



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

David encouraged himself in the Lord his God.—1 Samuel 30: 6.

Almighty Father, whose spirit is within all Thy creation, whose love faileth never, and whose presence is with us all our days, make us more aware of Thee, more responsive to Thy call, more obedient to Thy will, and more ready to help our fellow man.

Grant unto us a greater honesty of purpose, a more generous attitude toward others, and a most genuine faith in Thee—which will help us live unshamed before Thee and those who love us. When we are tempted, give us strength to overcome our temptations; when we begin to give way to discouragement, help us to find our encouragement in Thee; when we fall and would give up, grant us courage to try again.

May the light of truth illumine our way, may the love of life illumine our hearts, and may the life of love illumine our relationships with one another.

Spirit of life, in this new dawn
Give us the faith that follows on,
Letting Thine all pervading power
Fulfill the dream of this high hour.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 22, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 5852. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the basis on which certain dependency and indemnity compensation will be computed;

H.R. 7850. An act to amend section 1822(a) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to direct loan and insured loan cases;

H.R. 8699. An act for the relief of Mule Creek Oil Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation;

H.R. 11927. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under the veterans' loan programs;

H.R. 12119. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to

replace the existing 14th Street Bridge, also known as the Highway Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12352. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property to Pinellas County, Fla.;

H.R. 12664. An act to retrocede to the State of Colorado exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over the real property comprising the Fort Lyon Veterans Hospital reservation;

H.R. 13012. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H.R. 16863. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1844, in order to clarify the corporate name of Georgetown University, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16940. An act to amend the provisions of the act of April 8, 1935, relating to the board of trustees of Trinity College of Washington, D.C.; and

H.J. Res. 838. Joint resolution to give effect to the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Character, approved at Beirut in 1948.

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

H.R. 203. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases;

H.R. 6958. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data-processing system; and

H.R. 16008. An act to amend the charter of Southeastern University of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 16559) entitled "An act 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," 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. PELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. NELSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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. 2393) entitled "An act to authorize additional GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions for use in agencies or functions created or

substantially expanded after June 30, 1965."

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

S. 212. An act to designate a navigation lock and flood control structure of the central and southern Florida flood control project in the State of Florida as the W. P. Franklin Lock and Control Structure; and

S. 3830. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT, TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 17607

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight tonight to file a report to accompany H.R. 17607.

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

There was no objection.

TO AMEND SECTION 2056 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATING TO THE EFFECT OF DISCLAIMERS ON THE ALLOW- ANCE OF MARITAL DEDUCTION FOR ESTATE TAX PURPOSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 483) to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowance of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes, 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 2, strike out all after line 3 over to and including line 5 on page 3 and insert:

"(A) if the disclaimer of such interest is made by such person before the date prescribed for the filing of the estate tax return and if such person does not accept such interest before making the disclaimer, such interest shall, for purposes of this section, be considered as passing from the decedent to the surviving spouse, and

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

Page 3, strike out lines 6 to 10, inclusive, and insert:

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to estates of

descendants dying on or after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Page 3, after line 10, insert:

"(c) In the case of the estate of a decedent dying before the date of the enactment of this Act for which the date prescribed for the filing of the estate tax return (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing) occurs on or after January 1, 1965, if, under section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, an interest would, in the absence of a disclaimer by any person other than the surviving spouse, be considered as passing from the decedent to such person, and if a disclaimer of such interest is made by such person and as a result of such disclaimer the surviving spouse is entitled to receive such interest, then such interest shall, for purposes of such section, be considered as passing from the decedent to the surviving spouse, if—

"(1) the interest disclaimed was bequeathed or devised to such person,

"(2) before the date prescribed for the filing of the estate tax return such person disclaimed all bequests and devices under such will, and

"(3) such person did not accept any property under any such bequest or devise before making the disclaimer.

The amount of the deductions allowed under section 2056 of such Code by reason of this subsection, when added to the amount of the deductions allowable under such section without regard to this subsection, shall not exceed the greater of (A) the amount of the deductions which would be allowable under such section without regard to the disclaimer if the surviving spouse elected to take against the will, or (B) an amount equal to one-third of the adjusted gross estate (within the meaning of subsection (c) (2) of such section)."

Page 3, after line 10, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 642(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to disallowance of double deductions) is amended by inserting 'or of any other person' after 'shall not be allowed as a deduction in computing the taxable income of the estate'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act, but only with respect to amounts paid or incurred, and losses sustained, after such date."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowance of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes, and for other purposes."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I shall not object, I do so only because I think it might be well to have a brief explanation on this bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as passed by the House on August 11, 1966, H.R. 483 provided for changes in the estate tax treatment of property which passes to a surviving spouse through disclaimer by a beneficiary under a will.

Members of the House will recall that under present law the estate tax marital deduction, in general, permits the deduction of up to one-half of the adjusted gross estate for property passing to a surviving spouse. Thus, under present rules, property passing directly to a surviving spouse under the terms of the decedent's will can qualify for the mari-

tal deduction. Similarly, if the surviving spouse elects to take against the will, that is, to receive her share under the intestacy law of the State rather than under the will, the marital deduction is likewise available under such an election. Present law also provides, however, that the marital deduction does not apply to property passing to a surviving spouse as a result of a disclaimer by a beneficiary under the will in favor of the surviving spouse.

The purpose of H.R. 483, as passed by the House, was to eliminate inequities and discriminatory treatment that results from the present disparate rules in this area. Accordingly, the bill, as approved by the House, would amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code to allow an interest in property which a surviving spouse receives as a result of a disclaimer by a beneficiary under a will to qualify for the marital deduction where certain conditions are met. The House bill applied to estates of decedents for which the date prescribed for filing of the estate tax return occurs on or after January 1, 1965—that is, decedents dying on or after October 1, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, the other body for the most part left intact the provisions of the bill as passed by the House as far as their applicability to estates of decedents dying before the date of enactment of this bill and for which the date prescribed for filing the estate tax return of the decedent occurs on or after January 1, 1965.

The other body added amendments, however, which would apply with respect to decedents dying in the future; that is, on or after the date of enactment of H.R. 483. Under the Senate amendments, for the future, interests passing as the result of partial—as well as of complete—disclaimers could qualify for the marital deduction, and the maximum amount of these interests which may qualify for the marital deduction would be the same as in the case of interests passing to the surviving spouse directly; that is, one-half of the adjusted gross estate. In addition, the Senate amendments would provide that disclaimers with respect to property passing by the laws of intestacy or otherwise, such as insurance or by trust, are to be fully effective for purposes of computing the marital deduction.

The other body also added a provision which, in the case of a trust or any other person, provides that items incurred in the administration of the property of a deceased person may be deducted either by the other person for income tax purposes or by the estate of the deceased for estate tax purposes, but not for both. This provision is necessary in order to prevent a double deduction for such items which has been held to be allowable under recent court interpretation of the present language of the code.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Treasury has indicated that it does not object to the Senate amendments to this bill, and I recommend that the House concur in the amendments.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIRCH SOCIETY TACTICS ADOPTED BY MR. NIXON

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 were no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, nothing illustrates better the ethical bankruptcy of some elements of the Republican Party, and their desperation in pursuit of victory in 1966, than the return to the campaign trail of Richard M. Nixon and the use which Nixon is making of methods which are nationally recognized as the tactics of the John Birch Society.

In the view of the Birch Society and its followers, a political end justifies any political means—including misleading and false propaganda, deception and outright falsehood when expedient.

An Alaska report the other day said Richard Nixon declined to endorse a John Birch Society candidate there. In Oklahoma, several days later, the same Mr. Nixon refused to answer a television newsman when he was asked to explain his presence to support a Birch Society candidate who is opposing me.

Mr. Nixon then proceeded to demonstrate some of the forensic tactics which are the trademark of the Birch Society propagandists.

He made a big appeal for election of Congressmen who will vote to cut off aid to nations dealing with North Vietnam, and told his audience that my opponent would vote in this way, while I had "run away from that one."

This was outright, shameless, unadulterated falsehood, since I have voted twice—on April 26 of 1966 and September 20 of 1966—for a provision to cut off aid to nations trading with or shipping to North Vietnam.

Not content with one deception, Nixon also told a press conference that I "had as much to do with the Arkansas project as Barry Goldwater did with the TVA." The obvious inference was that I had not supported the Arkansas River development program, referred to by the reporter, since Goldwater was not a TVA supporter.

I will deal at some length with this landmark falsehood in a special order; it is too big, and too irresponsible, to treat lightly. Every American should be alerted to the methods being used by Nixon today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

JOHN BIRCHER CONTRIBUTES TO PRESIDENT'S CLUB

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

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

There were no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I hasten to remind the gentleman from Oklahoma that a member of the John Birch Society, within the last 6 or 8 months, contributed \$12,000 to President Johnson's President's Club and we can all assume this political campaign contribution will be used to help elect Democrats.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Surely.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have received no funds myself from the John Birch Society, and my opponent in this race cannot make that statement, I assure you. The gentleman's remarks about the reported President's Club contributions certainly have no bearing whatsoever on the campaign tactics being employed by Mr. Nixon or my opponent. I want no part of the Birch Society myself.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I repeat that the President's Club received a \$12,000 contribution from a very active member of the John Birch Society. Unquestionably the managers of the President's Club will use those funds on behalf of Democratic candidates and the Democratic Party.

DEATH OF MRS. JOHN PHILLIPS, OF RIVERSIDE, CALIF.

