the towns of Downs and Delphos, Kansas;

"Missouri River Basin project, Kanaska division, Nelson Buck union on Beaver Creek in northwestern Kansas.

"Sec. 4. The Secretary, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 2 and 3 of this Act, shall submit to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives within one year after completion of the final feasibility plan those studies of proposals determined to be feasible, with whatever alternate studies that may have been developed for the construction, operation, and maintenance of each water resource project or proposal in all instances where practical alternatives are known to the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide all the data and information developed on short-term and long-term benefits and costs necessary for the comprehensive and integrated development of each water resource project or proposal, including any and all factors directly, indirectly, ancillary, and/or incidental to the comprehensive development of each water resource project or proposal.

"Sec. 5. The Secretary may accelerate feasibility studies authorized by law when and to the extent that the costs of such studies shall have been advanced by non-Federal sources.

"Sec. 6. Section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes', approved June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200) is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 2';

"(2) by striking out 'That' at the beginning of the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, that'; and

"(3) by inserting at the end of such section two new subsections as follows:

"(b) It is declared to be the policy of the Congress that reclamation projects hereafter authorized in the Pacific Northwest to receive financial assistance from the Federal Columbia River power system shall receive such assistance only from the net revenues of that system as provided in this subsection, and that their construction shall be so scheduled that such assistance, together with similar assistance for previously authorized reclamation projects (including projects not now receiving such assistance for which the Congress may hereafter authorize financial assistance) will not cause increases in the rates and charges of the Bonneville Power Administration. It is further declared to be the policy of the Congress that the total assistance to all irrigation projects, both existing and future, in the Pacific Northwest shall not average more than \$30,000,000 annually in any period of twenty consecutive years. Any analyses and studies authorized by the Congress for reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest

shall be prepared in accordance with the provisions of this section. As used in this section, the term "net revenues" means revenues as determined from time to time which are not required for the repayment of (1) all costs allocated to power at projects in the Pacific Northwest then existing or authorized, including the cost of acquiring power by purchase or exchange, and (2) presently authorized assistance from power to irrigation at projects in the Pacific Northwest existing and authorized prior to the date of enactment of this subsection.

"(c) On December 20, 1974, and thereafter at intervals coinciding with anniversary dates of Federal Power Commission general review of the rates and charges of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Secretary of the Interior shall recommend to the Congress any changes in the dollar limitations herein placed upon financial assistance to Pacific Northwest reclamation projects that he believes justified by changes in the cost-price levels existing on July 1, 1966, or by other relevant changes of circumstances."

And the House agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
CRAIG HOSMER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
FRANK CHURCH,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
GORDON ALLOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House on the conference of disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill, S. 3034, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations for certain water resource development proposals, submit this statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. All the significant differences between the language agreed upon and the language of the House amendment are explained hereafter.

BILL FORM

This legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations was submitted by the administration with the feasibility investigations divided into three categories. The investigations listed in section 1 are those which have been completed or substantially completed. Substantially all of the Bureau's on-going program for feasibility investigations is included in section 2. These investigations are in various stages of completion. The investigations listed in section 3 are recommended new feasibility investigations.

As submitted by the administration, section 3 was further broken down between those feasibility investigations scheduled for initiation in fiscal year 1967 and those scheduled for initiation after fiscal year 1967. In the Senate-passed bill, these two categories of section 3 were combined and no distinction made between investigations scheduled for initiation in fiscal year 1967 and those scheduled for initiation thereafter. The conference committee agreed upon the Senate change in form, and the conference report combines all new feasibility investigations without regard to when they are scheduled to be initiated. In connection with this action, however, the conference committee requests the Secretary of the Interior to advise both the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs which of these investigations will be initiated in fiscal year 1967 and, hereafter, to report to

such committees, prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, on the feasibility investigations to be initiated in the upcoming fiscal year, keeping the Committees fully informed with respect to any changes that are made subsequent to such reports.

FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATIONS ADDED AND DELETED

This legislation was introduced in the form recommended by the administration and, therefore, the Senate and the House considered identical bills. Both bodies added and deleted certain proposed project investigations.

In section 1, the House deleted the third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam in Washington on the basis of the committee's understanding that no additional studies would be needed, and the Mountain Park project in Oklahoma because of a water supply problem. The Senate deleted the Devils Canyon project in Alaska. The conference committee agreed to retain third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam and leave out the Mountain Park and Devils Canyon projects. Thus, as compared with the House amendment, the conference report adds the third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam and deletes the Devils Canyon project.

In section 2, the House added the Pleasant Oaks and the Allen Camp units of the Central Valley project in California and deleted the Retrop project in Oklahoma because of a water supply problem. On the basis that the feasibility studies of the Pleasant Oaks and Allen Camp units are already underway and substantially completed, the conference committee agreed to retain these investigations in the legislation. The Retrop project was left out pending resolution of the water supply problem. Thus, with respect to section 2, the conference report is identical to the House amendment.

In section 3, the House added five project investigations in Utah, the Morongo-Yucca-Upper Coachella Valley project and the Little Rock Dam and Reservoir project in California, and the Marais des Cygnes River Basin project in Kansas. The Senate added the Bruneau division of the Southwest Idaho Water Development project in Idaho, the Hardin unit of the Missouri River Basin project in Montana, and the Nelson Buck unit of the Missouri River Basin project in Kansas. Both bodies added the Oroville-Tonasket unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project in Washington, the Price River project in Utah, and the Grass Rope and Fort Thompson units of the Missouri River Basin project.

After consideration of the status of planning on the projects added by the two bodies, the conference committee agreed to retain the Morongo-Yucca-Upper Coachella Valley project, the Bruneau Division, and the Hardin and Nelson Buck units, and to take out the five Utah projects and the Marais des Cygnes River Basin project in Kansas. The status of planning on the projects left out indicates that they are not ready for the initiation of the feasibility investigations. They can be reconsidered in a year or two when the next bill to authorize feasibility investigations is before the Congress.

The projects which both bodies added, of course, were retained in the conference report.

To summarize the conference committee action on section 3, the conference report includes three project investigations not in the House amendment, and does not include seven project investigations that were in the House amendment.

PROJECT INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED THE COMMITTEES

The House amendment includes a new section 4 (not in the Senate-passed bill) which requires that the feasibility studies for those project proposals which have been determined to be feasible must be submitted to

the Committees on the Interior and Insular Affairs in the Senate and the House of Representatives within 1 year after completion of the final feasibility plan. Along with the feasibility study and report on any project proposal, the Secretary must also submit the results of all studies he has made for accomplishing the project objectives in total or in part. The date of completion of the final feasibility plan for a project is considered to be the date when the Secretary approves the feasibility report.

The studies and information on the project proposal and on the alternatives are expected to supply sufficient information for the committees in the Congress to make intelligent and informed decisions with respect to the project plan to be authorized. In respect to both the project proposal and the alternatives, the Secretary must furnish to the committees all the detailed information developed during the studies.

The conference committee agreed to retain this section in the legislation but adopted minor language changes to make it clear that the language of this section is not intended to require the Secretary or the Bureau of Reclamation to study project alternatives in more detail than is required under present policies and procedures. In other words, the language of this section is not intended to be the basis for increasing the cost of project investigations. On the other hand, the language is intended to require the Secretary of the Interior to furnish the committees all of the information which is developed in connection with project investigations, including information on all of the alternatives studied, in order that the committees and the Congress may judge whether, considering all relevant factors, the best plan of development has been recommended.

FEASIBILITY STUDIES WITH DONATED FUNDS

Section 5 of the House amendment was a provision authorizing the Secretary to conduct feasibility studies on any project proposals when and to the extent that the costs of such studies are advanced by non-Federal sources. The purpose of this provision was to encourage financial participation by States and local interests in these investigations. The language in the Senate-passed bill (sec. 4) permitted feasibility studies to be accelerated with funds advanced by non-Federal sources, but provided that such studies could not be initiated without specific congressional authorization. The conference committee, agreeing that all feasibility investigations should be specifically authorized, even though conducted with donated funds, adopted the Senate language.

AMENDMENT TO THE GRAND COULEE DAM ACT

The Senate-passed bill included a new section (not in the House amendment) which amended the authorizing act of the third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam (sec. 6 of the conference report). That act establishes a form of basin account for the Pacific Northwest and provides for financial assistance from the Federal Columbia River power system to reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest that are hereafter authorized.

The purpose of the proposed amendment to the Grand Coulee Dam Act is to specify the conditions under which such financial assistance may be given and to place a limitation upon the amount of such assistance. The language of a new subsection 2(b) provides that reclamation projects hereafter authorized in the Pacific Northwest must be scheduled in such a manner that the required financial assistance for those projects, together with financial assistance for previously authorized projects, will not cause increases in the power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration. With respect to the limitation on the total amount of assistance to irrigation for both existing and new proj-

ects, such amount cannot exceed an average of \$30 million annually in any period of 20 consecutive years. The financial assistance must come from "net revenues" as defined in the language of this new subsection.

The language of a new subsection 2(c) provides for a periodic review by the Secretary of the Interior of the adequacy of the amount authorized for irrigation assistance and recommendation by the Secretary to the Congress for any changes that may be needed in the limitation on irrigation assistance.

The conference committee has made certain editorial changes in the language of the new subsection 2(b) of the amendment to the Grand Coulee Dam Act as included in the Senate-passed bill, and it also has revised the second sentence of that new subsection to read:

"It is further declared to be the policy of the Congress that the total assistance to all irrigation projects, both existing and future, in the Pacific Northwest shall not average more than \$30,000,000 annually in any period of twenty consecutive years."

The remainder of the second sentence has been stricken as unnecessary since it states the expected results of procedures presently followed. It is not the conference committee's intention to change the Federal Columbia River power system repayment policies and procedures adopted by the Secretary of the Interior in April 1963 and set forth in the hearings on H.R. 7406 before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, September 9 and 10, 1965.

Nothing in this new subsection 2(b) is intended to expand or to limit present Bonneville Power Administration authority to purchase or exchange power.

The conference committee approved, without change, the language of the new subsection 2(c) of the proposed amendment to the Grand Coulee Dam Act.

The amendment to the Grand Coulee Dam Act set out in section 6 of the conference report is not concurred in by Mr. SAYLOR and his signature on the conference report and on this statement of the House conferees indicates his approval only of the remainder of the legislation.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
CRAIG HOSMER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which we bring back to the House today is on legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations under reclamation law on specifically identified potential water resource development projects. For all practical purposes, this legislation covers the entire feasibility investigations program of the Bureau of Reclamation. It is necessary because of a provision which the Congress placed in the Federal Water Project Recreation Act which was enacted last year. That provision requires that hereafter all feasibility studies conducted under reclamation law must be specifically authorized. Heretofore, the Secretary has had general authority to investigate and report on reclamation projects.

As passed by the House on July 18, 1966, this legislation included authority to complete feasibility studies on 144 projects of which 31 investigations would be new planning starts. With respect to the ongoing investigations program, the

conference committee added one investigation not in the House-passed bill and deleted one project investigation that was in the House-passed bill. With respect to the new planning starts, the conference committee included three project investigations not in the House-passed bill and deleted seven project investigations that were in the House-passed bill. These actions by the conference committee were based upon careful examination of the status of planning on the affected projects.

The conference committee retained the House-approved provision which provides a time limit on the submission to Congress of feasibility reports after completion and requires the Secretary to furnish the legislative committees all of the information which is developed in connection with project investigations, including information on all of the alternatives studied, in order that the committees and the Congress may judge whether, considering all relevant factors, the best plan of development has been recommended.

The House-passed bill would have permitted feasibility studies on projects when the funds for such studies were advanced by non-Federal sources. The conference committee agreed upon the language in the Senate-passed bill which permits feasibility studies to be accelerated with donated funds, but such studies cannot be initiated without specific congressional authorization.

There was one new provision in the Senate-passed bill which was not in the bill considered by the House. This is a provision which amends the authorizing act of the third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam. This provision was accepted by the conference committee with certain language changes.

The Grand Coulee Dam Act establishes a form of basin account for the Pacific Northwest and provides for financial assistance from the Federal Columbia River power system to reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest that are hereafter authorized. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to specify the conditions under which such financial assistance may be given and to place a limitation upon the amount. As adopted by the conference committee, the language provides that the financial assistance for reclamation projects, both existing, and future, will not cause increases in power rates of the Bonneville Power Administration, and it limits the amount of such assistance to an average of \$30 million annually in any period of 20 consecutive years. The conference committee determined that this amount would be adequate to meet the foreseeable needs for such assistance in the Northwest. The new language includes provisions for a periodic review of the adequacy of this amount authorized for irrigation assistance and for recommendation by the Secretary of any changes that may be needed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report on S. 3034.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the language of the conference report is perhaps better written than that which was discarded. I concur with the gentleman's approval of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

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

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 935 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 935

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. 15963) to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, those who listened to the reading of the rule will know that it provides for an open rule, that it waives points of order, and provides 4 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15963, a bill to establish a Department of Transportation.

I suppose that all Members know that there has been some controversy over the bill itself, the Department of Transportation bill, but nobody has sought time from me on this side, so I will assume that there is little controversy on the rule, and reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding.

I am sure he knows I want to ask my usual question: Why is there a waiver of points of order? Was it asked for by the chairman, or did the committee in its wisdom put it in?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I will reply to the gentleman from Missouri by saying that it was requested by the gentleman from California, the manager handling the bill. This consolidates in one Department a number of other agencies and functions which are transferred to the Department. Naturally, the

funds are too. So for all practical purposes there are a number of reappropriations in the bill. The only way they can be protected would be by having a waiver of points of order. I believe the Committee on Rules agreed with that unanimously. That is the reason the rule so provides.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, putting it into a nutshell, it makes germane appropriation changes within an authorization bill submitted by a legislative committee.

Mr. BOLLING. It makes in order those appropriations.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, House Resolution 935 does make in order consideration of H.R. 15963, the Department of Transportation bill, with 4 hours of debate under an open rule, except that points of order are waived. It does provide for transfer of funds, and it is necessary to waive points of order for that reason.

The purpose of the bill is to establish a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation, bringing together a number of Federal agencies and activities involving transportation promotion and safety, but not the economic regulation, which will remain with the appropriate regulatory agencies currently performing that job.

It is estimated that the new Department will employ 100,000 people and spend some \$6 billion in Federal funds presently expended annually on transportation.

There is no need to dwell on the tremendous population growth and movement which has occurred in the past 20 years, and will explode even more dramatically in the next 20 years. A few figures will suffice to state the case: by 1975 about 120 million vehicles may be on American roads; domestic airline traffic may double by 1975; by 1975 intercity ton-miles of cargo and intercity passenger miles may reach 2,440 billion and 1,464 billion respectively, increases of 65 percent over current figures. It is clear that our transportation system will be greatly taxed to provide demanded service, demands which must be met.

A number of agencies, and some functions of other agencies will be transferred to the new Department. Chief among these are: First, the office of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, along with its staff and programs; second, the Bureau of Public Roads and the Federal highway program it administers; third, the Federal Aviation Agency, with its functions in safety, development, and subsidy programs; fourth, the Coast Guard with its activities relating to transportation and marine safety; fifth, the Maritime Administration with its construction and operating subsidy programs; sixth, the functions of the CAB to determine probable causes of aircraft accidents and its appellate functions related to safety certificates and licenses are transferred to

the National Transportation Safety Board created by the bill. The CAB's function in accident investigation are transferred to the Secretary of the Department of Transportation and will be delegated to the Office of Accident Investigation, also created by the bill; seventh, the safety functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, primarily the inspection and enforcement of safety regulations for railroads, motor carriers and pipelines.

In addition to the transfer of these agency functions to the proposed Department, other chief features of the bill include:

First, the exclusion of the transportation resources of the DOD from the new Department. Nor will the administration of the Panama Canal come into the Department—it will remain with the Army.

Second, there is created a National Transportation Safety Board within the Department. Its purpose is to determine and report the cause or probable cause of transportation accidents, and to review on appeal the orders of the Secretary in amending, suspending, or revoking any certificate or license issued by the Secretary. It is authorized to conduct studies relating to safety. The Board will be comprised of five members, appointed by the President with Senate confirmation. It will have its own budget and staff, but be within the Department.

Third, an Office of Accident Investigation is created in the Department to investigate aircraft accidents, independent of the FAA—transferred into the new Department—and using the former CAB investigative personnel.

The Secretary of Transportation is given the authority to set standards and criteria to be used in determining where Federal funds will be invested in transportation facilities or equipment. Currently this authority is diffused among several agencies, each concerned with a particular area in which it has expertise. The Water Resources Council's area of authority is exempted from this section; all others are included. The bill provides that the Secretary cannot promulgate standards or criteria contrary to existing law.

A number of additional views are presented. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] supports the bill but wants a stronger attack on transportation noise, particularly with respect to aircraft.

Members DWYER, REID of New York, HORTON, RUMSFELD, ERLBORN, and WYDLER support the bill. They point to facts and projections indicating current and rising problems, and believe that Federal coordination is indicated. They do feel that in several areas the proposed Department is not adequate to its projected role, particularly in removing economic regulation from its authority. Mass transportation is also left out. They point out that for all the talk of an independent safety board, it is not so in fact; its appropriations will be controlled by the Department, and it has no authority to conduct its own accident investigations. It independently will only

determine probable cause. These Members also believe that air accident investigations should remain with CAB, or be transferred to the Safety Board rather than to the Office of Accident Investigation to maintain fuller independence from other aircraft controls transferred into the Department.

Finally, these Members question section 7 of the bill which provides for the Secretary of Transportation to set standards and criteria for the investment of Federal funds on transportation facilities and equipment.

Members CALLAWAY and DOLE oppose the bill as reported, though they believe the concept to be sound. They cite the present lack of coordination among the present modes of transportation, but they believe the Department will not solve the problems, because authority is fractured, some taken into the Department, some not.

They do not believe that the problems of our merchant marine will be solved by moving the Maritime Administration from Commerce to Transportation; what is needed is for the executive to see the problem and follow the urging of Congress to request appropriations.

They point to the current success of the aviation industry under its present CAB, FAA control and see no reason to change, pointing to the problems of the railroads operating under ICC control.

They believe that safety and accident investigation and prevention, particularly with respect to airlines will suffer under the bill as independence is lost, and one Department will, in effect, be investigating its own safety regulations. They note that the National Transportation Safety Board does not even have authority to conduct investigations, but merely determining probable cause; it is the Secretary who is actually charged with responsibility to conduct the investigations.

They strongly oppose section 7, on much the same basis as do other members, that is, too vague a grant of power to the Secretary, with the clear possibility that he may, by the use of Federal funds, indirectly set Government policy in transportation.

Members BROWN and DICKINSON oppose the bill on these four points: First, section 7 abrogates congressional control of Federal investment in the fields of transportation; second, most modes of transportation have prospered without Federal coordination; third, urban mass transport is not even included in the bill; fourth, the independence of accident investigation is destroyed with the bill which will provide that the Department investigate itself—a very unlikely situation. They do believe a bill could be prepared to remove these problems and be a positive good for the industry.

Mr. EDWARDS, recently appointed to the committee, and a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, confines his views to the merchant marine problems. He points to our falling tonnage, our old ships, and our growing needs. Merely moving the agency to a new department is not the solution. Money for ships, which the

administration has continually refused, is the answer.

I believe our big problem today, as I understand it, will be on the merchant marine situation. There may be other amendments offered, but at the time the Committee on Rules heard this particular bill, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was considering a bill related to this. They have had this problem for a long period of time, as to the future of the merchant marine. Many of the members who testified, from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, stated that in their opinions the Maritime Administration has been more or less a stepchild within the Department of Commerce for many years, and that we are far behind on needed ships, possibly 100 ships or more. They requested that we try to hold up a rule on this bill until they could finish their hearings, and possibly make their bill, as they reported it, the one in order.

That did not seem to be what we could do at that time, because there was not any bill before us, so a rule was granted.

Subsequent thereto, a rule also was granted on H.R. 11696, which will remove the Maritime Administration from this particular bill and set it up as a separate agency. That will present some problems here today, Mr. Speaker.

As I understand it, the proponents of that position—which I personally support—will make a motion or offer an amendment to strike that part from this bill which deals with the Maritime Administration, so that subsequently that can be considered in a separate bill. I know that those who are completely in support of this bill will not agree with me, but some feel if it is not done at this particular time we may never get an opportunity to do it later on.

I want to bring that to the attention of the House, because this is where the tough vote is going to come today.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman anticipate that with the passage of this bill there would be an abolishment of existing agencies of one kind and another, or would they still exist?

Mr. SMITH of California. The agencies which are in existence, as I understand it, going right down the line—the Bureau of Public Roads, the highway program, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Coast Guard, the Maritime Administration, and so forth—all would be transferred into this new Department of Transportation, at the Secretary level.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, that is just the trouble. I went through the business of establishing the Defense Department. We were told by any number of Members of the House at that time—some of whom are still here—of the economy which would be obtained through the creation of the Defense Department. None of the various departments which existed previously was abolished. All were simply brought in, lock, stock and barrel, and on top was a layer of "fat" created, known as the Department of Defense.

We were supposed to have common catalog purchasing and free exchange of information, but nothing happened. Today we do not have a common purchasing catalog worthy of the name in the Department of Defense. Recently—only a few weeks ago, I believe—they needed certain calibers of ammunition in Vietnam. Instead of picking up the telephone and calling the other departments that use ammunition, such as the Navy and the Marine Corps, no one bothered to do that, but instead they went out and ordered it, when there was surplus to the use of the Marine Corps millions of dollars worth of this ammunition. It is incredible that a situation like that can exist in the Department of Defense, but we got nothing except an added layer of fat in the Department of Defense plus a huge payroll. If this is what we are out to do here, I want no part of it.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I will say in reply to the gentleman that I really do not see the connection between what I read in the report and the testimony here. I do not think we are trying to do away with any of these departments.

Mr. GROSS. Why not do away with them if you are putting it all in one Department?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am trying to answer the gentleman's question as long as he brought it in on this particular bill, if he will just let me do so.

The report shows that there is a tremendous population growth and that this growth will continue. Probably in the next 20 years we may have a tremendously larger number of people and vehicles. The report and the testimony show that the argument is in order to handle this large growth we should have a Department of Transportation with a Secretary who can run it. I see nothing there about doing away with any agencies or any savings, and I do not think there will be any savings.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that there should be abolished some of the agencies presently existing? If an argument for the creation of this brandnew Department of the Government is to provide for more efficiency, with less overlapping and so on and so forth, then why should not some of these agencies presently existing be abolished?

Mr. SMITH of California. I cannot answer the gentleman.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. There is a subtlety involved in this particular piece of legislation in that the responsibilities, duties, and powers of the FAA and the Bureau of Public Roads and a portion of the Interstate Commerce Commission are transferred, but those agencies as such are not going to be moved to the new Department of Transportation intact. The Secretary of the Department of Transportation under this legislation is given complete power to reorganize those agencies as he sees fit, so that the Bureau of Public Roads and the FAA will only be recognizable if

the Secretary of the Department of Transportation wants them to be recognizable.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I have no further requests for time and know of no objection to the rule.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. 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. 15963) to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15963, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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 California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself to 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15963 would establish a new Department of Transportation, making the 12th Department of Cabinet rank in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, it would bring together major Federal agencies and programs relating to transportation, promotion and safety, but not economic regulation which remains with the regulatory bodies.

Mr. Chairman, as the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union know, President Johnson sent his transportation message to the Congress on March 2, 1966, strongly recommending the creation of a Department of Transportation. His message highlighted the urgent contemporary problems which exist in the transportation field and emphasized the pressing need for a solution.

Mr. Chairman, in the year 1842 the great English poet, Tennyson, in his poem "Locksley Hall" said:

For I dipt into the future, far as human eye
could see,
Saw the Vision of the World, and all the
wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies
of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down
with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and
there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in
the central blue.

Mr. Chairman, that was in 1842. This is the year 1966. This present-day generation is called upon to look into the future.

Mr. Chairman, we have pending before us today a bill that seeks to set up an

organization, a Government organization, which will take care of the problems of transportation in the future.

Mr. Chairman, we have in this country 195 million people. It is estimated by Government students on population trends and growth that by the year 2000 we will have 362 million people. We will have to double our transportation facilities; yes, possibly treble them, because as we live in a more affluent society, there will be a constantly increasing trend of population and, therefore, the utilization of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to move the goods, the manufactured goods, the food, the products of the field and factory from place to place within the United States and throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, our transportation system has grown up helter-skelter, without any plan for coordination, without any plan as to efficiency of operation.

Mr. Chairman, some of our transportation modes have become obsolete, others have forged ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to analyze this bill which is pending before us today. I have placed in the RECORD of August 22, 1966, which is under the seats of the Members, an analysis of the bill. That analysis begins on page 20129. Therefore, I am not going to drone on for 25 or 30 minutes upon the analysis of this bill.

The 4 hours of debate in my opinion will give us an adequate time to consider the different sections of the bill.

I want you to know that this new Department will rank fifth among the 12 Cabinet-level Departments in Federal funding—fifth. It will rank fourth in employment used by transportation services, 14 percent of the Nation's work force.

So we are talking about a not unimportant Department, but we are talking about the fourth and fifth among our most important Departments in our 12 Departments of Government when this is established.

We are talking in terms of gross national product of about 14 percent of our gross national product of 700-some-odd billion dollars. That is what we are talking about.

We are following out the principle of the Hoover Commission. I was a member of the second Hoover Commission and I handled some 50-odd reorganization bills as chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization during those years.

We are talking about in this instance the bringing together in one new Cabinet-level Department the major scattered instruments of transportation located throughout the Government.

If you will look at the chart to my right, you will see the modes of transportation on the bottom line.

We are setting up a Federal Railroad Administration.

We are setting up a Federal Highway Administration.

Those are the two basic transportation modes at the present time in terms of tonnage and people.

We are transferring over into this Department a Federal Maritime Administration which has gone through a

number of changes. In 1950 I handled the Reorganization Plan No. 21. It has had another Reorganization Plan No. 7 in 1961. It has been an independent agency. It is now in the Department of Commerce. It is in a subordinate position in the Department of Commerce because the Department of Commerce is concerned with many subjects, many fields of jurisdictional duty and implementation. But in this Department there will only be one objective, there will only be one subject matter. That subject matter will be the one problem, the great problem of transportation.

So in moving the Maritime Administration from its present subordinate position in a department with many unrelated subject matters, we are upgrading it by putting in a department with only one interest, the interest of transportation. We are putting it on the same level as aviation. The same level as railroads. The same level as highway administration.

To those Members who have had a chance to read my remarks, they will find reference to subsidies. I think if they will read the latter part of my remarks they will find that I said that since World War II the Federal Government has funded to the tune of about \$3 billion maritime transportation. But they will also find that I refer to other subsidies to other transportation modes far greater than the maritime subsidies.

I say that he who wants to point the finger of charging subsidies to the Maritime Administration should look also to the subsidies we have given to the railroads in free right-of-ways in the early days, in giving them every other section of land—land containing in many instances mines, coal fields, and oil fields. We have given the railroads attractive tariff rates through our regulatory bodies.

I would not know how to compute the hundreds of millions and possibly billions of dollars that we have used to subsidize the railroads.

Let us get to the Federal highway system. We have a program now which this Congress is supporting of approximately \$50 billion over the period of the next 10 years to finance the highways for the benefit of the private automobile owners and for the benefit of the huge commercial trucking industry.

Let us consider, then, that in the present program of highway financing we have about a \$50 billion cost tag.

Let us move to aviation—

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. I hope I misunderstood the gentleman when he said that we were subsidizing the highway construction industry.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will complete that thought for the gentleman. Of course, we have taxes that pay back into the fund. We have taxes that pay back into all the different modes of transportation. But in the obligation of Federal funds at low-interest rates for these programs there is an element of subsidy. Now, I am not fighting the subsidies.

Mr. FALLON. There is no subsidy in the highway construction program. There is no borrowing of money. We have the use taxes to build these highways; so the people who use them are paying for them now and even highways that have not yet been built. They are already paid for. But there is no subsidy on the part of the Federal Government because the people are paying their way in this field.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman wants to say that the taxes that the people are paying in for these highways is not a public subsidy, that is all right with me. I will not argue the point.

Mr. FALLON. A public subsidy but not a Federal subsidy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am talking about subsidies. The same thing is true of your airplane tickets. You pay a tax on the airplane tickets you buy, and that goes back into the operation of the FAA. The expenses of that Agency are running about \$750 million a year and about \$200 million is being paid back in the form of taxes raised in various ways. But with Federal funds we are building airways and airports, and we are operating with about 40,000 people the aviation facilities in our towers, our weather bureaus, and other facilities that contribute directly to that industry.

So I am not using the term "subsidy" to run down the Maritime Administration. I want that to be made very clear. I am trying to put it in perspective because some people say that we should not have a Maritime Administration, and I do not say that, as anyone can see in my remarks. I say that we should have.

Now, there will be a move made to strike out the Maritime Administration from this bill, I am told. No one can foresee the future. If this occurs, I want the Members of this House to think about it very seriously. Will they obtain a dynamic, viable maritime program by withdrawing themselves from the mainstream of transportation attention, and getting off to one side and playing solitaire in the backroom, or if they allow themselves to be put into this Department of Transportation—and that is where the chips are—they might be able to sit in and get a few more chips from that game.

This is a matter of judgment for the House. I am not going to complain with anyone as to how they vote on this issue. I am not going to bleed on this subject. If after considering the arguments that will be put forth the majority of the Members want to vote to strike it out, that is within their power, and as the servant of the House, of course, I will abide by the result.

Needless to say, I will oppose the effort because I honestly and sincerely believe that the time has come when we need research and development in every form of transportation—yes, paid for with Government funds. I am not against that, because it is for the benefit of the people of this Nation to move their bodies and to move their goods. But I am going to ask the Members of this House to consider whether they believe they will get more attention with a Secretary of Cabinet-level rank to plead

their case before the various committees of Congress and the President or would they get more attention with a low-level administrator of a relatively small independent agency.

That is the problem we have to face. I know the pressures we have been under. I have had a little of it myself. I have some big ports in California handling about 75 million tons out of those ports. I believe Los Angeles ranks maybe third or fourth within the Nation. It is within 8 miles of the edge of my district. But we stand in the light of history. We have to make the decision as to what is best for this Nation in terms of the overwhelming problems that we are going to face tomorrow.

In the July Fortune magazine, there is a great and interesting article on transportation, with a picture of a modern train. The article states that we can have right now, with the technology we have, 125-mile-an-hour trains. It tells a lot of things. It tells how we can move, on a highway that costs \$6 million a mile, 7,500 people an hour, and how we can move on a high-speed train 45,000 people per hour.

It tells a lot of things—things that need to be done, things that the Secretary of this Department is charged with considering under the purpose of the bill, which is to develop an overall national policy of transportation. Get the declaration of purpose of the bill and read it.

It is up to the Secretary to do research and develop an improved, safe, efficient national policy and to come to the Congress with recommendations.

Here I want to make a final, and I believe important, point. When H.R. 13200 was brought up to our Committee on Government Operations I looked at the bill, which was sent up by the administration, and I said "This bill is not a good bill. It cannot be passed in the House of Representatives, and it should not be passed as it is." My committee worked hard. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLBORN], and others on his staff and on my staff worked hard. We rewrote the bill, and we bring it for consideration of the Members as a rewritten, clean bill.

What were the principles we worked under? We worked under these principles. We proposed to transfer over into this department the four modes of transportation, but we are going to respect the statutory responsibilities and duties which have already been enacted by the Congress.

We are going to respect the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We are not going to allow in this bill changes in statutory duties and responsibilities which they have enacted in that committee.

We did the same thing on Public Works. We said that the new Department Secretary cannot touch the highway fund. If anyone wants to touch the highway fund, the Secretary will have to go before the gentleman from Maryland's [Mr. FALLON] committee, and tell him why he wants to touch it. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and his committee can then work on that problem, and they can approve it

or disapprove it, and refer whatever they want to do to the Congress, because it has to be done from a statutory standpoint.

We did the same thing in the merchant marine field. We said that we cannot change the functions which pertain to the Merchant Marine Committee without going to the Merchant Marine Committee.

We did this with the Post Office and Civil Service. My staff conferred with the staff of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and we worked out a number of places where the bill would have changed laws pertaining to the classification and hiring of personnel.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] will offer a final amendment. We have made changes at his suggestion, and the suggestion of his staff, and we worked out even as late as today a final amendment which will make sure that the dual compensation law, which is a prerogative of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, will be followed in this bill.

So we have said in this bill that we are not going to encroach upon the powers of the President, and we are not going to let the President encroach upon the powers of the Congress. We are going to keep it as it is, and if they want to change the statutory responsibilities which have been enacted over the years, let them go to the respective committees and get them changed.

Could anything be more fair than that?

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from California, the manager of this bill, not only upon the statement he is making but also upon the long, long weeks of painful, arduous, and careful study he has devoted to this problem. There has been careful, painful, arduous study devoted by the committee, and specifically by the manager of the bill, to a detailed analysis and study of each one of the functions proposed to be encompassed in this new Department.

I am convinced that to the extent it has been humanly possible for the legislative mind and craftsmanship so to devise the gentleman from California, through his leadership, and his committee which met and studied this with him, have carefully preserved the integrity of each of the functions, so that no function benefits at the expense of another and so that no function of transportation is unduly harmed.

I believe he has preserved a balance of powers which had existed in the statutes between the executive and legislative branches. I know he has been extremely careful to preserve the integrity of the Congress. He has given to the administration no power it did not already possess, and has taken from the administration no power it possessed. He has taken from no committee any right or jurisdiction it possessed, and he has given to no other committee a right or power that would act to the detriment

of any other committee of the House. Above all, he has preserved inviolate the integrity of the Congress and its right to review in the same manner it has reviewed in the past each of these various programs.

I should like for the House to realize the long, hard, careful hours of detailed study and analysis that went into the preservation of this careful and delicate balance which the gentleman from California has brought to us today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. The gentleman knows that we worked with the gentleman from Texas, with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], and the staff of the Public Works Committee to very carefully take everything out of the original bill that interfered in any way with his committee. Our committee has worked hard and done a good job. It is up to the Membership of the House whether we are to move forward into the future or to look back toward the past.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Last week we passed two bills having to do with auto safety. It is my understanding that this new Department will have jurisdiction over traffic safety in its general sense; is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It would be my thought that when the Highway Administration is set up, all existing statutes on that point—and I believe the bills were drawn with at least the knowledge in mind that this legislation was in process—would go into this, and all these elements of safety on our automotive transportation system would be placed in this Department.

That would be at the lower level, at the operating everyday level. It would probably be in the same hands it is now in.

In the field of the National Transportation Safety Board, which is a planning and recommending field, they would look at highway, railroad, aviation, and shipping problems with the idea in mind of suggesting improvements but not implementing them. They would have to come to the Congress if they wished to do anything other than the statutes on those subjects which we have already enacted provided.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I appreciate that. In respect to the two bills we passed last week, one established within the Department of Commerce a safety advisory board or commission. I do not have the correct wording in front of me, but it is a committee to advise the Secretary. The other bill, which came from the Committee on Public Works, established a similar type of board, only to be appointed by the President subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

These are two conflicting committees or boards, in my opinion. Would this legislation perhaps draw those together, so that there would not be a conflict of the two boards?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would think it would. Of course, we cannot in legislating for the future try to correct, and

I tried not to correct, statutory provisions whether they were in harmony or in conflict. This would be part of the job of the Secretary of Transportation, that is, he should come before the proper committees and first work out a solution if there is a conflict and then come before the jurisdictional legislative committees for such changes as might be necessary that he might need over and above the existing statutory provisions given to him by simple transfer.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is undeniable that it is a historic occasion when we consider the creation of a new executive-level department. As has been pointed out by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], this would be the 12th such executive Cabinet Department, if this bill is successful and the Department of Transportation is created. It is also interesting to note that several of the existing Departments were created in this century, one of them just last year, in this particular 89th Congress. Last year when we considered the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development I took the floor to oppose that bill. Presently in our subcommittee we are considering the creation of a Department of Consumers, and I oppose that bill. However, I take the floor today in support of the creation of the Department of Transportation. Now, there has to be some reason to take this divergent view in opposing the creation of two Departments and supporting the creation of a third. I think it is important that we know we must have some pragmatic test against which to test the proposal to create a new Cabinet-level department. I think that test should be, Is there a sufficient body of Federal law, and is there a sufficient amount of Federal activity in this field to warrant the organizational structure to be developed for this particular activity? Now, the Department of HUD, as we pointed out last year, did nothing but take the Housing and Home Finance Agency and raise this to Cabinet level. It did not, as the sponsors so often said, bring together diverse activities of the Federal Government and put them under one roof so that we would have a better administration of our Federal laws. The same is true of the proposed Department of Consumers. It does not bring diverse Federal activities together and put them under one roof for proper administrative purposes. Here in this proposal, though, to create a Department of Transportation, we do meet the test of bringing together diverse Federal activities in the field of transportation, and we put them together in one Cabinet-level Department so that we can have the proper administration of these interrelated and presently fragmented Federal activities relating to the transportation industry. Just as one example of the fact that there is a sufficient level of Federal activity in this field is the fact that the proposed Department would have immediately, just from the agencies now existing which it would bring into the Department, 100,000 employees and

an annual budget in the various activities of some \$6 billion. I think this alone is ample evidence of the fact that there are sufficient Federal activities and Federal programs in the field of transportation so that they should be coordinated.

Now, some of the background as to the importance of transportation itself. At the present time some 20 percent of our gross national product each year consists of outlays for transportation services. At the present time we have a population of some 200 million people, and by the end of this century it is anticipated that population may be doubled, which will increase at least twofold the demands for the movement of goods and people.

Mr. Chairman, in 1946 there were 1.5 million miles of paved roads in this country. Today there are 3.25 million miles of paved roads and we have not as yet satisfied the demand.

Mr. Chairman, over the past century we have seen the evolution of the railroad industry from a transportation monopoly which needed to be closely regulated so that the public interest could be protected. It is a business that is in great difficulty because it is in keen competition with other modes of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, in this century we have seen the invention of the airplane, we have seen the instigation of air travel, we have seen the progress through a Federal subsidy, to the point where now no major air carrier is any longer in need of subsidy, but in fact they are very healthy and in some cases wealthy enterprises.

So, Mr. Chairman, there has been a tremendous increase in the demand for transportation, a tremendous increase in Federal involvement in the field of transportation in the last 50 or 60 years.

A Department of Transportation was first proposed in the late 1800's. Today, I believe, we have reached the time in history when the creation of a Department of Transportation, if it is not overdue, is certainly due.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at a few of these things which have brought this picture into focus and which have caused a proliferation of agencies and commissions that have been created and which have attempted to put the imprint of the Federal Government upon the field of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, we have the Civil Aeronautics Board, we have the Federal Aviation Administration, we have the Interstate Commerce Commission, we have the Bureau of Public Roads, we have the Maritime Administration and the Maritime Commission, we have the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. This is just to name a few.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this particular bill will not bring together all Federal activities in the field of transportation. I do not want anyone to be misled into thinking that this is a cure-all; and probably it is not.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the interest of the Federal Government in transportation we find that it has a twofold aspect. First of all is economic regulation and this function is served by

independent commissions primarily such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and like commissions; the Federal Maritime Commission, for instance, and designedly, these commissions were created as independent commissions and not as a part of the role or normal operation of the executive branch of our Government, because they exercise economic regulation, they exercise a quasi-legislative, a quasi-judicial function.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government's activity having to do with planning, research, promotion, safety regulations, and noneconomic regulations, is within the normal operations of the executive branch of the Government, agencies, and Cabinet-level departments. A part of this is lodged in the Department of Commerce and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, we do not propose in this bill to affect the economic regulatory functions of the independent commissions, and I do not believe we should ever do so. I do not believe we should give to any administration, whether it be Democrat or Republican, the power to set, through the executive branch of our Government, the policy for economic regulation. Therefore, properly, the Interstate Commerce Commission in its economic regulatory functions is left out of the bill, the Federal Maritime Commission is left out of the bill, and the regulatory functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board are left out of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings on this bill were extensive and lasted over a period of several months.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] for his patience in hearing all of these witnesses and in scheduling the hearings day after day. Many pages of hearings were filled with the testimony of the people who would be affected, the people representing the various modes of transportation who would be affected by the creation of this bill.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for those remarks and I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Illinois who is one of the hardest working Congressmen I have worked with. We have worked together in the committee. In many instances we came to agreement. He made many valuable suggestions. There were a few areas in which we did not agree but we did not disagree disagreeably, as the gentleman will tell you.

I want to pay tribute to the gentleman and his colleagues on his side, but particularly the gentleman who was there every minute of the hearings and worked just as hard as any of the Members of this House.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of the hearings, I discovered—and the other members of the committee discovered that generally speaking the representatives of industry and labor alike in the field of

transportation did support the concept of the creation of a Department of Transportation.

I think the original testimony developed from the representatives of the various modes of transportation—the airlines, the highway truckers and the railroad industry, had a rather similar ring to it. That was that they did like the concept of a Department of Transportation, but—and then usually they would have some exceptions that would almost in effect have taken them out of the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I think the action of the subcommittee in amending the bill in providing for separate administrations to represent the modal interests, satisfied most of the demands of industry for amendments to the bill to see that their interests were separately represented by the Maritime Administration, the Highway Administration, the Aviation Administration and so on.

One of the sections which came under the most criticism was section 7. Some amendment was made to section 7. Some of those who opposed section 7 were appeased when exceptions were added to this section to make the particular activities they were interested in exempted from the Secretary's control to establish standards and criteria, so some people were satisfied with those amendments.

The committee also improved the bill by beefing up the powers of the National Transportation Safety Board.

In the administration bill when first introduced, this was nothing more than a hollow shell. So these improvements were made. But I do not want to leave the impression with anyone that I think the bill is as yet perfect. Although I support the bill, I think there are some serious defects.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have had correspondence with a number of people, because of my interest in aviation in regard to the desirability of leaving the Federal Aviation Agency out of the so-called Department of Transportation.

I wonder if the gentleman could advise the Committee, and myself in particular, as to the reasons for the action in rejecting this request. I understand the request was made that the Federal Aviation Agency remain as an independent Agency but it was included for reasons that you apparently have decided to be in the best interests of anyone.

I wonder if the gentleman could elaborate on this for the purpose of the RECORD?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I would be happy to.

Mr. Chairman, in the field of Federal activity in the aviation industry, it may be somewhat unique in that we have two separate agencies—the FAA and the CAB, both of them quasi-independent agencies, presidentially appointed and confirmed by the Senate.

The FAA has as its principal function the regulation of air traffic, the opera-

tion of air traffic controls. The CAB has as its principal function the economic regulation of the air transportation industry.

The rationale in putting the FAA into this Department is that in these non-economic regulatory functions, such as the promotion of the industry and the conduct and control of the airways, this properly belonged in the executive branch of the Government in this new Department.

But the economic regulatory functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board did not belong in a new Department but should remain an independent Board such as the ICC is for the railway industry.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. You do not feel that their function will be diminished by, as someone has described it, being swallowed up in this overall Department and therefore will not be able to be responsive to the changing needs in the aviation fields?

Mr. ERLENBORN. No, I do not think they will. I think they are properly in this new Department, which will have an overall view of transportation.

I should mention one other thing. Though we are not transferring the CAB into this Department, we are taking the safety function of the CAB, the accident-investigating function. We are placing it in the new Department. This is one of the defects in the bill. Only a few short years ago this Congress, in its wisdom, separated the accident-investigating function and put it in the CAB and made it separate from the function of the FAA in conducting traffic in the airways, so that we now have the CAB as an independent body, including the investigating activities of the FAA.

This bill as it now stands would merge these two functions and would put us back to where we were 10 years ago, and we would have the anomaly of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation having the accident-investigating function and, on the other hand, having the FAA activity, so that in effect he would be investigating himself. This is one of the amendments I hope will be adopted to separate out this function. I will offer such an amendment.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. I think it should be made clear that only the functions, duties, and responsibilities of the FAA are transferred to the Department of Transportation, but FAA is not transferred not as an organizational entity into the new Department. In other words, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation would have the opportunity to set up any kind of organization he wants under the new Federal Aviation Administration.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Then you are satisfied that the function of the FAA will not be jeopardized in any way?

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. I am satisfied that the function of the FAA will

be moved into the new Department. I am not satisfied that it will not be jeopardized.

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

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

Mr. McCLORY. I commend the gentleman for his expert exposition of this legislation. I also wish to congratulate the gentleman from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Illinois on producing this important legislation. I happen to come, as does the gentleman in the well, from a metropolitan area, northeastern Illinois. I am particularly interested in the subject of urban mass transportation. I would like to inquire as to whether or not this subject is included within this legislation, and whether the function of promoting and improving urban mass transportation is going to come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am happy the gentleman asked that question because it brings me to the closing part of my remarks. This is again one of the defects that is presently in the bill under consideration, even though, as I have said, the subcommittee did a fine job in other areas of the bill. But to answer the question specifically, the urban mass transportation program, which was established by legislation last year and placed in the Housing and Urban Development Department because at that time there was no Department of Transportation, under this bill would stay in the Housing and Urban Development Department.

If we have a real transportation crisis in America, it is in the cities and urban areas of the United States. If we are going to coordinate our transportation activities, and if this new Department of Transportation is to be meaningful whatsoever, we should have the urban mass transportation program under the Secretary of Transportation, and at the proper time I will offer an amendment for that purpose.

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

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

Mr. McCLORY. I am interested in the gentleman's comments and also in the subject of his proposed amendment because it does seem to me that the subject of our highways and the subject of urban mass transportation are so closely interrelated that they really belong in the same Department. I feel very strongly that the encouragement of urban mass transportation is the only answer to relieving our highways leading into our great metropolitan areas and within our metropolitan areas, and it would certainly be appropriate, in my opinion, to employ funds for highway purposes or to provide funds for the general purpose of providing highways and for relieving highways through the promotion of Department of Urban Mass Transportation facilities.

I am not suggesting that this is the full function of the Federal Government.

But I do feel the Department of Transportation is an appropriate Department of the Federal Government in which these functions should be carried out and directed, so that the metropolitan area itself can provide the maximum of highway facilities as well as urban transportation facilities for the large populations that reside in those areas.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I agree with him wholeheartedly.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

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

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, we are presently and we have been appropriating moneys for research in transportation and also high-speed ground transportation within the Department of Commerce. Is it true that this new agency of transportation would assume this responsibility, or would it remain within the Department of Commerce?

Mr. ERLENBORN. It will remain in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as I recall. I am not certain. Certainly the urban mass transportation stays in Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. SLACK. Perhaps the gentleman did not understand me. I was talking about transportation research.

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman is talking about the northeast corridor high-speed?

Mr. SLACK. No, the transportation research. Since 1962 we have appropriated \$7,625,000 in the area of transportation research. In addition to that we have appropriated \$18,250,000 for the high-speed ground transportation. These are both within the Department of Commerce at the present time. My question is: Would they be transferred to the new Department of Transportation?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Yes, I understand the gentleman's question. My understanding is that they will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say, as I understand it, the functions of the Department of Commerce relating to transportation are transferred to the new Department of Transportation.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to reaffirm what the gentleman has said, that the functions of transportation that are now in the Department of Commerce are transferred over into the Department of Transportation, in line with trying to put all transportation matters together.

The gentleman has correctly said we have not put urban mass transit in, and there will be some discussion of that matter. We have not put in the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and the Alaska Railroad. There are a few things that have been left out, but reasons will be given, both pro and con, on that later.

Mr. SLACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. In summation, there are defects in this bill, as I have stated. Let me point out what these are. In colloquy they have been developed to a certain extent.

The fact that the accident investigating function of the CAB is going to be merged in with the Secretary of FAA is a defect, in my opinion, and also in the opinion of people in the industry it is a defect. This function should be separated out. Accident investigation should not be undertaken by the Secretary, so that he will not be investigating himself.

Section 7, although it has been amended, is still very unacceptable. Section 7 gives the Secretary of the Department the right to establish standards and criteria.

There is an amendment in this bill offered by the majority, which was adopted, that would give the appearance of making this unobjectionable, because it says—and this is in section 4(e)—that the standards and criteria so established by the Secretary shall not conflict with standards and criteria established by the law. The fact is, there are few if any standards or criteria in the area of Federal investment in transportation. There are few if any legislative enactments relating to standards and criteria in the Federal transportation area.

This still gives the Secretary pretty much of a free hand to establish standards and criteria for transportation. It also would require that any other agency or department proposing an investment in transportation by the Federal Government would have to establish their plan according to the facts developed by the Secretary of Transportation, and conform their proposal to the standards and criteria established by the Secretary of Transportation.

It appears to me that in the original bill as introduced by the administration there was an attempt to take what is now the function of Congress and give this to the executive department.

Actually, this whole area is somewhat a gray area, part executive, part legislative, but there certainly was an attempt by the administration to swing the pendulum over to the executive and to give all the power to the executive department in establishing standards and criteria for water resource projects and all other transportation projects.

If this section remains in the bill, that pendulum will still be on the side of the executive, taking congressional prerogatives and giving them to the executive department.

At the proper time I shall offer a motion to strike section 7 from this bill. I do not believe we can improve this section. I do not believe the amendments adopted by the subcommittee and the committee have made much of an improvement to this section. I believe that the entire section 7 should be stricken from the bill. It has no real bearing on the other powers and functions of the Secretary of Transportation.

So the amendments will be offered at the proper time. I hope I will have the

support of the membership in improving the bill even beyond the point the subcommittee and the committee did in their deliberations.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to pay some tribute to the chairman of the committee and to the senior Republican and other members who worked with them on the Committee on Government Operations for doing what I believe is a splendid job in full accord with the highest traditions of this legislative body in protecting the statutes as they now exist, as passed by the Congress, and at the same time putting them into an agency where they can be administered fairly and constructively.

Mr. Chairman, throughout history, the degree of development of a national transportation system has been a determining factor in boosting or in limiting the heights of greatness to which nations have aspired. Today our network of roadways, railways, waterways and airways monitor the heartbeat of our Nation—restraining us when inadequate, beckoning to us when lying useless.

The United States can be proud of its vast and varied system of mobility. In no industry has the inventive genius of the American people been more pronounced. No nation in history has been so successful in drawing together the far-flung reaches of its geography into a cohesive unit, working together to create the standard of living we enjoy.

We are no longer in a period of infancy in the development of our transportation system. We are in a period of highly sophisticated and challenging growth. In this era of development of supersonic transports, giant aircraft, high-speed rail transportation, and interstate highways, we cannot ignore the need for unified effort in planning and constructing a well-balanced transportation system that will complement and aid the growth of our country in all respects. We cannot permit even the possibility of an antiquated, uncoordinated, wasteful transportation system that would stifle the progress of our country.

Today we are considering legislation to establish a department in the Government that will provide the framework within which a coordinated effort can be put forth. In the past, as a particular type of transportation has become an important influence in our economic structure, the Government has assumed its responsibility for encouraging, assisting, protecting, coordinating and sometimes regulating the industry so that it could best serve the needs of our country. Water transportation was undoubtedly the most prominent means of linking the colonies along the Atlantic seaboard together. Rail transportation conquered our western frontiers in the late 19th century. The automobile and the highway virtually revolutionized the way of life in every community in the country in the early 20th century. Now, air travel pulls us even closer together.

Presently we have a fragmentation of Government agencies dealing with the administration of the Government's in-

terest in transportation matters. The ICC watches over the railroads and motor carriers while the Federal Maritime Administration and the Coast Guard are responsible for water transportation and the FAA and the CAB share responsibilities in aviation. The Department of Commerce has various functions in the field of transportation, particularly with regard to automotive travel. Transportation safety is scattered all over the Federal Government.

This fragmentation is not conducive to the development of a well-rounded, coordinated system. It lends itself to duplication and waste and leaves large areas untouched. Our Government cannot deal haphazardly with an activity of such national importance. Every dollar must be invested wisely if we are to maintain a transportation system which complements and aids the other segments of our economy.

We can afford neither an over-expansion nor an underexpansion in any individual mode of transportation. The problem now is with mixing and balancing the various means of travel in proper proportion so that for any given need, we will have the most efficient and convenient method of travel available. Only with sufficient direction, coordination, and cooperation can we delineate the problems and achieve the optimum reward for the investments of both the Government and the private citizens of this country.

The Government invests billions of dollars each year in highway construction, aircraft research and development, air traffic control, ship construction, railroad inspections and other transportation activities. Certainly there should be an officer of Cabinet rank to oversee the various programs and policies which we here in Congress have enacted.

In the new Department, these programs will be continued, but will be carried on in an environment oriented toward a complete transportation system rather than one distinct and isolated segment of the system. The advantage of a coordinated effort is obvious when we recognize the interrelation of the several modes of transportation—airline passengers travel to and from the terminals over superhighways; freight is delivered to and taken from the wharves by rail. There is no logic in administering these interdependent segments of the transportation system in separate Government agencies. A departmental organization with cognizance over all administrative transportation functions will permit a comprehensive evaluation of our needs and problems and enable us to develop an overall policy to meet the demands of the future.

Our cities and industrial complexes continue to grow at fantastic rates. The demands upon our rural areas for agricultural products and natural resources to support them will grow at a similar rate. This expected growth will impose a crushing burden on our existing transportation facilities. No one has suggested that our transportation system will not expand, but the Government's participation and investment in this ex-

pansion will be most productive only if made in a systematic, coordinated, and well-planned manner. No new department has faced a greater challenge nor held more promise. We cannot risk failing to recognize and meet that challenge.

Mr. Chairman, the state of our transportation may determine the state of our Nation. I urge the enactment of this vital legislation that will create a department through which this Government can fulfill the need of the people of this country.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15963. I think it is a good bill but there are some features, particularly the one I am going to address myself to, that warrant special attention.

Let me say first I want to join with my colleagues in acknowledging the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] rendered monumental service to the House in bringing this bill to the floor today. We know that he and the members of the staff, together with minority members, worked countless hours, days, nights, weeks, and months in order to bring to the floor a very difficult and involved but at the same time a very useful bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks specifically to an amendment that I propose to offer at the appropriate time to create within this Department an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement. Something must be done now to help to alleviate what has become, in my judgment, a most acute social problem in the areas surrounding our cities. Many Members of Congress have been particularly disturbed, as have their constituents been, about the problem of aircraft noise. The gentlemen from New York [Messrs. ADBABBO, TENZER, and WYDLER] and I have all spent many months, if not years, trying to see if something could not be done to alleviate if not to eliminate this very, very difficult social problem. Those of us who live near cities I am sure are aware of the interesting comment that the New York Times editorial offered on August 17, 1966, in commenting on the airline strike when they said the following:

About the only blessing of the airline strike is that life has been a bit quieter for the people unlucky enough to live within roaring distance of jet airports. Now that the planes are about to fly again it is time for Congress to do something about taking the decibels out of the aerial parade.

There is an enormous amount of evidence which documents the extent of the aircraft noise problem.

Aircraft noise is a matter that affects probably some 10 or 20 million American citizens, and I think it is about time that Congress did something to meet its responsibility in this very difficult area.

A brief review of what we have not done in the past might be useful in deciding what we ought to do in the future. All of you know that the jet engine was developed by the Air Force essentially

for military purposes, and those that developed the jet engine were concerned with thrust and speed and not with noise. Airport neighbors in those days were told that they had to learn to live with this problem and had to accommodate themselves to it in the interest of national defense. The fact is that the aircraft industry itself has done virtually nothing about solving the problem of aircraft noise. As I said in my separate views, which I commend to all of you, appearing on page 76 of the committee report:

Efforts over the past years have been far less concerted than many of us in Congress have thought necessary and believed possible. Airplane manufacturers have not been falling over each other in competition to produce quieter aircraft. Noise abatement research and development, after all, hardly promises higher profits. Indeed, it can be said that noise abatement has been to the airline industry what safety engineering has been to the automobile industry. It has been, in short, an irritating and costly sacrifice which private industry is understandably reluctant to undertake.

At the present time the Department of Commerce, the FAA, and the NASA have all made some efforts, but only token efforts. And this problem is of such proportion that it will not yield to tokenism. Everybody knows this is true.

Essentially, Mr. Chairman, past efforts, in principal, have only been in the areas of flight pattern planning. Budgets have been incredibly low. For example, in 1966 NASA requested nothing for research and development in the field of aircraft noise abatement, and whatever little money that Congress forced upon them, they refused to spend.

Mr. Chairman, several months ago, for the first time, after prodding by Members of Congress, the FAA established a noise abatement service. This same group also serves as the interagency committee, made up of the Assistant Secretary of HUD, Commerce, and NASA. There are four people—only four people—assigned by the FAA, to supervise the alleviation of aircraft noise abatement.

Mr. Chairman, this entire problem, I believe, is important to 10 to 20 million people, a problem which has created more controversy in the affected areas surrounding our cities than any other, and it is going to have to be solved by only four people. They are outstanding public servants—these four—but they have neither the influence nor resources to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is that up to now no one has really felt the need to do anything. The FAA has obviously been subject to pressure from the aircraft industry. There has been no effective spokesmen for the airport neighbor. My proposed office would provide that voice.

Mr. Chairman, the President acted in April of this year for the first time in recognizing that this is a problem. He established a Presidential panel on jet aircraft noise. Subsequently, he established an interagency group consisting of representatives of HUD, Commerce, OST, FAA, and NASA. We all welcomed that interagency group. But I submit that such an agency is not the most likely to

be active day in and day out. It is under no obligation to meet or to report to Congress. It has no continuing guarantee of funds. And, in any case its staff is the same four men who work on the FAA noise abatement staff. I repeat, their resources and influence are insufficient.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

		[Roll No. 239]
Adams	Gettys	Roudebush
Andrews,	Hagan, Ga.	Schisler
Glenn	Halleck	Schmidhauser
Ashley	Hanna	Scott
Baring	Hansen, Wash.	Senner
Blatnik	Hébert	Sickles
Broomfield	Jones, Mo.	Sikes
Byrnes, Wis.	King, N.Y.	Smith, Calif.
Cahill	Kirwan	Sweeney
Callaway	Kluczynski	Thomas
Carey	Landrum	Toll
Celler	Long, La.	Tupper
Cohelan	McEwen	Tuten
Conable	McMillan	Walker, Miss.
Conyers	Martin, Ala.	White, Idaho
Cooley	Martin, Mass.	White, Tex.
Cramer	Morrison	Williams
Denton	Multer	Wilson,
Diggs	Murray	Charles H.
Ellsworth	O'Brien	Wolff
Evins, Tenn.	Powell	Zablocki
Flynt	Resnick	
Fogarty	Reuss	
Foley	Rivers, Alaska	
Ford,	Rogers, Tex.	
William D.	Rooney, N.Y.	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 15963, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 358 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] had 4 minutes remaining. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, the present effort on the part of the Executive to meet this acute problem is dissipated and proliferated among a number of agencies. As I mentioned before, this kind of dissipation is simply inadequate to our needs. It was for this reason that the administration set up the FAA noise abatement service. They already realize the problem, in other words. My view is simply that their new concern and recognition will not receive sufficient expression without a visible office by virtue of congressional mandate.

Mr. Chairman, in 1966 the FAA, which has primary responsibility in the research and development field of noise abatement, received \$780,000; in 1967, it is proposed to receive only \$565,000. Nobody believes this is enough. But the noise abatement cause requires more political muscle if it is to get the money it

needs. And this is where my proposed Office fits in.

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

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

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time, first, to compliment the gentleman in the well for taking up the fight for jet noise control and abatement. I will support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and I should like to indicate my support of H.R. 15963, a bill to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] which will provide for the establishment of an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement within the Department of Transportation, will only take care of one aspect of the problem of jet noise. I want to alert my colleagues, my constituents, as well as the millions of citizens who reside in and around the Nation's airfields that this is only a very small step we are asking the Congress to take today by the adoption of the proposed amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the creation of an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement merely sets up an office to coordinate our efforts to reduce aircraft noise. We may very well by this means avoid the duplication of effort which has up to now taken place in attempts to find a solution to the problem.

Mr. Chairman, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, I called to the attention of my colleagues that a number of agencies of our Government are engaged in one form or another of noise research. By combining all these efforts we may be able to avoid a waste of funds. The establishment of a noise abatement agency connected with the new Department of Transportation does not provide a mandate from Congress to accelerate the efforts in this field. This is what is needed and this is what I will continue to urge. It does not give to the Department of Transportation the additional regulatory powers which it needs or the funds required to make real and substantial progress in combating jet noises.

Mr. Chairman, I live in the shadow of Kennedy airfield, and various flight paths travel over my own home and over the homes of many thousands of my neighbors in the Fifth Congressional District of New York.

Millions of people living in and near our airports are similarly affected.

I urge my colleagues to review the statements which I have made in this Chamber on the subject of aircraft noise

abatement, and I refer to my previous remarks:

	Page
May 6, 1965: "Aircraft Noise Abatement"	9701
Daily RECORD, May 13, 1965: "Jet Noise—Opens the Floodgates of Litigation"	A2377
Daily RECORD, May 20, 1965: "More on Jet Noise: NASA Conference"	A2533
Daily RECORD, May 27, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part IV—NASA Research Program"	A2718
Daily RECORD, June 10, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part V—FAA Aircraft Noise Symposium"	A3037
Daily RECORD, July 8, 1965: "Jet Noise—Part VI—Hazard to the Nation's Health"	A3630
Aug. 12, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part VII—Report on Noise Forum"	20398
Aug. 30, 1965: "More on Jet Noise—Part VIII—Novel Test Over Long Island and Correspondence With the President"	22277-22278
Sept. 15, 1965: "The Latest on Jet Noise—Part IX"	24020-24021
Mar. 2, 1966: "President Recognizes Jet Noise Problem"	4810-4811
Mar. 21, 1966: "President Johnson Acts on Congressman TENZER's Jet Noise Plea"	6420-6421
May 3, 1966: "Debate on NASA Appropriation"	9679-9685
July 12, 1966: "Jet Noise: A Plea for Bipartisan Support"	15392-15393
Daily RECORD, Aug. 8, 1966: "Jet Noise" (delay the supersonic transport)	A4263

Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of the gentleman in the well and to my colleagues that the additional steps needed will be the subject of hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to which my bills—H.R. 7982 and H.R. 16172, have been referred. The Committee will also consider the bill introduced by Chairman STAGGERS of that committee.

These bills when reported to the floor will present a more comprehensive and more meaningful program for effective noise abatement control.

I make this point, so that my support of the proposed amendment, may not be misunderstood. I want to indicate to my colleagues that this is not a cure-all or an answer to all of the problem of jet noise.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his efforts and welcome his support when I continue to fight beyond the action to be taken by the House on his amendment. I know I can count on his support in the long-range fight to find a solution to a national menace.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] for his thoughtful approach to this serious problem and for having focused the attention of the Committee upon the question of aircraft noise control and abatement.

When the NASA authorization bill was on the floor on May 3, I urged that \$20 million additional be utilized by NASA to conduct a full-scale research program on the engineering problems inherent in

jet noise. I pointed out that NASA was the proper agency to deal with the engineering questions associated with aircraft noise control and abatement. Unfortunately, the amendment which I supported was rejected, as was the motion to recommit with instructions similar to the amendment. In other words, the House voted to postpone the day of reckoning.

Five or six agencies have been involved in this problem without overall coordination or a sense of urgency. It is time that this matter receive the priority it deserves, for the effects of jet noise are becoming more serious every day for those who live in the shadow of our great airports and the noise belt of our airplanes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I think the bill before us expresses the theory of unifying command and responsibility in the field of transportation. This is good administration. I believe it is also good administration to assign specific statutory responsibility for a problem everyone knows is crucial. Only then do we assure action and provide for the continual review of a concerned Congress.

The very fact that this chart sits here today is an indictment of the failure to respond to this need.

Nowhere on this chart, under the responsibilities and duties listed for the Federal Aviation Agency is there one sentence or any comment of any kind about executive responsibility in the field of aircraft noise abatement. If the executives of the Department of Transportation are disposed to take this as a serious problem, then surely there must be some agency, some bureau, some other office responsible for getting at this problem. It is for this reason that this amendment is offered today.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for his initiative in this regard and to his statements, and I wish to lend my support to his amendment.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman alluded to the chart. There are many sections that are not portrayed on the chart. The use of the chart here is as an organizational chart.

But the gentleman is well aware that we wrote into the bill in section 4, page 5, lines 4 to 6, that the Secretary should promote and undertake research and development in relation to transportation including noise abatement with particular attention to aircraft noise. So we have given them a charge, a responsibility, and a duty. Many of these duties are not on the chart. The reference to the chart is inconsequential, in my opinion.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am very much aware of the amendment we added into the bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further—

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Because of the gentleman's interest—and it has been very great and he has been a great help to the committee—and the interest of others on the committee, we did write in that particular section of the bill a serious charge and responsibility to the Secretary to get to this matter. As the gentleman knows, there are other bills, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] has just mentioned, which go to the substantive problems, and which are in the jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I acknowledge that, and I acknowledge publicly my gratitude to the gentleman from California for inserting that provision in the bill. But the simple difference between the gentleman from California and myself is that I am convinced that the provision he refers to requires a specific office for its effective implementation. This would be a statement by Congress that we expect something to be done, and that we want to see a single agency responsible for action. It is a direct responsibility which Congress will be assigning to the proposed Secretary. I think this carries more significance and muscle than a mere commentary in the foreword of the bill. Once the office is established, it will have access to the Bureau of the Budget, it will have access to the Secretary, and it will know the American people have spoken through the Congress and expect something to be done.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 15963, which would establish a Department of Transportation on a Cabinet level. As a Representative from a metropolitan area surrounding New York City, it is clear to me that we must increase our efforts to combat the choking strangulation with which we are faced on our highways, railroads, and airways. In the jet era we cannot get by with horse and buggy policies.

I am impressed by the statement of the Committee on Government Operations that in 1965, 87 million vehicles traveled the streets and highways of the Nation, and that it is estimated that in another 10 years the number of such vehicles will double.

No matter how diligent existing agencies may be, it is necessary to combine them under one head to make sure that their efforts are coordinated and integrated. I think it important that such agencies as the Federal Aviation Agency, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission be subject to common control and direction. I believe that a most important function of the Department of Transportation will be to conduct research and development aimed not only at improving the flow of transportation facilities,

but also combating the air pollution and the noise which plague our cities.

I hope that this legislation will be enacted by an overwhelming majority.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I support the Rosenthal amendment to establish within the Department of Transportation an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement. I commend the gentleman from New York for offering this amendment.

If we are to find a solution to the problem of aircraft noise, then the responsibility for all noise abatement efforts and functions must be coordinated and concentrated within one office in the new Department. At the present time they are spread about among several Federal agencies—the FAA, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Several weeks ago I introduced a bill to provide for aircraft noise abatement study and regulation. Other Members have offered similar proposals, and the administration is strongly in favor of such legislation. This is a serious problem to which we must find an answer. I have received many complaints from residents of my 22d District in the Bronx, N.Y. The Bronx is severely affected as well as the Queens area in Long Island—since the addition of long runways at La Guardia Airport. But it is not a problem only in my city; it is one which confronts the residents of cities throughout the country which are adjacent to airports.

The office which would be created by the amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] would be the logical agency and would provide the sensible approach to coordinating and carrying out the objectives of my bill, and similar bills, to study, control and regulate aircraft noise.

I strongly support the gentleman's amendment and I hope the Committee will adopt it when we come to the amendatory stage of consideration of this legislation to create a Department of Transportation. I urge my colleagues in the House to join me at that time in supporting the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] to establish an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO].

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] as a member of this Committee on Government Operations, for bringing again to the attention of this House through this bill the serious question of aircraft noise abatement which besets us in Queens with reference to the Kennedy-La Guardia Airports, but which will also

affect many more areas with the additional airport activities and the increase in the jet noise of additional jet aircraft as is attested to by the increased concern of more and more of our colleagues each year.

Mr. Chairman, I generally support the bill before us, H.R. 15963. There is a need to bring the various agencies involved in the various modes of transportation together where the overall problems can be dealt with. The importance of these functions cannot be minimized for our national well-being depends upon an efficient and healthy transportation industry.

I was disappointed that the bill, as reported, does not give sufficient recognition to the most troublesome area of air transportation, I refer to the problem of aircraft noise for which I and my Queens and Nassau colleagues have for many years sought a solution. Greater recognition of this problem must be given—the problem has to be conquered. The amendment to be offered relative to the establishment of an Office of Aircraft Noise Abatement by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], should be adopted.

There is another area in the bill before us which I am convinced is a mistake. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the maritime affairs should not be included in the Department of Transportation. The problems and importance of the maritime industry are of such importance that they can be dealt with effectively only through a separate and independent Federal Maritime Administration. I shall support the amendment which will be offered to strike maritime matters from this bill.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office, Committee on Appropriations, I have had firsthand dealings and knowledge of the work of the U.S. Coast Guard, now an arm of the Treasury Department. The Coast Guard was originally established to prevent smuggling and like activities—today it still has important work and functions in this area and, of course, has been enlarged and given many other duties. However, by no stretch of the imagination, can one justify including this agency in a Department of Transportation. If it is believed that the Coast Guard no longer belongs in the Treasury Department, then the only logical move would be to move it into the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we can have a good bill and a more effective Department of Transportation with the adoption of the amendments I have discussed. The need for the new Department is apparent—let us make it the best possible.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for the amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL]. This amendment deserves support, in my opinion, because it would provide the kind of office that is so urgently

needed to administer the aircraft noise abatement regulations proposed in another bill, H.R. 15875, also sponsored by the gentleman from New York.

Every Member of this House was, I am sure, relieved and happy last Friday when the 6-week-long airline strike ended. By Saturday morning, however, those who live near airports were reminded of the relative silence during the strike. Today's high-speed jet transportation is a mixed blessing. With all its conveniences, it has brought the inconvenience—and sometimes discomfort of noisy skies.

Yet, as Mr. ROSENTHAL pointed out so well in his supplementary comments to the committee report on H.R. 15963, activities by existing agencies to curb aircraft noise "have been so modest because they have lacked any specific and vigorous statutory instruction. They have been so limited because no office has been specifically designated by the Congress to study and prosecute noise abatement policy. The conditions requiring an effective Federal aircraft noise abatement program, in other words, are exactly similar to those arguing for a strong transportation safety policy. The effort must be centralized, coordinated, designated by statute, and instructed to direct all its energies to that single purpose."

In another section of his comments, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], said that—

Noise abatement had been to the airline industry what safety engineering has been to the automobile industry. It has been, in short, an irritating and costly sacrifice which private industry is understandably reluctant to undertake.

Mr. Speaker, the President's Special Panel on Jet Aircraft Noise, which issued its report last March, concluded:

Initiative for solving problems of jet aircraft noise can effectively come only from a source not compromised by economic interests in conflict with those of the major groups now involved—engine and aircraft manufacturers, airline operators, and local governments. And there is only one source meeting this constraint which can be functionally effective—the Federal Government.

The problem of aircraft noise, while concentrated mostly around airports in metropolitan areas, is nevertheless a national problem. Without question, it is going to get worse before it gets better. One of the areas now concerned with the problem is Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., site of a major international airport. In July the operators of the airport, the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission, passed a resolution recognizing the need for Federal action. One pertinent part of the resolution says:

The Congress should act as quickly as practicable upon the recommendation of the President or, in the alternative, on its own initiative confer upon the Federal Aviation Agency or other body or group, in its wisdom, the authority to establish and promulgate a maximum standard of aircraft noise in perceived noise decibels or other acknowledged standard and to vest the authority and power in the Federal Aviation Agency or other appropriate body, to enforce adherence to such standards by all aircraft operators, or take such other action as will result in effective discipline over the total problem.

Mr. Chairman, I think an "appropriate body" in which to vest the much-needed authority to promulgate aircraft noise abatement standards would be the office proposed by this amendment. I urge the support of all Members of the House. In so urging, I ask that the resolution passed by the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission be printed in its entirety:

RESOLUTION No. 661

Whereas the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission, operators of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport—Wold-Chamberlain Field, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, has a vital interest in urging a solution to the aircraft noise problem; and

Whereas the noise created by the present jet aircraft is becoming a more serious problem and a solution of this problem is daily becoming more urgent; and

Whereas the problem defies solution at the local governmental level and is properly a problem of national concern by virtue of Federal Statutes defining the airspace to be within the public domain and subject only to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government; and

Whereas an orderly approach to the problem requires an extensive evaluation of the consequent effects created thereby, an analysis of the means by which aircraft noise annoyance can be reduced to acceptable levels, and the formulation and adoption of a comprehensive integrated program to solve the problem in the interest of the public; and

Whereas the President of the United States, in his message on Transportation delivered to the United States Congress on March 2, 1966, took cognizance of the urgency of solving this problem; and

Whereas at the present time no maximum standard of aircraft noise has been formulated or adopted by the Federal Government, and no agency or department possesses the authority to regulate aircraft noise; now therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission, operators of Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport—Wold-Chamberlain Field, that:

1. This Commission hereby finds and determines that noise created by the operation of present jet aircraft is a problem of serious proportions not within the control of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission as a local governmental unit;

2. This Commission is convinced beyond doubt that means and methods presently exist to reduce aircraft noise to a level acceptable to the communities at which jet aircraft operate.

3. The Government of the United States should accept Federal responsibility for the control and consequences of aircraft noise because of the congressional declaration that the airspace is public domain (Congress by such declaration has assumed the responsibility and duty to control in all respects the users of the airspace);

4. The President's Science Advisor, with the administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, should take steps toward the sound resolution of this problem by legislative recommendations to the Congress.

5. The Congress should act as quickly as practicable upon the recommendations of the President or, in the alternative, on its own initiative confer upon the Federal Aviation Agency or other body or group, in its wisdom, the authority to establish and promulgate a maximum standard of aircraft noise in per-

ceived noise decibels or other acknowledged standard and to vest the authority and power in the Federal Aviation Agency or other appropriate body, to enforce adherence to such standards by all aircraft operators, or take such other action as will result in effective discipline over the total problem;

6. The President's Science Advisor, the administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, take cognizance of the urgency of solving this situation and make provisions for receiving an expression of the views of representatives of national association or organizations comprised of State, County or Municipal Governments; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the U.S. Senators representing the State of Minnesota, the Congressmen constituting the Minnesota Congressional Delegation, the President's Science Advisor, the administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the President and Executive Director of National Association of Counties, the President and Executive Director of National League of Cities, and National Association of Municipal Law Officers and other interested organization, and that the Executive Director of the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Metropolitan Airports Commission inquire periodically as to any affirmative action or lack thereof on this matter so as to keep this Commission informed concerning the reactions of the recipients of this Resolution.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I might state that the congressional district which it is my honor to represent is subject to noises that seem incongruous as a result of the helicopters going from La Guardia and Kennedy Airports to the New York central area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are residential areas and are also business areas. These noises disrupt the life of the people and the life of the business community which is extremely important.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] is very salutary and in my opinion should be accepted.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN], such time as he may require.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 15963, the Department of Transportation Act, as a necessary advance in the ever increasing struggle to meet the complex demands for improved transportation.

As I stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 16 at page 19568, during the debate in the House on the mass transit bill—H.R. 14810—we live in a modern age, but with an archaic and chaotic transportation system. There is little question that with the technological know-how of our country we can meet the transportation problems of tomorrow. Our first order of business, however, is to meet the pressing needs of today.

One of the most pressing needs of today which we have failed to recognize is for the abatement of excessive noise, whatever the source.

It has been suggested by some of my colleagues that the proposed legislation before us today is deficient in that it fails to deal with the subject of aircraft noise abatement.

I concur with and commend those who would take active steps to abate aircraft noise.

I would be remiss, however, if I failed to caution my colleagues against being somewhat nearsighted about what they hear.

Aircraft noise is a serious problem. It is, however, one of a whole series of complex sources of excessive noise. To the city dweller, for example, the din of the helicopter flying overhead and the din of the air compressor and pneumatic drill outside his apartment window at 7 a.m. are both serious.

On April 21, 1966, I introduced a bill—H.R. 14602—which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 21 together with my statement and related studies and articles at pages 8745 through 8768 to provide a comprehensive study of the complex noise situation in the United States with a view toward a better understanding of the detrimental effects of excessive noise.

My bill would establish an Office of Noise Control within the Office of the Surgeon General. The Office, headed by a Director and assisted by a Noise Control Advisory Council, would provide grants to the States and local governments to research ways and means of control, prevention and abatement of noise.

The Office of Noise Control would cooperate fully with existing Federal agencies presently working in the specific field of jet aircraft noise abatement, and would prepare, publish and disseminate educational materials dealing with control, prevention and abatement of noise.

I am pleased that there has been considerable response to my noise pollution bill. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2 at pages 12191 through 12205 and August 4 at pages 18233 through 18257, I have set forth editorials and letters on the subject, together with additional studies and articles of interest to those concerned with noise.

Presently, FAA is primarily concerned with noise research from the perspective of where and how the planes fly. NASA seems to be primarily concerned with the mechanical generation of noise.

It is my firm belief that the notable research and admirable work being carried on by the FAA, NASA, and CHABA—Committee on Hearing and Bioacoustics—should be centralized to insure greater efficiency and more benefit to all those interested in the general field of noise abatement. We can no longer afford to go off in several different directions in our effort to reduce excessive noise.

We must develop a central unit or "noise information clearinghouse" where the efforts of all the present agencies working with jet and helicopter noise can be combined and coordinated.

If we were faced only with noise from vehicles and planes used in transportation, it would seem logical to place a central office of noise control within the bill to establish a National Department of Transportation, before us today—H.R. 15963. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 2 at pages 9470 through 9477 I set forth detailed studies relating to excessive noise caused by trucks and automobiles on our Nation's highways.

The fact is, however, that excessive noise is coming from several sources which have nothing to do with transportation as such.

As I stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3 at page 9679 during the debate on Congressman WYDLER's excellent amendment to the NASA appropriation to provide \$20 million toward jet aircraft noise reduction, we must be careful not merely to appropriate a blanket amount of money to be used for jet aircraft noise abatement without definite criteria, a well-planned program, and a systems approach with respect to controls.

One of the many types of controls which should be employed, for example, is the prescription of standards for accurate measurement of aircraft noise. I have today introduced a bill which would provide that the Administrator of FAA be empowered to prescribe such standards, rules and regulations with respect to aircraft noise abatement in the issuance, amendment, modification, suspension or revocation of any certificate. A copy of my bill is included at the end of that statement. I would stress, however, that this is only one small example of the overall program of needed controls.

The committee's decision to include in section 4 of the transportation bill a provision that the Secretary of Transportation conduct research on the problem is a good idea but little more. What we need is an immediate and all-out effort to launch a vigorous and imaginative program to deal with the general problem in all areas of noise pollution.

A copy of my bill on the question only of setting Federal aviation aircraft noise standards, follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title VI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1421-1430), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"AIRCRAFT NOISE CONTROL AND ABATEMENT

"Standards, rules, and regulations

"Sec. 611. (a) The Administrator is empowered to prescribe and amend standards for the measurement of aircraft noise and to prescribe and amend such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to provide for the control and abatement of aircraft noise, including the application of such standards, rules, and regulations in the issuance, amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of any certificate authorized by this title.

"Notice and appeal

"(b) In any action to amend, modify, suspend, or revoke a certificate in which viola-

tion of aircraft noise standards, rules, or regulations is at issue the certificate holder shall have the same notice and appeal rights as are contained in section 609, and in any appeal to the Board, the Board shall consider the aircraft noise violation issues in addition to the safety and public interest issues as provided in section 609."

SEC. 2. That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the center heading "TITLE VI—SAFETY REGULATION OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 611. Aircraft noise control and abatement.

"(a) Standards, rules, and regulations.

"(b) Notice and appeal."

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], 10 minutes.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15963.

I believe that few of us would deny the fact that our transportation system is in need of overhaul today. While the airlines are beginning to prosper, the railroads are in ill health and our merchant marine is dying. While we have developed a successful interstate highway system, our urban thoroughfares are choked and urban mass transit is decaying.

Transportation—as a vital public necessity—has been regulated by the Government almost since its inception. But, regulation has been piecemeal and patchwork. Over much of our history, we have concentrated upon individual modes of transportation, instead of looking upon each mode as part of an integrated system. Thus, in seeking to assist one form of transport, we have sometimes injured another. This approach, has, in too many instances, jeopardized the health of the entire industry and has also impeded the traveler and the shipper who generally must rely upon more than one form of transportation.

By establishing a Department of Transportation, there would be created the means for fashioning a coordinated and unified approach to transportation. Promotion, research, safety, planning and development could be approached on functional bases which cut across individual model lines. Economies and advances in technology, developed in one form of transport, would in the future be more rapidly and readily applied to others.

This does not mean, of course, that creation of the new Department would be a panacea. To the contrary, as I have pointed out in my additional views to the committee report, many shortcomings exist in the legislation, as reported.

H.R. 15963 does not deal, for example, with the issue of urban mass transportation. Rather, this matter is left in limbo for at least a year while metropolitan areas continue to strangle in transportation bottlenecks.

We are told in the President's message that the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development are to study this matter for a year and then decide where urban mass transportation should be housed.

But there is not one word in the bill which commands that these conversations be held, that establishes guidelines or priorities to be followed by the two Secretaries in their conversations, or that requires that a decision be reached within 1 year. This absence of clear direction and decisionmaking places in jeopardy the entire urban mass transportation program. Instead of deferring to this policy of drift, the committee should have resolved this matter before the bill was brought to the floor.

While it does not seem overly significant whether the responsibility for coordinating balanced transportation programs in urban areas is located in the new department or in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, it is deeply troubling that under this legislation the overall responsibility is located in neither department.

There is, as we all can appreciate from firsthand experience, a very close connection between highways and rail mass transit in urban areas and between transportation generally and other urban development programs.

If, therefore, we want to promote real balance between our highway and mass transportation programs—which should be a major objective—we must pay more than lipservice to the concept and provide a workable system for coordinating the two.

Moreover, we cannot have Federal highway officials, without taking into consideration all the factors which contribute to area growth, vetoing the carefully planned efforts of local communities to evolve their own development programs, including transportation.

Turning to the issue of air safety, the bill provides that the functions of the Bureau of Safety of the Civil Aeronautics Board are to be transferred to the new Department and are to be placed under the direct authority of the Secretary of Transportation. This could jeopardize the advances we have made in air safety in recent years.

In 1958, Congress established an independent Federal Aviation Agency which was to be responsible for control over the regulation of airways and over various promotional aspects of aviation. Among its duties, the FAA was charged with the responsibility for promulgating air safety regulations. At the same time, Congress also established an independent Civil Aeronautics Board which was given economic regulatory responsibility over civilian aviation and the responsibility for investigating aviation accidents.

Prior to 1958, both the duty to promulgate air safety regulations and to investigate aviation accidents was housed within the Department of Commerce. As my additional views point out, this dual responsibility proved unsatisfactory because it authorized one agency to sit in judgment upon its own mistakes. As a result, the state of aviation safety at that time was unacceptable. Since 1958, significant advancement has been made in the air safety record. Regretfully, we still experience most unfortunate accidents. But safety has improved and every effort is being made to improve it

even further. A major reason has been the fact that when the Federal Aviation Agency has been found to have contributed to an accident, the CAB has not hesitated to say so.

Now, however, we are asked to return air safety to that unsatisfactory state which existed prior to 1958. The regulation of safety, along with other functions, is to be transferred to the Secretary of Transportation from the FAA. Similarly, the functions of the Bureau of Safety are to be transferred to the Secretary from the CAB. It is correct that the latter would be placed in a separate office of accident investigation. But, this office would be under the direct supervision and control of the Secretary. Thus, once again, accident investigation and safety regulation would come under the supervision of a single agency—an agency which would be charged with investigating itself. This should not be permitted to occur.

Another objectionable feature of the bill is its failure to deal effectively with the subject of noise abatement and air pollution.

A majority of our country's population now lives in metropolitan areas. Each year this majority grows larger. While metropolitan living provides many advantages, it also creates a number of irritants. Among the most serious are those caused by noise and pollution. And, of course, the transportation media are among the major contributors to both of these problems. In the case of noise, for example, the whine and roar from low-flying jet aircraft over residential areas is particularly disruptive of normal living. As for air pollution, the fumes emitted from cars, trucks, trains, and other forms of transportation can all but suffocate the city dweller.

The continuation and aggravation of these objectionable conditions will surely turn our metropolitan areas into wastelands. Yet these problems continue to be shunted from agency to agency and from official to official. No one will accept real responsibility. No one will take it upon himself to institute the necessary corrective action. Now is the time and here is the place to stop passing the buck. We are here creating a Department of Transportation. We are placing upon the Secretary of this Department the responsibility for operating, coordinating, researching, and planning the many separate facets of transportation. If we are to launch an effective program to eliminate the irritants caused by noise and air pollution, we should do it now by authorizing and directing the Secretary to exercise the necessary responsibility.

Finally, section 7 of the bill is open to serious question. By this section, the Secretary is authorized to promulgate on his own authority criteria and standards for the investment of Federal funds for transportation. I recognize that the breadth of this section has been considerably narrowed since its original introduction. Many investment programs have been eliminated from its coverage. But some investment programs remain affected.

More important, however, is the fact that the principle behind this section will remain intact; namely, that the Secretary will be handed the unrestricted authority to interpose his judgment over that of Congress as to how or whether money should be spent. In addition, the Secretary would be in a position to interfere with national transportation policy. Under present authority, only Congress has the authority to establish such policy. In this bill, we specifically provide that Congress retain this authority and only give to the Secretary the authority to recommend changes in policy to the Congress. But, if the Secretary retains the right under section 7 to transfer money from one program to another or to withhold spending money on a particular program, he could be in a position to affect transportation policy in the absence of congressional directive. In my opinion, the Secretary should not have such authority.

Aside from these defects and a few others of a more limited nature, this is a good bill. By correcting these defects, we can make it an even better bill. I believe that in establishing the Department of Transportation we can better perfect the Government's means of coordinating and improving the Nation's transportation network. Generally, I am reluctant to create a new department of Government since this has a tendency to escalate bureaucracy without improving efficiency. But, in this case, transportation has historically been regulated by the Government. By establishing this new Department, we are fashioning a means of streamlining and improving the Government's role.

Mr. Chairman, I urge enactment of H.R. 15963.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL.]

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and particularly in support of an amendment which will be offered tomorrow by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Transportation concept is something which has been proposed and supported by several administrations.

We are at last at the point where we may implement these suggestions and, if there is any doubt about the important place of transportation activities in our Government and in our economy, the recent airline strike should have clarified our thinking.

The purpose of this legislation is to bring together into one place for coordination and administration all possible aspects of transportation activities within the Federal Government. If this is our purpose, and I think it is and should be, the matter of aircraft noise control should be high on the list of the things requiring the coordination to which I refer.

The history of the Federal Government activities having to do with abatement of aircraft noise has so far presented a rather sorry picture. There have been abortive studies, long hear-

ings, proposals of legislation, considerable conversation, and large amounts of public frustration. In short, nothing much has been accomplished.

Consideration of the legislation we have before us today may be our one real opportunity to bring together all of the activities having to do with aircraft noise and to get some real action started on this problem.

The creation of an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement within this new Department of Transportation will not only bring about better coordination of Government activities in this field, but it will also make it possible for the public and the Congress to look to one agency and to one office for results in the solution of this problem.

In one of the many special studies which have been made on this subject, the President's Special Panel on Jet Aircraft Noise concluded a report in March of this year as follows:

Initiative for solving problems of jet aircraft noise can effectively come only from a source not compromised by economic interests in conflict with those of the major groups now involved—engine and aircraft manufacturers, airline operators, and local governments. And there is only one source meeting this constraint which can be functionally effective—the Federal Government.

As my colleagues know, Washington National Airport, located just across the Potomac River in my northern Virginia district, is a vivid illustration of the need for noise abatement regulation at a more effective level.

The Federal Aviation Agency and its noise abatement staff makes a valiant effort to reduce noise in the Washington area resulting from National Airport traffic. But there is virtually no punitive action they can take against pilots who violate their procedures for staying within the prescribed flight pattern and/or climbing to prescribed heights before turning over residential areas. Voluntary methods can only accomplish a limited degree of success in spite of continuing agency pressure upon the airline industry and its pilots.

The FAA has even less success in the reduction of engine noise. It is quite natural that airlines under pressure from stockholders to make profits would resist use of mufflers or other noise abatement devices which would also reduce the amount of power output per gallon of fuel. It is natural, too, that engine manufacturers would direct the greater part of their research to improvements more directly connected with increased efficiency rather than into the problem of noise reduction.

An example of the weakness of the FAA in this field is a brochure recently sent to my office by the National Aircraft Noise Abatement Council, the private industry organization interested in this problem. In some four or five pages of the bulletin, all information and advice was solely related to soundproofing of buildings against aircraft noise.

The Federal Aviation Agency has requested and received cooperation from the airlines flying in and out of National Airport to limit the number of flights by commercial carriers to 40 an hour, including both jet and propeller-driven

planes. With the gradual changeover to jets it is both possible and probable that this will mean 40 jets landing and taking off each hour before long. In addition, unless this voluntary cooperation is backed with some enforcement authority there is bound to be more and more pressure to add to the number of landings and takeoffs which can be accommodated at National.

While the studies, proposals, hearings, conversations and frustration continue, those who live along the green valley of the Potomac suffer, as do all those who live in the immediate vicinity of any of our major city airports. The problem increases daily and the number of people affected increases accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support an amendment, which I understand will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], which would provide for the creation of an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement. I urge my colleagues to join me in making the creation of an Office of Aircraft Noise Control and Abatement an integral part of the Department of Transportation. The problem has been a lack of coordination and directed interest, and such an office can provide the focal point for action and solution.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to return for a moment to a discussion of some aspects of the amendment which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], indicated he will offer tomorrow.

I believe it essential that we get this problem of jet aircraft noise in its proper perspective.

In 1962 I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of the Subcommittee on Aeronautics and Transportation. We conducted extensive hearings on jet aircraft noise. Subsequently; the following year, I was instrumental in securing a series of jet aircraft hearings, prompted by a very serious situation in this area in my own congressional district, which embraces O'Hare Field, one of the busiest if not the busiest airport in the world. It became evident, after many days of hearings, that actually there was no one in the Federal Government who was responsible for the welfare and the interest of the people on the ground.