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

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

There were no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the House of the death of Dorothy Phillips, the wife of our long-time colleague, John Phillips, from Riverside, Calif. The funeral will be held at Riverside on the 30th of September. There has been a request that no flowers whatsoever be sent, but that any contribution to the Cancer Society of Riverside will be most commendable.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293, on September 20, I was inevitably detained in my district on urgent business and I was unable to vote. Had I been present, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted to support the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 302]

Adair	Gialmo	Moss
Albert	Gilligan	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Grabowski	Murray
Ashley	Gray	Nedzi
Aspinall	Greigg	Nix
Blatnik	Griffiths	O'Brien
Bow	Gurney	O'Konski
Brock	Hagan, Ga.	Olsen, Mont.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Halleck	Philbin
Callaway	Halpern	Pirnie
Carter	Hanna	Poage
Casey	Hansen, Idaho	Pool
Celler	Hansen, Iowa	Powell
Clausen,	Hebert	Rees
Don H.	Hollifield	Reifel
Clevenger	Holland	Reinecke
Collier	Hutchinson	Resnick
Conable	Irwin	Rivers, S.C.
Cooley	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Corbett	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Tex.
Corman	Jones, Mo.	Roncallo
Craley	Jones, N.C.	Roudebush
Cunningham	Keith	St Germain
Daddario	Keogh	Scott
Davis, Ga.	King, N.Y.	Shipley
Dent	Kluczynski	Sikes
Derwinski	Kupferman	Skubitz
Donohue	Landrum	Stanton
Dorn	McClory	Steed
Duncan, Oreg.	McEwen	Stephens
Dyal	McMillan	Sweeney
Edwards, Ala.	McVicker	Teague, Tex.
Edwards, La.	Machen	Toll
Evans, Colo.	Mailliard	Tunney
Farbstein	Martin, Ala.	Tutun
Fascell	Martin, Mass.	Walker, Miss.
Findley	Michel	Weitner
Fino	Miller	White, Idaho
Fisher	Monagan	Whitten
Flynt	Moore	Wilson, Bob
Fogarty	Morrison	Wright
	Morse	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 310 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 923, providing for the consideration of H.R. 15111, a bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 923

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. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed eight hours to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority members of the Committee on Education and labor, 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.

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

Mr. SISK. 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, House Resolution 923 provides an open rule with 8 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15111, a bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty.

To more and efficiently fulfill the goals of the Economic Opportunity Act, we must mobilize a larger portion of our national resources for the conduct of the war on poverty and at the same time be cognizant of the other national commitments and responsibilities. H.R. 15111, as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, comes within the President's budget.

The legislative committee apparently has attempted to take advantage of the experience gained from the more than 1½ year's operation of the war on poverty. The purpose of the 1966 amendments is to take maximum advantage of those programs offering the greatest opportunity for success. In so doing, it is felt that the cycle of poverty can be broken by beginning first with young children. Therefore, the authorization for Operation Headstart has been vastly expanded with its child development and family strengthening program.

I might say also that a substantial increase in the Youth Corps program has been proposed by the present legislation.

It is deemed necessary to encourage the present healthy demand for workers by expanding job training programs. The quickest and most logical road from poverty to prosperity is a good job and hard work.

No war on poverty can be successful unless there is a healthy economy. Never in our Nation's history has there been a more fruitful time to win the war on poverty.

The great human assets sought to be saved by this legislation are so precious they deserve nothing but our best efforts.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I know, there has been no program which has been written into law by Congress in the past 10 or 12 years that has been more controversial than the one that we will be considering this week. I think without exception almost every Member of Congress has found some good and at the same time some bad in the program as it has been administered in the past year and a half. I certainly have been highly critical of some of the administration of the present programs, some of which I believe to be wasteful expenditure of funds.

On the other hand, I think we all have to commend the work that has been done in other areas. As I mentioned earlier, the program of Headstart, the program of the Youth Corps, and the work that has been done in these areas has been generally very helpful, and it seems to me that the committee in its wisdom has attempted to emphasize and to expand those areas of the program which have

proven to be beneficial and which have established a record of which the Congress can be proud.

At the same time, they have severely restricted—in fact they have almost completely cut out—funds for some of those areas in which I believe the greatest waste develops. I am thinking, for example, of some of the demonstration grants. I know from my own experience in the State of California, that many of these demonstration grants have been of questionable value.

As I analyze the bill brought to us today by the Committee on Education and Labor, I am impressed with the consideration and the efforts given by that committee to make this bill conform with what I believe are the interests of the American people.

This bill has gone through some rather agonizing moments in the last year. The Committee on Rules held on this bill probably the most extensive hearings of any piece of legislation. We started our hearings on June 9. We held hearings on June 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, and, finally, on June 29. At those hearings, transcripts were taken and those have been printed.

I believe a number of important matters were brought to the attention of the Congress through those hearings, as well, of course, as at the hearings held by the Committee on Education and Labor. I hope Members will avail themselves of the opportunity to read the report issued by the Committee on Rules upon this resolution.

Some have indicated that this sets a precedent. However, this is not true. The committee simply attempted to outline some of the problems we had in getting full and complete testimony as to whether or not a rule should be granted.

The committee, in its wisdom, on June 29, did grant a rule on this bill calling, as I have indicated before, for 8 hours of debate. I believe it is a matter worthy of consideration by the Congress. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 923 provides an open rule with 8 hours of debate for the consideration of H.R. 15111, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, commonly referred to as the war on poverty. The rule also provides that any majority member of the Education and Labor Committee may call up the bill and control the time; and that any minority member of the committee can control the time of the minority.

You will recall that last Thursday, I made some remarks about the 21-day rule in connection with this measure. For record purposes, I wish to review the same at this time.

H.R. 15111 was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor on June 1.

On June 3 the Rules Committee received a letter from the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee requesting a hearing, "at the earliest possible

date in order that we may seek action on the floor of the House without delay."

Hearings were promptly held on the following dates: June 9, 14, 15, 21, 22, and 23. Hearings were also set on June 27 and 29 in order to give the chairman an opportunity to appear. He did not appear at any time before the Rules Committee.

On June 29 the Rules Committee reported an open rule with 8 hours of debate, as previously mentioned.

Due to the July 4 recess the report accompanying the rule was not available until July 14, at which time it was filed with the rule.

On September 1, more than 1½ months after a rule had been granted, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee filed House Resolution 1014 under the 21-day rule. It was defective and a corrected version was filed on September 2.

As I mentioned last Thursday, this, in my opinion, is not the purpose of the 21-day rule. The House rules provide for the use of the 21-day rule when the Rules Committee has acted adversely or not acted within 21 days. This was not the situation in this instance. The Rules Committee had acted affirmatively.

During the past several weeks, several informal discussions were held between various members of the Rules Committee. I made my position clear that if this measure were brought up under the 21-day rule, that I would raise a point of order, and, if overruled, would attempt to defeat the 21-day rule. I also made it clear that if this measure were brought up under the rule granted by the Rules Committee, that I would support the rule. I am supporting this rule here today. That does not mean that I support the bill as presently written. But I do believe the House should have an opportunity to work its will on this legislation.

Last year after the program had been in existence for some months, the report stated:

It was not possible to completely judge some of the programs of this great new approach to the elimination of poverty because the program is only in its initial stages of operation. It is possible, however, to say at this time that the program as a whole appears to be soundly conceived and that the administration of it is being well and faithfully carried on.

I believe most Members accepted this committee statement in order to give additional time to the program. I personally voted against the bill.

The report this year accompanying H.R. 15111 states as follows:

The Committee on Education and Labor has conducted an extensive investigation into the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended. This investigation extended over a period of approximately 1 year, including hearings in Washington by the committee lasting over 2 weeks, and on-the-spot and field investigations of 79 different programs in 22 States and the District of Columbia.

The investigations included visits to 15 Job Corps conservation and urban training centers. Also included were spot checks on the operation of Neighborhood Youth Corps and intensive investigation of 58 Community Action programs in large cities such as New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Boston and De-

troit and rural communities in North Carolina, Texas, New Mexico, and West Virginia. In fact, the investigation covered the entire range of programs funded under the Economic Opportunity Act.

The committee has spent many hours in open and executive session, and the legislation we present is the result of these extensive deliberations and in-depth investigations.

The extensive minority views take issue with these statements. They state that they submitted the names of numerous witnesses to the committee who they believed should have been heard, but that none were called. They are unable to locate an overall summary or report covering the so-called extensive investigations for which the House heretofore appropriated \$250,000. They feel that some parts of the program are good, that some are bad. Their desire is to work with the majority in an effort to try to make this program successful. They feel that they have not been given the opportunity to do this, which is in their opinion wrong so far as the House is concerned and so far as the people of the United States are concerned, particularly those living in poverty.

In reviewing some of the new programs, it is noted that there is a Nelson-Scheuer program for \$88 million. As best I can determine, this is somewhat of an Adult Neighborhood Corps. Apparently little, if any, information is available as to just what this program contemplates. Another new program is narcotics rehabilitation—\$12½ million. It was only a few weeks ago that we passed a bill which materially changed the law regarding narcotic addicts. After years of study it was determined that they may be sick people and should be treated accordingly. The House gave its approval. I am unable to find any information as to what the Office of Economic Opportunity intends to do with the \$12½ million for this narcotics rehabilitation program. It does not make sense to turn an important subject like this over to OEO without some ground rules or testimony as to what they contemplate doing. They could use the English system and provide narcotics to addicts, which the experts in the United States disapprove of. They could defeat what those of experience in this field are trying to do.

Another new program is personal emergency loans for \$8 million. There is little information as to what is contemplated on this new program.