The FAA generally, and I suppose properly, was primarily interested in the safety of the aircraft.

The local airport authorities did not have authority extending beyond the geographical confines of the airport.

The other people who testified before the committee, including the air lines representatives, felt that anything which could be done in this area had to be done primarily through improvement in engineering.

So at the close of the hearings it became quite evident that there was a void or a gray area in the matter of protecting the rights of many people on the ground who are constantly annoyed and who find the jet air noise a nuisance almost daily in their way of life, as well as to the

schools and churches in the areas affected by noise on the ground.

We have spent millions of dollars over the years researching aircraft noise problems both civilian and military.

There are funds within the NASA appropriation, as we all know, to deal with jet aircraft noise through improved engineering.

Today this remains a serious problem in many areas of the country. I quite agree with the gentleman from New York in saying I believe Congress has a responsibility to delegate to an agency authority and to make it mandatory that they deal with this very serious problem.

I do not believe it is going to be done unless we specifically direct through this legislation that it be done, and establish the power in an agency whose sole responsibility will be to handle the growing problem of jet aircraft noise in the space age in which we live.

I say to the gentleman from New York as one who has, incidentally, on two previous occasions, in the 87th Congress and again in the 89th Congress, introduced special legislation to establish a noise abatement commission, I will join him tomorrow in support of his amendment.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.].

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, I am, like everyone else who has spoken on this bill, for the concept of a Department of Transportation; but, unlike most of those who have spoken up to this point, I am opposed to this bill H.R. 15963, at least until the bill is cleaned up by action of this Congress.

I am a little like Sam Goldwyn who, when he was asked to be involved in a business deal that he really did not want to pursue because he felt it might be bad for business—but yet he did not want to offend anybody—said, "Please include me out."

I am not alone in wanting to be "included out" of this bill, because most of the industry people who testified, have also asked to be "included out." As a matter of fact, most of the Government agencies involved in transportation have succeeded in being "included out" as far as this bill is concerned.

The merchant marine, which is tied now to the Commerce Department, has asked to be "included out." It may have some difficulty in succeeding in doing this, but it certainly has made its case impressively to the Congress.

The Great Lakes carriers and barge lines in this country, fearing the executive's setting standards for transportation investment without congressional action, have also asked to be "included out."

The airlines, happy with the independent status of the FAA and the CAB and fearing overcoordination from the executive branch of the Government, have asked to be "included out."

The railroads, overregulated now but at least comfortable and trusting as far as the Interstate Commerce Commission is concerned, have asked to be "included out" of the proposed Department of Transportation.

Pipelines, not now as closely regulated and not wanting to be any more closely regulated than they are, have asked to be "included out" of the new Department of Transportation.

Trucklines, fearing the economics of perhaps inappropriate safety regulations, have also asked to be "included out" of the new Department of Transportation.

So let us look at the transportation industry for just a moment if we can. First, let us make note of the fact that businesses within each mode of transportation in this industry compete with each other. The different modes also compete with each other within the appropriate framework of Federal rules and regulations. They are not always satisfied, perhaps, with that Federal regulation, but at least most of them have grown comfortable with the independent agencies now in charge of regulating their rates, their routes, their rules of operation, and the safety requirements under which they operate.

These hitherto independent agencies which do this regulation job, compete in their turn with each other for the attention of the Congress. They compete for rulemaking legislation. They also compete for subsidy grants for things like harbors, airports, highways, riverways, and so forth—things that are of fundamental assistance to the successful operation of the various modes of transportation in our country. Each of these independent agencies and each of these modes has its champions within the individual membership of Congress. And each agency and mode has its champion within the committee organization of the Congress.

This is why the industries in each mode fear too much power in a single hand in the administration. Most of them have suggested that this power continue to reside in the Congress or in the quasi-independent agencies which Congress has set up to regulate the various modes of transportation for the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I think the reason for this fear is that they know the Federal Government—just like the grace of the good Lord—what it giveth, it can take away.

Mr. Chairman, we found this to be true in education, that what the executive branch of the Government controls, it can also withhold.

They also know that there are differences in the way some of the regulations can be applied. And, so, to yield safety regulations—which are economic in their base—and licensing control to the executive branch of the Government raises some areas of concern.

For the executive branch to set economic standards and criteria for the investment of Federal funds also raises some concern because then, if you do not have a champion in the executive department, your mode just might be in trouble.

And, Mr. Chairman, this bill also envisions the expenditure of a good deal more Federal time and effort and money in the area of research and development in the area of transportation in this country. If the research and development funds are being spent upon the

mode of transportation of someone else and not yours, then you would like to have a champion, which you may not have in the executive department.

The influence of a Secretary of Transportation upon rates and routes set by even independent agencies can certainly be great, also.

So, we see the various industries involved in transportation in this country expressing their fear of the weighted impact of the executive branch of the Government controlling their industry.

What would happen should the executive lay heavier emphasis, for instance, upon air and highways than upon railroads and barge lines, or vice versa?

Now, Mr. Chairman, these decisions are fought out in the Congress in a public forum. Under this bill that seems unlikely for reasons upon which I should like to expand. The worst thing that could happen is that you might be completely forgotten like the merchant marine.

The "include me out" approach that I suggest industry representatives felt when they testified on this bill did not show up in the testimony of representatives of the executive branch of Government simply because we did not have very many people from the executive branch of Government who testified on this bill. Moreover, they had taken care of their "include me out" feelings on H.R. 15963—or rather, its predecessor H.R. 13200—in the gestation period of the bill within the executive department. Apparently in most instances they accomplished their purpose, because under this bill the Department of Transportation Secretary is precluded from developing standards and criteria for the evaluation of Federal investment in transportation in such areas as these and, Mr. Chairman, I quote directly from the bill: "Defense features included at the direction or upon official certification of the Department of Defense in the design and construction of civil air, sea, and land transportation" will not have the comment or the criticism of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation with reference to standards and criteria.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, Secretary McNamara has been successful in getting the Department of Defense "included out" of this legislation.

Also, Mr. Chairman, "included out" are programs of foreign assistance, because, apparently, Secretary of State Rusk was successful in getting his Department "included out" of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the interoceanic canal outside of the continental limits of the United States takes care of both Dean Rusk and Bob McNamara, because it is also "included out."

And, Mr. Chairman, as if that were not enough, practically everyone else in the executive branch of the Government is "included out" under this language now contained in the bill: "acquisition of transportation facilities for equipment by Federal agencies in providing transportation services for their own use" and will not be under the purview of the Secretary of Transportation in establishing standards and criteria.

Thus the Post Office, the General Services Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and others are "included out" of the Department of Transportation.

Grant-in-aid programs are also eliminated. So urban mass transportation and the northeast corridor now under the Department of Housing and Urban Development are "included out" of this legislation. We have already had considerable expansion of the questionable logic in that.

Finally, in the action of the committee at the last minute as a matter of compromise in order to get the Committee on Public Works of this Congress off its back, this legislation "included out" water resources. This took the Corps of Engineers out of the standards criteria which are to be set by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation.

The Coast Guard which now comes under the Treasury Department—at least in the organizational way that some of the other agencies are brought into DOT—is also "included out," because the Coast Guard is brought in as an organizational entity inviolate from the Department of the Treasury—and the Department of Defense under which the Coast Guard operates in time of war. Thus, the Treasury was successful in getting Coast Guard "included out" so far as losing its identity the way FAA and BPR lose theirs.

The Coast Guard, as a matter of fact, comes in as a sort of "fifth mode" of transportation on a coequal organizational chart level with the highway, rail, air, and maritime administrations in the proposed Department.

The issue of the Federal Maritime Administration in the Department raises an interesting question. If it is stricken out by the action of the Congress, what happens to the Coast Guard? Who is the Coast Guard going to regulate under the Department of Transportation?

Mr. Chairman, we have obviously had many compromises to get this bill this far, and apparently some discussion of further compromise is going on at this moment with reference to the Maritime Administration in this Department. And it, too, may be successful in getting "included out" before today or tomorrow is over.

Now where do the agencies proposed to make up the Department of Transportation envisioned on this organizational chart come from?

First, the Maritime Administration. It comes from the Under Secretary for Transportation of the Department of Commerce to the Secretary of Transportation—and I understand also that he may even become the Secretary of Transportation if we create this Cabinet-level post. The Maritime Administration comes from the Department of Commerce where it has languished since 1950 when it was put in the Department of Commerce by a reorganization plan growing out of the Hoover Commission.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of course, has hit the ceiling on this move because it would rather have the Maritime Administration moved

away from the executive branch of the Government and closer to Congress.

Several of the representatives from the maritime industry have also expressed their opposition to moving to DOT as have the labor unions who work in the merchant marine industry.

The FAA and the part of the CAB to be brought under the Department of Transportation did not come from another executive department. As a matter of fact, there is very little in this bill that does come from other executive departments. The FAA functions and the part of the CAB functions which are to be transferred to the Secretary of the Department of Transportation come from the presently quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial and quasi-administrative independent agencies—FAA and CAB—which were established pretty much as arms of Congress.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been watching over the FAA and the CAB in this independent or quasi-legislative status. This committee did not testify on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, part of the ICC is also removed, transferred and split between the proposed Federal Rail Administration and Federal Highway Administration of DOT. These functions also come from an otherwise independent or quasi-legislative agency of the Government the independent agency which is now the ICC.

The Bureau of Public Roads comes under the Department of Commerce now, but its duties will move to the Department of Transportation.

This Bureau moves in the same way that the FAA will move. The Bureau of Public Works and the FAA will move in responsibilities only because they can be completely reorganized under the language of section 9(j), 6(a), 6(c) and 6(e) of this legislation.

Only the powers and duties of these two agencies are to be transferred. The Secretary is left with the right to reorganize them completely.

An amendment will be introduced to try to keep the organization of FAA and BPR unchanged after the transfer to DOT when we get to the amendments tomorrow.

But I would raise this point, Mr. Chairman. If the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee want the status of the Maritime Administration protected by moving it into an independent status, then it would seem to me that the Interstate Commerce Committee and the Public Works Committee might want to maintain the independent status of the FAA, the Bureau of Public Roads, the ICC, and some of the other agencies in which they are so involved.

The question was raised earlier about the use of user taxes in this area. Well, there was quite a bit of conflicting testimony, on whether or not ultimately the Secretary of the Department of Transportation might be able to redirect some of these user taxes from highway, to other areas of transportation investment after the creation of this department.

The question of cost has been raised in the organization of this new depart-

ment. The way the bill is written there is no limitation on the kind of reorganization that the Secretary of the Department of Transportation could make in some of these presently independent agencies when they come under his jurisdiction. And so it would seem to me that the cost question is opened, therefore.

So what this bill does not do is coordinate the executive branch activities now related to transportation. It does not say anything about the transportation activities of the Post Office, Defense, Housing and Urban Development, State, Agriculture, and the other Federal departments. It only coordinates under the Executive and the Secretary of the Department of Transportation many of activities of Federal Government affecting the private sector of our economy by taking the present Government activities in this private-sector area which have traditionally been the prerogatives of Congress and moving them into the executive branch of the Government.

Section 7—and if you have heard of this bill at all before today you have heard of section 7—sees the Department of Transportation Secretary prohibited from recommending standards and criteria in such executive branch areas of transportation as defense, post office, and so forth. But the Secretary of the Department of Transportation not only can recommend Federal investment in the private sector of transportation, he can set these standards. Under the way this law is drawn, Congress has nothing to say about it.

And the standards which the Secretary will set—make no mistake about it—will control much of the investment of Federal funds in the various areas of transportation.

Section 7(b) (1) on page 25, line 3 to 15, states that all reports prepared by other branches of the Government must conform to the standards and criteria which the Secretary sets, and so we will not have any "minority views" when the standards and the criteria are set.

Congress traditionally has made the final determinations on standards by which Federal investments and transportation policies are judged. Under this legislation the Congress will not make that final decision because there is no room for objection. The standards are set by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, after he has recommended them to the President and the President has approved what they will be. Those people in private industry who testified did not object—and I do not object—to the Secretary developing standard and criteria and recommending them, as long as he recommends them to Congress for congressional action. But the Secretary does not recommend to Congress; he recommends to the President, and the President approves the Secretary's standards, not the Congress.

Holy Pedernales, Mr. Chairman. It looks like the Corps of Engineers' decisions are now going to be made in the White House.

The Corps of Engineers' standards and criteria, with the cost-benefit ratio, for-

merly were recommended to Congress and accepted or rejected. And here we had the upper hand because we were a branch of the Government against only an agency of another branch of Government. But now we will be a branch of Government, the legislative branch, directly up against the executive branch, and who will control? My guess is that it will be the Bureau of the Budget. They will recommend and control which standards and criteria we will follow. Because, remember, under this legislation, all reports must conform to those standards and criteria set by the Department of Transportation. The Congress, in the final analysis, will just send the money.

No such power was granted to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development when that Department was created. As a matter of fact, it was not even conferred on the Department of Defense. But, as we know, the Department of Defense and even the Department of Agriculture, which was created in the last century, have given us recent examples of the Executive deciding on its own what it will do and will not do, regardless of congressional action to the contrary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. So, Mr. Chairman, we see the possibility of the Executive being able to set its own standards and criteria, and thus its own policies, and even the possibility of refusing to observe congressional policies.

I feel the integrity of Congress and perhaps even the balance of powers in the three branches of Government are at stake. If the Members believe this is not a political issue back home, then I suggest they discuss it with some of their constituents. People do not like their Congresses or their Congressmen to be merely rubber stamps for the executive branch of the Government.

In section 7(b), as noted earlier, other agencies are precluded from bringing in conflicting facts on transportation standards and criteria to those developed by the Secretary of Transportation. It will be somewhat like the good soldiers in the Defense Department, where they go along or get out.

The next step after this legislation is passed, as I see it, will be for the executive branch of the Government to submit a reorganization plan to bring in the rest of the activities now undertaken by Government in the transportation field. Thus the Department of Transportation Secretary will have the opportunity to be in fact a czar of transportation.

Perhaps it will be unnecessary to do that, however, because with Executive control of standards and criteria and Federal investments in rail, air, highway, and maritime activities, the rest of the areas in which Federal investments are made will be surrounded.

In my opinion section 7 should not be stricken from this legislation. It should be amended to say that Congress, and not the President, has the power to establish standards and criteria. An

amendment will be introduced to this effect.

I believe it is enough for the Congress to yield the quasi-legislative, the quasi-judicial, and the quasi-administrative duties of the present independent agencies to the Executive, and for the Executive to have in this new Department a direct line of control into the presently independent agencies which now deal with transportation.

The independence of the CAB will be discussed later on, I am sure, but it has been alluded to by my colleague from Illinois. The independence of the CAB will be largely vitiated by the fact that the independence in the investigation of accidents will be lost, by bringing this activity under the Department of Transportation's Secretary, so that he will have the power to control the expenditures for this formerly completely independent accident investigation activity. CAB will not have the unfettered opportunity to criticize other transportation activities of the Federal Government under this bill.

Congress will not be a watchdog in such areas any longer, because there will not be the opportunity for divergent views. So perhaps industries will speak up? There is no representation for a spokesman for any transportation industry in this bill.

What do the Assistant Secretaries and the Administrators do under this legislation? If anyone wants to find out, do not read the bill. We have to ask the author of the bill, because the bill is silent on this subject. The Secretaries are left in limbo, for the Secretary of Transportation to tell them what their assignment will be.

Research? Whom will we have appointed? A college professor? A labor union economist? Who will it be? It may not be—because the bill does not suggest that it will be—the representative of any mode of transportation. Who then suggests to the Federal Government with reference to transportation, and to whom do they suggest it? Apparently only to the Secretary himself. If there is a head of a trucking company who feels the Federal Government's policies are hurting his business, to whom does he go? He does not have any assured representation within the Department of Transportation and Congress does not determine standards and criteria for Federal investment any more.

H.R. 15963 is compromised in order to present to us a new model H.R. 13200, which was the original administration version. Frankly, it is just a little chrome added to the old steamroller.

There has been no industry testimony on H.R. 15963, and very little committee testimony, and very little testimony, for that matter, from the executive branch of the Government.

An allusion was made earlier to the Hoover Commission and the fact that the Hoover Commission recommended the formation of a Department of Transportation. I should like to clear up a point here, because my predecessor from Ohio in the seat I now hold was the author of the Hoover Commission and

served on it. The Hoover Commission did not recommend the formation of a Department of Transportation. The Brookings Institute, which did the homework for the transportation area of the Hoover Commission, recommended the creation of a separate Department of Transportation. The Hoover Commission members turned down the idea and suggested that the Department of Transportation should be incorporated into the Department of Commerce.

And the first step was taken in that area. Do you Members know what went in? It was the merchant marine. What success has it had since the Maritime Administration went into that Department?

What this bill does is to give great powers from the Congress to the executive branch of the Government.

What it does not do is:

It does not spell out any transportation policy.

It does not solve transportation labor tie-ups. They are not even mentioned under this legislation.

It does not tell how highway carnage can be ended. It does put safety regulation in the new organization, but it does not say what we will do about it.

It does not improve the merchant marine at all. As a matter of fact, it leaves it at the same level as now, or below.

It does not help the sick and over-regulated railroads. But it gives the railroads two masters instead of one.

It does not attack the problem of aircraft noise, so that airports can be located where the people are.

It does not accept the responsibility it ought to have in regard to mass transportation.

The author of the bill says that this bill is "a new organization, a new framework, and a new posture of government—a willingness to look at many interrelated transportation problems in a comprehensive way with readiness to grapple with them—a broad and enduring foundation upon which a national transportation policy can be built."

It gives the power to the Executive to do that or anything he might want to. It does not do much else.

The President was somewhat more candid in his message on this bill when he said:

We have fallen short because our transportation system has not emerged from a single drawing board on which the needs and capacities of our economy were all charted.

Section 7 consolidates all the industry drawing boards of all the modes of transportation and moves them from the Congress to the White House.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

As I have listened to my good friend from Ohio [Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.], I have been astounded by his approach to the bill. If I wished to stand up in the well of the House and mention 150 things that did not pertain to the legislation under consideration probably I could do so. Many of the things to which he referred require statutory changes by jurisdictional committees.

It is not within the jurisdiction of this committee to go into the statutory changes over which other committees have jurisdiction.

This has been one of the guiding principles of our procedure, not to step on the toes of other committees.

The gentleman speaks about section 7. He speaks about giving power to the Secretary.

The first three lines of section 7 are:

The Secretary shall develop and from time to time in the light of experience revise standards and criteria consistent with national transportation policies,

That is on page 23. Now let us look at lines 10 to 16 on page 6:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize without appropriate action by Congress, the adoption or revision of a national transportation policy. Nor shall the Secretary promulgate investment standards or criteria pursuant to section 7 of this Act which are contrary to or inconsistent with Acts of Congress relating to standards or criteria for transportation investments.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They have to come back. They have to come back to this Congress to do these things.

Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. How many of the standards and criteria for the investment made in transportation by the Federal Government are spelled out in existing legislation?

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute in order to answer the question of the gentleman.

All criteria and standards of investment that now exist still exist. No new ones will be allowed unless they are consistent with existing acts of Congress or, if they are not consistent with existing statutory acts of Congress, the Secretary has to come back to the Congress and get statutory enactment of the basic authority so that he can make rules, regulations, and criteria based upon that statutory authority.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. But the Secretary has the power under the language of section 7 to set those standards and criteria any way he wants to, does he not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, but not unless they are consistent with present statutes, criteria, and standards which have been approved by the Congress. If they go contrary to the existing statutes, then he has to come back to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I will pursue this further at another time, because I have now promised to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and I do so yield.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15963 to create a new executive Department of Transportation. This measure will provide coordination for the vast programs our Government is already engaged in the field of transportation and produce greater effectiveness in the solution of the many knotty transportation problems still remaining.

We have made remarkable progress in providing for the transportation needs

of our country and its fast growing population on land, by water and in the air. The utter dependence of our economy and the welfare of the people on transportation systems is patiently obvious. One-sixth of our gross national product is accounted for by transportation. But important as it is and as good as it is, it is not good enough.

In the words of our President in his message to Congress earlier this year:

It is not good enough when it offers nearly a mile of street or road for every square mile of land—and yet provides no relief from time-consuming, frustrating, and wasteful congestion.

It is not good enough when it produces sleek and efficient jet aircraft—and yet cannot move passengers to and from airports in the time it takes those aircraft to fly hundreds of miles.

It is not good enough when it builds super-highways for supercharged automobiles—and yet cannot find a way to prevent 50,000 highway deaths this year.

It is not good enough when public and private investors pour \$15 million into a large, high-speed ship—only to watch it remain idle in port for days before it is loaded.

It is not good enough when it lays out new freeways to serve new cities and suburbs—and carelessly scars the irreplaceable countryside.

It is not good enough when it adheres to custom for its own sake—and ignores opportunities to serve our people more economically and efficiently.

It is not good enough if it responds to the needs of an earlier America—and does not help us expand our trade and distribute the fruits of our land throughout the world.

The President said that America today still lacks a coordinated transportation system that permits travelers and goods to move conveniently and efficiently from one means of transportation to another, using the best characteristics of each.

It is obvious to me, Mr. Chairman, that greater coordination in the system is required, but before that can ever be accomplished there must be coordination in the Federal Government's own programs to aid our transportation system.

This need for coordination is widely recognized. The Wall Street Journal has expressed its amazement that because of our uncoordination the Nation's transportation web is not in worse shape. The Journal, and I might say other respected voices, cry that this bill does not go far enough. All functions, they say, both promotional and regulatory, should be in the Department.

Our friends in the Republican Policy Committee support the establishment of a new department but with reservations concerning various features of the bill.

We all recall, of course, that President Eisenhower called for such a department.

There is, then, a widespread consensus on the basic question of coordination and that an executive department is the proper instrument for such coordination.

This House has only last week expressed its continuing and vital interest in transportation problems by passing the Motor Vehicle Safety Act and the Highway Safety Act, both of which will have a profound impact on the excessively high accident rate in our country. Safety will be a prime objective of the

new department and for this reason alone the bill merits passage.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has already detailed the composition of the new department. I will not repeat this to you. I think the organizational concept is sound from the point of view of proper governmental management. I do not think it is necessary or desirable to bring the regulatory agencies and their functions into the new department. These are quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial. They represent, as we all know, an extension of the power of Congress and carry on their activities better in independent status.

I would like to stress here two aspects of transportation not included in this bill. Many Members like myself are interested in the St. Lawrence Seaway and the promise this holds for the development of the trade and commerce of our inland States. Last Friday, 49 Members of both the House and Senate sent a petition to the White House requesting the President to postpone for a year any toll increases on the seaway so that Congress may have an opportunity to review our Government's role in financing and, we hope, strengthen the seaway by passing legislation to make permanent our Federal investment in that great development. In his message on transportation, the President proposed that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation be included in the new Department of Transportation. The Corporation was not put in the bill because legislation was not necessary to accomplish this transfer and the President could and would do it by Executive order after the Department has been established.

We believe this should be done and will be done by the President. We have been given a clear understanding on this question and have, therefore, not introduced an amendment to the bill such as has been proposed by a number of Members of the other body.

Furthermore, the importance of this great Corporation is such that when brought into the Department it should not be subordinate to any operating agency but should be on a par with the other operating agencies such as the Federal Railroad Administration, Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Maritime Administration and the Coast Guard. We want the record being made here today to show that we have assurances from the White House that the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation will not be downgraded in the new Department. It will continue as an operating agency and, as such, will report directly to the Secretary. Its needs will not, therefore, be lost sight of in the competition with other transportation requirements.

In submitting his proposal for a new Department of Transportation, the President did not include urban mass transportation. As all Members know, this program is now being administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. HUD is responsible for a unified Federal approach to urban problems. The Department of Transportation is responsible for a unified approach

to transportation problems. Neither can work independently of the other in urban transportation. The two must participate in the important decisions that must be made, which will require the contribution and cooperation of both Secretaries. The President was unable to state with certainty at this time what the proper division of labor between the two Departments should be. He has said that after the new Department has been created he will direct the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of HUD to study the problem and recommend to him within a year the means and procedures by which the cooperation can best be achieved, not only in principle but in practical effect.

I believe the President has chosen a wise course. Urban mass transit is so intimately tied in with other urban problems that it seems to me that the program should remain with HUD. I do have an open mind, however, based on future developments after the new Department has been put into operation.

The Mass Transportation Act, now in conference between the Houses, not only increases the grant authorization but includes a proposal that I presented in committee directing the Secretary of HUD in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce to prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration of new methods of urban transportation. We are seeking new breakthroughs in this tough problem for our hard-pressed cities. The solution will probably depend primarily on new and radically improved methods. We cannot now be sure that transferring this program to DOT will be the answer. We need action, fast action on these problems. It may cause some delay to move it over.

In the Housing Act of 1966 that has been reported and is pending for action in the House, we give to the Secretary of HUD authority to achieve coordination of Federal programs in metropolitan development by calling on other Federal agencies to supply such data as he considers necessary and we require those other agencies to cooperate with him in carrying out his responsibilities. This would naturally include urban transportation and it may well be that under this authority the Secretary of HUD could adequately fulfill his responsibilities in successfully meeting the urban mass transit problem.

Thus, a strong case can be made for keeping mass transit in HUD and it would indeed be precipitous for Congress to transfer it to the Department of Transportation at this critical time.

The legislation before us is among the most important the Congress will act on this year. I hope H.R. 15963 will be passed by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Is there anything in the language of the legislation which we now have under consideration which says or even indicates in any way that what the gentleman just said is so, that the President will ask the Secretary of the Department

of Transportation and the Secretary of HUD to sit down together and make a study?

Mr. REUSS. No; there is no language in the act, but the President has strongly supported this. I have no doubt whatever, from my conversations with Secretary Weaver of HUD, that this study will probably be made and a recommendation made in no greater length of time than 1 year's time, and I would think the matter could then be resolved.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. This is in the area then of faith, let us say? We just sort of take some of these things on faith that these will be done at some future date in all likelihood if things are right and if everyone is agreeable. And if there is no real objection at that time?

Mr. REUSS. I think we take this on a little more than faith, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio. In the first place, we have the considered and public statement of the President of the United States, and in the second place, Urban Mass Transit now is in the Department of HUD, and any time the Members of the Legislature feel that it should be transferred over to Transportation or any place else this, of course, can be done.

Mr. Chairman, the President is acting in good faith when he says he cannot now determine where the public interest will best be served. I myself would have difficulty making that decision.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. These statements are not binding upon a future President nor are they binding upon the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, should we establish this Department and a Secretary is appointed?

Mr. REUSS. No. All that the President has said is that he is going to ask the two Secretaries to make a study and report back to him with their recommendations within a period of a year. However, he could submit such official report to the Congress at any time when in his judgment it is ready. It is open to the Congress at any time to make its judgment.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct, and let me read the words of the President of the United States in his transmission of March 2 with reference to his message on the subject of urban transportation. He stated as follows:

Urban transportation.—The Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development must cooperate in decisions affecting urban transportation.

The future of urban transportation—the safety, convenience, and indeed the livability of its users—depends upon wide-scale,

rational planning. If the Federal Government is to contribute to that planning, it must speak with a coherent voice.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development bears the principal responsibility for a unified Federal approach to urban problems. Yet it cannot perform this task without the counsel, support, and cooperation of the Department of Transportation.

I shall ask the two Secretaries to recommend to me, within a year after the creation of the new Department, the means and procedures by which this cooperation can best be achieved—not only in principle, but in practical effect.

This is the President's intention. Of course, you cannot bind the actions of Presidents in the future, but we would not doubt the integrity of the President in saying what he wants to do because he is not only a man of integrity but it is also a matter of good sense.

We are looking at this problem in the cities within the confines of municipal areas. We have a special problem there which is completely different from the intercity transportation across the country from city to city.

They are studying this problem down there. They have already set up a group down there that are working on this problem and they are going to come back to us at the end of a year and give us a report as to whether it should be in the Department of Transportation.

Maybe they will recommend that it should be in the Department of Transportation. Maybe they will recommend that it stay in HUD. But at least at that time they will have to come before the Congress—and if they do not come voluntarily, I will take the responsibility to ask them to come before my committee at the end of the year and give us their report. I think they will do this without any special urging because Mr. Weaver has told me he will be glad to come and report to us at the end of the year.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have the assurance of the gentleman in the well and of my colleagues from California and the assurances he read from the President. The only way we could tie this down any further is to write it into the legislation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] has an amendment, or at least is trying to prepare an amendment. I might say I would not want to commit myself to it because I do not know what the wording will be. But we have had some very pleasant talks together about this amendment that the gentlewoman is working on and I am in accord with her purpose. If we can work something out that will be germane to the bill and properly placed within the bill, I would say at this time that I have no objection to the principle that is involved, although very frankly I think it is unnecessary. But I am of an open mind on the subject, I will say.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. I think if we can get it into the legislation, we would all be satisfied.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if I may address myself to the point of urban mass transportation, which I know the

gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Ohio and the gentlewoman from New Jersey are all intensely interested in, I would like to give my own personal view, as one who is also intensely interested in a breakthrough in urban mass transportation.

I would hope very much that the problem of urban mass transportation could stay in HUD, where it now is, for some time to come. I say that not because I am mortgaged to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, but because they are now seized of the problem. They have been working at it.

Mr. Chairman, just this week this body, with bipartisan support, passed the Mass Transportation Act of 1966, which I trust will become law very shortly, a key provision of which was to impose upon the Department of Housing and Urban Development the task of working out within the next 18 months a 5-year crash program of research and development and demonstration of wholly new systems of urban transportation.

I think many Members feel in their bones that new technology must be evolved if we are really going to untangle the traffic jams of our cities.

It would be a bad blow to the expediting of this program if the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which has been working on this for many months and holding conferences with experts from all the great industries of our country and from our great universities, were suddenly to be divested of this jurisdiction, and if it should be lodged in the Department of Transportation or in some other place which, being a fledgling department, simply would not be set up to do it.

I am sure we would lose a couple of years of momentum which we so desperately need. I would hope my friends on the minority side would take that into account should they decide to offer an amendment on this point, and take into account the imperativeness of going forward with research and development on new systems of mass transportation.

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

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

Mr. ERLÉNBERN. I think the gentleman would agree with me that if we have a crisis in transportation in this country, it is in the area of urban mass transportation. Our greatest problem lies right there.

Mr. REUSS. I completely agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ERLÉNBERN. Certainly any solution to that problem will have to be coordinated with our overall transportation system. We cannot ignore the modes of transportation that are bringing people and goods into the central cities, and any urban mass transit program that we develop must be coordinated with our system of highway, aircraft, railroad, and other modes of transportation.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman is so right. Just as urban transport has to be coordinated with other forms of transport, so the forms of transport have to be coordinated with the transit problems

of our cities. The two are really indistinguishable parts of a whole. If we follow logic on the subject, we would say, "Let us have just one glorious Cabinet department which will handle all our problems."

Inevitably there are overlaps. They can be settled only by sympathetic coordination. Whichever way this thing goes, a year from now it will be the job of the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and others to see that that coordination is obtained.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman has made the point, and the point was made by administration witnesses in our hearings, that this is a new program. The Housing and Urban Department Act was passed only last year and that this is a new program. Therefore, we should let it grow where it is. Congress made a conscious decision to put it in the Housing and Urban Department program last year. Obviously the Congress was not presented with the choice last year of putting the urban mass transit program either in the Department of Transportation or in the Housing and Urban Development Department, because we had no Department of Transportation.

The point I would like to make is that if this is a fledgling program which should not be ripped up by its roots, then what is the rationale behind taking the Northeast Corridor, the high-speed rail program, out of the Department of Commerce, which is also a new, fledgling program, ripping that up by the roots and putting it in the new Department?

Mr. REUSS. I will be glad to try to answer that question.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Let me suggest an answer, and that is that we are developing the personnel for this new program. If we are developing the personnel for a new program, why not let this personnel and the program be developed where the program will ultimately rest, instead of having it start here and then moving it over, with the resultant dismay to those involved in it?

Mr. REUSS. I think the gentleman begs the question when he says that the mass transit program will ultimately rest in the Department of Transportation. We do not know. I want to wait to see what the study develops a year from now. It did make sense, since the Department of Commerce was being very largely relieved of its transportation functions, to take the Boston-to-Washington high-speed railroad out of that Department and put it in Transportation. It is also true that the high-speed Boston-to-Washington railroad related to railroads generally in intercity transport, and it will go to the new Department of Transportation.

I think, however, there is a vital difference between that and urban mass transit, where we for several months have been getting started and are gathering momentum and building up a staff on urban mass transit.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute, whether he wants it or not.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman, but I think I have divested myself.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to point out that on page 15 of the report the following statement appears:

The President has said he intends, upon the creation of the Department of Transportation, to ask the heads of the two Departments concerned to study and report within 1 year on a logical and efficient organization of urban mass transportation functions. It may well be that these functions will be lodged in the new Department. The committee considers that the President's proposed course is reasonable and that the final organizational decision on urban mass transportation should be deferred.

Until this study is completed.

Mr. REUSS. That says it in a nutshell. The matter should be deferred until we know what we are doing.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have no great conflicts in principle here.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I have considered it a privilege and a pleasure to serve on the Government Operations Committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson] and to work closely with the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] on the Military Operations Subcommittee.

Also I want to take this occasion to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN], for the very patient time that they have spent in bringing to the floor this very important piece of legislation. Knowing the gentleman from California, and having worked with him on the Military Operations Subcommittee of this committee, I know how thorough he is. I know, from having worked with Mr. ERLENBORN also on another subcommittee, of his thoroughness in this legislation. I know both of them have spent a great amount of time, as have other members of the subcommittee, in bringing this bill to the floor.

I want to indicate that I support the bill and I expect to vote for it.

I recognize that the establishment of a new department certainly creates problems, and this bill certainly does have some problems. I have signed the additional views, which are on page 79 of the report which accompanies H.R. 15963. I invite my colleagues to read those additional views, in which I was joined by seven other members of the minority. These views point out some of the problems with respect to this bill.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer an amendment to promote labor-management harmony in the transportation industry which will direct the Secretary of Transportation to assist in promoting industrial harmony and stable employment conditions in all modes of transportation. The Secretary also would be responsible for informing the President

of the status of labor-management contracts.

I am not suggesting another labor agency nor does the Horton amendment propose to interfere with or in any sense replace or duplicate the existing agencies concerned with labor-management relations.

My plan is an "early warning system," and my amendment would make constructive counsel available to labor and management before difficulties reach the point of work stoppages.

Collective bargaining is one of our fundamental freedoms. Government has a responsibility to help assure its vitality. Therefore, I believe our approach in Congress should avoid punitive actions that can only lead to erosion of this right. Rather, let us employ the resources of the Federal Government to induce cooperation and agreement.

Arthur Goldberg, when he was Secretary of Labor, expressed very well what I intend by my amendment. Speaking to the National Academy of Arbitrators at Pittsburgh in 1962, Mr. Goldberg said:

The government must give better aid to collective bargaining not only through improved good office and mediation procedures but also through better and more precise economic data—data provided before the fact, not as a post mortem inquest; so as to assist settlements, not simply analyze them.

My proposal will offer this kind of aid through the Secretary of Transportation. Such impartial assistance would benefit both labor and management by advance detection of friction points. From this knowledge, I would hope the Secretary could work with the parties involved in a common effort to resolve problems before they grow, otherwise unattended, into crisis proportions.

The recent airline strike points up the fact that labor relations in the transportation industries are far from harmonious. Work stoppages in the airlines, railway, and maritime industries have occurred with some frequency. The railroads have had a bitter conflict regarding work rules. In the maritime industry, Taft-Hartley emergency disputes provisions have had to be frequently invoked, and with little success, for the strikes often went on after all the emergency procedures had been exhausted. Only in the trucking industry has there been relative quiet.

Since transportation has a crucial role in the Nation's economy, transport work stoppages are almost immediately a matter of national interest. If the strike is prolonged, the Government becomes more and more involved. Emergency boards and commissions are appointed. The public demands that something be done. Finally, if emergency procedures are exhausted, the only action remaining is for the President to act, or for special legislation to be passed.

In offering my amendment which directs the Secretary of Transportation to assist in promoting labor-management harmony in the Nation's transportation industries, I am impressed with the need to study labor legislation in the transportation industries. Such studies

could deal with, for example, inconsistencies in the present law. The railroads and airlines are covered by the Railway Labor Act while the trucking and maritime industries come under the National Labor Relations Act, including the amendments enacted in the Taft-Hartley Act. The National Mediation Board and the National Railroad Adjustment Board are concerned with the railroads and airlines, while the trucking and maritime industries come under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services.

As an article published 2 years ago points out:

... Even students of labor relations are puzzled by differences in emergency dispute clauses found in the Railway Labor Act as compared to the Taft-Hartley Act. The employment of a Taft-Hartley injunction, as compared to the appointment of an emergency panel under the Railway Labor Act, results in a different procedure and time period for a "status quo" on the issues.¹

Under both laws, however, transportation disputes have become what the Secretary of Labor has termed "marathons of maneuver." At a 1963 meeting of the National Academy of Arbitrators, he said:

The last round of contract disputes in the airline industry (not yet quite completed) took over two years, and involved the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the Under Secretary of Labor, the National Mediation Board, a Special Presidential Commission, nine Presidential Emergency Boards, and three Boards of Arbitration—a total of 36 public representatives.

(In) the recent longshore case, the public participants, during its twelve-month course, were the President, the Secretary of Labor, an Assistant Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, his Deputy, fifteen FMCS mediators, a Taft-Hartley Board of Inquiry, the Attorney General, the Federal District Court, the Mayors of numerous port cities, a Special Presidential Board which was appointed but never convened, and another Special Board under the chairmanship of a U.S. Senator.²

Secretary Wirtz concluded then that "such a program of improvisation clearly offers nothing for the longrun future."³ The airline strike, and the uncertainty as to how it was going to be settled, appeared to bear out this conclusion. Therefore, it seems imperative that more workable and consistent means be devised to deal with labor disputes in the transportation industries. The present legal and administrative machinery is inadequate.

It is true that many legislative remedies have been suggested. They tend to be drastic—for example, compulsory arbitration—and/or hastily devised because they are usually the result of a transportation emergency brought on by a labor dispute. However, I feel an "early warning system" in the proposed Department of Transportation could

help come up with solutions which were arrived at through careful study of the complex issues involved.

Legislation is, of course, not the only or final answer to labor disputes. Good will and effective communication between the parties involved are also necessary. My labor-management amendment, in fact, directs the Secretary of Transportation to assist in promoting better relations between labor and management in the transportation industries as a supplement to the good offices of the National Mediation Board and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

The major justification for assigning this new authority to the Department of Transportation would be to put increased emphasis upon a problem area in transportation. The first stated purpose of the Department of Transportation Act—H.R. 15963 as reported by the House Committee on Government Operations—is to provide leadership in identifying and solving transportation problems. I believe the Horton amendment could make a major contribution to this goal.

When it is offered, during the amending process, I urge my colleagues to support it so that we can have this additional tool in this crucial area.

Again may I state my belief in this bill. It is important for us to establish a Department of Transportation in order that we can have one uniform Federal policy respecting national transportation.

I believe it is in the national interest to have this Department. Even though we do have problems, which I am sure will be ironed out during the amending process, this is a good bill.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute for the purpose of expressing my appreciation for the hard work that he has done on the Subcommittee on Military Operations, for his devotion to duty, for his attendance at the sessions, and for his always constructive approach to the problems which we have in that subcommittee. The gentleman knows how highly I regard his judgment. I will look forward tomorrow to seeing the context of his amendment, and I will give it every consideration that I can in relation to the integrity of the bill.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have never been an enthusiast about increasing governmental agencies. In fact, on previous occasions, I have opposed the establishment of new Federal departments simply because of a desire to slow down, rather than accelerate, the pace at which governmental activities and bureaucracy are expanding.

All of us know that governmental agencies have a way not only of perpetuating themselves, but of expanding both their personnel and the areas of their jurisdiction. Frankly, I think that Gov-

ernment is much too big and I wish there were some way we could decentralize it. But I am also conscious of the fact that as our national economy becomes increasingly complex, centralized direction becomes increasingly necessary in some areas, especially those which require regulation.

The field of transportation is such an area. It was inevitable that there would have to be Federal regulation of transportation by rail, by air, and by water. It was equally inevitable that major responsibility for the planning and financing of roads and highways would have to be undertaken by the Federal Government as would the regulation of transport traffic over the Nation's highways.

Heretofore, these highly important elements of our transportation industry have been scattered in a wide variety of independent agencies and some have been parts of governmental departments where they have been comparatively insignificant subordinate elements. Transportation is a tremendously important part of our economy, and there is such an inseparable interrelationship among the differing but competing modes of transport that a coordinating authority is needed. Such coordination, it seems to me, can best be provided by a new Federal department, headed by a Secretary with Cabinet status.

During committee consideration of this bill, my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] and I offered an amendment which was adopted by the committee that will leave with the Interstate Commerce Commission its present powers and functions in railroad "car service" matters. I consider this to be one of the more important amendments made in committee because such matters which often involve quasi-judicial determinations should be left with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There is much more to "car service" than getting freight cars to points at which they are needed. Numerous provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act vest the Commission with certain powers and authority over "car service." Some of those sections apply only in times of car shortages or emergency conditions, while other sections have general application and apply to the everyday operations of the railroads. All of these sections are, in a sense, interrelated and deal directly with the economic regulation of the railroad industry. In addition, car service, in its broad sense, includes such matters as demurrage, or car detention, and charges for these, along with the rules, regulations, and practices affecting such charges, are published in public tariffs.

Thus, the so-called car service functions reach deeply into the economic regulation of the railroad industry. Such economic regulatory matters should properly rest with the Interstate Commerce Commission and should not be placed in the hands of an executive or purely administrative agency.

Another point I want to discuss has to do with the placing of the Maritime Administration within the new Department.

I have the honor to represent a district where transportation is a major industry.

¹ Shils, Edward B. Transportation's Labor Crisis. Harvard Business Review. May/June 1964, p. 96.

² As quoted in Kaufman, Jacob J. The Railroad Labor Dispute: a Marathon of Maneuver and Improvisation. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, January 1965, p. 196.

³ Ibid, pp. 196-197.

My district is a maritime district. We boast the finest harbor in the world—Hampton Roads. We also pride ourselves on unexcelled shipping and ship-building facilities, as well as personnel who are outstanding in maritime services and operations. The first job I had after graduation from college was with a steamship agency. Through the years I have learned the importance of shipping to our Nation—the importance of our merchant marine, not only to the economy and commercial well-being of our country, but as an urgent requirement of our national defense.

In recent years I have been deeply concerned about our merchant marine, about the way it has been neglected, about our failure to pursue the policy officially set forth in our Merchant Marine Act. I shall not attempt to place the responsibility for this, but you and I have witnessed a rapid decline in the American merchant marine. We are not operating the ships that we should be operating. We have lost our position of leadership. Not only are we not operating the number of ships we should be operating, but we are not keeping our fleet modern—we are not building the ships we ought to be building. In short, although there is statutory authority to make the American merchant marine second to none, that statute is not being carried out.

Who can say how much of this is due to the fact that the Maritime Administration is just a little wheel in the big Department of Commerce? Who can say whether the lack of emphasis on new ship construction is due to disinterest on the part of the Secretary of Commerce or to the inability of the Administrator of the Maritime Administration to secure the kind of support he has needed?

Let me comment briefly on the proposal advanced by some of our colleagues to establish an independent maritime agency outside the Department of Transportation. I know that they are motivated by an earnest desire to try to promote our Nation's maritime interests and to try to restore Maritime to its proper place in our national picture.

I, too, share that desire, but I am convinced that the best way to accomplish that objective is to make the Maritime Administration one of the major components of the new Department of Transportation. Then that new component should be staffed by aggressive, competent top-level personnel who can enlist the full cooperation and support of the Secretary, and through him have access to the White House and employ persuasion with the Bureau of the Budget.

Unfortunately, none of us can say with certainty where Maritime would function best. It is a matter of judgment. But in recent years we have witnessed the transition of a number of agencies from independent status to constituent parts of two new Departments. I believe that the lines of communication for these constituent agencies have been improved and I think the voice of Maritime would be stronger when the needs of

our merchant marine are expressed by a Cabinet officer instead of merely by an agency administrator.

Under the bill, the Federal Maritime Commission would retain its independence as a quasi-judicial agency just as the ICC and the CAB would. This is entirely proper, and quasi-judicial functions should be separated from the responsibilities of the Secretary of Transportation. There is some question in my mind about the desirability of including in the new Department the responsibility for determining maritime subsidies which are of a regulatory nature, and may involve quasi-judicial determinations. It is my understanding that an amendment to establish an independent subsidy board may be offered, and as I understand that amendment, it seems to me to be a desirable one.

All in all, I think the bill before us justifies support, and that the administrative functions of the agencies which it embraces, including Maritime, can best be discharged by the new Department headed by a Secretary with Cabinet status.

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

Mr. HARDY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I compliment my beloved friend on his fine talk, but I must say that it is the first time in a long time that I must respectfully disagree with him.

Mr. HARDY. That does not make the gentleman right.

Mr. DOWNING. That does not make the gentleman in the well right either.

Does the gentleman believe it was wise when we passed Reorganization Plan No. 7 and we were told it would be helpful to the merchant marine—for you will recall that this was when they placed the merchant marine under the Department of Commerce and great things were supposed to happen to the merchant marine—but they have not. Would the gentleman agree with me that that was a mistake?

Mr. HARDY. Insofar as subsidy determinations are concerned, I am inclined to think that they should never have been placed in an administrative agency. I had some questions about that at the time.

I had some questions about this particular aspect of the matter at the time. As I recall it, when the reorganization plan was considered by our committee, I raised some questions about it. I think, however, we were given assurances that there would be adequate safeguards. I am not at all sure that it has worked as it should have. However, let me say this to my friend, I do not think the problem with our merchant marine stems from the fact that it is in the Department of Commerce, I think it stems from the fact that there has not been enough interest in the executive branch of the Government to give us the kind of merchant marine we should have had.

I put an editorial from the Norfolk Virginian Pilot newspaper in the Record yesterday. That editorial wound up

with this observation, which I think is a very valid one:

It is ultimately a Presidential responsibility.

If we have Presidential support for a sound merchant marine that would be our national policy. It does not make too much difference whether it is in the Department of Commerce or in a new department or whether it is an independent agency.

Without that we are still not going to get the kind of merchant marine we ought to have.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, in that respect I am very much in accord with the gentleman.

However, I am fearful that placing the merchant marine administration in the Department of Transportation will have the same result as when we placed it in the Department of Commerce and nothing good will come out of it. In my opinion, it is like transferring a body from one grave to another.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, let me comment just briefly on that, if I may. Actually as I stated a moment ago, I do not think it makes too much difference where it is. If it does not have support in the highest administration circles, Maritime is not going to get its place in the sun. However, a fault that I find with the present situation relates to the making of subsidy determinations which to my mind does have some quasi-judicial aspects. I think if that were removed from the administrative agency, it would be an improvement. However, I do not think the fact that this was placed in the Department of Commerce is responsible for all the ills of the merchant marine today.

The real trouble is that Maritime has not had the blessings of the top administrative people.

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

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman completely on his analysis of the plight of the maritime program.

Now it is well to go into some history. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] back in 1950, I believe it was—his committee made a complete analysis or scrutiny of the action of the Maritime Administration and came up with an interesting report. So interesting in fact that when Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950 came before us, there was not a disapproving resolution filed by the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries or any other Member of the House of Representatives and it automatically became the law.

Then, again, when Reorganization Plan No. 7 was considered, which was in 1961, our departed friend, the Honorable Herbert Bonner, came to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], and expressed his interest in the matter. The Committee on Government Operations voted to table the disapproving resolution introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr.

MONAGAN] at that time, and the matter was brought up on the floor on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], and in the debate on the floor Representatives CELLER and Bonner strongly supported the reorganization plan.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman is correct in his recollection that a subcommittee which I headed in 1949 and 1950 did make an extensive study of the Maritime Commission as it was then operating. I do not know whether our study had anything to do with the reorganization plan that was subsequently offered or not. I do know, however, that there were some shortcomings in the administration of the maritime program at that time and there was serious need for improvement. I cannot say whether there is any relationship actually between the reorganization plans of 1950 and 1961 and the deplorable situation in which Maritime now finds itself.

I am inclined to think its present plight is due more to neglect and disinterest in high places than anything else.

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

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

Mr. LENNON. I direct my remarks to the gentleman from California, who commented on the statement and position taken by a former beloved friend and chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, and call the attention of the House to the fact that the last official act of the late Herbert Bonner was to stand in the well of this House, after the introduction of a bill calling for the establishment of an independent maritime agency, and making the statement that he had made a grievous and grave mistake when he supported Reorganization Plan No. 17 in 1961, just to keep the record straight.

Mr. HARDY. I recall that that is an accurate portrayal of the situation. Whatever we do, Mr. Chairman, I think all of us are interested in improving the status of our American merchant marine. That is certainly my motivation.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARDY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Going back to Reorganization Plan No. 21 in 1950, which moved the Maritime Administration from an independent agency into the Department of Commerce, at that time under the Reorganization Act there was created in the Department of Commerce the position of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. That particular reorganization plan spelled out the responsibilities of the Secretary of Commerce to establish and promulgate a policy on transportation. It has not been done yet, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. HARDY. I must comment on that briefly.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hope the gentleman's comment will be brief, because I have an agreement for the Committee to rise at 5:30.

Mr. HARDY. That being the case, I will withhold the comment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman can conclude with his present commitments to speak before 5:30, I will ask that the title be read and then move that the Committee rise.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. I do not believe I have more than 20 minutes of time requested.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the creation of a Department of Transportation and the continued operation of the Coast Guard as a legal entity within it. I have asked for this opportunity to speak not only to voice my own support but to try to allay any apprehension there might be about uprooting this service originally established as a part of the Treasury Department by Alexander Hamilton in 1790. I speak as one who has served 4 years with the Coast Guard during World War II and also from my experience as an officer of the Coast Guard Reserve. I am pleased that those entrusted with maintaining the traditions of the Coast Guard have expressed full support for the transfer of the Coast Guard to the new Department of Transportation. In testifying before the Committee on Government Operations, Vice Adm. William D. Shields, former Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, stressed five special advantages accruing to the Coast Guard by this transfer:

First. The Coast Guard will be a part of an executive department whose sole objective is in an area in which the Coast Guard operates continually, that is transportation and transportation safety.

Second. The Coast Guard will be in the mainstream of development of national transportation policy.

Third. Coast Guard prestige at international conferences dealing with transportation will be enhanced by the Coast Guard being an integral part of the Department of Transportation.

Fourth. The resulting closer relationships with other elements in the Department of Transportation will improve Coast Guard capabilities.

Fifth. Coast Guard personnel would serve in positions within the Department of Transportation at high levels of policymaking and administration.

It is further to be stressed that the Coast Guard is the only Government agency being brought into the new Department which is to preserve its identity as a separate unit. As the committee report specifically points out on page 24:

So far as the Coast Guard is concerned, while it has a traditional link to the Treasury Department, its primary civil functions relate to maritime and to some extent air transportation. Now that a separate Department of Transportation is being set up, that Department is the logical home for the Coast Guard which, under the bill, would still remain as a separate unit in its present form.

It is essential that in view of the fact that during wartime the Coast Guard becomes a military service under the operational control of the Navy, and that its status as a complete entity should and must be maintained at all times.

That the Department of Transportation is the new, natural home for the Coast Guard is especially appropriate since the Coast Guard is the agency of the Federal Government principally responsible for safety in the maritime field. As transportation safety is to be a particular concern of this new Department it is imperative that the Coast Guard have an effective voice in policy questions affecting standards and procedures regulating our sealanes. As Vice Adm. Paul E. Trimble, at the time Chief of Staff of the Coast Guard, testified before the other body:

Because of our important missions in the search and rescue field and the aids to navigation field, and the maritime safety field, and others, it was apparent from the outset that the Coast Guard is an essential member of the Transportation family.

Speaking for the Coast Guard Admiral Trimble added:

I think we would feel like we were a second cousin if there were a Department of Transportation . . . considering transportation policy, transportation long range planning and research—(and) we were on the outside and not a part of it because of the part that we do play.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the relocating of the Coast Guard within the Department of Transportation will not adversely affect Coast Guard operations. Furthermore, there is a strong indication that it would actually be detrimental to the service and to the Nation if it were left out. I, therefore, support and urge my colleagues to support this section of H.R. 15963.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, a highly mobile population is probably the most distinctive feature of modern American society. Transportation today accounts for one-sixth of our \$700 billion gross national product. It is therefore anachronistic and wasteful to maintain the current overlapping and uncoordinated collection of Federal transportation agencies. Valuable streamlining will be achieved by passage of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966.

This act creates a Cabinet-level Department with operating divisions embracing the major modes of travel. The Department will coordinate the 100,000 Federal personnel employed and the \$6 billion in Federal tax funds spent annually for transportation.

In the long run, this consolidation will save the taxpayers' money. The Bureau of the Budget believes that budgetary economies, such as more effectively used computers, will completely offset within

2 to 3 years the cost of creating the Department.

All transportation problems will be more effectively attacked within the framework of the Department of Transportation. But one problem in particular will be given vitally needed special attention. A National Transportation Safety Board will work within the Department to try and awaken the American people to the high rate of transportation accidents.

Last year, 1,365 Americans died in Vietnam. The public was understandably concerned by each death. But where was the corresponding public concern for the 49,000 Americans who died in auto accidents during the same year?

Hopefully the National Transportation Safety Board will be able to break through the high wall of public apathy which currently surrounds this problem. This Board will carefully investigate the causes of accidents and then recommend appropriate legislation to Congress.

The Department of Transportation will also formulate consistent Federal policies governing investment in transportation facilities, just as the Water Resources Council now develops investment standards for water resource projects. Clear standards are needed to meaningfully evaluate the hundreds of transportation proposals brought before the Government each year.

The creation of a Cabinet-level Department is a large undertaking. But when 2.5 million Americans earn their living by moving people and goods, a large undertaking is required. Although we sometimes wish we could, it is impossible to go back to that period in history when only five Cabinet-level Departments were sufficient to run the affairs of this Nation. The Department of Transportation is necessary to help us keep pace with the growing complexity of modern life.

Mr. ERLÉNORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15963) to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14596) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department

of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14921) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. Con. Res. 90) entitled "Concurrent resolution to authorize printing of additional copies of hearings."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8989) entitled "An act to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. FANNIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE ACTIONS OF MR. HAROLD HOWE II

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall that during the recent debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1966, several Congressmen brought to the attention of the House the high-handed, tyrannical, inconsistent, illogical and even illegal actions of Mr. Harold Howe II.

Now, I have news for the Members that the constitutional guarantee of a free press has been dealt a shattering blow in the State of Georgia by four junior bureaucrats from the U.S. Office of Education.

It has come to my attention that a four-man team from the Office of Education has been visiting with boards of education throughout Georgia telling them what must be done if they are to continue receiving Federal aid.

Despite the fact that the State of Georgia has an open-meetings law, and ignoring the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution, these representatives of the Federal Government have refused to meet in the presence of accredited news reporters. Members of the press have been expelled from meetings they have a legal right to attend. While the local school boards have defended the people's

inherent right to be informed, the press has been barred at the demand of four political hacks, who were, on their own admission, carrying out orders from Washington.

These four men have stormed through Georgia with the diplomacy of a buzzsaw, disrupting our local communities and flouting the State's open meetings law. The team spokesman, who identified himself as James Rich, has taken the position that meetings between his uninvited group and local school officials can be compared to a jury session in which matters are understandably discussed behind closed doors. At least one school official told this emissary that he was not serving on a jury but rather attending a public meeting to handle public business.

Mr. Speaker, just in case any of my colleagues are wondering at this point why the local school officials and representatives of the press stood for such capricious and arbitrary treatment, I would like to remind my friends that the Office of Education holds a big stick over the heads of our educators. Through a bureaucratic interpretation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, our school boards are forced to bow and scrape to each and every silly demand of King Harold Howe II, and his numerous lackeys or face the withdrawal of Federal aid. Such action has served to strengthen rather than soften resistance toward the desegregation guidelines in the South.

The Georgia Press Association, which represents 227 newspapers in the State, has adopted a resolution expressing the indignation of the fourth estate. I have in my possession a copy of this resolution and selected editorial comments from the Georgia press which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission at this point in the RECORD to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

A RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GEORGIA PRESS ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Georgia Press Association, representing 227 newspapers in the state believes the public has a right to know about all matters of the public's business, and,

Whereas the newspapers uphold the inherent constitutional right of the people to be represented in meetings wherein are discussed matters of vital public concern and interest, and,

Whereas the laws of the State of Georgia provide that public bodies, including boards of education hold open meetings and maintain open records, and,

Whereas the representatives of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare are currently holding meetings with local school boards in Georgia for the purpose of resolving difficulties with regard to desegregation of school systems, a subject of vital public interest, as acknowledged by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare itself, in specifically recommending certain steps to encourage community support for its student-teacher transfer policies, namely "meeting with civic groups, parent groups and church groups and the like to express the purposes and nature of the desegregation plan and transfer policy encouraging public officials and other community leaders to make public statements and otherwise provide for the desegregation plan and transfer policy" and,

Whereas certain representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, including one James Rich, have arbitrarily refused to permit representatives of newspapers and other media, as well as interested private citizens, to attend various local meetings of representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and local school boards when matters of guideline compliance were discussed, and,

Whereas said James Rich claims to have been instructed by superiors in Washington to discuss the above matters only in closed meetings, and,

Whereas the Georgia Press Association feels the public interest and orderly transition of Georgia's public school system can best be served in an atmosphere of free discussion, free exchange of ideas, open meetings and trustworthiness on the part of representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Press Association strongly protests the action of said James Rich and other representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and hereby calls on the executive branch of the government and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to instruct its representatives to cease the policy of secret meetings and abide by the laws of the state providing for free and open meetings of its respective school boards; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be provided the Executive Department, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Georgia Congressional delegation, the National Newspaper Association and all members of this association and respectfully request that this resolution be acknowledged.

Adopted unanimously this 13th day of August, 1966 by the Board of Managers of the Georgia Press Association, Atlanta, Ga.
ROBERT D. FOWLER,
President.

Attest:

GLENN McCULLOCH,
Secretary.

[Editorial from the Dawson (Ga.) News, Aug. 18, 1966]

SCHOOL BOARDS AND HEW

School boards in Georgia which signed the new federal desegregation compliance forms with exceptions are finding themselves in pretty much of a predicament after all.

A team of four federal representatives—three white men and one negro—from the Office of Education are visiting the boards of education in those counties, telling them what they must do if they are to continue receiving federal aid.

In accounts of all the visits to boards which we have read or heard about, the press has been expelled though the federal Constitution and the laws of the State of Georgia provide that public meetings are open to the press, unless, of course, the national security is involved.

The expulsion has not been a decision of the county boards. The federal team simply has refused to discuss their business in the presence of the press.

In our judgment this is a flagrant violation of the American concept that the people have a right to know from an agency of our government which should be more concerned, above all else and all others, with compliance of the basic law of our country and a statute of the State of Georgia.

In effect, if not in reality, it would appear that the Office of Education considers itself above the law and that it has the self-appointed right to be prosecutor, judge and jury approaching a dictatorship.

It is indeed, a sad commentary on justice, when an agency of the government comes into a county and attempts to compel a

school board to comply with an arbitrary ruling and then flouts the very law it is supposed to represent.

This team from Washington probably will skip Terrell County. Our County Board of Education declined to sign the new compliance form, largely as its only means of expressing disapproval. The board previously had agreed to desegregate the county school system under a "freedom of choice" plan which gave all school children equal opportunity. This, as we understand it, is all that the law requires and our county board of education was well within bounds in refusing to accept a mandate which could and no doubt would lead to more harassment and more stringent demands.

While we have little doubt as to the ultimate outcome of desegregation in our schools as well as those throughout the state and nation, we cannot help but commend our county board of education on the position it has taken. As honorable men who are trying as best they can to adjust a school system to a difficult if not unreasonable situation, they were left with no alternative and time has proven the justification of their decision.

Elsewhere in the columns of this issue are editorial comments of other Georgia newspapers who, like ourselves, are protesting the violations of the freedoms conferred upon the press and the public by an agency of our own government.

When the time comes that the government cannot discuss its affairs with and before the people, we begin to have fears of the future.

[Editorial from the Griffin (Ga.) Daily News, Aug. 12, 1966]

GRIFFIN DAILY NEWS STRONGLY PROTESTS CLOSED MEETING

The Griffin Daily News today protested the closing by federal officials of their meeting with the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education.

Editor Quimby Melton, Jr., took two actions. One, he protested the closed meeting to the Georgia Press Association with the request that it take immediate action to do whatever it can to see that public meetings of this kind are open to the public in the future. Two, he sent the following telegram to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington, with a copy to United States Senator HERMAN TALMADGE with the request that the Senator "see that it reaches the Secretary."

"Last night four representatives of the U.S. Office of Education, a unit of your department, met with the Griffin-Spalding County Board of Education to discuss compliance with desegregation guidelines. James Rich served as spokesman for your officials. The meeting was held in a public building and was open to the public. Shortly after the board opened the meeting, Mr. Rich informed it that he had been instructed from Washington to meet with members of the school board only. The Chairman of the Board of Education stated that it was the board's desire that the meeting be open to the public and visitors be allowed to remain. However, Mr. Rich insisted upon his position and two representatives of the press and at least one person who was attending as an interested citizen withdrew. The meeting then proceeded. The Griffin Daily News protests vigorously the action of your representatives in forcing the closing of the meeting which was for the express purpose of discussing a public matter in a public building. Further, the Griffin Daily News respectfully but emphatically requests that personnel of your department be instructed that public matters of public concern should be open to the public.

QUIMBY MELTON, JR., Editor.

[Editorial from Swainsboro (Ga.) Forest-Blade, Aug. 10, 1966]

LITTLE BIT OF AMERICA

(By Bill Rogers)

Nations do not die in a blinding flash. They quietly rot from within.

History has never recorded an occasion when a malignant growth in peoples' principles and ideals has run rampant through the bloodstream of a nation and rotted its heart out in a matter of hours.

Rather, nations die bit by bit, in small ways that at the moment seem inconsequential and unimportant.

America died a little bit in Swainsboro Monday afternoon.

At least an official of the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare dropped the guillotine on a part of our nation's heritage when he totally rejected the concept that a free people have the right to know.

This government official was here with other representatives of "HEW" to attend a specially called meeting of the Emanuel County Board of Education. Purpose of the meeting was to give Health, Education & Welfare the opportunity to outline to the County Board what is expected of it in regard to the continued desegregation of the county's school system this fall.

The Forest-Blade was represented at the meeting of these two public agencies, a right guaranteed by Georgia law and in keeping with principles set forth by our nation's founding fathers.

The Emanuel County Board of Education promptly informed these visiting HEW officials that the Forest-Blade—as a representative of the people—had a legal right to be present and that not a single member of the County School Board objected to the attendance of the newspaper's representative.

But HEW official James H. Rich refused to discuss "anything" with the County Board as long as a reporter was present. He stated flatly that these were "his orders."

Your representative at that meeting—the Forest-Blade reporter—had no alternative within the bounds of decency: he could only leave.

The incident was a small one, but it evokes some rather serious questions that the people of Emanuel County—and others in our nation—deserve to have answered:

Why must the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare conduct public business involving public money and centering around public school children behind closed doors at a meeting held in a public building and which was legally open to the public?

Surely it does not hope to hide the effects of its rulings on the Emanuel County School System. It couldn't think that the people of Emanuel County have no concern with what happens to their school children, their school system, their tax monies. And certainly this being an agency of the American government, it cannot feel that our people have no right to be kept fully informed!

Can it be that this unit of our national government is now so powerful and important that it no longer must observe basic American ideals, that it knows best what is best for the public and it feels that the public doesn't deserve and desire a first-hand report of its programs and plans?

It is true that we are a part of the South, that some of our people object strenuously to some of the programs of the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare—but we remain under the impression that the South and its people are still a part of this nation, subject to its rules and laws certainly, but at the same time enjoying the rights and privileges of other citizens in other parts of the country.

These rights, we understand, include the privilege of knowing how and in what manner our public officials conduct our public affairs.

Certainly the rules and regulations being handed down by the government in the matter of desegregation of the public school system are matters of interest to all the public, both white and colored.

HEW (and every other governmental agency, local, state, or national) has the duty and obligation to instruct and inform the American people of its activities, its plans, its programs.

To do less is to destroy part of America—and less, much less was done here by the Health, Education & Welfare boys.

Indeed, you might say a little bit of our nation died here Monday afternoon.

[Editorial from the Metter (Ga.) Advertiser, Aug. 11, 1966]

FEDERAL MEN DEMAND SECRECY

The heavy hand of the Lyndon Johnson "Great Society" fell on Candler County again Monday of this week.

A four man team from the U.S. Office of Education refused to meet with the local Board of Education until two members of the reporting staff of the Metter Advertiser were removed from the meeting place.

Details of the meeting, as much as we know, will be found in this issue of the Advertiser.

We still believe that most employees of the government are the same as any other loyal citizen, but the employees of the U.S. Office of Education must be a rare breed indeed. If the attitude of these four bureaucrats is any indication of future action by the office of education, and we have every reason to believe it will be, we are in trouble, deep trouble.

Since the days of Valley Forge, Lexington and Concord, the freedom of the press to report the peoples' business to the people without hinderances, providing the national security is not endangered, has been a bulwark against everything the American Revolution was fought for.

When four federal employees can come to Candler County to tell our board of education what they must do to get our tax money back from the leaky federal pipeline to run our schools, there is something wrong, badly wrong.

The public schools are the peoples' business; how their policy is set is the peoples' business; the requirements of the Federal Government as they relate to the public schools is the peoples' business. The U.S. Office of Education seems to think by their action Monday they are immune from freedom of the press. The Democratic administration of LBJ seems bent on involving itself in every facet of each American's life, like it or not.

The highhanded tactics of any federal agency, and especially those of the U.S. Office of Education, should be protested by all citizens now and at the polls in November.

NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars national convention is presently being held in New York City. This organization is representative of all veterans of our Nation and of the entire American population as well. I think that it is fitting that the following two

resolutions passed by this body be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the Members of Congress and the general public.

I should also like to place in the RECORD a resolution of the Council of Veterans Organizations of Greater Dallas concerning draft card burners and so-called peace demonstrations that give aid and comfort to enemies with which we are engaged in armed hostilities. The council has for some time urged the Members of Congress to take constructive action on the subject of their resolution:

AUGUST 24, 1966.

The following two resolutions were passed by standing acclamation attending the Veterans of Foreign Wars national convention in New York City. We urge that immediate action be taken on these two resolutions:

"RESOLUTION 258

"Resolution reaffirming support House Committee on Un-American Activities

"Whereas the Committee on Un-American Activities has long been a stalwart factor in the preservation of our Government against those who would subvert it; and

"Whereas the committee has been subjected to ridicule and criticism by those who fear to be exposed by the committee's investigation; and

"Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities has proceeded with dignity and determination in the discharge of its duties; and whereas, the committee continues to perform a vital and necessary function in our Government, by reason of the continuing efforts of forces who are at work to undermine the security of the United States: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the 67th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we commend the House Committee on Un-American Activities and express the appreciation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to the committee for the services it is performing on behalf of our country, and reaffirm our continued support."

"RESOLUTION 259

"Resolution requesting enforcement of law against un-American actions

"Whereas the United States is today fighting in Vietnam in defense of freedom and for our own survival; and

"Whereas the forces of international communism are pushing relentlessly against the free world throughout the globe; and

"Whereas from a practical standpoint we are now in a state of war; and

"Whereas U.S. servicemen are now fighting and dying in Vietnam; and

"Whereas certain persons and organizations, engaged in criticism of and protest against our U.S. Government policy of resisting Communist aggression in Vietnam and elsewhere, are by their unpatriotic actions undermining the position of the United States, encouraging our enemies and sowing seeds of doubt among the uncommitted people of the world; and

"Whereas those who are engaged in such activities against our Government are encouraging our enemies and thus prolonging the conflict, with the result that more of our servicemen are killed and wounded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 67th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we urge the full enforcement of all laws applicable against such protesters, demonstrators, and critics; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the enactment of such further legislation as may be necessary to outlaw all such unpatriotic and damaging activities against our Government in time

of hostilities, including the prompt passage of H.R. 12047, now pending before the Congress of the United States.

"ANDY BORG,
"Commander-in-Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States."

COUNCIL OF VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS OF GREATER DALLAS AREA RESOLUTION ON DRAFT CARD BURNINGS AND DEMONSTRATIONS IN REGARD TO VIETNAM

Whereas, the United States is committed to aid Viet Nam and to help retain its integrity as a free nation, and American military personnel are now engaged in combat with the Viet Cong Forces who have been encouraged and aided by their Communist allies, and

Whereas, Americans are making great sacrifices on the battlefields of Viet Nam in carrying out our commitment to that courageous nation to stem the tide of Communist in Southeast Asia, and

Whereas, misinformed and confused students and others have been participating in rallies and burning their draft cards, thereby giving aid and comfort to an enemy of the United States, and which action is harmful to the morale of our American fighting men in Viet Nam and elsewhere, and

Whereas, many of the so-called peace demonstrations and protests are Communist, Nazi or Fascist inspired; desecrate the flag of our country and the principles it represents; and with utter disregard to the properly constituted authorities of local, state and federal government; and are planned to give comfort to the enemy of our country, and

Whereas, we are aware of the constitutional guarantees of the freedom of speech and the right of dissent of our citizens in a Democracy such as ours in this country.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Council of Veterans Organizations of Greater Dallas, composed of the American Legion, the United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jewish War Veterans, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of World War I, AMVETS, and the American GI Forum, meeting at Dallas, Texas, on this 6th day of April, 1966, supports our fighting men in Viet Nam, and condemns those who burn their draft cards, desecrate the flag of the United States, and participate in demonstrations that "border on treason", in time war; thereby giving comfort to the Viet Cong and their Communist Allies, while claiming the protection of the Constitution of the United States, and defying and violating the laws of our country, and

Be it further resolved, that the Council of Veterans Organizations of the Greater Dallas Area call upon the local, state and federal officials to use every means at their command to prosecute those who violate the laws of our country by burning their draft cards or participating in demonstrations that are injurious to the United States; and commit acts that are harmful to the morale of American fighting men in the Armed Forces of the United States, and the Council further urges that the Legislature of the State of Texas and the Congress of the United States enact such laws as are necessary and authorized by the Constitution of the United States of America.

Council of Veterans Organizations of Greater Dallas: United Spanish War Veterans; Disabled American Veterans; the American GI Forum; the American Legion; Jewish War Veterans; American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS); Veterans of Foreign Wars; Veterans of World War I.

Approved and adopted by the Council of Veterans Organizations of Greater Dallas, on this 6th day of April, 1966, at Dallas, Texas.

HYMIE GREENSPAN,
Chairman.
M. S. STEVENSON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SAD, SAD CONDITION OF MERCHANT MARINE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday reports from Saigon told us about a Victory ship loaded with supplies for our Armed Forces in Vietnam being sunk by a mine. Even though that vessel was 21 years old, this country could ill afford to lose it, because our pipeline to Vietnam, shamefully, is composed primarily of ships 21 to 25 years old.

The great United States already stands sixth in the world in the size of its active fleet, but much further down the line for the conditions of that fleet, 85 percent of which is of World War II vintage.

Even the country of Liberia, not a maritime nation, will not permit most of the American merchant marine to be transferred to Liberian registry, because our ships were built before 1946.

This is, indeed, a disgraceful situation. Unfortunately, this deplorable picture is worsening, as has been illustrated in the Baltimore Sun the past 2 days.

For 1967, this country will be lucky if nine ships are built out of the budget appropriation. And our ships going to Vietnam are in such bad condition, and the skilled manpower availability so short, a crisis is at hand. The story is late, but let us hope we are not too late to keep Russia from burying us at sea.

The articles in the Baltimore Sun referred to above are printed herewith:

SHIP ENGINEERS SHORTAGE CITED—VIET WAR EFFORT THREATENED, UNION LEADER WARNS
(By Helen Delich Bentley)

CHICAGO, August 23—Unless the Administration declares shipping a critical industry and expends special efforts to draft skilled seamen to shipping jobs, the president of the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association (AFL-CIO) asserted today, at least 150 ships bound for Vietnam will be backed up in American ports within a month.

Fourteen vessels were delayed yesterday because of the lack of licensed engineers in San Francisco, New Orleans, Seattle, Galveston and Houston and "the situation is snowballing," Jesse M. Calhoon cautioned James J. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary of Labor.

"CRISIS IS HERE"

"The crisis is here and the war effort is threatened because of the failure of the Administration over the past many months to heed our warnings," Calhoon declared.

Calhoon said that, as soon as he could make a count today, he expected the number of ships backed up to be increased—"at fourteen to eighteen ships a day."

"If we are having this much trouble to man enough ships for 297,000 soldiers in Vietnam, think what's going to happen when we get up to 400,000 troops over there," Calhoon continued. "All of this can be blamed on the fact that the pipeline of ships to Vietnam in 1966 is composed of 25-year-old bottoms."

"TWENTY-FIVE-YEAR-OLD CARS COMPARED"

"You can compare this to the trouble we would have if we tried to get by today on 25-year-old automobiles and airplanes.

"This is due to the lack of a maritime policy in this country and the failure to do anything about it."

The treatment of the seamen in the Vietnam area and the decrepit condition of the ships taken out of mothballs coupled with the general shortage of seamen were the reasons cited by Calhoon for what he described as the refusal of licensed engineers to take out any more ships for Southeast Asia.

Also he declared that the Victory ships broken out of the reserve fleet and now hauling supplies to Vietnam are going out in dangerous condition both because their equipment is faulty and because the number of skilled men aboard is short.

There are some 500 licensed engineers alone who have been graduated from the United States Merchant Marine Academy in the last five years after education at the expense of the Government, the MEBA official said, "and practically none of them have ever gone to sea.

"This is an untapped source of manpower, but nobody has made any effort to get them to do their duty to sail these old rust buckets to Vietnam.

"STILL DRAFT EXEMPT"

"They were draft exempt to go to school, then they got married and they're still draft exempt."

On top of this, he added, the Selective Service System is still on one hand drafting licensed seamen who are going to sea, and on the other releasing a few from the military forces to sail.

"What kind of a ridiculous situation is this?" Calhoon asked.

The Maritime Administration last April completed a manpower study which called for shipping to be declared a critical industry, the MEBA president claimed, but nothing has been done.

TOLD REPORT IS "ON DESKS"

"We have been told that report is sitting on the desks of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce without any action being taken yet," he said. "And here we are sitting on the verge of a national crisis, a national disgrace."

Even though his union changed its shipping rules in April to try to steer men first to those vessels without the number required by the Coast Guard, he said, the engineers who have been to Vietnam once, twice or more no longer will go.

NEW VESSELS' BUDGET DOWN TO BUT NINE—WILL BE LEAST UNDER REPLACEMENT PLAN SINCE 1958

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

CHICAGO, August 21.—Budget appropriations for new merchant ship construction for fiscal 1967 have "washed away" to nine vessels even before the first contract has been let, Administration forces are admitting privately.

This will be the smallest number of ships ever constructed under the nation's ship replacement program since it got fully under way in 1958.

When the budget was disclosed last January, the Maritime Administration stated that 13 ships would be forthcoming from the \$85,000,000 appropriated plus the juggling of some other funds.

Even that 13 figure was severely criticized because it was so small in a time of emergency when American-flag ships are in short supply to keep war materiel flowing to Vietnam and maintain this nation's commercial operations on a somewhat regular schedule.

PREVIOUS LOWS NOTED

Too, it was noted then that only in two previous instances—1960 and 1962—has the number of vessels to be built under the replacement program in the American merchant marine dropped as low as thirteen.

The replacement program is said to be more than 100 ships behind contract schedule, all due to budgetary cutbacks.

Uncle Sam pays the differential subsidy on new ship construction, which amounts to the difference in cost between building vessels in foreign yards and in the higher-priced United States yards. The differential paid out could be as much as 55 per cent.

New ships today are running between \$16,000,000 and \$17,500,000. Each vessel is larger and more sophisticated than the one she is replacing.

The initial request for new ship construction for fiscal 1967 was 25 ships by the then maritime administrator, Nicholas Johnson. The Secretary of Commerce, under whose jurisdiction the Maritime Administration functions, cut the number down to 17 when his department's budget was slashed \$100,000,000 to provide more money for Vietnam.

The next hatchet-job was applied by the Bureau of the Budget, which eliminated four more vessels, bringing the number down to 13 "with qualifications."

THREAT OF TIGHT MONEY POLICY FOR ECONOMY OF NEW YORK'S 27TH DISTRICT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke to you about the hearing I held at Goshen, N.Y. and about the threat the present tight money policy poses for the economy of New York's 27th District. At that time I stated that should present conditions continue the economic difficulties now being encountered by those in homebuilding and its allied industries would spread to other businesses and that as a result there is every possibility of a localized recession in our district by Christmas.

During the hearings several of those testifying were asked whether they attributed the decline in new building to lack of demand for housing. Everyone asked answered this question in the negative. They stated that in their opinion demand for houses was as strong this year as it had been over the past few years, if not a bit stronger. Instead, to a man and woman, they attributed the slowing down of homebuilding and real estate activity to the drain on funds caused by the high-interest policy now prevailing. Again and again those testifying reiterated that there was no mortgage money available.

Mr. James Bristow, a spokesman for five Orange County savings banks, reported his banks had experienced a net deposit outflow of close to a million dollars during the second quarter of this year. By contrast, he stated, in the same period of 1965, the same five banks gained almost \$400,000 in deposits. Mr. Bristow then went on to point out that whereas the banks were making every effort to stay in the mortgage lending business, they were having great difficulty in the face of these deposit outflows.

Mr. Joseph Fersch of the Sullivan County National Bank, added that up-country commercial banks were also having their difficulties in maintaining mortgage lending. A savings and loan

official testified that he was having trouble holding shares, especially larger shares in the \$10,000 area, and that he might have to go after lending more profitable than mortgages out of duty to his shareholders if the present situation continued.

Several builders also testified that New York City mutual savings banks, which have previously supplied mortgage funds for certain of the larger development projects in Rockland and Orange Counties have disappeared from the market altogether, and, as a result, these subdivisions cannot be built.

In concluding his statement Mr. Bristow had this to say:

I wish to make one point clear. We are not interested in placing new restrictions upon any financial institutions in order to benefit at the expense of others. What we are simply asking is that in competition for savings among financial institutions, instruments, such as the consumer type of certificate of deposits, should not be used to siphon off deposits from savings banks.

I agree with Mr. Bristow. I would add further, however, that this excessive competition he refers to constitutes an even greater danger, one larger in scope. For speculation is encouraged and thrift is discouraged. Stable relationships between thrift institutions and their customers, and a relative shift in incomes from those who produce goods and services by their own energy and effort, that is from labor, to those who hold idle funds for speculation is engendered.

The bankers and builders and others who testified at Goshen are buyers and sellers in the thrift market for money. This, to my mind, is a very important market, and one in which stability and good sense are necessary elements. Many savers, looking toward the future, put aside a small nest egg. They deposit these funds they have saved in savings accounts or they purchase shares in savings and loan associations. They are not speculators. The banks and associations serving them, including commercial banks with savings departments, lend these savings out as intelligently as they can, primarily in the home building and buying market. This is the service these bankers perform.

What they seek is a decent margin between the interest they receive from mortgage lending and the interest they pay out to shareholders or depositors. Let me emphasize again, this is not primarily a speculative market, and it should not be. Fair rates of interest and fair returns on services rendered are what is desirable.

We in this House are at present considering a number of bills seeking to correct the situation in the thrift market. In this we must avoid creating technical gimmicks that will only offer new outlets for the speculative fever. We must not contribute further to the high-interest acceleration, and thereby penalize those States such as New York which seek to maintain stable and reasonable interest rates in the thrift market through the so-called usury ceilings. We must hold the line against high rates and the chaotic market conditions which further encourage speculation. We

must seek, instead, in our legislation, to reestablish an orderly market in mortgages and savings, so that our local savers and home buyers, bankers and builders, and their employees can turn again to the important task, the construction and purchase of decent housing.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. BERNARD A. SCHRIEVER

Mr. HÉBERT. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces of the United States will lose to retirement, on August 31 of this year, a brilliant military officer, Gen. Bernard A. Schriever of the Air Force.

The national success story of how he fought for and delivered to this Nation the awesome deterrence of intercontinental ballistic missiles is indeed well known. His military genius and dedicated foresight as commander of America's biggest research and development organization—the Air Force Systems Command—has maintained this country's free world leadership in aerospace technology.

However, to part for a moment from the great and visionary space and aerial hardware whose development he has managed, I would like to touch upon another little-known phase of his career without which this dedicated airman could not have successfully accomplished his staggering mission.

That facet is General Schriever's great accent on the people who have comprised his team. General Schriever has noted that the greatest challenge to management is to find ways to encourage the full creative potential of individuals, and that an atmosphere must be created where the unique human capacity for innovation and judgment can be fully developed and employed.

It is a validated fact that job satisfaction is the most important single factor influencing young officers to remain in military service beyond their obligation, and as commander of an organization which relies heavily upon the creative genius of fertile young scientific and engineering minds, General Schriever has continuously accentuated the fact that technology depends on the quality of people, their dedication, and job satisfaction. His foresight in motivating and recognizing the accomplishments of highly educated young officers has resulted in the retention rate of these vital young people being more than tripled in the past 5 years. It must be noted that such an accomplishment is a major feat when one considers that these highly educated scientists and engineers could easily choose more lucrative civilian pursuits than the lesser monetary rewards of military service.

General Schriever has said that the problem of retaining people in the Sys-

tems Command should be afforded the same priority and importance as the development of any new major weapons system. And so believing, he has innovated revolutionary personnel management techniques to implement such thoughts, including a dynamic accent on people program, and an officers' career motivation plan addressed to the junior scientific and engineering officers. These programs furnish the greatest possible personal recognition for these essential people, and furnish them a better place in which to live and work.

But the programs themselves were not sufficient to guarantee such a great legacy of responsibility, and to them General Schriever added his own brilliant hand and dynamic leadership, spending untold days over the years personally visiting his people throughout the Nation in a schedule that would totally exhaust a lesser man.

Ben Schriever has said that despite the talk of pushbutton technology, in the military it is the man who counts and not the button; that it is the uniqueness of human spirit and the ability of man to develop his God-given gifts that is the hallmark of American accomplishment and the measure of freedom for all men.

Such astute observations on the nature of man, and the inspirational ability to instill in the hearts of his people such a spirit of dedication and patriotism is indeed the mark of Bernard Schriever.

Timidity is the road to failure, and General Schriever has been neither a timid nor a despotic leader during more than 30 years of brilliant service to his adopted country. The Nation and the free world owes this great American a deep debt, not only for his foresight in developing America's weapons arsenal, but for creating a great and dedicated mental arsenal of technology, without which this country would be militarily backward indeed.

VIETCONG SINKING OF THE "BATON ROUGE VICTORY"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we learned that the Vietcong had succeeded in sinking a U.S.-flag cargo ship, the *Baton Rouge Victory*, apparently killing seven American crewmen and blocking one of the two channels into the harbor at Saigon. This is but the most successful of a series of attempts to mine ships carrying supplies needed to carry on the war.

These attacks appear to be taken in stride as normal hazards of the conflict. It is certainly in sharp contrast to our present meticulous policy of not impeding in any way Communist ships sailing into North Vietnamese ports. If we were to attempt to cut off the supply lines to North Vietnam it would be trumpeted as a sharp escalation of the

war. Where, I ask, are the cries of escalation when the Vietcong sink a U.S. ship and continue to harass the shipping lanes supplying our troops that are giving their lives to keep South Vietnam free? It is but another incredible example of the way we are fighting with one arm tied behind our backs.

Although the free world trade with North Vietnam appears to have been reduced the Communists shipping has correspondingly increased and we have not done anything to stop it that I know of. In fact, it was just in June of this year that we even as much as blacklisted Polish-flag vessels that had been to North Vietnam from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes. I am informed by the Department of Defense that during 1964 Polish ships made 48 trips to North Vietnam. During 1965 the number was 40, and while the figures for 1966 are classified I can say they appear to be at about the same level. Yet it was only in June of this year that we finally got around to officially protesting this trade. Furthermore, I am informed by the Maritime Administration that between January 1965 and June 30, 1966, 10 Polish-flag vessels have called at U.S. ports a total of 56 times. Mr. Speaker, I have joined a score of other Members in sponsoring legislation to close our ports to all ships of any foreign shipping interest which permits any of the vessels under its control to trade with the Hanoi regime. The administration has opposed this legislation, even though for a time it was given de facto enforcement through the extra-legal boycott initiated by patriotic longshoremans.

I say we cannot sit idly by and watch the war being continually escalated in South Vietnam by supplies entering North Vietnam in Communist ships. The Vietcong are not giving our ships any safe conduct passes up the river to Saigon but we, with the full might of the U.S. Navy controlling the South China Sea, just seem to drift about, paying no attention to the growing volume of Communist shipping that continues to sail to Haiphong to supply the Communists that are killing our boys and making it necessary for us to send more troops by the hundreds of thousands. The President should explain this to the American people.

FRANCIS X. BUSHMAN, A GREAT AND NOBLE AMERICAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Francis X. Bushman, who died at 83, in summing up his life said he had lived in the richest period of American history. He was 1 year my junior and our friendship began in 1912 when he was with the old Essanay Film Co. in Chicago and I was striving for my place in the political scene. Francis X. Bushman was one of the young men who helped me raise the

cry of "Give Youth a Chance; Get Rid of the Old Fogies." That was the year that I won out over a field of seven others in the Democratic primary for Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and later was elected.

In 1915, we filmed "The Little Girl Next Door" at the Essanay studio at a cost of \$6,000, and it went on to establish the alltime attendance record for a movie up to that time, and the only professional in the cast was a charming woman who later was married to Bushman.

For years a photograph of a scene in "The Little Girl Next Door" hung in my law office in Chicago as now it hangs in my office in the Rayburn Building. The last time I saw Bushman was in my Chicago office some years ago. He was as full as ever of colorful optimism and the merriment of just being alive. Looking at the photograph he said:

No woman could wear shoes as she did. She had her own distinctive way.

Francis X. Bushman was never conquered by age. In his eighties, I am told, he was the same unconquerable, unsinkable Francis X. Bushman that I had known when we both were in our twenties and he was helping me on my political way. He was a great and noble American. With his passing the world that I have known—"the world of the richest period of American history," in his words—has narrowed.

AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3105, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (S. 3105) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader please explain to us the necessity for this, in view of planned committee meetings and other arrangements that have been made.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we have four conference reports which we would like to have considered tomorrow. We would like to finish this bill. We would also like to finish three bills that will not take much time, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. That will make it possible to adjourn from tomorrow until Monday; otherwise, we will meet on Friday.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, continuing the query, I am sure this has been cleared with the minority leader. May I ask the logic of coming in early tomorrow, in view of no business yesterday?

Mr. ALBERT. There is really no relationship between that and coming in early tomorrow. We had business scheduled for yesterday, but for good and sufficient reasons the chairman of the committee postponed it.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman did say it is his plan, if we finish the business tomorrow, to go over until the Monday following; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

TAKE-HOME PAY IS DOWN

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, despite any and all claims to the contrary, the real take-home pay of the average American fell between the first and second quarters this year. It is almost certainly falling faster now.

Per capita take-home pay—adjusted for inflation—fell from an annual rate of \$2,287 in the first quarter of this year to \$2,277 in the second quarter. The figures I cite were prepared by President Lyndon Johnson's own Council of Economic Advisers.

I think this fact is important to every American citizen. I want him to understand where contrary figures come from: they simply ignore inflation. Without taking into account the spiraling cost of living, administration spokesmen tell you per capita income rose between the first and second quarters of 1966.

Here is what an independent news agency, United Press International, reported from Washington July 25:

Higher taxes and higher prices more than wiped out whatever additional income Americans earned in the 3-year period ended June 30.

This is a fact and the cost-of-living figure of four-tenths of 1 percent increase during July means that the inflation-tax spiral continues to move up faster than the wage spiral, just as it did in the declining days of the Truman administration.

MORGAN GUARANTY SURVEY FOR AUGUST—ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, some of the statements that we in Congress make about the inflation and the failure of the administration to deal with it effectively are bound to be dismissed as "campaign talk" by some of the cynical. But now a professional report confirms all we have been saying.

I refer to the Morgan Guaranty Survey for August issued by one of the major banks of the United States which is interested in economic facts rather than politics.

The slower rate of economic expansion that has been evident in recent months has not been accompanied so far by any significant abatement of inflationary strain—

The Morgan Guaranty Bank Survey reports—

Strain could have been avoided only if demand itself had been dampened earlier this year by a well-balanced program of fiscal restraint.

The fiscal actions that have been taken, featured by the acceleration of corporate tax payments, have proved clearly inadequate. Their chief result has been merely to reduce the borrowing needs of the Treasury while adding to those of private parties.

And the survey concludes:

Both demand and supply sides of the economy still are signaling inflationary potential and the need for fiscal restraint.

Mr. Speaker, what those last words mean in simple terms is that the administration should cease its wild and wasteful domestic spending while conducting a full-scale war halfway around the world.

MILITANT SOCIALISM

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has publicly insisted—Thursday, August 18—that selective service should be brought up to date so that young people could be drafted for nonmilitary, as well as military, assignments.

This proposal to put the entire youth of the Nation under Federal command is nothing but militant socialism. It recalls the notorious Hitler Youth under the Nazis and the Young Communist organization in the totalitarian Soviet Union.

I have launched an investigation into reports that the administration is drafting a blueprint for economic dictatorship to be made effective right after the November elections. It is reported that wage and price controls, rent freezes, rollbacks, and industrial codes are all in the process of being drafted.

CXII—1287—Part 15

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join many of my colleagues today in introducing legislation to establish a National Commission on Public Management. My bill is in response to the observation that the traditional Government approach to a complex Government problem is no longer adequate. The Commission proposed in my bill would enable us to acquire valuable insight into how to effectively manage Government operations while better utilizing technological advances.