It appears that problem programs such as the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps are continued with no real improvements. A ceiling has been placed on the number of Job Corps enrollees, but no better controls or guidelines are proposed. The Neighborhood Youth Corps has fathered Neighborhood Adult Corps which has no more guidelines or controls than its parent, and will undoubtedly be subject to the same abuses.

Community action programs, called by many proponents the heart of the war on poverty, are floundering across the country. In many areas, the poor who were to be active participants on community action boards are not permitted

to elect their representatives and OEO refuses to intervene to correct this.

Duplication and working at cross-purposes abounds in two major areas of the program—education and job training. Two examples will suffice: First, the Office of Education partially funds Headstart programs, OEO partially funds the same program. Why is not the whole program placed under the jurisdiction of the Office of Education which has experience in the field and with whom school agencies are used to dealing. Second, why are not the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, both problem programs, along with the proposed Adult Corps, transferred to the Department of labor, which has experience in the field of job training and manpower development? Why the duplication and overlap? Why are not experienced Federal agencies utilized instead of creating new ones?

An editorial in the July 7 issue of the Glendale News-Press in my district sets forth their opinion of the poverty program:

POVERTY WAR STILL BUNGLING

The assertion of Sargent Shriver, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, that poverty will be eliminated in the United States in 10 years is another unfortunate statement that can only raise false hope.

It is visionary and cruel to intimate that the so-called war on poverty as presently constituted will eliminate poverty in the foreseeable future.

Also, if there were ever a Federal program that could be held up as an example of waste it is the current so-called war against poverty. It is crying for an investigation and corrections.

In the two years the "war" has been conducted a large proportion of the \$2.3 billion spent has been literally dissipated for no good purpose and has not helped the poor proportionately. Unless the program is altered drastically, the same will be true of the \$1.7 billion proposed for next year.

It is outrageous to know that communities have been declared "pockets of poverty" without logic and against their wills. How salaries aggregating \$53.5 million annually for a towering and overpopulated bureaucracy help the poor is hard to fathom.

The costs of enrollees and graduates from the programs is a flagrant waste of national resources. Overhead for the average Job Corps participant, for example, is \$22,000 a year which is nearly enough to send 10 young persons to a quality college. This is a mild example.

Poverty funds have been used to stage anti-social plays, finance demonstrations, haul stalled cars of the poor from freeways, gone into the pockets of children of well-to-do families and even paid adults who refuse to attend training classes.

At best the so-called war on poverty is an ill-conceived, crash program with political overtones. At the worst it is a political pork barrel that is a disgrace to good government.

Patchwork or piecemeal amendments to the present program will not correct the abuses. What is needed is an entirely new law with new guidelines, new priorities and a new respect for the taxpayer's dollar.

There is merit to the suggestion that most of the OEO programs should be shifted to other existing federal agencies, such as the Department of Education or the Department of Labor.

Unless the emphasis and the management of the present "War on Poverty" is changed, the only possibility in 10 years is that the

average taxpayer will be eligible for the program.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that every Member of this great legislative body would like to eliminate all poverty. But I doubt very much that this bill will accomplish that desire. I hope it can be appropriately amended so that the bad parts can be eliminated and the good parts made even better.

I support the rule, Mr. Speaker, and urge its adoption. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There were no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress again takes up its continued war against the Nation's poverty and its program to aid destitute families throughout the Nation to enjoy some of the Nation's abundance and prepare their children for future citizenship. The Committee on Education and Labor has devoted many weeks on meetings, on hearings, investigations, and checkup on operations of this program which was only started by our Government a year and a half ago.

Vice President HUMPHREY pointed out recently that our appropriations with regard to the poverty program are similar to the money our society spends on cancer research. Poverty is like a cancer in our society and any program initiated cannot cure all of the problems which are confronting us in a society as complicated as ours.

One of the most significant accomplishments of our poverty program has been the creation of community action agencies. These agencies are representative of the groups which are affected—namely poor people—and from my viewpoint they are important because about 50 percent or more of their work is devoted to the education of young people under programs such as Headstart and Upward Bound programs.

The direction of this mammoth and complex program is fortunately under the leadership of a dedicated American possessing the experience and ability to organize and withstand criticism, political, and otherwise, to which a mammoth operation of this type could be an easy victim. Very few Americans would have the heart and the stability and the mental fortitude to survive a complex operation of this nationwide magnitude.

People who have investigated the operations of this program and who are convinced that our Nation's poverty must be lessened and curtailed, without exception, pay tribute to Sargent Shriver and his assistants who have succeeded in successfully launching the poverty program. We all realize that in the first few years of this program mistakes will be made by the leaders. Correcting these mistakes has been done by

the experienced leaders who are gradually streamlining the program into an efficient and well-functioning undertaking.

Recently the Reader's Digest edited a five-page article on the great success of the "Headstart for America's Youngsters." I wish to incorporate at this point several paragraphs from this long article commanding the early success of the Headstart program:

Last summer, when most American preschool children were at home, more than half a million youngsters from poverty-stricken families were congregating in schoolhouses in such widely varying places as Indian reservations, Harlem slums, the backwoods hollows of Appalachia, and the Delta country of Mississippi.

Parents shared the impression that their children had benefited from the program. An analysis of teacher interviews with 10,000 parents showed that 87 percent believed that their children had improved in deportment and self-confidence; 96 percent reported a heightened interest in new things. And parent involvement was equally impressive. Tens of thousands served as volunteers, doing everything from preparing meals and shepherding the children on field trips to making toys and instructing the kids in games. They often became as excited about learning as did their children.

In Cleveland, with 4,383 children in the program, some 8,000 parents attended meetings; in New York, where 26,000 were enrolled, two-thirds of the parents came to meetings and classes. One parent-coordinator reported: "We made more progress with the parents in 6 weeks than we had been able to make in 4 years."

Of all the programs in the war on poverty, Project Headstart has involved the largest number of individuals, aroused the greatest enthusiasm at the grassroots level and caused the least controversy. Headstart is being continued on a permanent basis, with programs throughout the academic year and another large project scheduled for next summer.

Clearly, the program has made an auspicious beginning at one of the most inspiring tasks an enlightened nation can undertake: launching its youngest and most needy citizens on an upward spiral to preliminary education and the good life.

Had this program for kindergarten children been launched 30 years ago the Nation would have less crime and relief rolls in 1966.

The Headstart program is but one of several great undertakings which include urban and rural community action program, expanded job training, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and basic education for adults.

Twelve million dollars set aside for aid to drug addicts and youngsters who are exposed to dope and drugs of various categories, along with several other projects all tending to relieve our Nation of poverty of millions of unfortunate families throughout our land.

I hope this legislation to curtail American poverty, crime, and suffering is passed by a large majority.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a newspaper article from the Gary, Ind., Post Tribune setting out

the success of a few programs in connection with the Lake County, Indiana's Economic Opportunity projects in my congressional district:

TWO SUCCESSFUL ANTIPOVERTY PROJECTS EXTENDED BY LCEOC UNTIL JANUARY

CROWN POINT.—Two antipoverty projects, one in Gary and one in East Chicago, have been extended by the Lake County Economic Opportunity Council until Jan. 31, 1967.

"Operation Jobs," begun in Gary as a summer project by the Gary Urban League, and a tutoring project in the East Chicago schools, operated by Catholic charities, are the two programs.

Both are considered successful and will probably be considered for expansion to other areas of the county when 1967 programs are considered later this year.

Both Gary and Hammond have asked to be included in an expanded tutoring project, according to Robert J. Carlson, LCEOC's assistant director.

"Operation Jobs" makes use of persons from poverty areas in an effort to contact individuals who need jobs.

The Gary Aid to Dependent Children Mother's Club and several acknowledged "gang leaders" have been used in the canvass with remarkable success, according to George Coker, Gary Urban League's staff director.

From July 26 through Aug. 5, the project contacted 1,362 persons who needed work. Many were referred to employment and training agencies. A total of 256 were sent to the on-the-job training program and 150 were accepted.

Of the 31 referrals to the Gary Neighborhood Youth Corps, 14 were accepted immediately. Three of the seven referred to the city of Gary are working and several hundred others were given a chance for job training in various projects.

It will cost \$34,500 to keep the jobs program going and \$8,350 for the tutoring project.

Proposals to expand these programs and to operate all other community action and anti-poverty projects in 1967 must be in the LCEOC's Hammond headquarters by Sept. 1.

Carlson asked for one-page outlines of the intended program and budget for each project.

Any organization, including the LCEOC's neighborhood action councils and area councils, or groups like the Urban League and Catholic charities, can make a proposal.

The LCEOC meeting in September will include a review and decision on all the proposals. Applications for those that are approved will be written in October and given to LCEOC for a final decision in November.

All 1967 program applications must be submitted to the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) for funding approval at least 75 days before the LCEOC's new program year beginning Feb. 1, Carlson emphasized.

After Dec. 1, the LCEOC staff will begin working with area school systems in planning Operation Headstart for next summer. Some 1,900 children were enrolled in that program this summer in nine school systems in Lake County.

Beginning Feb. 1, 1967, the staff will work on special summer projects, like "Operation Decision," "Operation Jobs" and the school summer recreation program, now being offered.

With all LCEOC programs fitting within a specified program year, officials hope to eliminate the necessity for quick decisions that hampered preparation of this year's Headstart and summer programs.

To accomplish this, the deadlines for 1967 program proposals must be met, Carlson said.