Fragmentizing a national problem among several Federal agencies in the hope that none will antagonize each other in the process of drafting guidelines and regulations simply does not provide for comprehensive solution. What is needed is an in-depth study of the application of systems management to the affairs of Government in the nondefense sector, and the proposed Commission would be a big first step in that direction.

We know that Federal planners treating only one aspect of a national problem are too often content with administrative muddying of the waters, instead of seeking fresh viewpoints of enlightened private enterprise. Under my bill, the Commission would investigate the proper role of Government and industry in the broad spectrum of national programs.

Private enterprise has been and should continue to be the backbone of our Nation's progress, and the systems management approach developed in the private sector should be utilized to the fullest in applying technology to implementation of Federal responsibilities.

We know, too, that scientific and technical information is now doubling every 15 years. Technology will continue to expand, and the Commission should anticipate its growth when delving into such areas as education, health services, law enforcement, and water pollution. Also, special attention would be given to the role of small business in the years ahead.

It is my sincere hope that the concept of a national commission to study the application of management techniques to complex national problems will gain even more support in the Congress. The opportunity to lay the groundwork for improvement in the operation of our Government should not be bypassed.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE NATIONAL SCENE

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper column, "Say It Straight," by Victor Lasky, provides its readership with a hard-hitting treatment of current events which sifts the wheat from the chaff. As both a columnist and an author, Lasky's forthright observations let the chips fall where they may in the tradition of objective journalism. His realistic approach to the issues of the day help to counterbalance some of the slanted offerings of the left. His column of August 20 provides a good sampling of Victor Lasky's wide range of interests. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER DELINQUENT IN TAXES

(By Victor Lasky)

NEW YORK, August 20.—Some things to think about on a Sunday afternoon:

One of the noisier civil right organizations, whose leader has a penchant for traveling to such exotic places as Cambodia, is in hock to the Federal Government to the tune of \$200,000 in withholding taxes. Yet, the "Feds"—usually so forthright in tracking down transgressors—seem paralyzed in this case. Is this "Black Power" in action?

The key issue in the forthcoming elections may not be Vietnam as much as the rising standard of living plus increased taxes confronting middle-income families, according to an informal survey of GOP leaders across the country. This is borne out by a series of articles in New York's Daily News claiming that despite unprecedented "good times," middle-income New Yorkers are beginning to feel "poor." "And here lies potential social dynamite," reports the News. "For the city's families in the middle are beginning to blame the poor for the burden of taxes they bear."

Not all members of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) are happy about the group's efforts to obtain a court order blocking recent hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). "I deeply protest your work to obtain a court order to prevent HUAC from carrying out functions which Congress must exercise in order to legislate," Basil Rauch, professor of history at Barnard College, wired the ACLU. "That HUAC abuses its power is no reason to try to destroy the independence of Congress. Fight abuses by Congressmen but stop your dangerous fight to establish judicial control over Congress."

Good point. But Rauch should recognize that HUAC is more sinned upon than the sinner in such cases as those involving the recent ejection from its hearings of an obstreperous lawyer who refused to sit down when ordered by Chairman Pool. The lawyer, incidentally, has a list of leftwing credits as long as Khrushchev's arm.

The smearing has begun in California's hot gubernatorial race. The Democrats have come up with a 29-page "exposé" of Ronald Reagan's alleged relations with rightwing groups. GOP Candidate Reagan is pictured as guilty of a multitude of sins including his membership "on a committee to keep the ultra-rightwing magazine Human Events afloat." No doubt Human Events is a conservative weekly, but any effort to link this responsible publication with the lunatic right is truly "McCarthyism of the left," as Reagan's backers observed.

And what of Gov. Pat Brown's "guilt by association" with leftwing extremists? Are we to consider the Democratic incumbent some sort of leftwing stooge because he is being supported by all sorts of undesirables

including the Commie-infiltrated California Democratic Council? For once, why can't a California contest be decided on the issues and not on the merits—or lack of them—of the tag-a-longs who apparently have hopped on the bandwagons of both candidates?

COMMUNIST TERROR: RED CHINA— PART 2

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on July 25 of this year I initiated this series of insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Communist terror with an article by Lowell Thomas which appeared in the Reader's Digest in December 1960, entitled "Terror in Tibet." The horrors visited upon the unfortunate Tibetans by the Red Chinese were outlined in detail. The purpose of this series is to provide a standard which will help all citizens determine what our policies toward Communist regimes should be; namely, the basic standard of Communist treatment of human beings the world over.

A review of Red Chinese history since 1949 is especially pertinent at the present time since a concerted drive is now underway in the United States to have Red China admitted to the United Nations. Of special interest was a news story on the first page of yesterday's Baltimore Sun which read as its title: "U.S. Weighing Reversal on China in U.N." The lead paragraph stated:

Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg opened the possibility today that the United States may abandon its opposition to Communist Chinese membership in the United Nations when the General Assembly convenes next month.

Although it was stated that the United States would not abandon its commitments to Nationalist China and would not consent to ousting the Nationalists in order to seat the Communists, the mere consideration of ceasing our opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations is a departure from long established U.S. policy.

In anticipation of this drive to seat Red China in the United Nations, I inserted material in the RECORD on April 5, June 2, and June 28 of this year. Outlined in detail were the arguments against admission, along with a rundown on the various forces presently straining to admit this brutal bandit regime to a world organization where only peace-loving nations are eligible. On June 28 I pointed out, for example:

Every indication points to the continuing success of our policy toward Red China and now, as a result, the Maoist government is in serious trouble. It has just suffered two devastating political setbacks in Indonesia and Ghana. The Red Chinese-supported Vietcong are being constantly frustrated in their attempts to overthrow South Vietnam. Internally, Red China is being smothered by overpopulation, its food distribution is erratic, and its industry is greatly overworked and creaking at the seams.

One of the basic arguments against the Red regime is the unbelievable brutality with which it has ruled the Chinese people. In 1952 there was published an eyewitness account of the Communist conquest of China by Rev. Raymond J. De Jaegher and Irene Corbally Kuhn entitled "The Enemy Within." As a Belgian missionary, Reverend De Jaegher had arrived in China in 1930 and witnessed the unparalleled savagery of the Red Chinese from 1937 through 1949. The chapter, "Communist Tortures," is a thoroughly appalling and sickening account of the bestialities experienced by Chinese people at the hands of their own Red Chinese rulers. If the experiences of this one Chinese community were an isolated case, the indictment of the Reds might justifiably be limited to the local Red authorities. But when the official policy of a government results in the slaughtering of literally millions of human beings throughout the country, the inhuman nature of the regime is almost beyond human comprehension.

Yet this is the same government which some will admit to the United Nations presumably as a peace-loving nation.

I include the above-mentioned chapter from the book, "The Enemy Within," in the RECORD at this point:

CHAPTER X—COMMUNIST TORTURES

One day I was sorrowfully concluding my morning duties in Ch'en Lu Che, one of the parishes under my care, whose priest had been arrested by the Reds. The big bell in the village sounded, and a frightened youth, who had been the priest's servant, came to tell me that the Communists had issued orders through the mayor to everyone in the village to assemble at an open place ordinarily used as a children's playground.

"You will have to go too, Father," the young man said. "Everybody must be there at ten o'clock."

The bell sounded again and its heavy, ominous peals depressed me even more. I questioned the boy, but he was too terrified to talk, so I decided to go along and see for myself what the Communists were up to now.

When I reached the playground I found the whole village assembled there, old and young, men, women, and children. The children, with their teachers, were in the front row. I inquired what we had been brought here for, and one man whispered to me:

"We are to witness an execution—a beheading."

His companion leaned over my shoulder and spoke in low tones behind his hand.

"It is a big execution. They say there are many—ten or more."

"What is their crime?" I asked.

"They have committed no crime," the man said with bitterness. "They are students. From the anti-Communist school in Chang Ts'un."

"Seu-tsuen School?" I asked, and I had to brace myself to stop trembling.

"Yes, that is right," the man answered. Then he pulled my arm. "Look, here they come! And see—the children! These beasts will make the children witness this horror!" The man shuddered, then spat violently on the ground in anger and disgust.

Memories came flooding of my young friend, Wang Chi-sien, a graduate of this school, buried alive when the Communists were systematically tracking down all its graduates. I prayed for strength; I reminded myself that I must be the coldly objective surgeon; I must not let my feelings and emotions overcome me. I must watch and observe and not let these Red devils prowling

around up and down the lines of people suspect that I was sick with revulsion already.

The man behind me had said, "Here they come." I looked now and saw that a file of young men, most of them in peasant dress, hands bound behind them, were being led into the cleared space. They were all so young, so very young!

A Communist soldier barked orders at them, and they were all obliged to kneel down facing the people. The Communist barked more orders, and the young men moved closer to each other on their knees until they were not more than a foot apart. I counted them. Thirteen of them knelt there in the brightness of the morning, the wind from the northern plains blowing across their young faces.

These were the fine youth of China, the good, incorruptible ones, and they were going to be liquidated because they were incorruptible. The local militia, which had been guarding them, stepped back. A Communist officer read out a long rigmarole of charges against them. The word "traitor" kept jumping out of his mouth.

The people were silent. Contempt was written on their faces. Everyone knew these young men and knew they were not traitors. The Seu-tsuen School was a most democratic one. Its principal had conceived the idea of a half day of studies and a half day of agricultural work, a kind of practical training in new methods so that the students who couldn't go outside their province for an education would at least have some knowledge and be able to read and write a little when they had to return to their fathers' farms. It had made wonderful strides in giving a little education to peasant youths who otherwise would have been entirely unlettered. Given time, it could have leavened all of the largely illiterate area with knowledge.

The people listening to the trumped-up charges knew, too, that even if these young men had wanted to be traitors they could have had no opportunity since there were no Japanese in the area.

With this curious sense they have of knowing just when to stop their tirades and diatribes and strike, the Communist leader now gave two orders simultaneously: he told the teachers, white and trembling already, to start the children singing patriotic songs. And he gave the signal for the execution to the swordsman, a tough, compact-bodied young soldier of great strength. The soldier came up behind the first young victim now, lifted his great, sharp, two-handed sword and brought the blade down cleanly. The first head rolled over and over, and the crowd watched the bright blood spurt up like a fountain.

The children's voices, on the thin edge of hysteria, rose in a squeaky cacophony of dissonance and garbled words; the teachers tried to beat time and bring order into the tumult of sound. Over it all I heard the big bell tolling again.

Moving as quick as light from right to left as we watched him, the swordsman went down the line, beheading each kneeling student with one swift stroke, moving from one to the next without ever looking to see the clean efficiency of his blow. Thirteen times he lifted that heavy sword in his two hands. Thirteen times the sun glistened off the blade, dazzling at first, then dully as the red blood flowed down over the shining steel and stained and dimmed its glow. Thirteen times the executioner felt steel pierce cartilage and flesh, slide between the two small neck bones. Not once did he miss. Not once did he look back at what he had done. And when he came to the thirteenth, the last man, and had chopped his head off, he threw the sword down on the ground and walked away without looking back.

I thought sardonically as I saw this through my own misted eyes that, inhuman devil that he was, he still believed in the

ancient Chinese superstition that if a killer looks on the man he has killed at the instant of his death, the soul of the victim, escaping from the body the instant the head is severed, will rush into the soul of the killer, who never afterward in all his lifetime will know a moment's peace. The cautious Communist was taking no chances; this is why he had beheaded the men almost without looking at them.

There were a few Chinese in that company of forced watchers who now rushed forward with pieces of *man tou*, the steamed bread of North China, to dip them into the blood gushing from the trunks of the beheaded youths. Some Chinese believe that if one has *ye che*—a weakness in the stomach—eating bread soaked in blood will strengthen the organ and cure the disease. Criminals were always beheaded in China in the old days and in modern times too, but it was rare for any Chinese to avail himself of the opportunity to test the gruesome remedy. The Communists, however, encourage the people in revolting superstitions like this. On this day, though, they didn't indulge them long. They had something they wanted to do themselves.

My eyes started from my head when I saw what the Communist soldiers did next.

Several of the strongest, most aggressive among the group rushed forward now and pushed the corpses over on their backs. I stared horrified as each soldier bent down with a sharp knife and made a quick, circular incision in the chest. He then jumped on the abdomen with both feet, or pumped on it over and over with one foot, forcing the heart out of the incision. Then he swooped down again, snipped and plucked it out.

When they had collected the thirteen hearts, they strung them all on a pointed marsh reed, flexible and resilient, which they tied together to make a hand circular carrying device.

The two villagers who had watched all this, too, turned looks of withering scorn on the departing Communists.

"Why did they do that terrible thing?" I asked the older one.

"They will eat the hearts tonight. They believe it will give them great strength."

And he turned away and cursed them violently.

"Look at the children," sighed the other. "Our poor children!" he said, shaking his head sadly.

The youngsters were pale and disturbed. A few of them were vomiting. The teachers were scolding them and getting them together now to march them back to school.

This was the first time I had seen small children forced to watch such bloody executions. It was all part of the Communist plan to harden and toughen them, make them callous to acts of barbarous cruelty like this, and terrify them with Communist power. Unhappily, it worked in many cases. After this I often saw children forced to witness executions. The first time they were horror-stricken and emotionally disturbed, often sick at their stomachs as these children were. The second time they were less disturbed, and the third time many of them watched the grisly show with keen interest.

The second ringing of the bell for the execution of the thirteen students of Seutsuen School was at ten o'clock. The beheading took about ten minutes. It was all over in less than half an hour, the violation of the corpses, the return of the children to school, the sad departure of the families of the young men with their desecrated bodies, and the dispersal of the crowds. Communism is most efficient.

On another afternoon in this same village some children came running toward me as I was walking down one of the back alleys. "Come quickly, Father!" they said, and I ran with them. On the main road, leading to the headquarters of Red General Ho Lung,

were four Peking carts. These are the country carts, roughly made, without springs, and with two large ironbound wooden wheels.

I walked over toward the Communist soldier who was backing a mule into the shafts of the lead cart. Screams and wailing shattered the air, but there were so many villagers gathered, so many Communist soldiers and civilian stooges, that I couldn't see what was happening. Soon, however, all the carts were ready and the crowds parted to let the soldiers get in and drive away. Only then did I see in each cart a man nailed through his wrists and insteps to the floor of the vehicle. The Communist drivers whipped up the mules, shouted at them, and the cavalcade was off. The rough, rocky roads, so rutted and uneven, jolted the men and caused them almost intolerable pain; and the faster the mules went, the rougher the ride, the more terrible the pain. The Communists drove the carts at a furious pace through the village several times and then took off on the even rougher road to General Ho Lung's headquarters. There the men would be put out of their misery if they had survived the ride. Their heartrending screams echoed through the village. They reached my heart.

Every time I saw one of these acts of calculated barbarism everything in me cried out for some personal action on my part, some gesture of protest at least. Help I could not give. I had to remind myself of the role I had elected to play with God's help. I had also to remind myself of my own plans for counteraction to communism wherever I could follow them behind the front I had set up of the relatively helpless onlooker and observer. I kept detailed accurate accounts and records of everything I saw and heard, and I studied my notes constantly to discover the outlines of Communist plans and maneuvers. The more intently I studied Communist methods, the more I saw that while terrorism was the order of the day in those counties and areas which they had already brought under their control they were, simultaneously, launched on a much larger project—the conquest of all China.

They had a method of torture which served also to show their contempt for the National Government of China. They would find a good man, a patriot, one who had expressed sentiments favorable to the government, and would tie him by his hands to the topmost branches of the tallest tree in the neighborhood. Then they would gather below and shout up at him derisively, "Now do you see your friends from the National Government coming to help you?" If he said yes defiantly, a Red in the tree would lop off the branch and the victim would be dropped to the ground to his death; if he said no truthfully, they would mock his patriotism, revile the government, and drop him to his death anyway, with the excuse that he was a traitor! This kind of thing went on all through the war when the Communists were supposed to be co-operating fully and loyally with the National Government, and while they were sending out reams of propaganda telling the United States and Europe of their heroic deeds against the Japanese, their determination to free China from the invader, and their deep concern for the welfare of the Chinese people.

As time went on and the crescendo of terrorism mounted, it wasn't enough just to kill a man. The Communists added refinements of torture, sometimes formalizing them with descriptive names for identification, classification, and study by the butchers and sadists they were training in their indoctrination centers. Sometimes they forced a man to eat a great quantity of salt and then refused him any liquids until he died of thirst; sometimes they kept a victim under direct examination for twenty-four hours a day, con-

stant, direct examination, until death came from exhaustion.

They had a method they used for quick death. The doomed man was brought from his home or office directly to Communist headquarters. A group of officials met him and escorted him into a room. "Now we will examine your conscience," one would say, giving the nod to another, who would step forward at once, ripping off the man's upper garments and cutting out his heart.

Sometimes the Communists forced a man to take off all of his clothes and roll over and over in broken glass, jagged ends fitted close together and set in irregular, upright rows in a bed of cement. In the winter, for a seasonal change, they would break the ice of the river in two places. They would drop their victim through one hole into the freezing waters and then tease him by showing him the other hole, a little distance away, as he came up gasping.

"You can come out here," they would shout as the man made a supreme effort and struggled under water to the other hole in the ice. As soon as he came up his captors would push him back into the water. Now he knew there was another opening and he would make for that one, hoping that they'd relent, but as soon as he came up they would push him back in. They did this over and over until the man froze or drowned.

At the other extreme was a frightful method which was the invention of a Communist in Shansi. On a tour of a city in his province one day he came to a halt before a food shop and stood transfixed for a long time before the big caldrons, or cooking pots, which the shop used to prepare food in quantity. The Communist ordered several of these, and when they were delivered to him he immediately arrested some anti-Communists. He conducted the usual kangaroo court, except that this was even more perfunctory and ludicrous than most. While the farcical proceedings were going on he had coolies fill the caldrons with boiling water. As soon as the trial was finished and he had pronounced his three victims guilty, he had them stripped and dropped into the caldrons to be boiled alive.

These utterly savage tortures were devised and practiced by the same barbarians who unconsciously paid tribute to the technocracy of the industrialized Western world they pretended to despise. Many a Chinese peasant who had never seen any of the modern forms of transportation which are commonplace in the West was introduced to the Communist version of them. The ignorant victim who was invited to board "the Peiping Express" discovered it was a short, rough ride indeed. His feet were tied at the ankles with a slip knot, and the length of rope was then fastened securely to the tail of a mule or a horse which was beaten viciously so that the animal ran at a gallop. The stones in the road soon fractured the man's skull. When a victim was invited to "go by plane" he was suspended by his toes and thumbs from the branch of a tree; and when his sentence called for him to "go by parachute" he was tied inside a sack, taken to a pagoda or a tower, or even a tall tree, and dropped from the very top.

A man whom the Communists wish to mock and injure severely but perhaps save for other tortures if he should survive is introduced to a little game the Reds call "the ape climbs the perch." He is stripped naked and ordered to climb a pole which is studded with sharp spikes. Often he can get to the top without doing himself much harm, but he has to slide down, and in the quick descent he is ripped to pieces.

In P'ing Shan I met a man whose father was skinned alive by the Communists. The son was held by two Reds, he told me, and forced to watch the awful process and listen to his father's screams of agony until he

died. The Reds poured vinegar and acids over the man's body so that the skin would come off quickly and make the job a quick and easy one for the devil assigned to this frightful murder. He began at the back, peeling from the shoulders down in long strips. The man was skinned entirely, except for his head. He died within a few minutes after the peeler had completed his gruesome task.

SAFETY IS ECONOMIC SAVING

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to do all we can to assure that we are as safety conscious as possible. As our society becomes more and more complex, the incidence of accidents might well increase. This probability should encourage us to minimize their effects and reduce their incidence. With all that is written about automobile safety, we sometimes forget that this type of accident is only a fraction of the accidents that plague us. Our safety campaigns must remain broadened to include prevention of accidents in industry, in the home, and in all areas of recreation. Some progress has been made in minimizing the effect of accidents, if not the ratio of incidence in these areas. In 1965 there were only 54.7 deaths per 100,000 population due to accidents as compared to the figure of 70.3 in 1942.

In spite of the great increase in mechanization and the use of machinery, the time lost from work because of accidents at least has not increased. The rate has remained around the 12.9 hours lost per million man-hours which attests to the many industrial safety campaigns. However, while there has been progress, more is clearly needed. For this purpose, I join my colleagues in introducing a resolution declaring the month of September National Safety Month.

CURTIS TEXTILE REPORT SCHEDULE FOR MONDAY, AUGUST 29, 1966; THE LONG-TERM COTTON TEXTILE ARRANGEMENT AND U.S. TRADE POLICY

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of textiles to every American family and because of the economic significance of textile agreements to American business and labor, I am going to give next Monday, August 29, a lengthy and rather complete report on the long-term arrangement regarding trade in cotton textiles.

All Americans use one form of textiles or another. From shirts to socks, from pants to handkerchiefs, the price, availability and quality of cotton textiles is a matter of immediate concern to working American families.

U.S. cotton textile policy affects Americans, but it also affects developing countries. This Nation has professed a deep concern with the economic development of nations attempting to modernize. We have undertaken a massive program of financial assistance to demonstrate that concern, but we have tended to ignore sound measures that could help developing countries earn their own livelihood through trade in manufactured and semimanufactured goods with the developed countries. We have given lip service to the idea "trade not aid," but seem instead to have ignored it. My intensive examination of U.S. textile policy has convinced me that in this area "trade, not aid" is little more than a slogan. I will discuss this and other aspects of U.S. cotton textile policy fully on August 29.

POSSIBLE NEGOTIATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the important undertakings in the Kennedy round of trade negotiations concerns antidumping. Since June 1965, when I introduced House Resolution 405 calling for administration study of international antidumping code, I have urged our negotiators to pursue such discussions at Geneva. Earlier this year, discussions were held in Geneva among the United States, the European Economic Community, the United Kingdom, Japan, and other countries concerning the procedural and substantive issues involved in dumping. As a result of these discussions, all the countries involved have indicated a willingness to consider the possible content of an international antidumping agreement, or "code."

I have discussed these developments in remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—pages 5333 to 5336—and in my May 31 report on the sixth round of trade negotiations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—pages 11856 to 11869—on which I serve as a congressional Delegate. In this report I also considered briefly the economic condition of the cement industry, tentatively concluding that imports of cement, much less imports of dumped cement, did not seem to be a problem. As yet I have received no economic data from the industry to rebut my conclusion. Therefore I have asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare an economic analysis of the cement industry, including such subjects as the ratio of imports to domestic consumption, the sources of

imports, costs of producing cement here and abroad, and measures of the prosperity of the industry including return on equity. I have requested this economic analysis in order to determine with some degree of impartiality the basis for the cement industry's claims of injury from foreign dumping.

In preparation for possible international negotiations at Geneva, the Trade Information Committee of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations will hold hearings on September 12, 1966, the notice for which was published in the Federal Register on July 15, 1966. This hearing is designed to solicit views of industry and other interested parties about the basic issues which would have to be dealt with in considering the possible content of an antidumping agreement.

Following publication of this notice, Mr. John Mathis, Chairman of the Cement Industry Committee for Tariff and Antidumping, sent a letter and legal memorandum to the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations—with copies to the congressional delegates to the Kennedy round—which concluded that the President could not enter into negotiations on an antidumping agreement through the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations and that the forthcoming hearing was legally invalid. The Cement Industry Committee for Tariff and Antidumping is the remaining fragment of a much wider coalition of certain industries, the purpose of which was to tighten the present Antidumping Act of 1921. A list of its cement industry committee's members provided me by Mr. Mathis will follow at the end of my remarks.

I have also now received from Ambassador Roth, the Acting Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, a copy of his response to the memorandum of the Cement Industry Committee, which also encloses a legal memorandum prepared by his staff.

Because of the importance of the issues involved in this discussion, and in order to permit all interested persons to consider both sides of the question, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD Mr. Mathis' letter, with its enclosure, and Ambassador Roth's reply, with its enclosure, and the list of members of the Cement Industry Committee on Tariff and Antidumping referred to above:

CEMENT INDUSTRY COMMITTEE FOR
TARIFF AND ANTIDUMPING,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Longworth House Office Building,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CURTIS: Enclosed is the memorandum referred to in our telegram concerning the legal invalidity of the proposed hearings on the negotiation for an international antidumping code. We think that the legal authority supporting our position on each of the three points is quite clear. If you have any questions on any of them, however, please feel free to contact Donald Hiss of the Washington, D.C. firm of Covington & Burling, who is serving as counsel to our Committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. MATHIS,
Chairman.

MEMORANDUM RE LEGAL INVALIDITY OF PROPOSED HEARINGS ON AN INTERNATIONAL ANTIDUMPING CODE, JULY 21, 1966

On July 15, 1966 the office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations announced that hearings have been scheduled for September 12, 1966 to receive comment by United States industry, labor and other members of the public on the negotiation of an international antidumping code. These negotiations have already been started by the United States representatives at the current Kennedy Round of trade negotiations in Geneva under the auspices of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs.

This memorandum analyzes the legal authority for holding such hearings or for conducting such negotiations. It concludes first that there is no legal authority for the negotiation of an international antidumping code under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and such negotiations are in clear defiance of a resolution recently passed by the United States Senate. It concludes second that even assuming there were legal authority for the negotiation of an international antidumping code under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, there has been a total failure to comply with the requirements of the Act. It concludes third that in any event, the proposed hearings will be meaningless because no draft code or frame of reference has been provided on which comments or constructive criticism could be made.

1. There is no legal authority for the negotiations of an International Antidumping Code. The authority of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, which announced the public hearings on an international antidumping code, derives solely from the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Under that Act, the President and his representatives were given authority to negotiate trade agreements concerning "existing duties or other import restrictions." The Act makes it clear that this authority concerns only tariff duties or other import restrictions (such as quotas) relating to specific articles of merchandise. There is no authority to negotiate trade agreements with respect to non-tariff legislation, such as the Antidumping Act of 1921, which is not a tariff act and which does not relate to specific articles of merchandise.

The Antidumping Act is an integral part of the unfair trade laws of the United States. It is not designed to impose tariff duties upon specific articles of merchandise but rather to prevent unfair price discrimination by foreign sellers in their exports to the United States. As early as 1916 the Congress of the United States recognized that the "dumping" of goods in this market was an unfair trade practice, and made the practice punishable by criminal penalties and the subject of civil treble damage actions. 15 U.S.C. § 72.

The United States Senate has recently reaffirmed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 100 that there is no authority in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 for any negotiations concerning antidumping. The Resolution states it is the sense of the Congress that no trade agreement or other arrangement under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 should be entered into except in accordance with legislative authority delegated by Congress. The report filed by the Senate Finance Committee, recommending passage of the Resolution, concluded as follows:

"The Committee on Finance has been disturbed over reports that the current Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations may be broadened to include U.S. offers of concessions with respect to matters for which there is no existing delegated authority. . . .

"It has been reported that one area in which our negotiators may offer concessions concerns the American selling price method of evaluation. . . .

"Another area may involve the treatment of 'dumped' goods by the country in which

the dumping occurs. This problem concerns unfair trade practices in a domestic economy and it is difficult for us to understand why Congress should be bypassed at the crucial policymaking stages, and permitted to participate only after policy has been frozen in an international trade agreement."

It is thus clear that the negotiation of an international dumping code would be without legal authority and in clear defiance of the Senate Resolution. An international antidumping code would require revisions or amendments in the Antidumping Act of 1921, and this can be legally accomplished only by the Congress. This raises the alarming prospect that concessions will be made concerning an unfair trade law vital to the protection of United States industry without the prior deliberation and consent of the Congress as to whether such negotiations should be undertaken.

2. The proposed negotiation of an International Antidumping Code fails to comply with the requirements of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Even assuming that it conceivably could be concluded that authority to negotiate an international antidumping code is provided by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, there has been a total failure to comply with the requirements of the Act.

Section 221 of the Act requires the President to publish and furnish the Tariff Commission with lists of articles which may be the subject of any proposed trade agreement. Within six months after receipt of such a list, the Tariff Commission is required to advise the President with respect to the probable economic effect of the proposed trade agreement. There has been submitted to the Tariff Commission no list or directive which directs the Tariff Commission to advise the President as to the probable economic effect of an international antidumping code modifying the Antidumping Act of 1921. Hence, there has been no compliance with this mandatory requirement of the Act.

Section 221 of the Act also requires the Tariff Commission to advise the President on the probable economic effect on domestic industries of modifications of tariff duties or other import restrictions on specific articles. The Tariff Commission has not done this with respect to any change in the Antidumping Act of 1921. To do so, the Commission would have the impossible task of advising on the probable economic effect on practically every industry in the United States since antidumping duties can be assessed on all articles of merchandise entering this country as long as the unfair trade practices which the Act encompasses are alleged and proved in a fair and open hearing.

The language of Section 221 clearly does not contemplate trade agreements concerning antidumping, and in any case its terms have not been complied with. Any antidumping code resulting from the negotiations would hence be illegal.

3. No frame of reference has been provided which would permit meaningful comments or dialog on a proposed International Antidumping Code. The stated purpose of the hearings announced for September is to elicit from American industry, labor and other members of the public their opinions on an international antidumping code. The U.S. negotiators at the Kennedy Round have already begun such discussions with representatives from the other member countries of GATT. Thus, any opinions expressed in the September hearing would only come well after negotiations and discussion have already begun.

With such discussions having already begun, at the very least the Special Representative's Office should have provided those interested in testifying at the September hearings with the current draft of such an international antidumping code or with an

identification of those antidumping standards or procedures whose modification is being considered. Lacking either of these, domestic interests will have no frame of reference which would permit any meaningful comment or constructive criticism. Under these circumstances the hearing can hardly be more than an attempt to appease the Senate and others who have criticized the Special Representative's attempt to interject into the Kennedy Round negotiations a subject which is clearly beyond this authority.

COVINGTON & BURLING,
Counsel To Cement Industry Committee
For Tariff and Antidumping.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,

Washington, D.C., August 17, 1966.

Mr. JOHN MATHIS,
Chairman, Cement Industry Committee for
Tariff and Antidumping, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR JOHN: In Governor Herter's absence, thank you for your recent letters and telegram concerning the possibility of negotiations on an international antidumping agreement and the hearing called by the Trade Information Committee (TIC) on this issue.

In your letter of July 21, 1966, following your telegram of that date, you enclosed a memorandum which raises a number of questions regarding the President's authority to enter into negotiations on an international antidumping agreement through the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

I am enclosing for your consideration a response prepared by the General Counsel of this Office. In substance, this response concludes that the President has clear authority to enter into antidumping negotiations through the Special Representative, that the procedural requirements of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 are inapplicable to such a negotiation, and that the TIC hearing is legally valid by Executive Order.

Aside from such legal considerations, I should like to emphasize the following five points—about which there has been some confusion lately:

1. To date in Geneva the United States has been engaged in purely exploratory discussions of the issues involved in dealing with dumping. Neither the United States nor any other country has taken a formal position on any issue.

2. The GATT Secretariat is currently preparing a paper which will draw upon these discussions and outline under appropriate headings the possible elements of an antidumping agreement. This paper is designed to facilitate consideration by the countries concerned of the possibility of negotiating such an agreement and by their unanimous decision will in no sense represent a draft agreement.

3. The TIC hearing has been called for the explicit purpose of soliciting the views of interested persons regarding any possible antidumping agreement. The notice of this hearing identifies all of the basic areas which would have to be dealt with in negotiating such an agreement.

4. No formal position will be taken by the United States on any issue relating to a possible antidumping agreement until after the views expressed at the TIC hearing have been fully considered and approval has been given by the President.

5. Any antidumping agreement would be evaluated on the basis of its intrinsic merits and would be concluded separately from the overall Kennedy Round agreement.

I should add that the TIC hearing is, in our judgment, fully responsive to your request in your letter of July 6, 1966, for an opportunity to be heard and to give us the benefit of your experience and counsel regarding antidumping. Moreover, I assure

you that we are available at any time to meet with you and other members of your Committee to discuss any issue relating to the possibility of negotiating an international antidumping agreement.

I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this letter, together with its enclosure, to our Congressional Delegates as well as to other members of the Congress who have requested our comments on the memorandum enclosed in your letter of July 21, 1966.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. ROTH,
Acting Special Representative.

MEMORANDUM FROM OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS, AUGUST 17, 1966

This memorandum is in response to a memorandum, dated July 21, 1966, prepared by counsel to the Cement Industry Committee for Tariff and Antidumping. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum raises a number of questions regarding the President's authority to enter into international negotiations on antidumping, through the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

BACKGROUND

During the past several months, as part of the general discussions on non-tariff barriers in the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations, discussions have been taking place in Geneva regarding Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the content and administration of national antidumping laws. Other countries have criticized aspects of the U.S. antidumping law. The United States, in turn, has pointed to difficulties encountered by U.S. exporters in the application of foreign antidumping laws, and has expressed concern that such laws will increasingly be used as unjustifiable non-tariff barriers to trade. As a consequence of these discussions, the United States and the other countries concerned have indicated interest in a possible international antidumping agreement, which would elaborate and perhaps alter the present provisions of Article VI of the GATT. To assist the United States in preparing its position on this question, public hearings have been set for September 12, 1966 by the Trade Information Committee (TIC) in the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

After consideration of the questions raised in the Cement Industry Committee memorandum, we have reached the following conclusions:

1. The President has clear Constitutional authority to enter into negotiations looking toward a possible international agreement on antidumping.
2. Both as a matter of Constitutional law, and under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (TEA), it is clear that the President may authorize the Special Representative to enter into negotiations on an international antidumping agreement.
3. If any international antidumping agreement is concluded which envisions amendments to the U.S. Antidumping Act of 1921, the President would have to seek legislation from the Congress. The President has no statutory authority to amend the 1921 Antidumping Act pursuant to a trade agreement. Consequently the procedural requirements of sections 221-224 of the TEA, including publication of lists of articles whose duties may be reduced in trade agreements and Tariff Commission hearings and advice, are inapplicable.
4. Because it is not clear that any international agreement would entail amendments to the 1921 Antidumping Act, the concerns expressed in the Senate Finance Com-

mittee report accompanying S. Con. Res. 100 are not wholly opposite and, in any case, would be fully met in the conduct of any negotiations.

5. The public hearing of the Trade Information Committee (TIC) is clearly legal, being expressly authorized by Executive Order.

6. The Trade Information Committee (TIC) hearings will serve a useful function by providing a forum in which interested parties can present their views on antidumping so that those views may be taken into account if any international antidumping agreement is negotiated.

DISCUSSION

1. Under the Constitution, the President has the authority to conduct foreign relations. It is clear that the President may exercise this authority to enter into agreements with foreign nations, such as an international antidumping agreement. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum does not appear to question the existence of this clear Constitutional authority.

Moreover, the President has expressly given to the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations the responsibility not only of advising him with respect to non-tariff barriers but also of assisting him in the negotiation of trade agreements which rest upon his Constitutional authority. This the President has done by sections 3(b) and 1(b) of Executive Order No. 11075, as amended (48 CFR 1.3(b) and 1.1(b)).

2. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum states that the "authority of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations . . . derives solely from the Trade Expansion Act of 1962," and that this Act gives the President authority only to "negotiate trade agreements concerning 'existing duties or other import restrictions'" but gives no negotiating authority regarding a non-tariff trade issue such as antidumping. From this premise, the memorandum argues that the Special Representative cannot enter into negotiations, at the direction of the President, on a possible international agreement on antidumping. This argument is incorrect.

The TEA in no way restricts the President from exercising his Constitutional prerogative to enter into negotiations with foreign countries regarding any subject affecting international trade. Nor does the TEA restrict the functions which the President may delegate to the Special Representative regarding such negotiations. Indeed, section 241(a) of the TEA (19 U.S.C. 1871(a)) explicitly provides that the Special Representative shall be the chief representative of the United States for negotiations under the TEA "and for such other negotiations as in the President's judgment require that the Special Representative be the chief representative of the United States."

Moreover, in the exercise of his Constitutional authority to conduct foreign relations, the President must necessarily be free to secure assistance from any source he chooses. Pursuant to this authority, section 3(a) of Executive Order 11075, as amended, (48 CFR 1.3(a)), provides that the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations shall have such functions as the President may direct from time to time, in addition to those functions conferred by the TEA and the Executive Order.

Thus, as a matter of both Constitutional and statutory law, it is clear that the President may authorize the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations to negotiate an antidumping agreement.

3. Under the TEA, the President is authorized to modify "duties and other import restrictions" pursuant to trade agreements. In our judgment, this authority does not

permit the President to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921, pursuant to a trade agreement. If the President entered into an international agreement which envisioned amendments to the 1921 Act, only Congress could enact such amendments. (If an international agreement was limited to changes which did not require amendment of the 1921 Act, the Executive could implement the agreement without Congressional action.)

The Cement Industry Committee memorandum states that consideration of an international antidumping agreement must be preceded, under section 221 of the TEA, by "publication of lists of articles which may be the subject of any proposed trade agreements" and Tariff Commission hearings and advice to the President. This argument is incorrect.

The prenegotiation requirements of section 221 of the TEA apply regarding "articles which may be considered for modification or continuance of United States duties or other import restrictions . . ." As noted above, the Presidential authority to alter "duties or other import restrictions" pursuant to a trade agreement does not apply to the Antidumping Act of 1921. Since this authority does not apply to the Antidumping Act, the statutory prenegotiation requirements in section 221 of the TEA also do not apply.

4. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum states that "the negotiation of an international antidumping code would be . . . in clear defiance" of Senate Concurrent Resolution 100. This Concurrent Resolution (which has not been passed by the House of Representatives and is therefore not in effect) expresses the sense of Congress that the President should only enter into trade agreements in the Kennedy Round which would not require subsequent Congressional implementation. With regard to an antidumping agreement, the Senate Finance Committee Report notes concern that Congress would "be bypassed at the crucial policymaking stages, and permitted to participate only after policy has been frozen in an international trade agreement."

Further consideration by the Executive Branch of the possibility of an international antidumping agreement, including the TIC hearing, would not be "in clear defiance" of this Senate Concurrent Resolution. It is clear that an international agreement may be concluded which would not require changes in the 1921 Antidumping Act, and such an agreement would not involve the policymaking functions of the Congress.

If, however, any agreement envisioning changes in the 1921 Antidumping Act were concluded, the interests of the Congress would be respected and the concerns expressed in the Senate Finance Committee report would be met. First, the Congress would be kept fully informed at every step of any antidumping negotiation—indeed, whether or not Congressional action would be required. The September 12 TIC hearing will inform the Congress, as well as the Executive, regarding the views of interested persons. Moreover, the Congressional Delegates to the Kennedy Round would be able to observe the conduct of any negotiation in Geneva. Second, if any agreement were in fact concluded envisioning changes in the 1921 Act, the Congress would be free to accept or reject any proposed amendment to the 1921 Act based on its evaluation of the intrinsic merits of any such antidumping agreement. Any antidumping agreement will be concluded in an agreement separate from the overall results of the Kennedy Round, which Congress could accept or reject without affecting the overall Kennedy Round agreement.

5. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum asserts, without elaboration, that the proposed hearing of the TIC is legally invalid. This assertion is incorrect.

As noted above, by Executive Order No. 11075, as amended, the President has given to the Special Representative the responsibility of advising him with respect to non-tariff barriers and of assisting him in all activities related to the negotiation of trade agreements which rest upon his Constitutional authority. In discharging this responsibility, section 3(c) of this Order (48 CFR 1.3(c)) provides that the Special Representative shall, as he may deem to be necessary, draw upon the resources of bodies established by or under the provisions of the same Order. These bodies include the TIC. In addition, a TIC hearing concerning the possible negotiation of an antidumping agreement is clearly envisaged by section 3(b) (3) of Directive No. 1 (48 CFR 202.3(b) (3)), which established the TIC, and by section 2(d) itself of the TIC regulations (48 CFR 211.2(d)).

6. The Cement Industry Committee memorandum states, in effect, that "negotiations have already begun" and therefore interested persons will not be able to make meaningful comments at the TIC hearing unless they are provided "with the current draft of an international antidumping code or with an identification of those antidumping standards or procedures whose modification is being considered".

First, no negotiations on an antidumping agreement have taken place. The meetings to date in Geneva have been devoted only to exploratory discussions of substantive and procedural issues involved in dealing with dumping. These discussions have in no way committed the United States or any other country to any position on any possible provision of an antidumping agreement. Indeed, no formal position will be taken by the United States on any issue until after the views expressed at the TIC hearing have been fully considered within the Executive Branch and approval has been given by the President.

Second, there is no document in existence which is regarded by the participating countries as the draft of an antidumping agreement. The papers submitted by many countries, which have been the subject of the discussions in Geneva, were tentative and exploratory. In the light of these discussions, the GATT Secretariat is currently preparing a paper which will outline under appropriate headings the possible elements of an antidumping agreement. This latter paper is intended to facilitate consideration by the participating countries of the possibility of negotiating such an agreement. It has been expressly agreed by all that this paper would in no sense represent a draft agreement. It should be noted that, under GATT procedures, none of these papers is available for public circulation.

Third, we believe that the terms of the notice of the TIC hearing do provide an adequate frame of reference for meaningful contributions by interested persons. Paragraphs (1)-(v) of section 2 of the TIC notice (31 F.R. 9619—July 15, 1966) identify all of the basic areas which have been dealt with to date in the discussions in Geneva. In addition, these paragraphs set out some of the major subsidiary questions which must be dealt with in considering a possible antidumping agreement and which may lead to a modification of existing antidumping standards or procedures. Moreover, section 8 of the TIC notice expressly provides that additional information regarding the coverage of the hearing may be requested from the TIC. Finally, the staff of this Office is available to meet at any time with interested persons to discuss the issues which will be the subject of any possible negotiation of an antidumping agreement.

CEMENT INDUSTRY COMMITTEE ON TARIFF AND ANTIDUMPING, 1966

Allentown Portland Cement Co.
Alpha Portland Cement Co.
American Cement Corp.
Ash Grove Lime & Portland Cement Co.
Atlantic Cement Co., Inc.
California Portland Cement Co.
Columbia Cement Corp.
Coplay Cement Manufacturing Co.
Diamond Alkali Co.
The Flintkote Co.
General Portland Cement Co.
Giant Portland Cement Co.
Gulf Coast Portland Cement Co.
Huron Portland Cement Co.
Ideal Cement Co.
Kaiser Cement & Gypsum Co.
Keystone Portland Cement Co.
Lehigh Portland Cement Co.
Lone Star Cement Corp.
Marquette Cement Manufacturing Co.
Martin Marietta Corp.
Medusa Portland Cement Co.
Missouri Portland Cement Co.
National Cement Co.
National Portland Cement Co.
Nazareth Cement Co.
Northwestern States Portland Cement Co.
Oklahoma Cement Co.
Oregon Portland Cement Co.
Penn-Dixie Cement Corp.
Puerto Rican Cement Co., Inc.
San Antonio Portland Cement Co.
Southwestern Portland Cement Co.
Whitehall Cement Manufacturing Co.
Wyandotte Chemicals Corp.

ADVICE AND DISSENT

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the soaring prices under the Johnson-Humphrey Democratic administration have become a serious matter for millions of our people. We cannot dismiss this problem with the "slip, slide, and duck" technique recommended by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. An editorial in the Detroit News for August 17, 1966, entitled "Advice and Dissent," emphasizes that current high prices deserve greater and more sincere consideration by Mr. Johnson and his administration.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial:

ADVICE AND DISSENT

If a "Politician's Almanac" is ever written, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman should be assigned to write the chapter on consumer prices. The secretary has given some fascinating advice on the subject to Democratic congressional candidates:

"Slip, slide and duck any question of higher consumer prices if you possibly can. Don't get caught in a debate over higher prices between housewives and farmers. If you do, and have to choose a side take the farmer's side. It's the right side and, besides, housewives aren't nearly so well organized."

Freeman practices what he preaches. He is an excellent "slip, slide and duck" man. He has called on the Federal Trade Commission to investigate soaring food prices in

order to keep his own department out of the cross-fire. Freeman has also prejudged the investigation by blaming the middleman for rising prices and, of course, this is good politics because middlemen are not very well organized either.

But Freeman may be in for a jolt if housewives remember that "organization" is not necessary in a voting booth. Congressmen who follow Freeman's slippery tactics can be voted out of office with a mere flip of a lever. When politicians try to make political hay out of the housewives' soaring food budget, they deserve no better fate.

VIETCONG IN CAMBODIA

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, a little over a week ago a self-appointed group calling itself "Americans Want To Know" returned from a tour conducted by the Cambodian Government of areas bordering on South Vietnam. To no one's surprise the group found no evidence of Vietcong or North Vietnamese units in Cambodia. Many have taken the same guided tour with the same results in the past. Unlike this particular group, some others have been genuinely concerned enough to check the situation from the other side of the border by asking the troops who are doing the fighting.

A columnist who has recently examined the evidence, Richard Fryklund, has joined a growing group of journalists who are convinced that Cambodia is being used by the Vietcong irrespective of the diplomatic protests of that country as to its "strict neutrality." In an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star, August 23, Mr. Fryklund writes:

Despite State Department and Pentagon efforts to question the existence of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese bases in Cambodia, the evidence is overwhelming.

They are there. They are immensely valuable to the enemy. The only question remaining is what to do about them. The evidence of the use of Cambodia has come from all of the traditional and a few new means of intelligence. But any visitor to South Viet Nam can find his own evidence. He can question prisoners of war at great length, listen to their descriptions of their movements in and out of Cambodia and decide for himself whether the men know where they have been and what they have done. This reporter has checked on the scene and is convinced that the intelligence reports are accurate.