MR. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

MR. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think it is perhaps at least of historical interest to note that when the so-called ad hoc subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor met on Tuesday, March 8, 1966, 6 months ago, the chairman of that committee opened the hearing with these words—and I am quoting now from the first volume of the hearings on this bill:

The ad hoc subcommittee is sitting today, and will continue to sit until it is finished with the testimony that we hope will be as brief as possible, so we can get the show on the road before the full committee, with the expectation of having this legislation on the floor the week after the Easter recess.

Well, as I have indicated, 6 months have passed since those words were spoken.

Apparently a funny thing must have happened on the way to the floor of the House of Representatives.

A week ago, on September 19, along, I presume, with other Members of the House of Representatives, I received a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor which enclosed a report which is entitled "The Summary of the Report of the Investigative Task Force of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee of the War on Poverty Program." This is a mimeographed document of about 41 pages with a lot of blank spaces, I might add, and for totally unexplained reason this report could not be made available to the Rules Committee when we conducted our hearings some months ago, nor could it be made available to the other Members of this body until just a week ago Monday, even though, you will note, it bears a date of March 1, 1966.

It purports to be a summary of that investigation, an investigation for which this House has to date authorized \$250,000.

I mention that for this reason, that in the letter of transmittal that accompanies the so-called investigative report, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee makes what I regard as the perfectly astonishing statement:

This report, along with the newspaper series on the war on poverty which I placed in the Record during the subcommittee hearings this past March, should give you a comprehensive picture of the war on poverty.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of this House, exercising their responsibilities as legislators, are going to base their legislative judgment to authorize a \$1,750 million on this report and on a series of newspaper articles which the chairman put in the Record 6 months ago, I submit that we are not doing our duty to the American people.

You know, we were told—and this was told to us, I think, by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIEL]—that this bill was drafted in closed caucuses of the Democratic majority of that committee, and that when some 67 witnesses were

asked to be called, that the answer given by the chairman when the request was denied was—"Well, the reason they are not being called is because I am the chairman."

This is the kind of treatment that this bill had in the Committee on Education and Labor, and you have already heard from my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], as to the less than satisfactory treatment that the Rules Committee received in its effort to bring out the facts surrounding this expensive and controversial piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, let us consider for just a moment the context in which we consider this bill today.

The headlines of our Washington newspaper this morning said:

Two Johnson Aides See Tax Rise Likely.

The lead story goes on to say that—

Treasury Secretary Fowler regards it "as certainly within the realm of probability that we will have an increase in personal income taxes."

Secretary Connor waxes even a little bolder and says that for some time he has favored higher taxes to combat inflation.

Mr. Speaker, once again we have begun to hear the very carefully modulated orchestration of administration spokesmen who are composing what must be for them a new tune, this time the tune of fiscal responsibility. They are talking about the necessity of having revenues balance expenditures.

Well, you know, this tune that they are composing is not very new to John Q. Public. He recognizes it, I am sure, as that old Democratic melody of "The Taxpayer Blues."

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are going to be following closely developments in this Chamber this week. They are going to be listening to the debate as it develops and unfolds on this bill. They are going to be seeking an answer to this question: Does not fiscal responsibility also mean that programs like the poverty program should require the most searching analysis and careful evaluation so that we know for a certainty that the taxpayer is getting full value?

Sure, we can spend \$2.3 billion and spread it around the country and do some good. Nobody is going to be foolish enough to challenge that statement. But are we getting dollar for dollar the kind of value and administration which we have a right to expect when the American people are being confronted with the imminent possibility of an increase in taxes?

To turn just a moment again to this very curious document, which is called an investigative report. To be sure, there are some very interesting tidbits here.

Mr. Speaker, this report of the investigative task force is filled with interesting little tidbits of information—witness the fact that the Los Pinos Job Corps Camp is situated only one-half mile from a nudist camp in California, but for some reason it does not discuss the serious

charge that the Government leased a rundown old hotel at disadvantageous terms in West Virginia—that is, to everyone but the owner of the hotel.

In its "General analysis" section this report comes to the astonishing conclusion that:

Generally the Job Corps is operating efficiently and effectively.

One wonders therefore why the chairman in his list of amendments feels it necessary to suggest a cutback to a goal of 45,000 enrollees by June 30, 1967. Gone apparently is the first blush of optimism which talked about 100,000 in the Job Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that with the recent announcement by the Secretary of Defense of the intention to lower draft eligibility standards to salvage about 40,000 young men who would otherwise be rejected because of mental and physical deficiencies that title I of this bill needs a whole new look by the Congress.

To turn to title II, the section on community action programs, I am shocked to read the short four-sentence paragraph of the investigative report on HARYO-ACT in New York City which as of January 1, 1966, had been funded to the extent of \$12,115,586.

All it says with respect to the well-publicized charges of irregularity is that they are under investigation by the Department of Justice and the New York County district attorney so "therefore further investigations by the task force have been postponed, pending the outcome of the above-mentioned investigations." That scarcely provides the kind of information this House needs to make an enlightened judgment.

I think despite the sketchy nature of the report about which I have been talking the very last sentence in it manages to encapsulate what has been wrong with this program:

The reorientation of the whole war on poverty into a program of education, training, and jobs through which the unemployed could be put to work doing some of those things which are not now being done in many American communities—this would be the first order of business.

While there are some interesting tidbits like that, this report does not begin to illustrate, at least in my mind, what justification this administration has to come before this Congress and ask for the kind of increased funds they are asking for today.

I supported the resolution in the Rules Committee, and my support of the resolution today is predicated on the hope and expectation that, during the week of debate that we hope to devote to this bill, we will give the kind of searching consideration to the amendments that will be offered to make this a better program than it is today.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we all have sympathy for the poor and would like to see their lot improved.

But, I am just as sure that we will disagree in our definition of the words, "the poor," and, therefore, in our estimate of how many Americans are poor. Further

we will most certainly disagree about what can be and should be done to help those who, for one reason or another, are not able to help themselves.

My purpose in rising is not to dwell in any great detail on the duplications of other established programs, the confused administration, and the abuses that have arisen under poverty programs. Others will no doubt go fully into these weaknesses.

In passing, however, I would like to note briefly a few reports that have come to me on the way the Headstart program is operated in my State. I realize that the Headstart program is generally regarded as the show case project of the war on poverty, and maybe it is in your State. I note that throughout the Midwest, the East, and the Far West, the Headstart grants were made to responsible school people, either the local school board or a parochial school. But that is not how it operates in my State.

A few token grants have been made to responsible public or private school officials, but \$7½ million was granted this past year in my State to a tiny Negro junior college that had not seen \$75,000 at any one time before it was touched by the wand of the Fairy Godfather in Washington. The grant to this tiny institution of funds for Headstart centers in almost half of the counties of my State was, of course, a subterfuge, a gimmick, to get around the Governor's veto. The real grantee, who acts as the college's subcontractor, is an organization called the Child Development Group of Mississippi. It was organized and is controlled by a militant civil rights group located at Mount Beulah near Edwards, Miss., and staffed by out-of-State ministers with records of extreme leftwing activities. The Mount Beulah center not only fathered the CDGM, but also in conjunction with SNICK the invasion of the Greenville Air Force Base, several wild demonstrations here in Washington, the demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention in 1964, a demonstration against our State legislature in special session to liberalize our voting laws so that anyone who could read and write could register, and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. You will recall that this last group's Communist and Communist-front lawyers attempted to deprive the State of Mississippi of any representation in this Congress.

Knowing that background of the behind-the-scenes group pulling the puppet strings, neither you nor I should be surprised to find that the Headstart funds in Mississippi have in a very large measure been used to subsidize, with the taxpayers' money, the most militant advocates and adherents of black power.

This indirect subsidy was apparent most recently during the Meredith march, when Headstart trucks were used to haul marchers and Headstart centers fed them. Actually, it became apparent from the first grant to CDGM. In Hattiesburg, Miss., a Negro school teacher with some graduate work applied for employment and was told by the Mount Beulah organizer that she would not be hired because she had not taken part in civil rights activities.

Also, the stories one hears of fiscal irresponsibility in the Headstart program in my area should surprise no one. For example, I get reports from my home county of grocery bills of over \$500 for one center several times a week. I hear that quantities of fresh meat are purchased on Fridays, presumably for the employees to carry home for the weekend. I am told of Headstart purchases of cigarettes.

I repeat that this is not surprising when the Headstart program is set up by two outsiders without consulting any responsible county official. A newsman with our local paper telephoned the mayors, the school superintendents, the health department, and the welfare office, and though the program was nearly 2 years old, only the welfare officials knew about it. The newsman interviewed a consultant sent by the CDGM itself to evaluate the program, and she reported "squalor, apathy, and disorganization causing a waste of effort and money." She was reported further as saying, "This project needs the help of the white community there." The next day the officials of the project denied the squalor charge and jealously rebuffed any assistance or involvement of the white community in the self-segregated project.

This leads me to wonder, further, Mr. Speaker, if this approach does not make the supposed beneficiaries even more dependent, this time upon a new form of paternalism. I ask you, my friends, does this approach not actually destroy initiative and lead to the apathy noted by the Headstart consultant in my hometown?

INFLATION

Mr. Speaker, a broader consideration that concerns me deeply is the effect of all of this Federal spending for programs like the war on poverty on the economy of the country at a time when it is being called on to support a very real war in Vietnam. I am concerned about the effect on the poor and those who live on a fixed income of the continued policy of pump-priming by the Federal Government, the continued nonessential spending that feeds the fires of inflation, that helps push prices higher and higher, that increases the cost of living to the poor and to us all. I venture to say that no person within this membership has waved the warning flag against inflation as much as I over the past 20 years.