I will include the entire article entitled "Cambodian Sanctuary Prolongs War," in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the handling of the Cambodian situation may very well hold the key to the success of our efforts in South Vietnam. It is becoming increasingly clear to everyone that until the Cambodian border is sealed, the Vietcong can carry on the war indefinitely.

To date the efforts of the administration with regard to Cambodia have been

clearly ineffective. Official tolerance of use of Cambodian soil by the Vietcong has done nothing to end the Cambodian Government's courtship of Communist China, North Vietnam, and the National Liberation Front. The great optimism that Prince Sihanouk was at last ready to take some real steps toward tighter border surveillance now appears to have been a false hope. Sihanouk continues to act on the assumption that the Vietcong will ultimately win, and we continue to stand ineffectually by and officially pretend to believe in Cambodian neutrality while at the same time finding it necessary to send hundreds of thousands of American boys to fight for South Vietnam's freedom.

The situation cannot be permitted to drift. The Vietcong's back-door source of supply must be closed and it is time the administration faced up to it.

The complete article follows:

CAMBODIA SANCTUARY PROLONGS WAR
(By Richard Fryklund)

There can be no doubt now that Cambodia is being used as a privileged sanctuary by the Communist armies and that continued use of the rest and resupply areas there puts a heavy handicap on allied forces fighting in South Viet Nam.

Despite State Department and Pentagon efforts to question the existence of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese bases in Cambodia, the evidence is overwhelming.

They are there. They are immensely valuable to the enemy. The only question remaining is what to do about them.

The evidence of the use of Cambodia has come from all of the traditional and a few new means of intelligence. But any visitor to South Viet Nam can find his own evidence.

He can question prisoners of war at great length, listen to their descriptions of their movements in and out of Cambodia and decide for himself whether the men know where they have been and what they have done.

This reporter has checked on the scene and is convinced that the intelligence reports are accurate.

The military men in South Viet Nam may not know on a precise day which enemy units are infiltrating through Cambodia or resting and being resupplied in the primitive jungle camps there, but they do know that they cannot corner an enemy who keeps his back to the border and slips across, sometimes on rocket signal from outside Cambodia, when the going gets too hot.

The sanctuary is prolonging the war. If the guerrilla war is won eventually without closing the border, this will be the first such success in the recent history of counter-insurgency.

But how to close it?

There are many proposals, some efforts and no progress.

The State Department is trying to get the Cambodian ruler, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, to close his own borders or cooperate in a joint effort. He does not concede that the Communists side uses his territory for infiltration or as a sanctuary, but he has said that he will cooperate with the International Control Commission that probably could supervise the border under terms of the 1954 Geneva Convention.

But one of the ICC members is Poland, and Poland will not permit a border check.

There are suggestions in Washington that the United Nations do the job, financed by the United States; but there are some hazards, in the U.S. government view, in introducing the United Nations and its vetoes and neutralists and Communists into this struggle.

So military leaders in South Viet Nam and Washington are looking for ways to seal the border by force—or at least to reduce the movement back and forth.

Allied land and air forces are trying now to find and destroy large enemy units in the border area.

But it's a long border, wooded through most of its length, and enemy soldiers have plenty of trails and waterways to choose from. Operations by scores of thousands of allied soldiers probably have forced the enemy to work harder, but they haven't slowed him down.

Some military men in Viet Nam would like to extend their operations across the border.

From a simple military point of view, without consideration of diplomatic complications, it would be logical to harass and destroy in the storage and trail areas of Cambodia.

The allies might sow mine fields; they might put outposts in the Cambodian jungle.

But these efforts still would not stop the movement.

So there are many proposals also to seal the border.

France put fences and mine fields along much of the Algerian border in the late 1950's, and that proved to be fairly effective in containing a war that was hopeless anyhow.

Some American officers would like to try this along the Cambodian border.

They would start in the areas where the infiltration is the greatest, say in the Ia Drang River Valley near Pleiku.

First they would get rid of the trees in a strip several hundreds yards wide. Present defoliating chemicals take the leaves off the trees and kill most of them, but they do not hold the lush jungle undergrowth in check for long. So better chemicals are needed.

Or modern "tree-crusher" machinery could grind up the forest.

The clearing job would be a vast one, but some military leaders point out that huge construction jobs can be completed in Asia with the slow application of massive manpower.

The cleared area could be fenced, mined, patrolled and watched by various electronic, infra-red and acoustic devices.

However difficult the job, it does not seem nearly as slow or as tiring as the job of finding all the enemy soldiers who use the sanctuary.

ATTACK OF THE TAIL-FIN PEOPLE

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the August 15th issue of NAM Reports has been brought to my attention. Since this article is concerned with the so-called truth-in-packaging bill which is presently under consideration in our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I include it in the Record at this point in my remarks:

ATTACK OF THE TAIL-FIN PEOPLE—OR, AFTER THE HART BILL, WHAT?

(NOTE.—A few years ago, the tail fins on cars, like the dachshunds in World War I, became targets of inexplicable attacks by anti-industry groups. Some of the same people, with new allies, today are just as upset by a package that says "giant size," or a sticker that says "10 Cents Off." Here is explored the question of what such people

will be upset about tomorrow, and what they may do about it that will affect American industry.)

Anyone who markets anything and fails to concern himself about the progress of the Hart Packaging and Labeling Bill through the House must be unaware of the nature of the pressures for consumer legislation of all kinds.

When Senator HART (D., Mich.) resisted addition of other commodities to the ones covered by his bill, he made perfectly plain that he favored such legislation—but in additional bills. The Senate passed the bill, leaving other commodities for later.

This was wise strategy on the part of the supporters of consumer legislation. If all the regulation they favor had been wrapped in a single package and honestly labeled all businessmen would have been alarmed into action.

The food and grocery products manufacturers, alone, have considerable resources, and have deployed them well in their effort to defend their marketing freedom. Hart Bill supporters are confident that the food industry, alone, can't defeat the bill. After all, in the Senate they were proved right.

If the Hart Bill (H.R. 15440) passes, then, the food industry may be expected to be on the sidelines when the next regulatory bill comes along, and the divide and conquer tactics will have worked. The strategy of the consumerists evidently is never to engage all industries at one time.

If the Truth in Lending Bill should come up next, in the present Congress or the impending one, the food companies will have no direct interest (who buys oleo on time?) and the consumerists will again be facing with their entire force only a fragment of the resources that all industry and business are capable of putting into the field.

A swift survey of consumer protection proposals now in varying stages of incubation should convince nearly anyone that additional regulation is certain for every industry if the Hart Bill gives the consumerists the start they need. From then on, industry will be faced with such proposals as:

1. Truth in Lending (S. 2275)—a bill by Sen. DOUGLAS of Illinois. This one could adversely affect every company whose products are sold on credit at retail, regardless of who extends the credit. The bill offers no way in which credit may be made less expensive, and actually might tend to frighten consumers away from credit by pinning a warning label on it as the Government has finally succeeded in doing with cigarettes. (Sales are up since.)

A customer could conceivably boggle at learning that he will pay an effective "interest rate" of 11½ percent by charging an air conditioner he can't now pay cash for. But whether he will, in fact, choose to swelter through a summer rather than pay all the costs that someone must meet if credit sales are to be arranged is a matter that only he is prepared to answer.

He may, with some consumerists, feel that six percent is somehow a maximum moral figure, whether it covers the expenses of credit checks, paperwork and the company's own interest payments, and refuse to buy. Or, he may be bright enough to say that 5½ percent of \$200 is \$11, or a few cents a day for beating the heat all summer, and please deliver as soon as possible. It costs more to rent an air conditioner.

The Douglas Bill could affect sales, but certainly it will add to the cost of extending credit by adding clerical and paperwork and printing.

2. Grade labeling: This veteran proposal has been resurrected by the Food Marketing Commission.

Its companion in kind is the proposal to force physicians to write prescriptions in generic, rather than in brand, terms. (Expense for the latter, of course, is that the

Government now pays for some prescriptions under Medicare, and earlier assurances that Medicare would not affect the practice of the doctor are already forgotten.)

3. Design standards: The auto safety bill (H.R. 13228) is an example of this, but once this one passes consumerists will be encouraged to remove the designing of additional products from the engineering departments of companies to the committees of Congress and the staffs of the regulatory agencies and Federal departments.

4. Publicized comparisons of products on the market: One official has suggested that the Government subsidize such outfits as Consumer Reports and Consumers Union in their product tests, and broadcast the outcomes.

Another suggestion is that the Government's purchasing agents be required to make publicly available the results of their studies for purposes of making Federal purchases.

Perhaps one needn't concern the grocery items producers much, because it would work like this: The housewife draws up a list of 35 or 40 grocery items. First is, say, canned peaches. So, she goes to the public library and reads through the technical data on the hundred or five hundred brands of canned peaches that are offered in the U. S., plus the sublistings for halves and slices, and the packs in heavy syrup and dietary mixtures, cling and freestone, Elberta and other varieties. Fine, this is the one (if the store has it.) Now for the canned tomatoes. And so on. By the time she gets to the store, it is closed.

But what about consumer durables?

The private consumer testing outfits do some meticulous tests, and adulterate their reports with all sorts of subjective comments. One or two units of a product run in hundreds of thousands are tested, if the items are expensive, and a squeak in one unit could be amplified so it could be heard around the nation. Often the most important features of a product (like the sound of a radio) must be judged subjectively, and are. The panels are relatively small, and the opinions seldom unanimous. But tiny differences from unit to unit, slight edges in panel approval and such could give disproportionate boosts to the products of some firms and spell disaster to others, once such mixtures of test and opinion bore the Federal cachet.

Then, with millions at stake, the temptation to bribery would be present, and the suspicion of bribery pervasive.

The findings of Federal purchasers would be largely irrelevant to the needs of the consumer. The purchasing agent, convinced an office chair will last 50 years without maintenance and is low priced, is satisfied. He doesn't have to sit in it.

His taste standards, likely, will run to Rayburn Building neo-classic, and he will seldom make an error in calculating costs larger than was made in estimating that building—say 100 percent.

5. Limitations on advertising: When the Federal Government wants to enlist the public in the interest of Savings Bonds, beautification, employment of the handicapped or prevention of forest fires, it garners free space in all the media and free service from all the advertising agencies. But many in the Capital are on record as feeling that any other advertising is, somehow, evil.

Assistant Attorney General Donald F. Turner has proposed that the advertising expenditures of large companies be controlled as a novel anti-trust measure to prevent concentration.

His support from the consumerists, who would prefer to do away with all advertising, will be strong.

This is a matter of concern, of course, to the largest companies, who would be directly affected.

It is also a direct threat to every TV and radio station, every newspaper, every magazine, every outdoor advertising company, every printer and every direct mail house.

It is, consequently, a threat to our entire expensive and intricate system of gathering and disseminating information independent of Government sources and subsidies, known collectively as the "free press," and now including the broadcast media.

6. Regulation of volume discounts of advertising media: This is an idea that would raise costs to every regular, substantial user of advertising space and time, and consequently raise costs to consumers, or it would reduce the use of advertising, and raise Cain with the media and with sales.

7. Federal sponsorship of consumer education classes in the public schools: The NAM and other businesses and business organizations have no objection to consumer education, as such. Woe to business in general if its success ever depended upon ignorance. In such a case, all research and development to improve consumer products would be sheer waste.

The danger of this proposal is that its administration surely would wind up in the hands of the consumerists, whose mistrust of business is notorious.

It might be that such classes would not recommend bulk cracked wheat as less expensive and just as nutritious as wheat cereal pre-sweetened and made in the shape of kangaroos, but would you want to bet? And the young homemakers who follow such advice are, take it from the father of a 3-year-old, going to have woes inducing consumption of such chicken feed by willful toddlers.

Such classes are nearly certain to reflect the consumerists' strange set of values that people are more important than money, but nothing is more important to people in what they buy than money. The theme song can hardly be other than "cents per ounce, and forget the differences."

As our Government consumerists presently are oriented, we may reasonably expect the classes to bear some resemblance to the "make your wedding dress out of flour sacks" approach recalled from the Federal advisories to consumers in the 1930's.

Austerity is traditionally the keynote in such classes—a hair shirt lasts longer than a cotton one. Best Buy.

8. A "Hart Bill" for consumer durables: This will require legislative ingenuity and will lead to an administrative monstrosity, but a full wave of consumerism must lead here. If, as some lawmakers now contend, your wife is hopelessly baffled choosing between two boxes of corn flakes, can the Government, from which all blessings flow, fall her when she must choose between two electric floor polishers, which last longer than corn flakes in most cases, and which make a bigger dent in the family budget? No, customer "confusion" was the reason for the Hart Bill, and Steinmetz might have been confused by the wealth of competing virtues and features offered by today's manufacturers of hard goods.

So any Hart approach to consumer durables probably would have to take the same line as the Hart Bill on packaged goods. You can eliminate the confusion by eliminating the choices.

9. Federal supervision of warranties and guarantees: This would simply make a Federal case out of each dissatisfied customer. Today, the manufacturer's interest in such a customer is in making an adjustment that will keep the customer. The new approach would make the manufacturer and the customer adversaries before a third party, and likely dash any such hope. The customer, then, could expect less interest—because the manufacturer's attention would be centered on getting Uncle Sam rather than the customer calmed down.

10. Licensing: NAM has had two reports from separate sources that the White House is actively seeking a workable plan for the Federal licensing of businesses in the interest of assuring consumer satisfaction. The licenses would be suspendable and revokable, and are intended to be designed for deterrent effect like atomic bombs.

Where is the support for such measures?

Labor unions and credit unions long have had consumer programs, although not necessarily pro-regulation, anti-business programs. A few individuals had made precarious livings as executives of "consumer" organizations. There were some consumer magazines, which evaluated products for audiences of college instructors and ladies with no make-up.

When politics discovered the consumer—whom Congress had been representing all along under the impression they were constituents—these venerable institutions were shaken up by unwonted attentions, the calling of conferences coast-to-coast, the appointment of commissions and committees and groups and panels and boards, all with mandates to forget the roses and search for thorns.

Business, which had habitually kept prices down through competition and development of new manufacturing and marketing methods, was accused of rifting the customer's pocketbooks, and Government, which had for years boosted prices with farm programs, commodity stabilization agreements abroad, excise and other taxes, minimum wage laws, etc., was quickly sketched in as the guardian of the purchaser's pennies.

A public, concerned with its own affairs and larger issues like Viet Nam and inflation, learns of a "bill to help consumers," and pays little note, save to be flattered by the attention and hopeful that results may be good.

Backing the consumerists now are the White House (with Esther Peterson as Presidential Advisor on Consumer Affairs and a full-blown, report-issuing "Consumer's Advisory Council"); the majority of the Food Marketing Commission, majorities of the Democratic majorities in both houses, minorities of the Republican minorities in both houses, a host of organizations that have been set up with Office of Economic Opportunity cash, some academicians, some anti-trusters, a horde of Federal employees in regulatory agencies that are already years behind on their cases, and a dear lady in our block whose Chalmers Touring Car once developed a crack in the ising glass after dealer had gone out of business.

Broad-scale public support is not in evidence.

But the strength to pass the bills is enough, provided businesses and industries can be picked off, one by one, each unaware of the general trend and not even bothering to send to ask for whom the bell tolls.

Observers feel that any businessman who thinks he is not affected by the Hart Bill cannot be fully aware of what a Hart Bill success would release upon other industries. And, in these days diversification may lead any business into an area covered by the Packaging and Labeling bill, anyway.

They feel that this bill, now pending in the House, is the foundation upon which a vast regulatory structure will be based, and that it will be nearly impossible to stop the construction once the foundation is in place.

TO PERMIT TEACHERS TO DEDUCT EDUCATION EXPENSE FROM FEDERAL TAXES

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill amending the Internal Revenue Code to permit teachers to deduct the expense of their own education from Federal taxes.

Excellence in education is of paramount importance to our children and to the future welfare of our country. The purpose of my bill is to offer our teachers an incentive to continue to upgrade their own abilities and thereby improve the quality of education generally.

A teacher's pay is often dependent upon his or her educational attainment. Students, parents and the whole Nation benefit by encouraging teachers to improve themselves by keeping up with the latest and most modern techniques while at the same time giving our dedicated educators an opportunity to increase their own salaries.

Businessmen are allowed tax deductions for legitimate expenses relating to their business, and it seems only fair that teachers be given similar treatment under the law.

The greatest investment our Nation can make is to provide our youth with the best possible education, and tax help for teachers would be a giant step forward.

LEGISLATION TO CURB ANTIWAR ACTIVITIES

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. **Watson**] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, it should be perfectly obvious to the Members of this body after a week of hearings before the Un-American Activities Committee that the international Communist movement has successfully infiltrated the antiwar groups in this country. In fact, one could reasonably conclude that these groups are actually dominated by the Communist conspiracy. The committee has heard testimony from avowed Communists who are proud of their role in obstructing and interfering with the movement of men and supplies to South Vietnam.

I have been shocked and appalled by the extent of Communist subversion behind these peace groups which has come to light during these hearings. The witnesses called upon to testify are not simply leftist-oriented idealists seeking a just peace in Vietnam. They are hard-core Communists who advocate the overthrow of this Government by violence or any other means to attain this end. They are just as dangerous to the survival of freedom as a Communist aggressor locked in a life and death struggle with an American soldier at this very moment in Vietnam.

They are actively engaged in attempts to thwart the war effort. This sort of activity is in no way related to the right of American citizens to peacefully dissent from Government activities. They are the perpetrators of organized attempts to block troop movements involving our military personnel. They are burning draft cards and contributing financial support to the Vietcong.

Make no doubts about it, these protesters are giving aid and comfort to the enemy at a time when this Nation is at war. Their actions border on treason, and actually would be treason were we in a declared state of war. It is up to Congress to see that such revolutionary tactics by these anarchists are dealt with by severe penalties under the law.

I urge my colleagues to give overwhelming support to the measure approved by the Un-American Activities Committee today to deal with this critical problem. My friend, the gentleman from Texas, who has so ably conducted these hearings, introduced this legislation which would curb the activities of these "peacenik" groups. His bill would amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 by providing a fine of not more than \$10,000 or a prison sentence of not less than 5 years, or both, for persons convicted of obstructing our military effort or giving assistance to enemy forces.

We must not let this Congress adjourn without passing a measure of this type. It is our obligation to American fighting men who are dying to preserve our way of life. It is incredible to me that while our young men are giving their lives for freedom in a faraway land, youth of a comparable age in this country are joining ranks with the forces of oppression. They are indeed plunging the dagger into the backs of our fighting men. Now is the time to deal with these acts of treason. I think a long-term period of incarceration might tend to curtail this seditious activity, and it is up to us to provide such a penalty.

COMBINED GREEK ORTHODOX SERVICES IN TRIBUTE TO WAR DEAD AT CATHEDRAL OF THE PINES, RINDGE, N.H., JULY 10, 1966

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. **CLEVELAND**] may extend his remarks at this point in the **RECORD** and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 10, I was privileged to participate in a portion of the ceremonies at the Cathedral of the Pines in which the faithful of the Greek Orthodox Church from throughout New England assembled to witness a very special event during the annual combined services at the cathedral.

The beautiful Cathedral of the Pines, in Rindge, in my district, is an international shrine to war dead. It is the site

of the Altar of the Nation, which is the only memorial which pays tribute to all of America's war dead.

This special event was the result of a truly responsible attitude within the Greek community of New England. Realizing that many personal sacrifices are being made daily in Vietnam, they wanted to honor the memory of the members of their church who have died in the defense of liberty. And this is very understandable because these sons of Greece in America today have ancestral lines running back to the homeland of Western democracy. The blood that they have now shed is mingled with the blood of earlier heroes who have likewise fallen throughout the centuries of conflict in defense of human liberty.

The ancient Greeks were peace-lovers; so too were these young Americans being honored. The ancient Greeks were men of freedom; so too were these young men. The ancient Greeks were mighty warriors who were not afraid to give their lives for their ideals; so too were these young men. The ancient Greeks loved and worshipped the Creator as the source of all their blessings; so too did these young men. Now they are joined in one company of heroes and the Greek community of New England assembled on this day to be in the spiritual presence of these men.

BISHOP GERASIMOS OFFICIATES

Officiating at this archieratical divine liturgy was His Grace, Bishop Gerasimos of the New England Diocese. He was assisted by various clergy from throughout New England. Liturgical responses were provided by the Byzantine Male Choir of Lowell, led by Dr. Christos J. Bentas.

As part of the memorial services, a large wreath was presented by New England members of the AHEPA, a nationwide fraternal organization of Greek-Americans.

These AHEPA members passed three separate resolutions at three separate conventions of the three districts comprising the New England area. These resolutions made possible the attendance at this event of the three separate district lodges. Leading their respective districts was Attorney Harold Demopoulos, district governor No. 7, James Tzellas, district governor No. 8, and Attorney John Pappas, district governor No. 9. More than 5,000 persons worshipped and prayed at this mountaintop Cathedral of the Pines.

Following the services the Greek community of Keene, N.H., provided an outdoor barbecue for those attending. This barbecue was held on the campus of nearby Franklin Pierce College, which had donated its complete facilities for this occasion.

This day's events truly depicted the tradition of responsibility and cooperation so prevalent in the ancient Greek culture that has now become a significant part of our American society. For just as the ancient Greeks respected honor, liberty, and justice, so too do today's Americans of Greek descent cherish these ideals and use them to guide their everyday conduct. Let us salute the valor of these young men who

have given their lives, and live so as to be worthy of the sacrifices made. Let us also salute the responsible spirit of the Greek community that makes possible events such as those that took place on July 10.

INSTITUTION BUILDING IN THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY—A PACIFIC BANKERS' ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we have entered the era of institution building in the Pacific community. Within the past few years we have seen many institutions begin to take form pulling Pacific neighbors ever closer together. Among the more well known have been the recently formed Asian and Pacific Cooperation Council, the Asian Development Bank, and the Mekong River project. Among the less publicized, but equally significant in their own way, have been such institutions as the Australia-Japan Business Cooperation Committee and the Trans-Tasman Trade Agreement. These are the sure signs, the first light of the dawning of the Pacific era, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad that our President has so astutely recognized this critical, dynamic factor of international relations today.

If I read his momentous speech of July 12, 1966, correctly, the President of the United States has given our foreign policy new luster and new energy to meet the challenges and opportunities that lie in the Pacific. He has said that our policy shall be to encourage, to help cultivate, and to help protect the bright future of a dynamic new Asia that is now blossoming in the western Pacific.

The war, of course, is a great and poignant tragedy as war always is. It is tragic for the Vietnamese people. It is tragic for us and for our President. It is tragic for all men who hope for lasting peace. However, in the recognition of such tragedies let us not be so absorbed by the pall of war that we fail to see that elsewhere in the Pacific community, Asians are on the move, vigorously advancing toward a better life for themselves and a progressive and prosperous future for their children.

Mr. Speaker, the President has set the tone for constructive action in the Pacific. He has created an enlivened environment for positive thinking about the Pacific community. But setting the environment, as our President well knows, is not enough. A community does not spring forth whole, as Minerva did from the head of Zeus, merely because of the environment. It must be built by hard work, one brick at a time and, Mr. Speaker, institutions are the bricks of any community.

It has been long evident to the students of society and its governments that you must build institutions to bring together a people and enable them to have a common consort in their activities. In the process of building a community, institutions have always been both the seed and the catalyst, essential ingredi-

ents with which societies, working toward common goals, may develop a harmonious working relationship.

We conclude that it is helpful but not sufficient for an institution to begin at the topmost level. Institutions which begin at the very top, such as the United Nations and its subsidiary, the Commission for Asia and the Far East—ECAFE—fulfill a crucial function in the diplomacy of a changing and shrinking world. They provide a necessary framework for coordinating and setting general guidelines on international political harmony. Within that framework they are starting work on solving some of this world's critical problems: economic development, world hunger, and peace. In many cases they have made important progress, and my remarks today are not meant to demean these great institutions nor to belittle their impressive achievements. My point is that while we must recognize the importance of vast multipurpose institutions like the United Nations and its subsidiaries, like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and like the Common Market, we should also recognize their limitations and realize the necessity for new thrusts in new directions in international institution building.

For the U.N., NATO, and the Common Market are, after all, the creatures of diplomacy. They were created and are maintained to serve the ends and deal with the problems of their creators: the governments of nations. They are, therefore, political in nature. Their direction, and, indeed, their very existence, depends upon the vague winds of high international politics. Because of this they are not well equipped or well suited to deal with the practical day-to-day problems of international business life. For example, the current financial crisis in the U.N. could easily paralyze the whole range of U.N. operations. Furthermore, the U.N. is a preserve of the diplomats, and diplomats are too often hampered by what I call the "strictures of structures." Strict guidelines must be laid down by his government before a diplomat can talk to another diplomat who is in turn similarly restricted by carefully detailed instructions from his own government. Clearly these "strictures of structures" decidedly limit the flexibility of diplomats in dealing with hard, very real day-to-day problems.

It then becomes the responsibility of those outside Government who find themselves working toward common goals in a common community to build new institutions with new ideas to satisfy more mundane needs and provide solutions to the practical problems of international life on a different level.

It is in this spirit that we now launch the idea of building a new institution; a Pacific Bankers Association. As my colleagues in the House will remember, some time ago I discussed extensively my concept of the Pacific community. This is a transoceanic community of free nations rimming the vast Pacific basin, a community of Japan and Korea, of Taiwan, the Philippines, and Hong

Kong; of Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand, and indeed, of the west coast and the Pacific islands of our own United States of America.

In connection with this, I was later privileged to speak here in our Capital before a Japanese Trade Commission sent here specifically to study the possibilities of expanding trade to new areas and to solve some of the problems in connection with existing trade relations. At that time, I suggested that we perhaps needed to follow up the recently established Asian Development Bank with a more informal institution for the Pacific community: a Pacific Bankers' Association. I engaged in extensive correspondence with leading governmental, banking, and financial officials in the Pacific community. Almost 130 letters were sent out. The list of those we sent letters to and those we received replies from are listed in the appendix of this speech.

I am happy to report that I received numerous and encouraging responses indicating the widespread support for a Pacific Bankers' Association. To quote from some of the many letters we received, Pacific bankers feel "a need for increased cooperation between bankers and businessmen from countries in the Pacific area." Further, an association for Pacific bankers could serve to "exchange information on credit," to "expose each nation's representatives to the customs and special conditions of other countries," to "develop a spirit of cooperation in achieving a common goal," and to "serve to build up a vast network of personal contacts which could play a vital role in building the understanding and confidence upon which trade depends."

Owing to the affirmative response to our query we feel that present Pacific institutions could well be supplemented by the formation of a Pacific Bankers' Association, and we now call for an informal meeting to be called by the bankers and their affiliates who share a common interest in the Pacific basin to discuss its structure and bylaws.

From our contacts with countries in the Pacific basin, it is agreed that such an organization could make great contributions. Its formation could serve:

First. To promote and foster international Pacific banking and trade by appropriate measures toward the stimulation of public interest therein and to undertake programs of common benefit.

For example, the Pacific Bankers' Association would perform a great service toward international banking by developing educational programs for Pacific member banks. This could follow patterns similar to the existing SEANZA course for central bankers.

The association could also act as a regional reference point in providing relevant information as regard special investment opportunities in Pacific countries. Information relevant to the formation of joint ventures would be provided by company representatives resident in the respective countries. Again, the Association would be a focal point for organization and distribution.

Member banks could also exchange information on credit through the Association.

Second. To improve existing machinery of international Pacific banking and trade through mutual cooperation and exchange of ideas.

For example, Pacific member banks could arrange through the Association a consortium to handle and underwrite larger types of risks involved in joint ventures or other investments. This would make available much larger resources to spread the risks among the portfolios of all banks involved.

The association could also act as an intermediary channel to study easier and more efficient methods for settling international accounts of member banks.

Third. To build up more personal contacts outside government.

For example, the Association could encourage and arrange for exchange missions involving banking and technical personnel between related industries in Pacific countries. Such technical exchange missions would become a most valuable instrument toward improving understanding via mutual contacts and cooperation between member Pacific countries.

Fourth. To sponsor productivity centers within developed and underdeveloped countries.

In recent years, both developed and underdeveloped countries in the Asian-Pacific area have been increasingly concerned with the problem of raising their general productivity to meet rising competition in world markets.

To increase international trade, exporting countries must have access to information concerning methods in marketing, distribution, and so forth, of the importing country. They must also produce goods and services which the importing countries have grown accustomed to in terms of quality standards, packaging, and so forth. Therefore the association could provide a greatly needed service of mutual benefit by sponsoring a productivity center to increase Pacific trade. Of course, increased trade also enhances the profit potentials of all member banks.

The productivity centers could be designed to function along the following general lines: To aid exporting companies to adjust to quality standards and other requirements for consumption in importing countries; to provide information and training on marketing, advertising and distribution; to perform research in developing new demands in developed countries for goods and services from underdeveloped countries; to provide management and technical consultants; to provide library facilities for statistics, technical books and periodicals, and translations of relevant information.

We realize the difficulties of international institution building at any level and the long protracted discussions which are necessary before real progress becomes apparent. A Pacific Bankers' Association would suffer from no less than the problems outlined by Mr. C. R. Darvall, general manager of the Australia and New Zealand Bank,

Ltd.—a diversity in the countries of the Pacific area in relation to cultures, stages of economic development, forms of government, degrees of political stability and national aspirations.

However, may we point out that it is exactly in the banking institution where we have people who first break through these barriers. After all, outside of government, the banking community has always indicated a concern with, and knowledge about immediate and future needs in international economic, financial, and political developments. Indeed, we are all most fortunate to have bankers who are all natural internationalists by profession.

Therefore, let us once more strongly urge Pacific bankers to call for an informal meeting to discuss the formation of a Pacific Bankers' Association. In this manner, another cornerstone would be laid toward the final formation of a Pacific Community.

The appendix referred to follows:

APPENDIX

AUSTRALIA

Bank of New South Wales, 341 George Street, Sydney, Australia.

The Commercial Banking Company of Sydney Limited, 343 George Street, Sydney, Australia.

Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia, Pitt Street & Martin Place, Sydney, Australia.
Australia & New Zealand Bank Ltd., 394-396 Collins Street, Melbourne, Australia.

The Commercial Bank of Australia Ltd., 335-339 Collins Street, Melbourne, Australia.

The English, Scottish & Australian Bank Limited, 287 Collins Street, Melbourne, Australia.

The National Bank of Australasia Limited, 287-285 Collins, Melbourne, Australia.

CANADA

The Bank of Nova Scotia, 44 King Street W., Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

The Bank of Montreal, Corner of King & Bay Streets, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, 25 King Street W., Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

The Royal Bank of Canada, The Royal Bank of Canada Bldg., Place Ville Marie, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

The Toronto Dominion Bank, King & Bay Streets, Toronto, Canada.

The Mercantile Bank of Canada, 491 Victoria Square, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Banque Canadienne Nationale, 511 Place d'Armes, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

La Banque Provinciale du Canada, The Provincial Bank of Canada, 221 St. James St., W., Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

HONG KONG

The Bank of Canton, Ltd., 6 Des Voeux Road Central, Hong Kong.

Bank of East Asia, Ltd., 10, Des Voeux Road, Central, Hong Kong.

The Chartered Bank, 4, Des Voeux Road, Central, Hong Kong.

Chekiang First Bank, Ltd., 3 Wardley Street, Hong Kong.

Hang Tai Cheung Kee Bank, Ice House Street, Hong Kong.

The Hong Kong & Shanghai Banking Corp., 1 Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong.

Kwong On Bank, Ltd., 137-141 Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong.

Shanghai Commercial Bank Ltd., 12 Queen's Road, Hong Kong.

Wing Lung Bank Ltd., 110-114 Queen's Road, Central, Hong Kong.

The Wing On Bank Ltd., 22 Des Voeux Road, Central, Hong Kong.

JAPAN

The Daiwa Bank, Ltd., 21 Bingomachi 2-chome, Higashiku, Osaka, Japan.

The Sanwa Bank Limited, Fushimi-machi 4, Osaka, Japan.

The Sumitomo Bank, Ltd., 22, 5-chome Kitahama, Higashi-ku, Osaka, Japan.

The Dai-Ichi Bank, Ltd., 1, 1-chome Marunouchi, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.

The Bank of Tokyo, Ltd., 6, 1-chome, Nihombashi, Hongo-Kucho, Chuo-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.

The Long-Term Credit Bank of Japan, Ltd., 1, Otemachi 1-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

The Mitsubishi Bank, Ltd., 5, 2-chome, Marunouchi Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.

The Nippon Kangyo Bank Ltd., Hibiya, Tokyo, Japan.

The Tokai Bank, Ltd., 1, Sakaemachi 2-chome, Naka-Ku, Nagoya, Japan.

The Fuji Bank, Ltd., 1-chome, Otemachi, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo, Japan.

KOREA

Bank of Korea, 110-3 ka Namdaemoon-Ro, Chung-Ku, Seoul, Korea.

The Cho-Heung Bank, Ltd., 14, 1-ka Namdaemoon-Ro, Choong-ku, Seoul, Korea.

The Commercial Bank of Korea, Ltd., 111 Namdaemoon-Ro, Seoul, Korea.

The First City Bank of Korea, 53-1, 1-ka, Chungmuro, Joong-ku, Seoul, Korea.

The Han-11 Bank, Ltd., 130, 2 ka Namdaemoon-Ro, Choong-ku, Seoul, Korea.

MALAYSIA

Kwong Yik (Selangor) Banking Corp. Ltd., 75 Jalan Bandar, Kuala Lumpur, Federation of Malaysia.

Malayan Banking Ltd., 92 Jalan Bandar, Kuala Lumpur, Federation of Malaysia.

The Oriental Bank of Malaysia.

NEW ZEALAND

Australia & New Zealand Bank, Ltd., 196 Featherstone Street, Wellington, New Zealand.

Bank of New Zealand, 239-247 Lambton Quay, Wellington, New Zealand.

The National Bank of New Zealand, Ltd., 182 Featherstone Street, Wellington, C. I., New Zealand.

Bank of New South Wales, 318-322 Lambton Quay, Wellington, New Zealand.

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Bank of the Philippine Islands, 150 Plaza Cervantes, P.O. Box 777, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

China Banking Corporation, 108 Juan Luna Cor. Dasmarias, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Citizens Bank & Trust Co., 411 Rosario Street, Binondo, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Commercial Bank & Trust Company, J. M. Tuason Bldg., Escolta, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Equitable Banking Corp., 262 Juan Luna, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Far East Bank & Trust Co., Muralla Street, P.O. Box 1411, Intromuros, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

The Manila Banking Corp., Escolta, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Metropolitan Bank & Trust Co., Wellington Building, Plaza Calderon, Binondo, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

The Overseas Bank of Manila, 410 Rosario Street, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Pacific Banking Corporation, 460 Rosario Street, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Philippine Bank of Communications, 216 Juan Luna Street, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

The Philippine Bank of Commerce, 377 Plaza Santa Cruz, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Philippine Commercial & Industrial Bank, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Philippine National Bank, Escolta, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Philippine Trust Company, Plaza Coiti, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Republic Bank, 277 Escolta, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Security Bank & Trust Company, 371 Escolta, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

Prudential Bank & Trust Company, No. 1 Plaza Coiti, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.

SINGAPORE

Chung Khai Bank, Ltd., 59 Robinson Road, Singapore.

Far Eastern Bank, Ltd., 137-139 Cecil Street, Singapore.

The Industrial & Commercial Bank, Ltd., 117-119 Cecil Street, Singapore.

Lee Wah Bank, Ltd., 18 South Canal Road, Singapore.

Oversea-Chinese Banking Corp. Ltd., China Building, Chulia Street, Singapore.

Overseas Union Bank, Ltd., Raffles Place, Singapore.

Sze Hai Tong Bank, Ltd., 57 Chulia Street, Singapore.

United Overseas Bank, Ltd., 2 Chulia Street, Singapore.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Ngan Hang Quoc Gia Viet-Nam (Banque Nationale du Vietnam), 17 Quay Chuong Duong, Saigon, South Vietnam.

Viet-Nam Thong-tin (Credit Commercial du Viet-Nam), 17 Ben Chuong Duong, Saigon, South Vietnam.

TAIWAN

Overseas Chinese Commercial Banking Corp., 102 Heng Yang Road, Taipei, Taiwan, China.

Bank of China, 15, Chungshan Road, North Second Section, Taipei, Taiwan, China.

Bank of Communications, 39 O'Mei Street, Taipei, Taiwan, China.

THAILAND

Bangkok Bank, Ltd., P.O. Box 95, 3-9 Plap-lachai Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Bangkok Bank of Commerce Ltd., 171 Suriwongse Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Bangkok Metropolitan Bank, Ltd., 186-96 Rajawongse Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

Bank of Asia for Industry & Commerce Ltd., 601 Samyok, Chareon Krung Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Bank of Aydhya, Ltd., Lampoonchai/Jawaraj Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Laem Thong Bank, Ltd., 289-9 Suriwongse Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Thai Military Bank, Ltd., Mansion 2, Raja Damnem Ave., Bangkok, Thailand.

The Union Bank of Bangkok, Ltd., 624 Jawarad Road, Samyok, Bangkok, Thailand.

Wang Lee Chan Bank, Ltd., 1130 Wathong Dhumchat, Donburi, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Provincial Bank Limited, 632 Mahachai Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Siam City Bank, Limited, 13 Anuwongse Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Siam Commercial Bank, Ltd., 1280 Yodha Road, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Thai Danu Bank, Ltd., Mahachai & Jawaraj Roads, Bangkok, Thailand.

The Thai Farmers Bank, Ltd., 306 Suapa Road, P.O. Box 1366, Bangkok, Thailand.

UNITED STATES

Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association, 300 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Plaza, New York, N.Y.

First National City Bank, 399 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., 20 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

Wells Fargo Bank, 464 California Street, San Francisco, California.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from California, the Honorable RICHARD T. HANNA, in his plea for meetings between bankers in this country, Canada, and the Orient to discuss the possibilities of forming a Pacific Bankers' Association. Representative HANNA is to be commended for the initiation of this proposal and for the groundwork he has laid by corresponding with bankers in Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Singapore, South Vietnam, Taiwan, Thailand, and the United States.

A proposed association of bankers like this has dynamic potential for the countries involved and for the Pacific area, in which I am vitally interested, particularly because of the implications for my State of Hawaii. Such an association would offer many benefits to its members in the form of mutual exchange of information on credit, on investment opportunities, on market potentials, and a variety of other topics of great utility to the economic progress of the nations involved.

Earlier this year, the Congress approved, and the President signed, a bill to create an Asian Development Bank, and I envision the Pacific Bankers' Association as a potential private counterpart, with many similar functions but with many services to its members that the Asian Development Bank was not designed to perform.

Like the Asian Development Bank, the Pacific Bankers' Association could be instrumental in aiding the underdeveloped countries in the Pacific region to speed up their economic development, specifically by providing the type of information and coordination necessary to stimulate export and import operations. Not only would current information and future prognostications about markets for various goods and raw materials be useful, but also the association could serve as a clearinghouse for details as to quality and standards necessary for a member nation to share in international trade.

The association would be a forum for members to meet personally and exchange ideas and information and would thereby serve an educational function for those nations striving to catch up with the competition. By disseminating information to financial institutions around the world, it could attract investment capital so badly needed if the Pacific region is to prosper in relation to the rest of the world. International financial dealings could be coordinated and expedited through cooperative arrangements worked out between members of such an association, facilitating the exchange of goods and materials.

Though we have several international organizations, such as the Asian Development Bank mentioned previously, already operating in promoting economic progress in the Pacific region, the Pacific Bankers' Association would provide a vital impetus from the private sector by enlisting the participation of banks in the area and by encouraging private citizens to consider the products and in-

dustry of this region as potential sources of investment.

I second Representative HANNA's call to the bankers of the Pacific nations to meet with representatives of the Western Hemisphere to conduct discussions into the possibilities of such a Pacific Bankers' Association. Nothing would be lost, and the potential benefits are inestimable.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] for his excellent presentation and for his leadership in advancing an exciting and dynamic concept in international relations: the establishment of a Pacific Bankers' Association.

To test the feasibility of establishing such an institution, he has willingly assumed the responsibility of seeking the written opinions of leading governmental, banking, and financial officials in the nations which are found in the Pacific basin. The responses he has received are not only encouraging, but they point to a definite need for an institution such as a Pacific Bankers' Association.

It is entirely fitting and proper that the United States should assume a leading role in the formation of such an institution. As we know, in the years since World War II the United States has pioneered in the field of cultural and technical interchange between the East and West through the East-West Center in Hawaii. We have already seen the incalculable benefits which have flowed from this institution to the peoples of Asia and America.

In other spheres of international relations among Pacific nations we have recently witnessed the establishment of the Asian and Pacific Cooperation Council, the Asian Development Bank and Mekong River project.

The future holds even greater promise for all countries which lie within or along the rim of the vast Pacific basin. This was perceptively stated by our President in his July 12 address on Asian policy. He said that one of the three essentials upon which our Asian policy must be based is the building of political and economic strength among the nations of free Asia. And I am convinced that the establishment and development of a Pacific Bankers' Association would help a great deal to build the economic strength of the nations in the Pacific.

The proposed Pacific Bankers' Association, as a privately initiated and privately sponsored institution of international scope, deserves our wholehearted encouragement and support.

TOY MANUFACTURERS ASKED TO REFRAIN FROM ADVERTISING TOYS OF VIOLENCE: GRABOWSKI URGES PARENTS NOT TO BUY SUCH TOYS THIS CHRISTMAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks Americans have been

confronted with news stories depicting death and violence. Stories which seem almost incredible; but, unfortunately, are pitifully true.

On July 28 of this year, the FBI released its annual "Uniform Crime Reports—1965" which, according to Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, disclose there were more than 2¾ million serious crimes in the United States in 1965, an increase of 6 percent over 1964.

I should like to quote from a news release from the FBI, dated July 28, which states:

The crimes of violence—murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, aggravated assault, and robbery—rose 6 percent as a group while crimes against property—burglary, larceny \$50 and over in value and auto theft—likewise recorded a 6-percent upward trend. Since 1960 the total volume of serious crimes reported in the United States has risen 46 percent with the violent crimes showing a 35-percent rise and the property crimes a 47-percent jump.

In discussing crime costs FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover noted that during 1965 there were more than 5,600 murders, 34,700 aggravated assaults with a gun, and over 68,400 robberies where a weapon was used. The value of goods stolen in robberies, larcenies, and auto thefts exceeded \$1 billion.

To quote these statistics, Mr. Speaker, is to indicate that crimes of violence are ever presently on the increase.

The point of my remarks is to place no blame on anyone. Rather it is to call to the attention of two responsible segments of our society—the toy manufacturers and parents—the need for their active participation in promoting toys of peace, not toys of violence and death.

Who is to say that toys which promote violence do not psychologically and adversely affect our children?

We do not know that Richard Speck and Charles Whitman, as children, played with toys which psychologically placed them in news headlines upon attaining adulthood. But who will defend these toys of violence as instruments for healthy minds and bodies?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have a right to ask our toy manufacturers and distributors to refrain from advertising those products which depict violence and death.

Would it not be better to advertise a toy as one of constructive beneficence rather than one of destructive powers?

What better time to begin thinking about this than now—just 124 shopping days from Christmas? Christmas. That day of the year when we celebrate the birth of Christ, the Prince of Peace—not the day for celebrating the birth of the vicar of violence.

America's children look upon Christmas as a time of receiving toys. Many of them, unfortunately, are prone to forget that this is the day of the Prince of Peace's birth. Therefore, our children's whimsical hearts and minds are influenced by the suggestive power of advertising, and they ask for those toys that are advertised—and primarily via the media of television, a media which affords the demonstration of the mobility and violence of a toy.

Children can view on television the toy depicting how one can kill, injure, and maim individuals whether it be a superduper rocketgun, a nine-way-to-fire machinegun, or a toy hand grenade.

Frankly, we cannot ask our toy manufacturers to refrain from producing such toys of violence; for, if we did, we would be violating the spirit of free enterprise upon which this great Nation has been founded and prospered. But, we can ask them to refrain and restrain from depicting the toys as those of destructive force.

Why cannot our toy manufacturers who devise a superduper cannon or an ugly robot who kills, promote and teach our children through toys of an educational and/or cultural value?

For instance, why cannot toy advertising promote "Buy your child a train—the vehicle which won the West"? Or, "Promote your child's scientific talents through a chemistry set this Christmas"? Or, "Learn safe driving habits through a speed racer set"?

But, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for developing healthy minds and bodies of our youngsters does not lie with toy manufacturers alone. It lies also with the buyer, and particularly, the parents.

I urge every parent this Christmas to refrain from buying those products which may maim the mind of your child and at the same time produce within the child an emotional, traumatic experience which later may affect his adult life.

I am confident that if we celebrate this coming Christmas with toys of peace that we will be more in keeping with the celebration of the birth of Christ—the Prince of Peace—than celebrating the day with purchases of toy '38's, tomahawks, and other terror weapons.

A BILL TO PROVIDE A 5-PERCENT INCREASE IN THE RATE OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION PAYABLE TO VETERANS DISABLED FROM SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SCHISLER] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House of Representatives a bill which provides a 5-percent increase in the rate of disability compensation payable to veterans disabled from service-connected disabilities.

Under the present laws a veteran with a disability incurred during peacetime is compensated only 80 percent of the rate which is paid to a veteran who receives his disability during time of war. I strongly feel that there should be no differential between rates paid to peacetime service-connected veterans and wartime service-connected veterans. Therefore, my bill contains a provision to provide that differential between rates

shall be eliminated and the peacetime service-connected veteran shall be paid compensation at the same rate as the wartime service-connected veterans.

I might also add that the existing law provides a different rate in death compensation paid to parents of veterans who die from disabilities incurred during peacetime than those who die from disabilities incurred in wartime service. This differential does not exist in the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to dependent parents. Therefore, I feel that it should not exist in the payment of death compensation; so my bill further provides to eliminate the difference between wartime and peacetime death compensation as well as disability compensation.

Of all the recipients of Federal benefits, our veterans who are disabled from disabilities incurred during their military service are most deserving of this Congress attention; so I am hopeful that the proposals contained in my bill will receive early and favorable consideration.

A BILL TO INCREASE NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION RATES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SCHISLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to provide a greatly needed and most deserved increase in the non-service-connected pension rates payable to veterans and to their widows and to also increase certain income limitations as well as provide outpatient medical services to veterans of World War I and medicines and drugs to certain additional veterans. I wish to emphasize that under the provisions of my bill not only are the pension rates for veterans and widows receiving benefits under the so-called new pension program increased but also the pension rates for veterans and widows receiving benefits under the so-called old pension program are increased.

Over 1,200,000 veterans now receive non-service-connected pensions of whom over 965,000 are veterans of World War I. Approximately 900,000 widows and an additional 200,000 children of deceased veterans will receive additional benefits under the provisions of my bill. It provides for a \$5 monthly increase in the pension rates payable to all veterans and widows receiving benefits under the so-called new pension program. Moreover, it provides further assistance to the veterans and widows with the lower incomes by increasing the income limitation of the lowest income bracket from \$600 to \$800. For veterans and widows with dependents, the present income limitation for the \$1,000 to \$2,000 income bracket is increased to \$2,200.

Veterans receiving benefits under the old pension law have not received an in-

crease since 1954. Therefore, my bill proposes to increase to \$67 monthly the rate for the veteran under 65 and who has been on the pension role for less than 10 years and to \$80 monthly for the veteran 65 years of age and over or who has been continuously on the pension role for 10 years or more. Also, the aid-and-attendance allowance for veterans under the old pension program would be increased to \$140 monthly. My bill also proposes to increase the pension rates payable to widows under the old law who also have not had an increase since 1954, to \$55 monthly or \$67 monthly if they have a minor child with \$9 monthly for each additional child.

Because of his limited income and age, one of the greatest problems facing the World War I veteran receiving a non-service-connected pension is being able to afford adequate medical treatment. My bill further proposes that the Veterans' Administration shall grant outpatient treatment to World War I veterans for any disabilities for which outpatient treatment is needed regardless of whether or not the disability is service connected. This provision of the bill now grants to the World War I veteran the same outpatient treatment benefit that has previously been granted to veterans of the Spanish-American War and Indian Wars.

Under the existing laws the veterans presently receiving pensions with the special aid-and-attendance allowance under the new pension program may be furnished by the Veterans' Administration drugs or medicines ordered on a prescription by duly licensed physicians. This veteran may also be furnished an invalid lift if medically indicated, as well as other medical equipment and supplies. These benefits are not now available to a veteran receiving a pension with the special aid-and-attendance allowance under the old law, but my bill proposes to also furnish these benefits to him.

Certainly the increase in benefits which is proposed in my bill would be most helpful to all veterans, including those of World War I. However, I feel that the provision providing for the outpatient medical treatment for World War I veterans, which would be a new benefit for them, would prove to be of the greatest benefit to these veterans.

NO QUICK VICTORY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson—certain critics to the contrary—has never attempted to create any illusions about the prospects for success in Vietnam.

He laid it on the line again when he recently spoke to the press with our commander in Vietnam, General Westmoreland.

The Scripps Howard newspaper in Washington, the Daily News, comments approvingly on the candor of the President's remarks. As part of an editorial on the subject, the newspaper quotes this statement:

The American people must know that there will be no quick victory, but the world must know that we will not quit.

That, says the editorial, is as flat and frank as you can get.

To assure my colleagues of a chance to read this commentary, I offer it now for printing in the RECORD:

NO QUICK VICTORY

President Johnson has been accused by his political critics of having shown a "lack of candor" in telling the American people about the difficulties of the Viet Nam war. Yet it would be hard for anybody to make that charge in the light of the President's statement yesterday at the Texas ranch as he sat alongside Gen. Westmoreland, our Viet Nam commander, and faced the press.

It was a confident but somber statement that should lay to rest any false hopes that the job we are trying to do there will be cheap, easy or quick.

The allies, said the President, will not be defeated. The communists cannot win. Our task is to convince the communists they cannot win, that their only course is to quit fighting or agree to a negotiated peace. And our determination and patience to persist in Viet Nam until the communists recognize the hopelessness of their efforts is now "the single most important factor" in the war.

The communists will be turned back, said the President. But, "no one can say when this will be, or how many men will be needed, or how long we must persevere. The American people must know that there will be no quick victory, but the world must know that we will not quit."

That is as flat and frank as you can get.

ADDRESS BY HON. ANTONIO ARROYO ALFARO

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, one of our closest and most valued friends in the free world is the Republic of Costa Rica with its understanding government and democratic people.

I have had the pleasure of visiting Costa Rica and have a high personal regard for its people and institutions.

While on a recent visit I addressed the Costa Rican Congress following an introduction by the Honorable Antonio Arroyo Alfaro, a leading member of that body.

I respectfully submit this introductory speech for the RECORD at this time.

[Translation (Spanish)]

REMARKS DELIVERED BY DEPUTY ANTONIO ARROYO ALFARO ON THE OCCASION OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN DENT'S VISIT

Mr. JOHN DENT, Member of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, Mr. President of the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica, Messrs. Deputies, today we have suspended our daily task of frank and patriotic discussion of national affairs to re-

ceive the visit of the very distinguished member of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, Honorable JOHN DENT.

In the name of my colleagues I wish to express to him that his visit makes us extremely happy because he is an outstanding and distinguished figure in the realm of politics of that great nation.

And that his visit honors us because he is a representative of the people and the Government of the United States.

In greeting such a distinguished guest we would like, at the same time, to profess to him our friendship, declare our solidarity, and convey our admiration, appreciation and respect, conducive as our expressions are to making patent all the things that join us together with that great nation.

Historically and politically the United States and all of our Latin America have taken the same course.

And the same well-springs of political philosophy which inspired the great builders of the United States were drawn on also to satisfy the yearning for independence, freedom, progress and justice that was stirring in the hearts and minds of all American patriots.

In effect, almost at the same time, during the same stage of history, our nations obtained their independence and thus ceased to depend on Europe for attaining autonomy and their own physiognomy among the nations of the world.

The same way of thinking which designed the constitutional fabric of the United States also laid the foundations for our legal systems. We too recognize that man is a rational being, naturally good, morally responsible, that he is an aim to himself, with the absolute right to govern his own destiny. We believe in the equal rights of the human family, and that the happiness of the individual is the only just purpose of the government. We believe that the will of the people is the only just foundation of any government; and that it must always be our primary objective to protect the free expression of that will. We believe that all human beings, besides being born free and equal, are endorsed with certain inalienable rights, and that in order to guarantee those rights, governments are instituted which derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We also believe that man's political activity as well as his private life are subject to a fair hearing by his peers; and that in complex situations, freedom must be reconciled with authority and the just balance must be sought between the individual freedom and the requirements of the general welfare [in a democratic society].

We also believe that the law is an instrument by means of which justice is shaped by the will of the majority which makes reason prevail and causes progress to advance according to a predetermined course. And we believe in the rule of law as the supreme instrument of government, public order, and security.

The [same] thought patterns, historical events, and our geographical union have been the great causes [links?] which have kept our countries united with yours. And therefore we can say that there is also a community of ideals.

Together with our beloved Costa Rican patriots, with the worthy principles and guide-lines, and with the great Latin American idealists, we carry, deeply rooted in our hearts, the memory of the great North American figures:

Thomas Jefferson, whose doctrine inspired the democratic system and influenced the formative years of the United States as a nation;

Abraham Lincoln, The Great Emancipator, great humanist, world figure, example to youth, a man of vision and merit, the love for whom is growing day by day;

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Father of the Good-Neighbor Policy, who so greatly helped this Continent;

John F. Kennedy, who is already occupying one of the most prominent places among the pleiades of great men of the United States and who was able to win for himself the sincere affection of all Latin Americans.

George Washington, John Quincy Adams, Daniel Webster, Alexander Hamilton, Woodrow Wilson, Benjamin Franklin, and many others, all of them men of genius and of brilliant intellect, who have been admired and revered by us since the days of our youth.

We Costa Ricans are following with keen interest the products of American thinking in all areas of learning, in philosophy as well as in politics, in the sciences as well as in economics, etc. Through the years a tide of admiration has been forming which is increasing its influence on us. In the American projects and realizations we have observed at all times a universal, fair, and noble criterion, we have seen an interrelationship between things religious and political, we note a practicing of certain universal principles which convince us more and more of the importance of that system's survival and of the necessity for remaining united.

The rapprochement of all countries of America in order to attain greater community of ideals and purposes, and to make the pursuit of our common purposes more workable, is becoming more urgent and necessary every day. The steps which have been taken in recent years and the achievements made up to now, have brought about a notable change and it is felt by all of us. And there is in the hearts of all Latin Americans the good will to contribute to the closest possible Pan American union.

I wonder whether it would not be a good idea for all of our governments to finance and maintain a carrier service, with the permanent mission of establishing closer relations, carrying abroad representatives of all ages and all levels of all countries, so that on visits to our countries, on frequent trips, they would become more aware of what the American Continent is like. On repeated visits of students, businessmen, professionals, and workers of all countries we would get to know one another better and become more closely acquainted.

We understand perfectly that in the international area we must maintain the same posture of unity and solidarity, not only in the interest of promoting our common ideals but also with an eye on defense in the face of threats from the outside which are also threats to all Americans alike.

We fervently believe in the principle of free determination for our nations.

But I also wonder whether it may not be convenient to further strengthen and invigorate the democratic system, common to all our countries, by the creation of an international organization made up of representatives of all our nations, and designed to advise, organize, and maintain the national political organs entrusted with the holding of free political elections in all our countries, and whether it would not be convenient for that international body to have the important function of supervision and control with respect to the clean functioning of the entire political election system in all our Republics, which would guarantee its correct functioning and, through it, the functioning of free determination which is the sovereign function of all these States. The international guarantee would serve to achieve the free functioning of the national sovereignties, and would neither destroy nor limit the national independence since, on the contrary, it would invigorate it. The day on which the American people will help one another attain the free exercise of the political freedoms we will have taken an honest step for-

ward toward improvement of the general welfare and of peace for our countries. This is more and more necessary. Because as the individual living in a society, must allow a limitation of his own freedom and sovereignty in order to guarantee the freedom and sovereignty of the others, and it will be necessary to limit the rights of the others in order to guarantee to the individual the enjoyment of his rights, so must our Latin American nations also accept limitations of their sovereignty in the interest of the general welfare.

I wanted to leave for the conclusion of my remarks a small reference to the Alliance for Progress Program.

We American countries were actually glad to receive President Kennedy's message of March 13, 1961, in which he proposed the Alliance for Progress Program. Our ears are still ringing with the words of that great President, whose memory is revered in all of America and who has nowadays become number one in the heart of all Latin Americans.

"Alliance for Progress and Economic Development" are today the goals in which we invest greatest interest and concern. It is our first opportunity to give our country the great push forward which it has been needing, and we are willing to do so.

We realize that our continent is rich in natural resources and in manpower. We are aware of the still prevailing bad conditions. We want to make the change. We want progress and we would like to attain it through our own efforts and your help.

Thinking of the promising future that is awaiting us, we would like to get together all representatives of this country, all its productive forces, in order to try to do an intelligent and patriotic job which would be the fruit of the effort and the cooperation of all.

We want a policy of development based on an overall program, with concrete objectives, to be the fruit of the discussion of all and of the advice of the informed. We aspire to achieve, within the frame of prevailing conditions and within the realm of possibility, the maximum utilization of our natural and human resources. We want every investment to be applied in such a way as to ensure the greatest possible benefit, from the economic and social point of view. And with this purpose in mind, we want to embark first on a study of our necessities and possibilities and resources, and then establish our possibilities of development and determine our objectives, with priorities and preferences, concerning the use of resources available to us. It will be our aspiration to attain the highest goal possible within our limited possibilities.

I want to emphasize that we deem the participation of the State necessary as an instrument through which all resources of the nation will be applied to the achievement of the great objective. That participation is necessary in order to stimulate and to help create the necessary conditions for private initiative to grow and expand; but we are not thinking of state control of the economy in terms as to suggest the destruction of private initiative.

But we want to mention, in particular, Mr. DENT, that one of the most effective ways in which the people and the Government of the United States could aid the development of our economies is by helping us secure better prices for our vital export products.

And we would like to call your attention and, through you, to the attention of the distinguished government officials of your country, the very great importance which lies in securing those better prices which must come to the aid of our progress and development.

We would like our prices to be made an object of an economic protectionism within

the United States herself; because, if that philosophy was useful in creating the economic power of that great nation, it should, for the sake of American solidarity, for the sake of justice, be useful in helping the weak economic sector of the Continent. How wonderful it would be for us to have the great American nation help us with that program! How much more solid and vigorous a fraternal spirit would spring up all over America as a response to that policy!

Mr. DENT, in extending to you, in the name of my colleagues, our warmest welcome, we wish to reiterate our sentiments of fervent adhesion to and friendship for the United States of America.

You are very welcome in our land which feels greatly honored by your visit and which welcomes you as one of our own!

[Translated by Elizabeth Hanunian]

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS G. CORBIN

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years Maj. Gen. Thomas G. Corbin has served both the Air Force and the Congress as Director of Legislative Liaison in the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force. During that time he has become a familiar figure on Capitol Hill and has done an outstanding job of furthering Air Force congressional relations.

General Corbin is now leaving for a new assignment as commander of the Special Air Warfare Center at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to this officer for his outstanding service as Director of Legislative Liaison which typifies a distinguished military career.

General Corbin graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1941 and immediately underwent flying training. On being awarded his wings he joined the 44th Bomb Group at Barksdale Field, La., until his transfer to the European theater. General Corbin was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action while flying B-26's with the 386th Bomb Group which he later commanded.

In 1945 General Corbin became the air inspector of the Air Training Command and later commanded the 91st Air Base Group, McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. Later he attended the Royal Air Force Staff College on completion of which he commanded the airbases at Sculthorpe and Brize Norton, England.

In 1953 General Corbin was assigned as provost marshal for the Strategic Air Command and a short while later became the deputy commander of the First Air Division at Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr. He attended the National War College in 1957 and thereafter assumed command of the 4060th Air Refueling Wing at Dow Air Force Base, Maine. Just before being assigned to the post to which he is now leaving he was the commander of the 818th Strategic Aerospace Division at Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr.

We will all miss General Corbin but I want to take this occasion to wish him every success in his new assignment.

CITIZENSHIP FOR CUBANS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, support for legislation to make Cuban refugees eligible for U.S. citizenship appears in a Hearst newspaper, the Baltimore News American.

The newspaper recalls that since Fidel Castro became dictator 7 years ago, more than 115,000 of his countrymen have fled to the United States. About 4,000 are still arriving each month by airlift.

Because of their special status, however, they are unable to qualify for citizenship.

The News American endorses bills backed by the administration to make them eligible. This is a welcome prospect, the newspaper declares editorially, both as a humanitarian gesture and a demonstration of our sincerity in urging others to seek the liberty we enjoy.

I submit this editorial for the RECORD.

CITIZENSHIP FOR CUBANS

Since Fidel Castro became dictator of Cuba seven years ago, more than 115,000 of his countrymen have fled to the United States. Some 4,000 are still arriving each month by airlift to Miami.

Although most of these refugees have proved to be hard-working and desirable additions to our population, they do not enjoy full freedom. They are on a special "paroled" status rather than as immigrants. None, as a result, can qualify for citizenship. Many professionals are unable to practice.

Bills now introduced in both houses of Congress would permit these people to become fully qualified citizens of the democracy they chose. The move has strong administration backing and adoption is expected. We welcome the prospect both as a humanitarian gesture and as a proper demonstration of our sincerity in urging others to seek the liberty we enjoy.

A CIVIC-MINDED INDUSTRY— CARLING BREWING CO.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, one often hears the expression "soulless corporation," and it has often been said that social welfare, as commonly construed, is not the concern of business. Such statements are not always true for there is a new theory that business will prosper from economic, social, and cultural advancement of the people who work in its plants and buy its products.

About 5 years ago, Carling Brewing Co. opened a new plant in the Halethorpe area of Baltimore County, and, from the start, success marked every step of its business operations. That company is, however, more than a mere successful concern; it is also a firm imbued with a civic consciousness and stands as an object lesson to all industries.

Recently, in the excellent Baltimore magazine, which is published monthly by the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan Baltimore, under the title "Miscellaneous File," due acknowledgment was made of the Carling Brewing Co.'s many and varied civic endeavors. Believing this to be a matter of general interest, I include this item in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

Birthday greetings are in order: Carling Brewing Company's Baltimore plant (that awesome, already-a-landmark structure you see from the west leg of the Beltway, in the Halethorpe area) is five years old. It was on May 16, 1961, when the beer began to flow, and since then, production has jumped from 385,000 to over a million barrels a year. This doesn't necessarily impress us; after all, the Carling people are businessmen, well versed in the complexities of manufacturing and marketing their product. No, the reason we want to call attention to the anniversary is found in the really amazing number of things Carling is doing around here, most of them far removed from up-ending a bottle of beer. (Besides, we've never been able to understand this business about thousands or millions of barrels, maybe because one barrel seems like a Niagara of suds to us.) The local Carling folk sponsor all manner of activities; last month, for example, there was the Carling Palm Sunday concert at Morgan. There's a Carling print collection at the Pratt, music scholarships at the University of Maryland, a scholarship award made in conjunction with the Baltimore Civic Opera; Carling has a cruise for veterans of Perry Point Hospital, an art exhibition at the famed old Charcoal Club. It sponsors the annual exhibit of the Baltimore Press Photographers Association. Sportswise? The months coming up are jam-packed: June sees the Carling Cruiser Classic, July 9-10 are the dates for the Carling Skeet Challenge Cup competition at Loch Raven. One of the area's nicest events is brewery-backed—the Lady Carling Open, which brings the top lady pros to Turf Valley. August 11-14 are the dates this year, and the gate money goes to KILD, a charity set up for the families of policemen killed in the line of duty. Other goings-on include the summer-long Ocean City Marlin Contest, the Carling Trap Challenge Cup and the Carling Cup Regatta, meaning hydroplane races; August 14 is the date. It strikes us that the brewery buys a lot of cups, and we think this is fine. But maybe somebody ought to present one to Bruce Wilson and his people for a job well done.

MISUSE OF U.S. FUNDS BY U.N. RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as an American and as a Member of the Con-

gress of the United States, I feel it is my duty to most strongly protest against the misuse of American money by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency—UNRWA.

The United States is a heavy contributor to the assistance program administered by UNRWA; in funds and commodities, our Country contributes nearly two-thirds of UNRWA's budget.

Last month, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, chairman, Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Senate Judiciary Committee, at a hearing on refugees in the Middle East, said:

There are various substantial abuses in the UNRWA operations which should be condemned by all people truly interested in the welfare of the refugees—whether those concerned be Arab or not.

It has also come to my attention from various other sources that the United Nation-administered schools in Arab refugee camps inculcate hatred directed against the West and particularly against the United States and the State of Israel. Flagrant abuses and fraud in the refugee relief rolls in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and the Gaza strip were uncovered.

The United Arab Republic and Syria have an estimated 10,000 to 14,000 refugees serving in the so-called Palestine Liberation Army whose goal is the announced destruction of the State of Israel. The army's recruits, I understand, are regular recipients of food and relief supplies from the United Nations Relief and Works Agency—UNRWA.

It certainly is incompatible with the policy of the United States and with the original idea of the United Nations to supply material assistance to an army whose sole purpose is to destroy a member country of the U.N.

If our State Department and the U.N. are so ineffective as to be unable to stop the conditions described, I plan to vote against any appropriation of funds for the U.N.-administered schools or for the resettlement of refugees in the Near East. I have so advised Secretary of State Dean Rusk by letter dated August 15, 1966.

On July 29, 1966, the Baltimore Jewish Times published its Times' Letter From Israel, bearing on this matter, entitled "How Stupid Can One Get?" Because of the importance of this subject, I include it and my letter to the Secretary of State in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are as follows:

TIMES' LETTER FROM ISRAEL: HOW STUPID CAN ONE GET?

(By Eliezer Whartman)

JERUSALEM.—I recently met a Christian minister with whom I had long been acquainted in the United States. He had just crossed into Israel after a tour of the Arab states during which he visited a number of Arab refugee camps.

The picture that he presented of the camps was horrifying. It was not so much the physical condition of the camps which bothered him, for the refugees had a higher standard of living than the surrounding populations; it was the systematic inculcation of hatred, in the UN administered schools, directed at the West and Israel that caused his alarm. Children at a tender age were being taught that Israel was a monster which had to be exterminated, and that it

was the West—particularly the United States—which supported Israel and was, therefore, the real enemy of the Arabs.

For those of us who have been living in the Middle East for some time this was not new. We hear the Arab broadcasts daily, but it came as a shock to my friend who had been unaware of the virulence of western hatred among the refugees. Apparently it has shocked an American investigating mission headed by Senator TED KENNEDY which has just concluded a study of the camps. Here is a classic case of people biting the hand that feeds them, for the United States pays 70% of the cost of maintaining and educating the refugees. During the last seventeen years the total has come to a staggering half billion dollars, exclusive of the extensive grants-in-aid that America has made to the Arab governments. (In contrast, the Russians have not contributed a single ruble, nor have the Arab host governments.)

Today over a million and a quarter Arab refugees are on the UN relief rolls, despite the fact that less than half a million actually quit the country (based on the Mandatory Government census figures) in 1948. The chief reason for the swollen figure, according to a former United Nations Relief and Works Agency Director, Henry R. Labouisse, is accountable to the "wholesale holding of duplicate ration cards, fraudulent registrations, non-reporting of deaths, etc." This is admitted by the Arabs themselves. The Middle East Mirror (Vol. 7, No. 9, July 23rd, 1955) published by the Arab News Agency of Cairo declared: "There are refugees who hold as many as 500 UNRWA ration cards, 499 of them belonging to refugees long dead. They are dealers in UNRWA food and clothing, and sell ration cards to the highest bidder . . . Refugee capitalists is what the UNRWA calls them."

The Arab states have consistently refused to allow a census to be held in the camps to determine who holds the ration cards, who is living and who is dead, who has quit the camps and who is still there, etc. It is common knowledge that many Arab civil servants are carried on the rolls, and that the camps are a prime source of the lucrative black market which exists in these countries.

Worse, many holders of ration cards are enrolled in the so called "Arab Liberation Army" which receives training in guerrilla warfare and frequently engages in murderous raids into Israel.

There are some basic facts which should be known about the refugees. The claim they make that they were driven from their homes is, of course, false. Even the British, who were no friends of the Jews, have acknowledged that the Israelis tried to persuade them to remain. The fact is that those who remained enjoy a much higher standard of living than those who fled.

Secondly, it is claimed that the Jews seized their land. According to the British Mandatory figures of 1946, 70% of the land which now comprises Israel was in the public domain, including most of the Negev, which makes up more than half of the country, and vast stretches of the upper and lower Galilee. Of the remaining 30%, the Jews owned 9% and those Arabs who remained where they were owned at least 4%, which means that only about 17% of the land could accurately be described as abandoned. Israel has repeatedly offered to sit down with the Arab owners of this land and discuss compensation (most of these Arabs were wealthy absentee landlords whose land was tilled by sharecroppers) but the Arab states have consistently refused to allow this. Sir Alexander Galloway, the former head of the UNRWA in Jordan is on record as having stated: "The Arab states do not want to solve the refugee problem. They want to keep it as an open sore, as an affront to the United Nations, and as a weapon against Israel. The Arab leaders

don't give a damn whether the refugees live or die." (As quoted in the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 8th, 1958).

"The fact that there are these refugees," declared Emil Choury, the Secretary of the Arab Higher Committee, as quoted in the Beirut Telegraph of Sept. 6th, 1948, "is a direct consequence of the action of the Arab states in opposing partition and the Jewish State. The Arab states agreed on this policy unanimously, and they must share in the solution of the problem."

This has been the point of view of the Congress as well. On June 7th, 1957, notice was served by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that it would not continue indefinitely providing relief for the refugees. The Foreign Aid bill adopted by the Senate that year reads: "In determining whether or not to continue furnishing assistance for Palestine refugees in the Near East, the President shall take into account whether the Arab host governments are taking steps toward the resettlement of the refugees . . ."

The following year the committee reiterated its stand: "It is the committee's view that the United States is not going to continue indefinitely to contribute to relief with no concrete evidence on the part of the states directly concerned that they are willing to take steps for the resolution of the problem. The Committee intends to reexamine this situation very carefully next year to ascertain whether continuation of this assistance is justified."

This "agonizing reappraisal" has been going on from year to year. The House of Representatives, too, which passes on all fiscal matters has consistently called for resettlement of the refugees "in lands where there is room and opportunity for them" but each year, at the urging of the State Department additional sums are voted for refugee relief.

The State Department takes the attitude that if the situation deteriorates in the camps, the refugees will turn to Communism and will try to overthrow existing regimes. The Arab leaders, too, warn of this danger. However, it is clear to even a child that if the refugees revolt, the first ones to hang will be the Arab leaders, and that if they want to have their necks, the refugee problem must be solved. But they are resolutely against solving it. Some of their comments are instructive. The Jordanian Government radio on Dec. 26th, 1960 declared: "Jordan will accept no solution to the Palestine problem that does not involve the liquidation of Israel." Nasser, in an interview quoted in the Swiss newspaper Zuercher Woche, Sept. 1st, 1961, asserted: "If the Arabs return to Israel, Israel will cease to exist." Leaders of the other Arab states have expressed similar sentiments.

If the Congress were to go ahead with its oft-repeated threats to stop all funds to the refugees unless immediate steps were taken to phase out the camps and begin resettlement in the Arab lands, the problem could be solved. The Arab leaders, to save their skins, would have to solve it. But Congress has been persuaded to go on footing the bill. There are many anti-Israel elements at work in the United States. These include church leaders of all denominations, missionary groups (who must appease the Arab states if their missionaries are to be permitted to continue their work in the Middle East) so called "educators," a few political leaders, etc. The most effective help received by anti-Israel groups comes from the Arabian-American Oil Company (Standard of New Jersey & California, Texaco and Socony Vacuum) who contribute heavily to these groups, and, of course, the State Department and various personalities in the Pentagon. The oil lobby, of course, has its own ax to grind, as do the church groups. A number of the anti-Israel public organizations receive

sizeable grants from the Arab League. But it is the State Department (which is a story in itself) that is responsible, in the last analysis, for the present state of affairs.

The question is: how stupid can you get? Apparently, as far as the State Department is concerned, there's no limit.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1966.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am very much disturbed about the enclosed article which recently appeared in The Baltimore Jewish Times and I will appreciate an immediate detailed explanation from you as to why our State Department continues to permit the use of American funds for purposes outlined in this article.

It is inconceivable to me that the United Nations administered schools would permit the teaching of such hate and bigotry as outlined in the enclosed article while the people of the United States pay seventy percent of the cost of maintaining and educating these Arab refugees.

If our State Department and the United Nations are so ineffective as to be unable to stop the conditions described in the enclosed article, then I plan to vote against any legislation to provide any more funds for the U.N. administered schools or for the resettlement of refugees in the Near East. It is certainly time that the State Department realized that Israel is the only friend the United States has in this strategic Middle East and made it quite clear to the leaders of the Arab countries that no further funds will be provided by the United States as long as they maintain an attitude that "Israel must be liquidated."

It is my intention to have this article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to call to the attention of all the Members of the House the manner in which our Foreign Aid Funds are being spent to the detriment of the United States, rather than to win friends which is supposedly our intention.

Warmest regards.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
Member of Congress.

MODEL SECONDARY SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF ACT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill entitled the "Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act." In doing so, I am following the wise and able leadership of my colleague from New York, HUGH L. CAREY, chairman of the ad hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped, of the Education and Labor Committee, who first introduced this bill yesterday.

Recent studies, particularly the investigations of programs for the handicapped by the ad hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped, have clearly shown the need for Federal assistance in secondary education for the deaf. Only 8 percent of deaf children as compared with 40 percent of hearing children gain admis-

sion and attend out colleges and universities.

The reason has nothing to do with the innate intelligence or abilities of the children who cannot hear. Rather, the poor educational achievement record of the deaf is the direct result of the poor educational facilities that are available to cope with their special problems. Public high schools are not equipped or staffed to take on this responsibility, and adequate special secondary schools simply do not exist. Thus, only in exceptional cases—where the parents have the financial resources to pay for special training and tutoring, for example—is a deaf child enabled to benefit from higher education opportunities. The human waste involved is tragic.

The bill I have introduced will establish a model secondary school for the deaf to be operated by Gallaudet College in Washington, D.C., for the National Capital area. Gallaudet College is a federally supported college for the deaf and blind created by Congress in 1857. It is well suited to extend its activities to the secondary school level and is the logical place for the location of a school of this nature.

Public support for secondary schools for the deaf is long overdue, and I am hopeful that eventually this principle may be expanded so that similar schools will be set up in other parts of the country.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT IN MAINE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD of the House is now beginning to be quite full with inserts concerning the celebrated Dickey-Lincoln School project in Maine. Some views both pro and con have appeared and, in my opinion, have served the best interest of this House. For we are now, finally, after a year, beginning to get the record straight on this project. If nothing else we are beginning to break through the clouds of confusion, the charges and countercharges, the claims and counterclaims and surely most of us must be coming to the conclusion that my request for one, complete, thorough and accurate study of this project is in order—just as the House determined last year.

A recent editorial in the Portland Press Herald has charged me with assaulting this project only in the interests of protecting the coal industry and workingmen in my district. I do not deny this charge, I welcome it, but in fairness to all of the Members of this House, I feel compelled to point out that this same editorial and newspaper remains strangely silent in pointing out that my distinguished colleagues from that State

are doing exactly the same thing—representing the interests of their district.

But the gentlemen from Maine end up, I fear, slightly on the short side of the score of the total ball game. For I find myself in the most fortunate position of being able to represent the best interest of my district as well as in a position to represent the best interests of the entire New England area and the Nation.

Let me present to this House a few figures that more than amply demonstrate the logic, from any point of view except Maine's, of my position:

First. The Dickey-Lincoln School project will eventually cost the taxpayers of the entire Nation \$300 million.

Second. It will certainly not benefit the taxpayers from Arizona or Arkansas, Minnesota or Montana, Washington or Wyoming. It will have no national benefits and, therefore, is not in the national interest.

Third. It will not even benefit the New England States because, as the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston has pointed out in a thorough study, it will produce power at 15 to 20 percent higher cost, even with the Federal subsidy, than power that can be produced by private, investor-owned companies spending their own money and not the taxpayers.

Fourth. It will work entirely to the detriment of the coal-producing areas of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and surrounding States because it will substitute high-cost water power source for the lower-cost coal-burning steam-electric plants.

Fifth. The investor-owned electric companies of the New England area are now well into a \$1,500 million building program—the largest building program ever undertaken in the region. Six of the so-called Big Eleven Powerloop plants are already under construction, and have been for upward of 5 years totally obviating the argument that they are a response to the Dickey proposal.

Sixth. Three of these eleven plants will be huge, coal-burning stations. It is a most striking coincidence to observe these figures. These three plants will produce 1.4 million kilowatt hours of electricity, some 7,000 hours a year, or a total of 10 billion kilowatt hours of low-cost power. That means an annual consumption of 6 billion pounds of coal starting in the 1968-69 time period. In other terms, it means some 3 million tons of coal, or at present market prices approximately \$30 million annually to the coal industry and its workers. Over the decade from 1968 to 1978 that amounts to \$300 million.

Look carefully at those facts and figures. If the Dickey project is built it will cost the taxpayers \$300 million. If it is not built, it can mean \$300 million in revenue—private revenue—going to the industry that can produce a product that produces lower cost power.

Yes, gentlemen I welcome the charge that I am defending an industry in my district. I further welcome any charge that I am at the same time defending the taxpayers of the United States, who will get a higher tax bill, and the electric

rate payers of New England who would get nothing but higher electric bills from such a project.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in view of the complaints during the recent airline strike that there had been little give-and-take collective bargaining until the two parties were right at the strike deadline, I think it is significant that a situation in which the collective-bargaining process is working quite effectively has been receiving far less attention.

Thus, few people appear to realize that in the negotiations between the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, and the management of Western Electric, a subsidiary of the Bell System, there has been a sustained effort to reach agreement. Obviously, we hope they do reach a settlement without the need to take recourse to strike action. Even if they do not reach agreement, we can at least take satisfaction in knowing that a sincere attempt was made by the union and management to avert the need to strike.

As CWA commented in a recent advertisement, the union wants agreement but realistically must be prepared for the possibility of disagreement. CWA throughout the Nation has earned a well-deserved reputation as a responsible union dedicated to serving both the interests of its members and the communities in which they live.

The same can and should be said of Western Electric and its parent, the Bell System. Both are responsible firms dedicated to serving the interests of their shareholders, their employees and the communities in which they live.

In the present situation, the men and women of CWA have once again demonstrated that, in the best traditions of American labor-management relationships, they want to make collective bargaining work.

In the present situation, the representatives of Western Electric have also once again demonstrated that they, too, strongly desire to reach a settlement through and maintain the integrity of collective bargaining.

Whatever the result, they deserve our commendation for that.

A VISION OF GOD

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the able, dedicated and eloquent pastor of my church, the Reverend H. Floyd Folsom of the Miami Shores Baptist Church of Miami Shores, Fla. The sermons which Dr. Folsom preaches are always able and inspiring but I thought one that he delivered on February 27 of this year under the subject "A Vision of God" was so superior that I asked Reverend Folsom to send me a copy of it so I might put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the edification of my colleagues and all those who read this RECORD and that it might be preserved in the permanent RECORD of the Congress.

I am pleased, therefore, to insert following my remarks this movingly meaningful sermon of Reverend Folsom—"A Vision of God."

A VISION OF GOD

(Preached at Miami Shores Baptist Church, Miami, Fla., on February 27, 1966, by H. Floyd Folsom, Th. D., Pastor)

Text: Isaiah 6: 1-8.

King Louis XIV was dead. At the funeral the great Cathedral was packed with mourners. Atop the golden casket was burning one lone candle, the only light in the vast room. It pierced the darkness to say that the king was alone in his magnificence among men. The court preacher stood to address the assembled great of France. Before ever he said a word he stepped from the pulpit, reached over the casket and snuffed out that one candle. Out of the darkness came just four words: "Only God is great."

More than two thousand years ago Isaiah, the prophet, was also in mourning. Isaiah had loved dearly his king, and when Uzziah died the man of God was enveloped in darkness. Uzziah had been a good king through many years and when, in later life, he was stricken with leprosy and passed under the shadow of death it was this experience that brought Isaiah the man to become Isaiah the prophet. "In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord . . ."

Some of you never look up until you find yourselves down. Some of you never behold the King of Heaven until that which you have made your king on earth is taken from you. In the midst of the forest the blue of the heavens is blotted out until autumn and winter come and the leaves, dead, drop to the ground. Only then can you see the heavens. The lights of the city make it virtually impossible for you to observe the brilliance of the stars. Astronaut Scott Carpenter was a hundred and fifty miles above man's electric maze when he observed: "The sky is black. The stars are brilliant." Uzziah must die in order that Isaiah might see that it is God who ever lives.

What has truly become your God? Is it some king? Some political personage? He, too, will some day die! Is physical beauty your king? Your obsession? It, too, shall one day fade before some leprosy disease. Is television your god? Do you give allegiance to it? Bow down before it? Its picture tube will fade forever one day. Is Wall Street your god? Do you bow at its shrine? Its financial structure will one day crumble like the wall which gave the street its name. What has truly become your god? Does it stand between you and a vision of the Living God? Must He continually take away our little kings in order to show us that there is One who does not pass away? "In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord."

There are three things about this vision to which we must give note. It took place in the Temple; God was seen on the throne; and the living King was surrounded by worshippers.

Isaiah's vision of God took place in the Temple. So many of us today have a superficial concept of the person of God because there is such infrequent entering into the Temple of God. America makes the claim to be a godly nation and, compared to many nations of the world, doubtless it is. But on any given worship day in my county eighty per cent of the people are not found in the house of worship.

Many who "holler the loudest" over the absence of Bible reading and prayers in the public schools are not to be found reading the Bible or praying in the designated places of worship on the appointed day of worship! A deaf-mute attended worship regularly. When asked why, he said: "To show which side I'm on." Benjamin Franklin in his "Autobiography" tells of a minister of old England who was ordered to read an edict by a king, bidding the people to return to sports on Sunday.

To the congregation's amazement and horror he did read the royal edict in church—a thing which many clergymen had refused to do. But he followed it with the words: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." And then he added: "Brethren, I have laid before you the commandment of your king and the commandment of your God. I leave it to you to judge which of the two ought rather to be observed." Some, I say, never see God because you never go where God is likely to be seen! It was in the Temple that Isaiah saw the Lord.

A second thing to notice about this vision is that God was ". . . sitting upon a throne . . . high and lifted up." The king of Israel was dead and in a casket; the King of Heaven was alive and sitting upon a throne! The king of earth was buried in the heart of the earth; the King of Heaven was exalted, high and lifted up! The leprous Uzziah's death left Isaiah disappointed, deserted and desolate; the Living Lord filled Him with hope and trust and confidence.

Two cripples entered a church one day; Crippled, but each in a different way; One had a body strong and whole But it sheltered a warped and twisted soul. The other walked with a halting gait, But his soul was "tall and fair and straight."

They shared a pew. They shared a book, But on each face was a different look. One was alight with hope and joy And faith that nothing could destroy. The other joined not in prayer or hymn, No smile relaxed his features grim.

His neighbor had wronged him; his heart was sore; He thought of himself, and nothing more. The words that were read from the Holy Book Struck deafened ears and a forlorn look.

To one came comfort—his soul was fed; The other gained nothing from what was said.

Two cripples left the church that day; Crippled—but each in a different way.

A twisted foot did one body mar, But the twisted soul was sadder far. —MILDRED M. NORTH.

"In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord; sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple."

A third characteristic of this experience is found in the worshipping creatures which Isaiah beheld surrounding the throne. "Above him stood the seraphim." Now these creatures are not elsewhere mentioned in Holy Writ. Surely they were angelic beings, and the fact that they ever worshipped Him reminds us of the picture of heaven in the book of the Revelation of John. They are described as having three pair of wings: "And each had six wings: with twain he covered his face . . ." This angelic being, in

the presence of Holy God, used two of his feathery appendages to hide his face, two to cover his feet, and the third pair were used for flying. These uses are very suggestive.

The covering of the face suggests the need of reverence in our worship of God. A true worship experience is to be found somewhere between a cold formalism, as is sometimes experienced, and a picnic atmosphere which sometimes prevails. In claiming the "priesthood of all believers"—which means that in Christ all can come into the presence of the Father—we are prone to lose the awesomeness of what it means to be in His presence. One must not lose his reverence in the midst of his confidence! Moses "hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God."

The publican in Christ's parable "would not so much as lift his eyes toward heaven, but smote himself on the breast and cried: 'Lord, be merciful unto me a sinner.'" These angelic beings covered their faces in reverence. A man was being shown over a church house in which he had never been before. He failed to remove his hat. "I hope you don't mind my keeping my hat on?" "I mind? Not at all! It isn't my house!" replied the pastor. I experience an involuntary shudder everytime I hear the term: "The Man upstairs." I cringe everytime I hear the name of God spoken lightly.

I fear for our future whenever I observe parents permitting their children to run in the worship place. This is no place for boys and girls to court one another; it is the place for all of us to court the favor of God. This is not the place to sit and talk to one another; it is the place to sit and talk with the Living Lord. This is not the place to sit and read story books, but to sit and seek THE story in THE Book. This is no place to sit and draw airplanes, but to sit and draw near to Him who paints the western sky. This is no place to chew gum, but to eat the bread and drink the water of life. This is the place of worship. "With twain he covered his face."

In Dr. C. Roy Angell's Book, "Iron Shoes," is the story of another preacher: Dr. Carter Jones of Philadelphia told of a time in his pastorate in another town. In the parlorium was a prayer room—a Sky Room, he called it. It was an attic room, used only for prayer and meditation. "One day I came in irritable and fretful, have hurried from one appointment to another. 'I'm going up to the Sky Room,' I said to my wife, 'Don't let anybody interrupt me.' I dragged up the steps, shut the door, and sat down. The only furniture was a chair, a table and a Bible. As I idly turned the leaves, I heard footsteps tapping the stairway outside, then a timid knock. A bit irritated that somebody had gotten by my wife's watchful eye, I opened the door with a frown on my face; and there was my little six year old. She was nervous, because she knew she wasn't supposed to disturb me. 'Daddy,' she said, 'you've been so busy these days that I just haven't had time to love you. I just want to love you a little.' I dropped down on my knees, and she put her arms about me and I put my arms about her, and she kissed me, and tiptoed out of the room. I pushed the door to, without getting off my knees; and I looked to heaven and I said: 'God, I have been so busy going to and fro and up and down, that I have not taken time to love you. I just want to stay here a little bit and talk with you.'"

"Be still," wrote the Psalmist of old, "and know that I am God." "With twain he covered his face"—in reverence! Dr. Carter Jones came out of that Sky Room a different man! And would you notice that Isaiah added to his account of the vision that "The whole earth was full of His glory." God will fill your whole earth for the week to come, if you will fill your eyes with a vision of Him on the worship day.

"With twain he covered his feet." Self-forgetfulness. Humility. True, the nearer we get to God the better we see ourselves, the more clearly we see our unworthiness and the more aware we become of our limitations. But in the Temple we ought consciously to endeavor to forget those matters which claim us throughout the week. Some of you boys are out there right now with minds on the ball and glove! You clerks have your order pads open and you teachers have your books open in your mind's eyes. Some of you housewives, even while you sit in the congregation, must take care lest you in your minds be opening oven door or standing with the mop in hand! You bankers, are you counting your money? You vain women, are you right now examining a dress in a shop window? What are you thinking about? "With twain he covered his feet" in self-forgetfulness. He was in the Temple! He was in the presence of God!

A small boy returned home from a Sunday school which on that day met in the sanctuary in a worship period. He announced proudly to his lazy parents who stayed at home: "I went into the big church this morning." "You didn't go all the way, did you?" anxiously asked his dad. "Sure I did! How can you go just part way into the church?" Well, many of you do! You bring your body in but leave your mind outside. You are physically on the ground, but mentally in orbit! I appeal to you: Cover your feet! Forget yourselves and look on God! "And with twain he did fly." The third set of wings suggest service. No body is really going to behold God and in awe hide his fact and in humility veil his feet without feeling impulses to go forth and serve the King! It is just because of irreverence and self-conceit and idleness that our lives are weak. Vision will be turned into vocation!

A little later the prophet heard the question: "Whom shall I send? Who will go for us?" His answer: "Here am I, Lord, send me." Worship and service. When the Master and His disciples came down from the mountaintop experience of worship they met the man with the afflicted son, and He healed him. Worship and service. When at Bethany the Lord called forth Lazarus, he said: "Loose him, and let him go." And I'm sure that, once loosed, Lazarus went out to serve Him who restored his life. Worship and service! "And with twain he did fly."

William Carey in 1792 England was a shoemaker and a lay-preacher. He preached with a Bible in one hand, a shoemaker's hammer in the other and a map of the world on the wall. At length William Carey realized that he must go to the heathen in India with the gospel. "I will go down into the pit," he said, "if you will hold the ropes." All of us cannot be missionaries, but all of us can hold the ropes. Service must accompany worship.

When she was a young child Princess Juliana of the Netherlands once watched a parade from the palace balcony. "Do all those people belong to me?" she asked her mother. "No, indeed, child," replied Queen Wilhelmina, "We belong to all those people!" God does belong to me; but I belong to God, also. And as I see Him in my worship, I must serve Him in my world. "In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord."

OUTSTANDING SERVICE BY NON-STRUCK AIRLINES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, now that the airline strike has been settled and normal service restored, I feel it is appropriate that we pause for a few moments to acknowledge our debt of gratitude to those who served the country with such distinction during the past 6 weeks.

As one who was dependent upon air travel, I want to express my appreciation to the management and employees of American and the other nonstruck airlines who rendered such efficient and devoted service throughout the period of the strike.

During the past 6 weeks American Airlines flew more people more miles than any airline in history. Instead of the expected workload of approximately 125,000 calls during July, American employees received and handled nearly 350,000 inquiries which required many of their telephone reservation clerks to work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week.