You have heard me say time and time again that communism is not America's greatest enemy. Instead, I have contended that inflation would be the first destroyer of this our great common country. I have repeatedly pointed out on the floor of this House that the Communists want neither war nor peace. Their main purpose, in my humble judgment, is to conquer this country, as they have conquered others, by the simple procedure of bleeding us white in the destruction of our economy. They would accomplish this here as elsewhere through fear, infiltration by prodding us into bankruptcy, and taking over in the resultant confusion of chaos and hunger.

I again call your attention to the fact that the first line of security of this Nation is not how many nuclear subs, jet

bombers, and so forth we have, but the solvency of the American dollar. Once the financial stability of the Nation is lost we have lost everything, and we will not be able to help anybody.

Washington urged that we "cherish public credit." He said:

One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible.

In his farewell address, he said:

Avoid likewise the accumulation of debt not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in times of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.

Now our President tells us that the extent of our inflation is less than other industrial countries of the free world, and for us not to worry about it. This is the same as the doctor telling me that I have high blood pressure and that if I do not slow down, I will have a fatal heart attack. To which I reply, "But, Doc, you should make my neighbor take it easy. His blood pressure is higher than mine and I am not going to slow down until he does." In the end, we both end up just as dead.

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the problem of poverty is not more Federal spending, for that only adds fuel to the flames of inflation. The way to help the poor as well as the country generally is to put our fiscal house in order.

Among other objections I have to this bill renewing the poverty program at an additional cost of \$1 1/4 billion is this inflationary side effect. On March 19, 1952, in the well of this House, worried as I was then about this deficit spending and resultant inflation, I laid down a blueprint for Members of Congress to follow.

I thought it appropriate then. I think it is appropriate now. It is as follows:

First. Our legislative committees, as well as committees on appropriations, must cease reporting out bills except those which are absolutely essential to our economy and national defense.

Second. Every member of this body must recognize that the objective of balancing the budget is his most important assignment.

Third. Sectionalism, partisan politics, responsiveness to highly organized minorities, must give way to the national need for a sound financial policy.

Fourth. Every dollar appropriated must be considered as carefully as if it were coming out of the pockets of the Members themselves, as indeed the Members' proportionate share is.

Fifth. Our congressional committees, particularly the appropriation committees, must be staffed with an adequate staff of experts equal in efficiency to the staffs of the various governmental agencies who appear before them seeking appropriations.

Sixth. The Congress and the country must recognize that financial solvency is as important as military might in preparing ourselves against any potential foreign aggressor, a fact which our military captains should be made to understand.

Seventh. Our foreign friends must be made to understand that there is a limit to the resources of America.

Eighth. The system of permitting the carry-over of unspent funds from the current fiscal year into the new year must be abandoned. A meticulous study of the 1,200

pages of the President's budget this year will show that the carry-over of unspent funds from the current fiscal year will exceed \$60,000,000,000.

Ninth. The procurement of military requirements, which constitute more than 50 percent of our expenditures, must be placed in the hands of trained civilians who appreciate the value of the dollar.

Tenth. And finally, the citizens of the Republic, now conscious as never before of the burdens of taxation, must practice the doctrine of States' responsibility as well as States' rights. The practice of looking to Washington for Federal aid in civil responsibilities of their own must cease. They must realize that there is no State, county, or city whose financial statement is not sounder than that of the Federal Government

In the name of the founding fathers who gave the country its birth, in the name of the untold thousands who have died to preserve it, in the name of free peoples everywhere, I beseech you to save the Nation from bankruptcy and thus perpetuate this, the most glorious form of free government ever conceived by the minds of men.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, this will be a long and, we hope, a complete debate on the poverty legislation. Those of us on this side of the aisle do not intend to oppose the rule, because we think it is long overdue that the Congress of the United States consider the poverty legislation in detail and have an opportunity to debate its merits and to make changes in it. We intend to offer a variety of amendments which will be constructive in their purport in order to try to redirect this program that we think is desperately in need of redirection. We have our concern at the lack of consideration in depth in the committee. We have our concern, as has been mentioned by some of the previous speakers, at the lack of full consideration with witnesses who could be critical and constructively critical and make a report that could be helpful to this Congress. However, we will go along with a rule today, because this is the only way, in our opinion, that this House can have an opportunity to debate the poverty program this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as an example of the kind of thing we have developed on our own and which we have been working to correct, let me cite what I call the million-dollar poverty fuddle. This is a quote from the chief engineer hired by Con Am Corp., which was given a million-dollar contract to evaluate Job Corps sites:

The most frustrating experience of my business life, says the Chief Con Am Engineer.

And I quote him further:

From the outset the Con Am situation was confused and at times completely ineffective. It was apparent OEO was not equipped to effectively guide a program of feasibility studies and rehabilitation of Job Corps Center Facilities.

These are the words of Mr. Dan Miller, the chief engineer hired especially by Con Am to supervise their million-dollar poverty contract. On August 11 the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I revealed that OEO had arbitrarily chosen Con Am to evaluate Job Corps sites, although Con Am did not meet

OEO's own specifications, and at least four qualified firms were available.

Coincidentally, a contribution to the President's Club and the Democratic Party was made by the senior vice president of Con Am. The contract with Con Am was recently terminated and totaled \$1,350,000.

In January 1965 Con Am hired Mr. Dan Miller as their chief engineer on this poverty contract. Mr. Miller in a sworn affidavit continues as follows:

It was apparent to me the selection of several sites were politically motivated (Kanawha Hotel, Charleston, West Virginia; Camp Rodman, Massachusetts; and Camp Atterbury, Indiana). Despite Con Am reports recommending abandonment of several sites, OEO disregarded these recommendations and proceeded with contract awards. William Hobbs, on several occasions, indicated he had been instructed by OEO to pass favorably upon sites, which in the opinion of competent engineers, were not as suitable as alternate sites would have been.

Con Am eventually built a staff of approximately 60 people. Mr. Hobbs, in the Spring of 1965, attempted to conceal the activities of certain personnel from me; however, I was generally aware these people were working on matters other than OEO business and their salaries and travel expenses were being vouchered for payment with OEO funds.

In the Spring of 1965, Hobbs hired a retired military Colonel (name not recalled) who was assigned to matters not involving OEO. This man came to me after about two months and expressed concern that he was signing OEO vouchers and receiving OEO checks. The Colonel feared a Congressional investigation would divulge this situation and his career and reputation would be jeopardized. This individual resigned because of this fear.

I am convinced an audit of reimbursement costs on the Con Am contract would reveal a number of these irregularities.

Mr. Miller summed up the situation in these words:

In my professional opinion, Con Am was not equipped to perform this service satisfactorily and I feel subsequent developments confirmed this. The Con Am project was the most frustrating experience of my business life. I became very much interested in the theory and philosophy of the Job Corps Program and felt the program was being jeopardized by OEO bureaucracy and political favoritism.

Mr. Miller is a respected and distinguished engineer who was acclaimed by Con Am officials as a well-qualified man. After his brief frustration with Government waste and boondoggle he returned to private employment at a high level of responsibility. I have requested GAO to make a full investigation of the Con Am contract.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD at this point Mr. Miller's full sworn affidavit.

The affidavit referred to follows:

MONTEREY PARK, HIGHLANDS, CALIF.,
March 1, 1966.

To Whom It May Concern:

On January 17 and 26, 1966, I, Dan Miller, furnished the following voluntary information to John R. Buckley who identified himself to me as a staff investigator, Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the War on Poverty, Education and Labor Committee, United States House of Representatives. No promises or rewards were made by Mr. Buckley in connection with this matter.

I am a graduate engineer (C E Degree Penn State) and have been engaged in the management of construction and heavy engineering projects for more than thirty years.

Late in 1964, I was aware William Hobbs, Senior Vice President, Consolidated American Services, Inc. (ConAm), California, was negotiating with Milton Fogelman, Contract Officer, The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), concerning a contract to provide engineering services to OEO in connection with feasibility studies and resident engineer services for anti-poverty Job Corps sites and centers. At that time, ConAm had no staff or personnel equipped to provide such a service. ConAm's principal service had been the cleaning of equipment and facilities at missile bases and providing janitorial services. I subsequently discovered several competent firms were in competition for the contract, including the reputable engineering firms Ralph M. Parsons, Inc. and Daniel, Mann, Johnson and Mendenhall of Los Angeles, California, and several Eastern engineering firms. These firms possessed the experience, personnel, background and capabilities to do an effective job of surveying and designing rehabilitation of facilities to be used for Job Corps Training Centers. In my professional opinion, ConAm was not equipped to perform this service satisfactorily and I feel subsequent developments confirmed this. It is my understanding ConAm was awarded the contract New Year's Eve, 1965.

Early in January, 1966, I was contacted by ConAm officials and offered the position Chief Engineer of the OEO project. After salary negotiations, I agreed to take the job, transferred to Washington, D.C., and commenced hiring a staff nucleus comprised of competent, experienced engineers from the Los Angeles, California, area. William Hobbs, Senior Vice President, ConAm, was in charge of the Washington, D.C., operation.

From the outset, the ConAm situation was confused and at times completely ineffective. It was apparent OEO was not equipped to effectively guide a program of feasibility studies and rehabilitation of Job Corps Center facilities. It was apparent to me the selection of several sites were politically motivated (Kanawha Hotel, Charleston, West Virginia; Camp Rodman, Massachusetts; and Camp Atterbury, Indiana). Despite ConAm reports recommending abandonment of several sites, OEO disregarded these recommendations and proceeded with contract awards. William Hobbs, on several occasions, indicated he had been instructed by OEO to pass favorably upon sites, which in the opinion of competent engineers, were not as suitable as alternate sites would have been.

ConAm eventually built a staff of approximately 60 people. Mr. Hobbs, in the Spring of 1965, attempted to conceal the activities of certain personnel from me; however, I was generally aware these people were working on matters other than OEO business and their salaries and travel expenses were being vouchered for payment with OEO funds. In this regard, John Heintzelman (phonetic), a former associate of Hobbs' at North American Aviation headed a staff of several technical procedural people who spent a substantial amount of their time working on Department of Defense proposals. An employee named Hobbie, an ex-North American Aviation employee, was occupied on matters other than OEO business and his salary and travel expenses were charged to OEO.

In the Spring of 1965, Hobbs hired a retired military Colonel (name not recalled) who was assigned to matters not involving OEO. This man came to me after about two months and expressed concern that he was signing OEO vouchers and receiving OEO checks. The Colonel feared a Congressional investigation would divulge this situation and his career and reputation would be jeopardized. This individual resigned because of this fear.

I am convinced an audit of reimbursement costs on the ConAm contract would reveal a number of these irregularities.

I was personally knowledgeable that ConAm personnel wrote the proposals for the Huntington, West Virginia, Women's Job Corps Center and feel Hobbs guided the contract award to Basic Systems, Inc., a subsidiary of Xerox Corporation. Xerox representatives spent several days in the ConAm office and Hobbs made it a point not to introduce me to them or explain their presence. This was irregular because OEO was paying the salaries of the ConAm people preparing the proposal and I feel it constituted a Conflict of Interest on ConAm's part.

During the Summer of 1965, relations between Hobbs and I became strained. Hobbs commenced releasing the Los Angeles area engineers and replacing them with retired military officers who were not equipped to do an effective job. Reports and recommendations of ConAm engineers were being disregarded by OEO. I protested these developments to Hobbs but he gave me little or no satisfaction. I was eased out of the operation late in the Summer of 1965.

The ConAm project was the most frustrating experience of my business life. I became very much interested in the theory and philosophy of the Job Corps Program and felt the program was being jeopardized by OEO bureaucracy and political favoritism.

In the event my testimony is required at a hearing or any type legal proceeding, I will be a willing witness provided the scheduling does not seriously interfere with my business schedule and I am reimbursed for reasonable expenses incurred.

DAN K. MILLER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, this is just one example of many that have been developed and documented with sworn testimony as to what is going on in this poverty program, and we hope we can redirect the program in the consideration of this proposed legislation.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There were no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, as we finally get the so-called poverty bill before us for action, I just want to say that I have not seen worse handling of a piece of legislation in the Committee on Education and Labor or in any other committee of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, to start with, I believe such a controversial program, such an expensive program, about which people all over the country were wondering, would require complete hearings before our committee. Not one witness requested by the minority, however, was permitted to testify.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the witnesses we requested were not just individuals who would be condemning the program. They were, on the most part, individuals who had the responsibility of conducting these programs at the local or field level.

Mr. Speaker, not one expert witness who one would expect to hear about such a program has testified before our committee.

Mr. Speaker, in the hearings which were held by the Committee on Rules, on page 112 of part III, I had placed in the record the names of individuals who either wanted to testify—and if you will look over these and if you can secure a copy thereof, you will see that these were truly experts who could have helped in developing legislation, which would have enabled us to put the so-called war on poverty on the road to help the poorer people of the country.

But, instead, we have seen the malfunctioning of OEO and many of its programs, all the way from the Director down through to many of the field areas and in the local cities, where the programs are operating poorly.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is not another program which is operated by the Federal Government that is malfunctioning as badly.

So, Mr. Speaker, the House is now to take action in the extension and amendment of the war on poverty. I had hoped that we would be able to get this bill before us in time so that the House could send it back to the committee and require it to do its job as is expected of a legislative committee.

Now, of course, at this late hour we have the decision of whether we are going to send it back to the committee so that the committee can conduct hearings as it should and call the proper witnesses and engage in debate and the amending process which would bring forward a better bill than this. But, there just is not the time to do that and we will have to spend our time in the House trying to make the corrections here so that the program can function better in future years.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] made the statement that some 67 witnesses were not called to testify because the chairman of the committee said, "I am the chairman and that is the reason they are not going to be called."

I wonder where the chairman is today with debate opening on this bill and how much interest he has in it today. I understand that he did not answer the quorum call.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that I believe in the words, "I am my brother's keeper," but I do not know where he is.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman does not aspire to the role of being his brother's keeper in this case.

Mr. QUIE. It would be most difficult in this case.

Also this House appropriated \$200,000 to investigate the so-called war on poverty. After the investigation had terminated, one would expect the results of the investigation would be before our committee as it studied the legislation, but they were not all made available.

We did not hear anything on a final report until a few days ago on the investigation, 6 months after it should have been completed and some of the individual reports that have been made in it are about a year old.

In fact when we first began the investigation, the criticisms made by Members of this House and by the press were all bundled up and shipped down to the Office of Economic Opportunity for them to answer. I have not heard anything from that since.

Also, there was never a thorough investigation of OEO, the national office itself. The money, \$50,000 that has been appropriated for the study of the Office of Education, already has done more than all of the study here of OEO. The education study handled by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has provided a more thorough investigation and examination of its activities in the education field than we ever saw in the \$200,000 poverty investigation.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution and I move the previous question in the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. GIBBONS. 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. 303]

Adair	Fisher	Morrison
Albert	Flynt	Morse
Ashley	Fogarty	Moss
Aspinwall	Gaimo	Murphy, N.Y.
Blatnik	Gilligan	Murray
Boland	Griffiths	Nedzi
Bow	Gurney	Nix
Brock	Hagan, Ga.	O'Konski
Callaway	Halleck	Olsen, Mont.
Carter	Hanna	Philbin
Casey	Hansen, Iowa	Pirnie
Celler	Hansen, Iowa	Poage
Chamberlain	Harvey, Ind.	Pool
Clausen,	Hébert	Purcell
Don H.	Holifield	Reifel
Clevenger	Hosmer	Reinecke
Collier	Hutchinson	Rivers, S.C.
Conable	Irwin	Rogers, Colo.
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Tex.
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Roncalio
Corbett	Jones, Mo.	St Germain
Corman	Jones, N.C.	Scott
Craley	Keogh	Shipley
Cunningham	King, N.Y.	Sickles
Daddario	Kluczynski	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Kupferman	Skubitz
Derwinski	Landrum	Stephens
Dickinson	McCarthy	Sweeney
Donohue	McClory	Teague, Tex.
Dorn	McEwen	Toll
Duncan, Oreg.	McMillan	Tuck
Dyal	McVicker	Tunney
Edwards, Ala.	Maillard	Walker, Miss.
Edwards, La.	Martin, Ala.	Weltner
Evans, Colo.	Martin, Mass.	White, Idaho
Farbstein	Mathias	White, Tex.
Farnsley	Michel	Whitten
Fascell	Miller	Willis
Findley	Monagan	Wilson, Bob
Fino	Moore	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 312 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. POWELL. 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. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15111 with Mr. BROOKS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [MR. POWELL] will be recognized for 4 hours to control the time for the majority, and the gentleman from Ohio [MR. AYRES] is recognized for 4 hours to control the time for the minority.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [MR. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that many of my colleagues—except for a few like my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [MR. GIBBONS] and myself who have really the least difficult battles in the weeks to come—they have to prepare themselves—we on this side are going to do everything we can do expeditiously in the course of debate, however, under no circumstances do we intend to be arbitrary when we reach the 5-minute rule. Thus all of our colleagues may have an opportunity to advance their views.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that despite any personal differences that may have existed between our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [MR. GIBBONS]—to whom, at his own request, I gave the authorship of this bill, and who has done a remarkably difficult job in moving this bill along—I wish to announce that on this side we are in complete unanimity.

The Bible says, "It does not appear what it shall be."

So, Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks I would like to make.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to explain the purpose of H.R. 15111, a bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty—the 1966 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

In my 22 years in the Congress, I have seen no Federal program more exposed to the heartless glare of daily publicity than the war on poverty.

During the past 697 days of its infant existence, the war on poverty has lived in a fishbowl of public scrutiny in each one of the thousands of hamlets, cities, and counties which have a com-

munity action program, a Job Corps, a Neighborhood Youth Corps, a work experience program, an Operation Headstart, a legal services project, VISTA, a Small Business Development Center, a migrant workers training program, a basic adult education program, or a rural loans program for farmers.

Because of the war on poverty's program complexity and attendant differences of opinion on the success of some of these programs, I have provided every Member of the House with four things:

First, a copy of the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act as amended in 1965.

Second, a short but concise breakdown of the 1966 amendments which total 44. Of these 44 amendments, I proposed 11.

Third, a copy of the ad hoc subcommittee war on poverty investigative report. This report, the result of 6 months of investigations, is a 42-page summary of inspections of 79 programs in 22 States and the District of Columbia. The full reports totaling thousands of pages are available to the Members.

Fourth, a copy of my letter to Chairman GEORGE FALCON, of the Public Works Committee, outlining suggestions for a possible strengthening of the Nation's total war on poverty effort.

The Members should also know that I have sent a letter to Chairman MILLS, of Ways and Means, requesting that he consider appointing his ranking members to a joint legislative task force with the ranking members of Chairman FALCON's and my committee. The enormous output of vital legislation issuing from the Ways and Means Committee which affects the war on poverty should be integrated into our overall legislative program.

In the other body, Senator CLARK has already declared that his subcommittee plans a thorough study and evaluation in the next session of the war on poverty.

My proposal would go beyond such a study and would more efficiently coordinate all of these programs.