As a traveler on American Airlines during the strike I can testify personally in regard to their courteous and outstanding service and I take this opportunity to commend everyone concerned for an important job well done.

In particular I want to express my deep gratitude to those who manned the service counters at New York's LaGuardia Airport. Their efficiency and congeniality was such that somehow they managed to make every standby feel important. As an ex-standby I want to say thank you to them especially.

EXTENSION AND TRAINING OF THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be speaking today in favor of measures that would greatly assist the mentally retarded and other handicapped children of this country. Certainly the legislation proposed by Mr. CAREY and Mr. FOGARTY will do much to close the gap between the needs for and resources available for training and educating handicapped youth.

There are a number of good reasons for urging the enactment of this legislation. I would like to briefly summarize some of the considerations that demonstrate the need for this bill.

First of all, we must recognize that only 25 percent of the handicapped children in this country are receiving the educational services they need.

Second, the costs of educating and training such children are, by the very nature of the special services required, greater than costs are for "normal" children.

While the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided badly needed funds to assist State-supported schools for the handicapped, there is still the matter of aiding public and private

local schools where there are classes for these children.

There is also an acute shortage of trained personnel to work with the children. The lack of funding for special programs in schools has resulted in far too few people entering this rewarding and important field.

While there has been work done in the development of instructional materials for the handicapped, such efforts have not been comprehensive enough. To be sure, books are available for the blind, but even these are limited in number and in their suitability for the very young. Captioned films for deaf children are an aid. But what kinds and how many aids are designed for the mentally retarded child? Not many, I am afraid.

And finally we find that there is no national policy or direction to the many efforts in this area. Past experience with such programs has shown that in order to focus maximum attention on the problems and to achieve maximum effectiveness in their solution, a coordinated and comprehensive national effort is needed.

The provisions of these proposals, while modest in appropriations, are certainly designed to promote and expand work in all phases of training for the handicapped child. Provision is made for the recruiting and training of greater numbers of educational personnel. Assistance is provided to the States for the establishment of administrative and supervisory units to coordinate existing programs and begin new ones. Exemplary programs—the proving ground of new methods and the stimuli for widespread adoption of those methods—are to be encouraged and funded. I am also happy to see that private corporations and institutions will be encouraged to assist in the development of new educational techniques and equipment. Too often, I think, we overlook the role that industry could be playing in education.

We have here, then, proposals which are comprehensive in scope, yet modest in appropriation. While they may not meet all of our present needs, they provide the machinery with which those needs can be met. For the first time, we have faced the entire problem of education for the handicapped and met it well on all fronts.

COOPERATIVE WORK TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a highly successful summer school program called cooperative work training which was held at the King Educational and Vocational Guidance Center in Chicago located in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois.

This summer program, which terminated August 19, took 230 boys and girls,

14 years of age and older, off the streets of Chicago. It gave them an opportunity to learn, to participate in recreation, and to be gainfully employed. In short, it reached children who had given up and who did not care about the future any more. Cooperative work training helped these discouraged youngsters improve their status and their outlook on life, and dramatically changed "losers" into "winners."

The youngsters who were under 16 took part in the academic and recreational aspects of this program. Those over 16 were assisted in finding part-time jobs, in addition to participating in the other portions of the program. Many of these youngsters will continue their part-time employment after they return to school in the fall. Cooperative work training helped these young people become employable and then took positive action in finding employment for them. This short-term program achieved concrete results and is certainly worthy of continuation next year.

I want to congratulate Mr. Gilbert Benowitz, principal, and Mr. Stanley Vopat, assistant principal, of the King Educational and Vocational Guidance Center, Dr. Arthur R. Lehne, assistant superintendent, Vocational and Practical Arts Department of the Chicago Board of Education, Mrs. Helen J. Evans, director, Bureau of Vocational and Practical Arts Education, Mrs. Lucile Broadwell, director, Division of Vocational Education for Girls, Mr. John W. Craig, project coordinator, and Mr. John Broderick, work study coordinator, whose efforts were instrumental in assuring the success of the cooperative work training program.

I want also to commend the more than 70 private firms and companies which, as cooperating employers, gave jobs to these youngsters. I am proud that the great majority of these firms that gave jobs to the youngsters are located in my congressional district. Education has become a little more meaningful and the door to opportunity has opened a little wider for these youngsters because these companies participated in the cooperative work training program.

And, of course, Dr. Benjamin C. Willis, general superintendent of schools in Chicago, and the principals, coordinators, and district superintendents for the 13 participating schools made an invaluable contribution by the part they played in initiating this exceptional summer program. Their foresight in recognizing the need for such a program made it possible for 230 Chicago youngsters to develop a sense of responsibility to themselves and to their community. As a direct result of cooperative work training, these youngsters have become contributing citizens and assets in our society.

It is my pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief description of the cooperative work training program written by Principal Gilbert Benowitz. The article follows:

KING EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE CENTER, CHICAGO, ILL.

(By Gilbert Benowitz, principal)

Earn money while you learn, play ball and go swimming, train for office work in an air

conditioned building, visit museums and art galleries, picnics; all this and more is taking place at the King Educational & Vocational Guidance Center, 2420 West Harrison, during the summer school session for 1966. With federal assistance supplied through the Vocational Education Act of 1963, an effective school work training and academic program is taking place for two hundred and thirty (230) boys and girls. These students, all of whom are over fourteen (14) years of age, were classified as over age and underachieving in their regular schools. They needed to be motivated so that their learning ability would improve. Many of these boys and girls had given up, they were "losers". Providing a beneficial academic recreational school program has created the desire for continued education and has helped the students improve their status and self image.

During the summer, students who are fifteen (15) years old may attend school two hours and work four hours for tax supported agencies. Ninety six (96) students at King have taken advantage of this training program and are working in offices at the Illinois Employment Security, at Cook County Hospital, at the Chicago Public Library, and at other schools in the area. Thirty six year old students are working for industrial organizations as part time, self employed workers. Many of these sixteen year old students are being trained for the printing trades, for clerical work, for restaurant services, for factory and stock helpers, and for grounds maintenance. Western Electric, Sears Roebuck, The Hilton Catering Service, F & M Industries and Goodwill are a few of the large industries where Cooperative Work Students are employed.

Each tax supported agency and industry agrees to provide an on the job trainer who works closely with the trainee during the hours of employment. After working four hours, work study students return to King where a special tutoring program provides beneficial academic classes in reading and arithmetic. If any academic work is needed in the work situation, the school prepares a special tutoring program to help the student become more productive. Fifteen year old students earn approximately forty five (\$45.00) dollars per two week work period. Sixteen year old students earn from \$1.25 per hour to \$1.80 per hour for their part time employment.

An out of school recreational program has been highly successful during the summer program. In this program, King students have the opportunity of participating in a competitive baseball tournament at the Altgeld Park. Both boy and girl teams have been formed in this tournament play. A Red Cross swimming course for boys has been organized for Wednesday afternoons at the Crane Swimming Pool. Girls participate in a recreational fun swim on Tuesday afternoons. Square dancing, tumbling, small group games, kick baseball and tournament basketball are also part of the physical education program.

This summer, King Educational & Vocational Guidance Center has a staff member whose purpose is to work with groups of neighborhood teen boys. This community Representative has been a major force in the area around King for the past four weeks. He has organized six groups of boys, ranging in age from fourteen to eighteen, into baseball and basketball teams. These groups represent the Rockwell Gardens, boys on 19th and Albany, boys who live near the Altgeld Playground and the youngsters on Harrison and Western. Since the start of summer school, this Community Representative has been out on the street seeking out youth groups and trying to get these groups interested in tournament play. The participation by these out of school boys has been encouraging and indicates that this type of activity is needed in this area.

A third activity which has been highly successful during this summer has been a bi-weekly trip by all students for cultural enrichment. School and group tours have been taken to middle class neighborhoods, to the Chicago Public Library, to the Museum of Science and Industry, as well as the Field Museum, Planetarium, and Aquarium, O'Hare Field, The Theatre on the Lake, Art Institute, Lincoln Park Zoo, the Concerts and the movies at the Field Museum, the Armory, the Sun-Times Building have all been visited. These trips, movies, concerts, outings and educational tours provide first hand experience with the cultural richness of Chicago.

The academic theme of the King Educational & Vocational Guidance Center Summer School has been, "Heroes of Western Civilization." This theme has been explored in depth so that students could identify these heroes as outstanding personalities of Western Culture. Each classroom has developed this theme around people in various walks of life. Athletic heroes, scientific heroes, political heroes, heroes of literature, etc. Each student has also been encouraged to make a notebook in which his summer work is recorded.

Possibly the outstanding part of this summer school is the individual attention which each student receives. Reading progress is considered of first importance in planning the entire program. The school's language laboratory, containing tachistoscope, language masters, and controlled reader is second in importance. Through ESEA funds a thermofax, tape recorder, opaque projector, and an overhead projector were added to the equipment in this room.

Selective SRA Newspaper, Phonics, and Library Materials are used successfully to upgrade students reading. Many reading games and manipulative devices of all sorts are also used as an integral part of the reading and arithmetic instructional program. Severely disabled readers are programmed as students to be individually tutored. These one-to-one tutoring sessions have provided the needed incentive for reading diagnoses and improvement.

On August 17, a school program is being planned to take place in the Cermack Woods. Nature hikes, competitive sports events, games, food preparation, and recognition of students will take place at that time. This event will be the culminating activity of summer school.

Employers and interested parents will be invited to take part in this event where recognition for merit will be given to each employer and to the students who have participated in the various parts of the summer school program.

EDUCATION IN THE NEW ORLEANS AREA

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend the public and parochial school systems and the colleges and universities in the Metropolitan New Orleans area, and their teachers and administrative staffers, for their dedicated, unselfish good works to unfold greater educational and cultural horizons for the children of my area, particularly the underprivileged young

children who will enter school for the first time this fall.

Through such programs as Operation Headstart, the public, parochial, and private schools in the New Orleans area—with the aid of volunteer workers and professional staffers of Total Community Action Inc. of New Orleans and social and public welfare agencies—have devoted their efforts this summer to preparing children for entry into grammar school or into college.

Among the summer programs are remedial, enrichment, recreation, providing academic and nonacademic courses to young children from low-income areas at 33 elementary and 14 secondary schools through a Federal grant of \$2.5 million; summer enrichment for mentally retarded children in which 161 youngsters in 4 schools participated; Project Genesis in which 650 children at 4 schools were given courses in the arts, music, ceramics, languages, and theater, again through a total of \$143,956 in Federal funds; Operation Headstart in which more than 3,000 children took part in New Orleans alone at 47 schools in the city, and did so with the help of \$495,514 in Federal funds; SCORE, conducted by the Archdiocese of New Orleans for children of all faiths at 12 schools with the aid of \$46,000 in Federal funds; Upward Bound programs for more than 470 boys and girls, who will be high school seniors this year, at 3 New Orleans universities: Dillard, Xavier, and Loyola, and others.

Mr. Speaker, a fine educational leader in our area, Dr. Carl J. Dolce, superintendent of Orleans Parish public schools, recently stated that the total cost of these summer programs for the education of our children was more than \$5 million:

Said Dr. Dolce:

This is our most significant summer in terms of education, these programs could not exist without federal funds.

Dr. Dolce's statement, Mr. Speaker, is a recognition of the significant and landmark legislation in the field of education which the 88th and 89th Congresses have enacted, and I know the Members of this House and of the Senate are proud of the roles they had in enacting the most far-reaching education legislation in the history of the United States.

The Higher Education Acts of 1963 and 1965; the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; the Vocational Education Act of 1963; the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and the subsequent amendments to expand this significant act, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 and its amendments in 1965, the Mental Retardation Facilities and the Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, Training Teachers for the Handicapped of 1965, the Nurse Training Act of 1964, National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities of 1965, the National Defense Education Act amendments of 1964, Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, and other important education programs all are making their impact felt in our country for the benefit of all the citizens of this great Nation of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend to my colleagues four recent newspaper articles on these summer education programs in the New Orleans area which were published in the Times-Picayune, the New Orleans States-Item, and the Clarion-Herald, the official newspaper of the Archdiocese of New Orleans. These articles appeared this month in these newspapers in my city, and I am happy to insert in the RECORD. The articles follow:

[From the Times-Picayune, Aug. 12, 1966]
PROJECT HEAD START TO END—ESTIMATED 5,000 TAKE PART IN PROGRAM

Project Head Start classes end Friday for 3,500 pre-school children following eight weeks of intensive activity in 47 public schools.

The program, which began June 20, was conducted by New Orleans Parish School Board, said this year's program brought "a possibilities of the four and five-year-old children with learning, cultural and other special experiences designed to give them a "head start" when they begin formal schooling this fall.

Dr. Julianna Boudreaux, director of kindergarten-primary education for the School Board said this year's program brought "a marvelous teacher and community wide response."

FIVE THOUSAND INVOLVED

"We estimate that nearly 5,000 citizens—teachers, volunteers, teacher aides, social workers and others—were directly involved in the program and we are eternally grateful for their splendid cooperation and support," she said.

Dr. Boudreaux said this year there was a much larger social services program—visits to homes of parents whose children were enrolled. There also was more direct contact with families, more psychological screening and parent involvement.

She said the medical and dental examination phases of the program were the most extensive ever conducted in New Orleans. Medical examinations were administered to the children at the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital and the dental program was conducted by an advisory committee of representatives of organized dentistry.

In this program, portable dental units were used in classrooms for the first time to aid dentists in cleaning teeth and administering fluoride treatment.

PROBLEM SCREENING

During the final weeks of the program, the children received screening for special problems and strengths in intellectual functioning.

Parents were also involved through social workers who encouraged their interest in the children's achievements. They participated by attending parent education classes and related home education.

The New Orleans program was open to children of lower income areas of the city without regard to race, creed or national origin and was financed by an Office of Economic Opportunity grant of \$495,514 to the School Board and Total Community Action Inc., the local antipoverty coordinating agency.

Dr. Boudreaux said a Head Start policy advisory committee composed of parents of youngsters in the program and community leaders will meet Friday afternoon to discuss various aspects of the program.

[From the New Orleans States Item, Aug. 20, 1966]

FEDERAL FUNDS POUR IN: SUMMER EDUCATION HITS NEW RECORD IN ACTIVITY
(By Allan Katz)

An unprecedented wave of education this summer swept up more than 14,000 children

in the New Orleans area and carried them to the threshold of a new school year.

Total cost of the previously unmatched vacation-time effort to increase children's potential for learning was more than \$5 million, most of it in federal funds.

The programs ranged from Operation Head Start for 4- and 5-year-olds to Upward Bound programs at three local universities for 11th graders from low-income homes who show promise of being college material.

Principal forces behind the surge for education were the Orleans Parish School Board, Total Community Action Inc., which is the local anti-poverty agency; the Archdiocese of New Orleans, and Loyola, Dillard and Xavier Universities.

Dr. Carl J. Dolce, superintendent of Orleans Parish public schools, calls it "our most significant summer here in terms of education."

He says the massive, coordinated programs represent a sharp deviation from often haphazard summer school programs aimed chiefly at youngsters who flunked during the regular year. Dr. Dolce said the difference is federal funds.

"These programs could not exist without the federal funds," says Dr. Dolce.

He points out the programs are not a rehash of regular material but are largely enrichment programs aimed at increasing youngsters' ability to learn.

In addition to the educational programs were the Orleans Parish School Board adult program which attracted 1,700 persons, and jam-packed recreation programs run by the New Orleans Recreation Department and Total Community Action.

Also taking part were members of the New Orleans Police Department who addressed a number of Head Start classes.

A thumbnail sketch of some of the summer programs:

A data processing course conducted at two public schools and aimed at helping high school students from low-income areas to gain an understanding of basic functions of data processing and practical business problems. About 100 students took part in the program financed by a \$7,797 grant.

Remedial-Enrichment-Recreation, known as RER, offered academic and non-academic courses to children from low-income areas at 33 elementary and 14 secondary schools. More than 8,500 participated in the \$2.5 million program made possible by a federal grant.

Summer Enrichment for Mentally Retarded attracted 161 youngsters to four schools. The program offered retarded children new experiences through special trips and a chance to learn through use of the newest visual aids.

English for Native Spanish-Speaking Children was financed by a \$48,242 federal grant and was aimed at 213 children, many of them youngsters of Cuban refugees. The program, carried on in six schools, was designed to relieve the problems faced by the youngsters switching to U.S. schools.

Project Genesis involved 650 children at four schools and cost \$143,956 in federal funds. Courses were offered to students from public and non-public schools in the arts, music, ceramics, languages and theater. The program was culminated by a Festival of the Arts held at the different schools.

Operation Headstart is the oldest of the upgrading programs and this year enrolled 3,111 4- and 5-year-olds. Cost was \$495,514 in federal funds and included 47 schools. Children from low-income areas were prepared to enter school and also were given medical and dental examinations.

SCORE, conducted by the Archdiocese of New Orleans for children of all faiths at 12 schools. More than 300 youngsters took part in the basic reading language program that cost \$46,000 in federal funds.

Upward Bound programs attracted more than 470 boys and girls who will be seniors in high school this year to summer programs at Dillard, Xavier and Loyola. The three programs together cost more than \$550,000. Stressed were English, mathematics, and communication—subjects which students beginning college traditionally find hard to master and areas where children from low-income backgrounds are at a particular disadvantage.

The summer programs were carried on in the midst of plenty with small classes and an abundance of the latest teaching aids and learning machines.

A recent visitor jokingly told Dr. Dolce students and teachers would be spoiled when they returned in the fall to crowded classrooms and he replied:

"That's wonderful. We want our students and teachers to be dissatisfied with less than maximum educational conditions.

"This summer gave us a chance to show what we can do with small classes, new equipment and adequate funds.

"The educational programs staged this summer in New Orleans, and to be staged in the summers ahead, will have a far-reaching beneficial effect on our community."

[From the Clarion-Herald, Aug. 18, 1966]

HEAD START TOWARD HEALTH

(By Newell Schindler)

A child with teeth that ache constantly, eyes that don't see properly, ears that hear only garbled sounds starts school with a hand tied behind his back. Thus health care of pre-school children is one phase of the three-pronged effort waged by Operation Head Start as it prepares four- and five-year-olds for entrance into schools. Here are some startling facts about the health of deprived New Orleans children who have begun to get care this summer under the \$700,000 Operation Head Start program in which 40 dentists, 20 doctors, and 13 nurses have participated this summer or will participate in during the follow-up health care before the end of the year.

Seeing a classroom full of children brushing their teeth in unison may strike the viewer at first glance as being amusing.

But an analysis of the necessity for such a drill—the fact that many four- and five-year-old children in New Orleans have never had a toothbrush—is cause for more serious thought.

The lack of knowledge on the part of the children and their parents about routine dental care is just one of the crucial health handicaps faced by children caught in the stifling clutches of poverty.

Medical test findings conducted this summer under Operation Head Start, an anti-poverty program administered in New Orleans by Total Community Action, would startle those not directly involved with the poor in the war on poverty. For example:

1. Abscesses in some four- and five-year-olds have reached such a state that the children must have all their teeth extracted.

2. Dentists said they were amazed that some children with advanced tooth decay could chew at all. The pain just in chewing food must be excruciating, they said.

3. At one school, 137 of 183 children need follow-up dental care. And in another group, 32 of 37 had an average of 10 cavities each and needed further dental attention.

4. Blood test reports of 797 children indicate that 350 of them—approximately 45 per cent—were suffering from malnutrition or possible anemia. This results both from lack of funds for food and lack of knowledge in how to prepare a nutritious diet on a limited budget.

Diets for the poor mean maybe Coke and candy for breakfast, noodles and Kool Aid for supper, and beans much more than just once a week.

Because of the obvious lack of a proper diet, the daily meal allotment for children in Operation Head Start this summer was increased from 31 cents to 50 cents per day per child. Each child in the program was given one meal daily while at school.

As an outgrowth of the situation, two nutrition experts connected with the Tulane university school of medicine are making a study of local malnutrition problems.

The need for extensive adult education in this area is evident.

Sight and hearing defects, while not so prevalent as tooth problems, are present among a significant percentage of the 3,300 children in the eight-week Operation Head Start program.

Ten to 15 per cent of them need further evaluation of possible vision defects. The same percentage is true for hearing.

Loss of vision in one eye can result from eye muscle imbalance, which is not too uncommon among young children. This muscle imbalance causes a child to use one eye, leaving the other idle—and an idle eye will not develop.

This is a condition which should be—and often can be—corrected in the early years if a person is to enjoy the benefits of full vision. But the poor who cannot afford the tests suffer permanent eye injury for lack of attention.

Hearing ailments are sometimes found to be impacted ears, a situation which can usually be corrected by a visit to a doctor's office.

A child examined under the Operation Head Start program, for example, was found to be nearly deaf, unbeknown to his family. As one member of a large family, it was assumed that he was just the quiet one with the withdrawn personality.

Innumerable other physical defects go undetected among the poor because a child sees a doctor only in the case of an emergency.

Among the untreated child diseases is impetigo—Indian fire—which is easily treated, but if left unattended can develop into serious kidney conditions. The nurses found that many parents shrug off impetigo as being infected mosquito bites.

An official of Total Community action said that medical findings in Operation Head Start have served to emphasize the need for comprehensive medical facilities to treat the poorer children of the community.

New Orleans is one of the nation's great health centers and if a poor child has something like a heart condition which can be corrected through surgery, his chances of being cared for are excellent.

But there are no free care programs in the community, for example, for the child who needs extensive dental care, hearing aids, or eye glasses, said Mrs. J. B. Hickey, assistant supervisor for health services in the Head Start program.

Through Operation Head Start and with the help of top medical and dental people in the community, a program has been set up to take advantage of the fine medical facilities in New Orleans and provide follow-up care for those children in the program who have serious defects. Such attention will be given during the next several months.

But such care is for only a small percentage of 3,300 children in an area with a population of one million and with a high proportion of poor people. Tens of thousands of other youngsters in New Orleans and surrounding communities are not among those reached by Operation Head Start.

Many of these have fallen into a pattern of school failure because some physical defect which could have been corrected in the formative years has gone undetected and has impaired the learning process.

They offer society a potential welfare burden rather than an educated member of a community ready to contribute something to society.

[From the Clarion-Herald, Aug. 18, 1966]

PROJECT GENESIS: AWAKENING CREATIVITY

(By Florence Herman)

A classroom without textbooks? C'est impossible!

But this is exactly the approach being taken by a new project of the Orleans Parish School board called "Genesis of a Vibrant Cultural Program." An eight-week program aimed at cultural enrichment of the average school-age child from fourth through 11th grades, Project Genesis is using the most modern and innovative equipment to pursue its goals.

Courses in music and art appreciation, individual instruction in instrumental and vocal music, in-depth courses in various art media, culture and conversation in Spanish and French are offered enrollees.

Depending upon the course the student chooses, he can learn theater arts in depth, enamelware, printmaking, or ceramics. Included with the art courses is one in art appreciation.

With the choice of a music course, the students learn to play one of a wide range of instruments, and participate in concerts given at the end of the study. If enrolled in a vocal course, depending upon age and group, the student can take part in an operetta, a vocal music performance, or a choral concert.

Classes for project Genesis are held five days a week in the mornings from 9 a.m. to noon. Four centers are being operated, at McDonogh senior high school, and Wright, Karr and Gregory junior high schools. There are 650 children enrolled in the pilot program this summer, which is funded by a federal grant of \$147,781 under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education act of 1965.

Extensive use has been made of local resources by project directors. Delgado Art museum, Gallery Circle theater and Young Audiences, Inc., are all intimately involved in the project, with extensive use being made of their facilities and personnel.

The program is aimed at the average kid-next-door, who attends either public, parochial, or private school. During the course of a school year, in-depth music and art appreciation courses are not offered, and neither is an in-depth study of any particular type of art. A project such as Genesis allows the kids to pursue a particular course of study intensively for eight weeks.

The languages, as are standardly taught throughout the school year, cover a specified amount of ground in a specified time, with little creativity involved. The approach used by Project Genesis to language arts is conversation and culture. Students do not use textbooks, paper, or pencil. Extensive use of films and tapes gives the children a glimpse of culture of the country which they are studying and teaches only conversation, rather than grammar or syntax. The feeling behind this approach is that the children will have a better understanding of the customs and ideas of the country and will be more inclined to study the language further during the regular school year.

Numerous field trips were planned by project directors. Delgado Art museum has been visited by all the enrollees, and while there they were lectured on the different types and periods of art on display. Included also were trips to private galleries.

Gallery Circle theater, in cooperation with Project Genesis, has spent eight weeks this summer staging "The Glass Menagerie." Students enrolled in theater art courses have spent much time at the theater, watching the play being put together from the beginning on. They were allowed to attend rehearsals and asked numerous questions on everything they saw being done. Object of this was to let the Gallery project serve as a model for the productions they will stage

during the "Festival of Arts," the finale of the summer program.

The week of Aug. 13 through 18 has seen the culmination of the eight weeks of work done by the students. Concerts and plays are being performed at the centers to show the results of the work, and an art display will be put on Aug. 18 at the McDonogh center.

Friday, Aug. 12, saw the staging of a concert put on by the beginners, many of whom eight weeks ago did not know the first thing about violins, clarinets, or trumpets. A choral concert and vocal music performance were put on Aug. 15 at the McDonogh center; and dramatic performances Aug. 16 at the Wright center and Aug. 17 at the Karr center.

Still to be held are a vocal music performance at the Gregory center Aug. 18 and a dramatic performance of selections from "The World We Live In" at the McDonogh center the same evening.

Enthusiasm has run high throughout the entire project, with some of the children making parents rearrange vacation trips so as not to miss any classes. With the apparent success of this year's pilot program, Project Genesis will most probably be slated for renewal in 1967.

THE ATOM HAS COME OF AGE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], who on Monday of this week declared before this body that the atom has come of age.

I take great comfort in the fact that the new and awesome power and potentialities of the atom have been harnessed for the advancement and enrichment of the human race. Particularly do I take comfort from the fact that men, our scientists, have found constructive use for a force originally conceived for destructive purposes.

The force of the atom was early unleashed in a spectacular demonstration of death and destruction. Today, that same force lights and warms millions of homes, saves untold numbers of lives, contributes to our industrial might, and serves in many other ways.

The atom has come of age and man, it seems, has rewarded the faith of his Maker by seeking to put it to creative and humane purposes.

On this point I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. I sincerely hope that the potential for good of the atom is only beginning to be revealed to us. And, I hope that this revelation will unfold swiftly, in order that we may reap its full benefits soon.

It pleases me that I can open this statement on a note of agreement with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. However, agreement must end here for his recent statement calculated to discredit the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project was, in all other respects, grossly inaccurate and misleading.

I disagree with his suggestion that hydroelectric powerplants are obsolete, and I most emphatically disagree with his appraisal of the merits of the Dickey-Lincoln School project which has been approved by this Congress and is to be constructed in Maine.

I feel that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is not familiar with the voluminous testimony which has been presented in support of the Dickey project. The arguments he offers have been heard before, and totally discredited. For reasons that only he knows, he has seen fit to peddle the wares of the avowed enemies of the Dickey project; the private utilities of New England and others who have no profit to make from inexpensive hydroelectric power.

I would remind my colleagues, including the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], that the big 11 power loop, which he visualizes as the answer to New England's prayers for reasonable electric rates, is itself a product of Dickey and public power.

No word was ever heard of private utility plans to rescue New England consumers from usurious electric rates until the impending authorization of the Dickey project by Congress became a clear possibility. Once announced, the big 11 power loop was hopefully endowed by its worried creators with powers which technology cannot in fact support.

The big 11 power loop, will in time, enable the New England private utilities to generate power less expensively and to make more money. As there was no thought of a giant power loop before the advent of Dickey, there is little assurance of its completion should Dickey be scuttled. And there is no assurance whatsoever that construction of the big 11 will significantly decrease power costs because the private utilities have consistently refused to predict future costs to consumers.

We know that the New England utilities can produce power at a cost to themselves much lower than at present. This could have been done 20 years ago but because competition did not force them to do so, they did nothing.

With the advent of public power in their area, they must take steps to become competitive, and as a result consumers will at long last find hope for relief.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, permit me now to comment upon some specific allegations made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. He claims that nuclear plants and pumped storage can produce power more cheaply than the Dickey project. The fact is that Dickey-Lincoln School peaking power can be marketed from the proposed 345,000-volt transmission which is included in its cost figure at a price of \$14.60 per kilowatt and 2.6 mills for energy. The combined nuclear energy and pumped storage plants of the big 11 power loop would have to market their peaking power at \$17.40 per kilowatt and 2.6 mills for energy. These figures have been established by the Federal Power Commission and were adjusted to include transmission, operational costs, and maintenance expense.

The reason why Dickey costs are so favorable is that this project will take advantage of an abundant supply of cost-free water. A pumped-storage plant is designed for use where water is not abundant and is designed to reuse water. Pumping water uphill in order to reuse it is expensive.

Nuclear plants are still not competitive with efficient hydroplants. None of the nuclear plants now in operation have ever operated consistently or efficiently as baseload plants, and it is only by operating at high rates of output over long periods of time that truly low-cost performance can be realized.

The charge that hydropower is obsolete is completely absurd. Private utilities are building, and applying for licenses to build, conventional hydroelectric plants on sites which offer an abundance of water as does the Dickey-Lincoln School project site.

The two statements offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] in support of his views are both interesting and amusing. A thoughtful reading of the article from Barron's is especially recommended as revealing the motives of interests aligned against the completion of the Dickey project.

The statement of William Webster, chairman and chief executive of the New England electric system is amusing. It is this gentleman, so positive and confident in the statement quoted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], who went blank when asked by a committee of Congress a year ago how much New England consumers would have to pay for electric power when the big 11 power loop went into operation.

Mr. Speaker, the Dickey project is New England's only real hope for relief from the highest power rates in the Nation. The Dickey project is the only real hope for a dramatic advance in the industrial progress of my State.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has said that power to be produced by the Dickey-Lincoln School project in northern Maine will find its only market 400 miles away in the Boston area. I view the prospects differently and hope that by the time it is completed Maine's needs will be such that there will be no Dickey power to export.

Maine is known throughout the Nation as a vacationland. For many Maine people, forced vacations due to unemployment have been frequent and lengthy. I view the Dickey project as a means to expand industrialization and job opportunities.

It is my hope and purpose that Maine should become a "vacationland" for all its citizens as well as a vacationland for people everywhere who seek charm and peace and rest on their annual holiday.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in support of this project and I ask them to guard against the false arguments that are being leveled against it.

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article on financing higher education deserves wide consideration. It was written by one of the outstanding young educational leaders in the Nation.

The southern regional education board is supported by the Southeastern States and is a pioneering effort to raise the level of educational opportunity for all who reside in the region.

The article follows:

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION

(By Winfred L. Godwin, director, southern regional education board)

"The fact that they won't take Federal aid appealed to us," explained the husband and wife who recently gave a small church-related Southern college the largest financial gift in the history of the school. It may be appealing to some, but it is decidedly at odds with what is happening and with what most people obviously consider appropriate.

Last year, Federal money for primary, secondary and higher education came into the South to the tune of one billion dollars plus. The South's share of the some \$3 billion Federal total exceeded by \$82 million the amount which distribution in proportion to population would have brought the region.

Private support for education is desirable, and gifts to colleges and universities are being encouraged, but it is unrealistic to suppose that our nation's educational programs will develop without Federal assistance.

National interest in the quality and availability of education is so fundamental that financial assistance from the national government has been inevitable; any concern must lie with the questions of scope, purpose and form of such assistance.

Higher education in the United States is a \$10 billion annual operation. Our public colleges and universities rely on tuition, state and Federal funds, and private gifts to meet their budgets, while operating expenses for the private institutions come from tuition, the Federal government and private benefactors. Approximately twice as many Federal dollars go to public institutions as to the private ones.

The Federal funds for higher education go mainly for research, facilities and equipment, student aid, institutional grants such as National Science Foundation grants, and fellowships or training grants. The largest allocations are for research and facilities and equipment, with fellowships and other student support receiving somewhat less.

The two major functions of higher education, research and instruction, are both growing enormously. But the proportion of effort devoted to research is constantly increasing, largely because of demands originating from government activity. The Federal government has accordingly accepted responsibility for paying the bulk of the research bill, with the largest part of Federal funds for education designated for research.

Over the past ten years as costs have risen, the Federal government's share of support has been increasing. Although state governments and private benefactors continue to give increasing amounts for education, the percentage of Federal support gets larger each year.

In higher educational instructional support, the share shouldered by the student has increased significantly, while the share of all other support categories has declined, a situation financially handicapping many

able students but for loans and scholarships, the largest part of which again comes from the Federal government.

While some people continue to express a strong and thoughtful conviction that the Federal government should not assume a major responsibility in education, the facts are that without Federal assistance our colleges and universities could never keep pace with the growing demands being made of them. Federal obligations to higher education for fiscal year 1967 will total some \$4 billion, exclusive of loan funds.

The very magnitude of Federal support poses problems of its own. Forty-three separate Federal agencies administer programs affecting education, almost all of them operating in the field of higher education.

Categories and conditions of aid have been established to insure that Federal funds are spent in an efficient manner, but it is the responsibility of education officials to be aware of and to make the best use of the many types of assistance offered.

There is national concern that specific needs of higher education be met—and acts relating to facility construction, graduate education, faculty salaries, libraries, laboratories, research projects and student aid all reflect the response of Congress to pressing national needs.

The Federal government has moved beyond offering sporadic financial aid to taking an active, constructive part in improving American education.

HUAC HEARINGS AID TO THE ENEMY?

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, last week on the unhappy occasion of the violent ejection of counsel and witnesses from the hearing chamber of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I rose on the floor of the House in protest. I stated that these events which were depicted on the front pages of newspapers around the world, by AP Wirephoto, could only demean us and our cherished institutions at home and abroad; could only cause satisfaction to the tiny extremes in our society—the minute hard core of Communists on the left and the John Birchers on the right.

Today's syndicated column by Marquis Childs brilliantly completes this picture—the outlines of which I etched—in a sober and thoughtful commentary, which I am sure reflects the frustration and resentment of many Members of both House and Senate, at the futile, pointless, and destructive conduct of the affairs of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Childs' article follows:

HUAC HEARINGS: AID TO THE ENEMY?

(By Marquis Childs)

In assessing the damage done by the House Un-American Activities Committee the effect of that wrestling match on the foreign audience ranks high. Those televised scenes of witnesses and attorneys being dragged from the hearing room are even

now being shown in Peking and North Vietnam.

In the propaganda drive to hold the North Vietnamese in the war they are offered as evidence that the brutal hirelings of imperialism will go to any length to suppress the true representatives of the American people. In this propaganda exercise these representatives being trundled off of jail speak for a majority of all Americans.

That is a measure of the harm the hearings have done. They give a tiny splinter of peaceniks—by their own admission not more than 5000 in the whole country—an opening for worldwide exposure and martyrdom. Before that opening their attempt to dramatize their opposition to the war had fallen off almost to zero.

Whether the masters at the top in Hanoi and Peking believe their own propaganda no one can say. Shut away in their airtight ideological prison they seem to have an infinite capacity for self-deception. But, belief or merely cynical propaganda, the uproar in the committee room was a godsend to the Communists bent on fighting the war in Vietnam to the bitter end. See, they are saying, here you have it—only force holds free Americans from revolting against the military and the capitalists waging a war of aggression against the Vietnamese people.

Underscoring the damage is the fact that active opposition to President Johnson's policy in Vietnam has, with the exception of the peaceniks, all but subsided. Sen. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, the most articulate of the congressional critics, in an interview the other day said in effect that opposition was futile since the Congress was more warlike than the President. He was saying to Hanoi that the Johnson Administration means to go through with the war no matter what the cost in escalation.

Aside from the Communist capitals, the damage elsewhere in the world and here at home cannot be discounted. The scenes of disorder and violence will have a powerful impact in Western Europe where the long-drawn-out tragedy of the war is equated by critics with a quality of recklessness and savagery in the American temperament. The fact that the disorder was begun by the witnesses is irrelevant for the foreign audience, since their martyrdom in being brought before the committee in the first place is established by the past record of what appears in European eyes to be a sinister inquisitorial body with no objective other than to harass anyone whose views are to the left of center.

It may be that past experience with the committee's wild divagations has blunted the effect at home. What, they're at it again? This cannot, however, be taken for granted. Despite the disclaimer of the acting chairman, Rep. JOE POOL of Texas, that there was no intention to deny the right of dissent the line between intellectual criticism of Vietnam policy and acts such as trying to stop a troop train will be blurred.

In a climate of concern as the consequences of the war bite deeper and deeper with the number of American troops close to the 300,000 mark the emotions generated in the hearing room can be infectious. The short way with dissenters—bounce them out and put them in jail—that was the lesson of the hearings shown on television throughout the Nation.

As for the cast of characters the most vengeful and satirical film-maker could not have improved on it. JOE POOL looks like an Alabama sheriff ready at the drop of a bull whip to throw his deputies around the courthouse. He is said to be delighted by the whole affair since it cast him in the role of Communist destroyer and thereby put

his right-wing Republican opponent in Dallas in the shade. Such exposure on television was a boon that couldn't have been bought with all the campaign funds in Texas.

The young peaceniks were cast with equal verisimilitude. They were brash, rude, obstreperous, bent on causing as much trouble as possible given a golden opportunity to discredit Congress and the democratic process. That they were given the opportunity is the saddest commentary of all.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, August 24, 1966, and balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. SCHISLER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. DELANEY), for Wednesday, August 24, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PICKLE, for 1 hour, on Thursday, August 25, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON), for 1 hour, on August 29; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FUQUA (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 10 minutes, on Thursday, August 25, 1966; 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. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) to extend his remarks during general debate on H.R. 15963 in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. PIRNIE.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. QUITE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WATTS.

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. FASCELL.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3158. An act to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3711. An act to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 23, 1966, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8760. An act to amend the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1961 (33 U.S.C. 1001-1015), to implement the provisions of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 25, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2669. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential reductions in cost of automotive travel by Federal employees where use of Government-owned vehicles is feasible; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2670. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2671. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Public Law 8-136 enacted by the Eighth Guam Legislature, pursuant to the provisions of section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2672. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an application for a loan by the North Extension Canal Co., of Grace, Idaho, pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 1044, as amended, 71 Stat. 48; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2673. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an application for a loan by the North Poudre Irrigation Co., of Wellington, Colo., pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 1044, as amended, 71 Stat. 48; 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. PATMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3688. An act to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction (Rept. No. 1868). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on conference. Conference report on S. 3700. An act to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (Rept. No. 1869). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 3510. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a Connecticut River and National Recreation Area, in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12536. A bill to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, relating to the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services; with amendment (Rept. No. 1871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1035. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that baggage and parts thereof shall be admitted free of duty; with amendment (Rept. No. 1872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 16813. A bill to transfer to the Atomic Energy Commission complete administrative control of approximately 78 acres of public domain land located in the Otowi section near Los Alamos County (Rept. No. 1873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 17119. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to be assigned or detailed to the Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce (Rept. No. 1874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 976. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11555, a bill to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande River in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico (Rept. No. 1875). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 977. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 11880, a bill to authorize conclusion of an agreement with Mexico

for joint measures for solution of the lower Rio Grande salinity problem (Rept. 1876). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolutions 979. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12723, a bill to amend chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, to provide medical treatment and services, and drugs and medicines to those veterans receiving additional pension under old law pension provisions based on need for regular aid and attendance (Rept. No. 1877). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 979. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14604, a bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to remodel the existing structures of the U.S. Botanic Garden for use as a visitors' center (Rept. No. 1878). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 980. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16330, a bill to provide for extension and expansion of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1879). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 981. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16367, a bill to extend the benefits of the war orphans' educational assistance program to the children of those veterans of the Philippines Commonwealth Army who died or have become permanently and totally disabled by reason of their service during World War II, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1880). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 982. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16559, a bill to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to authorize the establishment and operation of sea grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education and research in the various fields relating to the development of marine resources, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1881). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 983. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 1217, joint resolution to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks (Rept. No. 1882). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 984. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16574, a bill to amend the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1883). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1884). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 16774. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain existing rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay (Rept. No. 1885). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 15941. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1886). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3105. An act to authorize certain construction at

military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1887). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 17211. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 17212. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt servicemen from the excise tax on transportation by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 17213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt servicemen from the excise tax on transportation by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 17214. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for cost-of-living increases on the annuities and pensions (and lump-sum payments) which are payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 17215. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1924, to revise existing law relating to the examination, licensure, registration, and regulation of optometrists and the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 17216. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 17217. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 17218. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder, to strengthen the reserves of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and to eliminate gradually the contingent liability of the Treasury to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 17219. A bill requiring the disclosure of financial interests of Members, officers, and certain employees of the House of Representatives and prohibiting financial transactions with groups seeking to influence legislation or to do business with the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 17220. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 17221. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder, and to provide that any such increase shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility for pension under title 38 of the United States Code (veterans' benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 17222. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States

from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 17223. A bill to authorize the establishment and operation by Gallaudet College of a model secondary school for the deaf to serve the National Capital region; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 17224. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 17225. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 17226. A bill to modify the navigation project on the upper Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 17227. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 17228. A bill to provide that certain expenses incurred in connection with an urban renewal project in Camden, N.J., shall be eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 17229. A bill to authorize the transfer of vessels of the Office of Economic Opportunity by the Secretary of Commerce for educational purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 17230. A bill to authorize the establishment and operation by Gallaudet College of a model secondary school for the deaf to serve the National Capital region; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 17231. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 17232. A bill to amend section 523(b), chapter 15, of title 38, United States Code, to enable certain permanently and totally disabled veterans to receive the full rate of disability compensation found payable for their wartime service-connected disabilities, and also a proportionate amount of disability pension under a specified formula; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17233. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefits payments shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17234. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17235. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the payment of additional pensions to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and to widows of such veterans, to raise the income limits with respect to the payment of such pensions, to increase by 10 percent the pension payable to such veterans who served overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 17236. A bill to establish a National Commission on Public Management, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SKUBITZ (by request):

H.R. 17237. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Iowa Tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 17238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 17239. A bill to limit contests of elections of Members of the House of Representatives to contents brought by duly qualified candidates whose names appear on the official ballots; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 17240. A bill to authorize the establishment and operation by Gallaudet College of a model secondary school for the deaf to serve the National Capital region; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 17241. A bill to make certain expenditures of the city of New Orleans, La., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 17242. A bill to provide that certain expenditures made by the city of New Orleans, La., shall be eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 17243. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 17244. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 17245. A bill to permit the city of Oakland, Calif., to count certain land acquisition costs as part of the development cost of a proposed facility for purposes of the neighborhood facility grant program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 17246. A bill to provide that expenditures made in connection with the construction of a city hall in Allentown, Pa., may be counted as local grants-in-aid toward federally assisted urban renewal projects in Allentown; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 17247. A bill to provide that expenditures made in connection with certain structures and facilities in the city of Bethlehem, Pa., may be counted as local grants-in-aid toward an urban renewal project in that city; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 17248. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 17249. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that an individual's entitlement to retirement benefits under that act or the Social Security Act while he or she is entitled to dependent's or survivor's benefits under the other such act shall not operate to prevent any increases in his or her benefits under the 1937 act which would otherwise result under the so-

called social security minimum guarantee provision; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 17250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 17251. A bill to amend the act of March 1, 1933 (47 Stat. 1418), entitled "An act to permanently set aside certain lands in Utah as an addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 17252. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLOREY:

H.R. 17253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 17254. A bill to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 17255. A bill to provide for the more flexible regulation of maximum rates of interest or dividends payable by banks and certain other financial institutions on deposits or share accounts, to authorize higher reserve requirements on time deposits at member banks, to authorize open market operations in agency issues by the Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 17256. A bill to amend and extend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 17257. A bill to amend and extend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.J. Res. 1279. Joint resolution designating the month of September in 1966 as National Safety Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 986. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Con. Res. 987. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Res. 985. Resolution to include drum and bugle corps under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Res. 986. Resolution to create a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H. Res. 987. Resolution relative to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee

making an investigation and study of certain policies of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 17258. A bill for the relief of Bodo Diehn, Ph. D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 17259. A bill for the relief of Dino J. Caterini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17260. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Jellison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17261. A bill for the relief of Augustus J. Theodore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 17262. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Janet A. Vaughn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 17263. A bill for the relief of Garabet Civelekyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 17264. A bill for the relief of Vilmos Levay, Isabella Levay, Vilmos Levay, Jr., and Arpad Cornello Levay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17265. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Sacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17266. A bill for the relief of Gilfrola Sacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPEER:

H.R. 17267. A bill for the relief of Luis A. de la Vega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 17268. A bill for the relief of Lee Chin Yuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 17269. A bill for the relief of Albert L. Kellyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all men, Thou hast taught us that in quietness and in confidence shall be our strength. In the midst of these feverish days we pray that Thou wilt breathe through the heats of our desire Thy coolness and Thy balm.

Take from our souls the strain and stress and let our ordered lives confess the beauty of Thy peace.

Strengthen us with Thy might that the anxious pressures of these days may not break our spirits and that no denials of human freedom now loose in the world may intimidate our souls.

Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy holy spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name.

We ask it in the name of that one who is the truth and the way. Amen.