Fifth, may I also call the Members' attention to the published report of the hearings held in March this year on the war on poverty.

Not only do these hearings reveal a cornucopia of information from various antipoverty officials, witnesses, and official records, they also contain 124 pages of in-depth newspaper articles, all of which I personally placed in the record, analyzing the war on poverty: a 16-part series by 8 Washington Post reporters; 12-part series by the Christian Science Monitor; a 7-part series by the Cincinnati Inquirer; a 6-part series by the Los Angeles Times; a 5-part series by UPI; a 3-part series by the Associated Press; a 2-part series by the Detroit News and a remarkable article by Nathan Glazer in the New York Times magazine.

I am also confident that every Member here today has read extensive reports and editorials about the war on poverty in his hometown newspaper.

Why do I call attention to these informational outlets?

It is merely to emphasize to the Members the tremendous amount of informa-

tion readily available to them on the operation of this critically important and valuable national program.

Why is the war on poverty valuable?

Is it because of the 50,000 poor people in America now employed by community action programs?

Or the 90,000 people actually placed in jobs through the war on poverty?

Or the 373,800 people who have received or are receiving some form of job training?

Is it because of the 561,000 poor children who have benefited from Operation Headstart in the last year?

Or is it because of the millions of dollars of loans to low-income farmers and small businessmen to get a new start in life?

It is all these reasons and more.

It is the righteous awakening of the forgotten families of America's slums and rural backwoods to help them to help themselves.

It is the new fact of public policy that this Nation can no longer shrug away the suffering of the deprived amongst us.

It is, above all, that highest reaffirmation of man's love for his fellow man—the democratic and Judaic-Christian principles which built our nationhood.

Is the war on poverty for some special interest group? Has it been designed to primarily help one racial group before another?

It has not. There are approximately 30 million poor people in America.

Of that number, 22 percent are Negro.

But the ugliness of poverty is not a respecter of race or color.

There are 182 counties in America where the median family income is below \$750.

These poorest counties are as follows: Georgia, 38; Mississippi, 37; Kentucky, 20; Tennessee, 18; North Carolina, 17; Alabama, 10; Arkansas, 9; South Carolina, 7; Texas, 4; Louisiana, 4; Virginia, 4; New Mexico, 3; North Dakota, 3; Alaska, 2; South Dakota, 2; Oklahoma, 1; Colorado, 1, and West Virginia, 1.

The war on poverty, then, must be a war on poverty, regardless of race, color, or region.

By no means has the war on poverty achieved all its goals.

And though it has been "blown about with every wind of criticism" it is a far cry from the failure its harshest critics would impute to it.

On occasion, I have been a sharp critic. And I have lavishly praised the program for its remarkable accomplishments.

In the last 18 months, I have issued 15 major statements on the war on poverty's program and administration.

I have criticized the war on poverty for requesting and spending too little money. A doubling of its current appropriation to \$3 billion would expedite its success.

I believe we can and we must spend as much money on domestic aid programs as we spend on foreign aid projects.

Furthermore, more poor people should be involved in the day-to-day policymaking decisions and operations. If there is any shortcoming in the program, it is our

legislative failure to spell out precisely the role of the poor.

And, so my criticism of the war on poverty has been "not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved Rome more."

While I speak from a sense of urgency today, an inquiry may arise on the delay in the legislative scheduling for this bill.

My colleagues are aware, I am sure, that the other body has yet to bring this legislation to its floor for debate.

As this body prepares for its own debate, there will be an abundance of charges.

Questions will be raised about high salaries, excessive costs, scandals, so-called mismanagement, and the problems caused by local Job Corps participants.

In every single instance, I am confident our committee members can provide substantial answers and refutations. The amendments we have submitted will demonstrate this.

Where a community has suffered some disorder, let us recognize that in every creative effort, there is an element of disorder.

Let us be aware that the rising costs of the war on poverty can mean a lower crime rate, lower welfare expenditures, and a drop in unemployment.

The war on poverty was not conceived as a powder puff wrist tap to help stable, emotionally balanced middle-class families.

Rather it was inaugurated as an iron-tough crash program to reach out and raise up the hard-core unemployed father, the school dropout, the mother on ADC, the functionally illiterate, the potential teenage criminal hanging out on street corners, the dope addict, the slum-ridden child of despair, and the struggling sharecropper.

The war on poverty is the finest human renewal program America has.

It is the foundation for the guaranteed society—a guarantee that all Americans, whatever their color, their ability, their family background, their region or their place of residence will enjoy every comfort and every blessing this democracy can offer.

Mr. Chairman, may I also call the attention of the Members to the fact that I have just sent a letter to our outstandingly distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS], asking that the gentleman from Arkansas be the chairman, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and myself, with ranking minority and ranking majority members, meet together to see if in the forthcoming Congress we cannot bring together all of the programs which are now fragmented in the Committee on Ways and Means, Public Works, and the Committee on Education and Labor which would make a total thrust in the poverty war of close to \$10 billion.

I have not yet, of course, received a reply from these gentlemen, but knowing their integrity, I have every reason to believe, Mr. Chairman, that these gentlemen will at least sit down and talk with us and the members of the three committees.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are many other remarks I would like to make, but

we have decided we are going to make our remarks as brief as possible on this side. I, therefore, would like to revise and extend my remarks and yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the author of the bill, who has done a yeomanlike job in working on this piece of legislation—and I have nothing but the highest of encomiums and praise for his work in this particular field.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, in the spirit in which this debate has begun, knowing the extensive amount of time that we will consume under the 5-minute rule, I am going to keep my formal remarks extremely brief.

This bill, H.R. 15111, that we have before us today, consisting of some 41 pages of amendments to the overall Economic Opportunity Act, has required a tremendous amount of time, labor, and love of the job to put together.

The work that has been done by the committee as a whole, by the Democratic caucus, by the Republican caucus, and by all of us meeting together has, I think, resulted in a good bill.

This is not an administration bill. This is not the same bill that came to us from the agencies. This is a bill which is the work of Congress and the work of a committee. As divided as it may be at times, the members of the committee worked together on this bill which I think every Member in this Chamber can vote for.

Let us talk about the bill very briefly. The bill is within the President's budget. This bill would authorize an appropriation of \$1,750 million for the fiscal year that we are already in. It is only \$250 million more than was appropriated or spent in the last fiscal year. In fact, this authorization bill is at about the same figure as last year's authorization bill as passed by the House and the Senate. So if there is any major complaint about economy, funding, and spending in relation to this bill, it is important to note that the bill does not authorize a major step-up in spending this year. From that point of view this is an extremely conservative bill. I shall not dwell upon that aspect of it, but it is certainly a great deal smaller than the authorization bill now being considered in the other body.

What would this bill do? One of the most controversial sections of the whole Economic Opportunity Act has been the Job Corps program. We recognize it as a controversial program and we recognize it as a good program. We recognize it as a program that many of us have investigated with our own eyes. We have talked to the people who are working in these Job Corps centers. Certainly, we have some reservations about some of these Job Corps centers, but by and large they are doing a good job. The conservation centers are taking what may be the worst results of our social and

educational system and trying to make good men out of them.

The urban training centers in the Job Corps are taking the counterpart, but just a little higher up the scale in the social and educational development of men and women, and trying to make better citizens out of them or to give them an opportunity to be better citizens.

Yes, the program is expensive. The expense is more than I anticipated. The expense is more than this Congress anticipated, not because of what has been thrown away but because the job has covered more than we ever thought it would. These people who are going to the Job Corps centers are in many cases so disadvantaged that they require almost complete physical rebuilding of their bodies. They are either excessively underweight or excessively overweight; they have bad teeth and other poor physical conditions that need a lot of corrective attention.

They really need the care they should have gotten in a good home, but the home they had was not the kind that provided adequate care. Many of these people have never in their whole lifetime seen a doctor except by accident.

What is the average educational attainment of these people? It is so low it would be shocking to those of us who brag about our compulsory education system. The average educational attainment is only at the fourth grade level for these people even though most of them have attended school through the seventh grade.

These people are shockingly disadvantaged. They have multiple problems. It takes much longer and requires much more therapy and much more education to cure this problem than any of us ever imagined.

If the Members would go—as I have had the opportunity to go—to see these young men and women and the people in the training centers, I am sure all would be impressed with one thing immediately apparent, not only from the enrollee but from the instructors and people who work in these centers. That is, there is a good spirit of wanting to improve themselves. These people are not the types who are just typically lazy and will not work. These people know they are receiving an educational opportunity geared to their capacity, and their background, and they are moving ahead very rapidly in their educational attainment.

At Pleasanton, Calif., at Camp Parks, run by Litton Industries, there is a course on rehabilitation and a course on education. The rehabilitation runs all the way from dental, medical, and psychiatric work, to basic education, to learning to read and write and add up a column of figures, and all the way to a course that is so complicated in electronics that I am told—and I believe it from having observed the actual instruction—that it is equivalent to what a person would get in a junior college in a community.

Not everybody is going to be able to go that route. Some unfortunately do not have the intellectual ability to go that far. So their courses vary all the

way from courses that deal with yard maintenance and building maintenance all the way up to these very complicated electronic courses I have talked about.

The Job Corps is doing a big job. It is more expensive than I want it to be, and more expensive than I thought it was going to be, but it is a tough problem. Just because a problem is tough does not mean America ought to turn its back away from the problem. As I know America, that is not the kind of people we are. We tackle all those tough problems and do something about them.

Another program that has been effective—and one of the things that we intend to do under H.R. 15111 is to expand the very effective program which has been conducted under the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The Neighborhood Youth Corps has been one of the most spontaneously successful and most popular programs we have had. More than a half million men and women have served in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. They have had an opportunity to earn some money so they could stay in school and not become dropouts, or, having already dropped out of school, they can earn some money until they can go into permanent employment. In this way they can earn their way in society and at the same time get vitally needed remedial education.

The committee, in looking at the Neighborhood Youth Corps, decided it should be expanded, and the committee's proposal here today is for a substantial increase in the Neighborhood Youth Corps funds over what the administration proposed—yet all this is done within the President's budget.

One of the successful parts of the Neighborhood Youth Corps we thought was getting people into private employment. We provided in this bill today for an opportunity to work with private industry in getting people into jobs.

I would like to talk about all the rest of this bill because we made so many constructive changes in it.

However, I do not wish to take any more than the fair amount of time I should have in this part of the debate. I realize we will be going back over this time and time again under the 5-minute rule.

I wish to say that on the whole H.R. 15111, the 1966 Economic Opportunity Act Amendments, is constructive. The amendments are sound. They are within our fiscal ability to meet. If anything, in that sense they are extremely conservative.

This program is tough. It is hard. That is not because the people administering it are incapable and not because the concept of the whole program is wrong, but because the problem we in America face is much greater and much tougher than we ever realized.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the spirit of this whole thing. This bill will call for all the compassion and all the love we can muster for our own fellow human beings.

If we can do that, we can pass a bill this year—a good bill that all of Congress and all of the American public can be proud of.

As we go ahead, in 1967 and 1968, the Committee on Education and Labor, I am sure, can improve and perfect the whole operation of this program.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 304]

Abernethy	Fulton, Tenn.	Nix
Adair	Fuqua	O'Brien
Albert	Gialmo	O'Konski
Ashley	Gilligan	Olsen, Mont.
Aspinall	Gray	Passman
Blatnik	Griffiths	Pepper
Bow	Gurney	Philbin
Brock	Hagan, Ga.	Pirnie
Brown, Calif.	Halleck	Poage
Callaway	Hanna	Pool
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Powell
Casey	Hansen, Iowa	Rees
Cederberg	Hansen, Wash.	Reid, N.Y.
Celler	Harsha	Reifel
Clausen,	Harvey, Ind.	Reinecke
Don H.	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Clevenger	Holifield	Robison
Collier	Hutchinson	Rogers, Colo.
Connable	Ichord	Rogers, Tex.
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Roncalio
Cooley	Jones, Mo.	St Germain
Corman	Jones, N.C.	Scott
Craley	Keogh	Shipley
Cunningham	King, N.Y.	Shriver
Daddario	Kluczynski	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Kupferman	Skubitz
Derwinski	Landrum	Steed
Dickinson	Long, Md.	Stephens
Dingell	McClory	Sweeney
Donohue	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Dorn	McMillan	Toll
Duncan, Oreg.	McVicker	Tuck
Dyal	Maillard	Tunney
Edwards, Ala.	Martin, Ala.	Walker, Miss.
Evans, Colo.	Martin, Mass.	Weitner
Everett	Mathias	White, Idaho
Farbstein	Michel	Whitten
Fascell	Miller	Williams
Findley	Monagan	Willis
Fino	Morrison	Wilson, Bob
Fisher	Morse	Wilson, Charles H.
Flynt	Moss	Wright
Fogarty	Nedzi	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, 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. 15111, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 306 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.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the members of the Education and Labor Committee for the patience that they have shown in dealing with this very, very controversial legislation.

Although the charge has been made that this particular legislation was being held up, I have had no requests from any Members on our side that it should be expedited. I have received no requests from Members on the other side saying that they were anxious to vote on this legislation. We have had, under the leadership of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIEL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], a num-

ber of reports regarding the so-called antipoverty program.

The minority views which were filed some time ago received considerable comment by the Members, and were also displayed very prominently in the press throughout the United States.

I am of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that there are very few Members of this body who really believe in their hearts that this is good legislation.

Speaking for myself, it is a simple fact that the war on poverty was conceived in politics a few months before the 1964 elections, and make no mistake about it. It has been mired in politics ever since, providing the richest lode of political patronage ever mined by political gold-diggers. It is a war of the politicians, by the politicians, and for the politicians, and just a few crumbs are left to the poor.

Now, this should come as no surprise to anyone, because it was planned that way.

We have new Members in this House who are serving their first terms. They were not here in 1964 when this war on poverty was first conceived in this political bid.

Those Members who were here will recall the ruthless sacrifice of Mr. Adam Yarmolinsky, during the first skirmish in this war in August of 1964. Among other alleged sins against Mr. Yarmolinsky, a Defense Department official on loan to the poverty troops as chief strategy man, was that he had the candor to state that the poverty program should make a visible—get this—a visible impact before the fall elections.

In a memorandum to Mr. Joseph A. Califano on June 13, 1964, Mr. Yarmolinsky stated that:

We anticipate the necessity of starting the Job Corps in a clearly visible way throughout the country during the early fall.

If Members would care to look back at the RECORD they will find, in August 1964, starting on page 17995, a proposal that was offered at that time as a substitute for the antipoverty bill. There were many of us in the House at that time who realized the politics involved in this and realized also the urgency with which he was being pushed to get it started before the elections of 1964.

I offered a substitute which would have authorized an appropriation of \$1.5 million to set up some guidelines and to make an effort to find out what could be done to break the pockets of poverty; and, at the same time, this commission would have reported back to the Congress so that we could have taken a sensible look at the problem this country faces with regard to the unemployed, who are the poverty-stricken people.

Now, some may say this was laughed off. It was not. This substitute only failed by 151 to 124.

Since that time I believe it has become very apparent that had we done this in 1964 we would not be in the situation in which we find ourselves today.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman made the statement just a minute ago that this program had been completely buried in politics from the very first.

Mr. AYRES. I say to the gentleman, my dear friend from Oklahoma, I said it had been conceived in politics, which it was, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thought the gentleman also said it had been a matter of politics ever since that time. Perhaps I misunderstood him.

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

Mr. AYRES. Of course I yield to the Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that this bill was conceived in politics?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The word was "conceived"? Did I correctly understand that?

Mr. AYRES. Yes. So that there will be no misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, I said it is a simple fact that the war on poverty was conceived in politics a few months before the 1964 elections.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would you not say that anything that would try to help the underprivileged people of this country is something that is conceived out of human consideration for the underprivileged? Would you accept that definition?

Mr. AYRES. I am not going to reach for the dictionary at this point, Mr. Speaker, but conception and what you wind up with are two different things.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a difference between conceptions. Up my way we are a very strong Democratic district. Other districts are strongly Republican. There might be conception for the party in power at that time, but it seems to me that the gentleman would accept what should be the definition in my opinion, and I want the RECORD to show it, that this bill was conceived out of human consideration for millions of our own citizens who are underprivileged.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that many of us are just as interested in helping the poor as is the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know. I would not argue with that.

Mr. AYRES. And they may have had in their hearts things like this, but by the time they got around to putting it together it was conceived in politics. Mr. Yarmolinsky learned his lesson the hard way and he is now back at Harvard among his own friends.

Mr. McCORMACK. You are backing the bill and the purpose of it, are you not?

Mr. AYRES. I would back the purpose of it and the Republican substitute.

Mr. McCORMACK. You are not backing it because in your own mind you have any political conception, are you?

Mr. AYRES. We are doing our best to take politics out of this.

Mr. McCORMACK. You are, but you say that it was conceived in politics. Have you conceived your support of the legislation along this line in politics?

Mr. AYRES. We want to put this poor child out for adoption. We think it would be treated better there than it was by its own parents.

Mr. McCORMACK. You are avoiding my question. I think the gentleman needs some support.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. AYRES. Yes, I will.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me and let me complete the point that I was trying to make a moment ago before he goes to his own side?

Mr. AYRES. As the Speaker said, I had better take a little help over here, because I think the gentleman here is on our side, too.

Mr. CAHILL. I do not know what side the gentleman in the well is on at the moment. I think I am on his side, but I would like to say something in response to the Speaker. I supported this bill and voted for it originally and voted for it the second time around and voted for its appropriations. I do not know what I am going to do this, because I am deeply concerned personally about what I conceive to be political motivations in this bill. More importantly, if I may say so to the gentleman in the well, I think the American public is deeply concerned. It has always been my understanding that if you want to attack a program or if you want to attack an institution, the easiest way to do it is to destroy the credibility or the confidence that the people have in the leader or leaders.

One of the problems I am faced with and what my people are faced with is the publicity that has been given to the attacks that have been made upon Sargent Shriver, who is the Director of this program. Now, I do not know, because I am not a member of the committee, but from what I know of Mr. Shriver, he is a decent gentleman and a hard-working public servant. However, when the chairman of the committee who has jurisdiction of this bill and who is promoting this bill issues statements to the American public questioning the ability and the integrity of the Director and head of the program, he has to know that he is, in turn, harming the program with the American public. The American public does not understand all of the technicalities and all of the legalistic jargon that is in this bill. They look at it from an overall picture. Is it a good one or is it a bad one?

They ask, "Is it an honest program, or is it a dishonest program?" "Is it a political program, or is it a nonpolitical program?"

And, Mr. Chairman, they look to the man who is the head of it, just the same as all of us look to a man who is the head of any institution, and to a degree at least, judge the institution by the man who heads it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], the gentleman in the well, this question:

Is this attack that is being made upon the Director in the opinion of the gentleman a justified attack, based upon the

facts in the situation, or is it a political attack? And, if it is the latter, can the gentleman throw some light upon the question as to why politics should have entered into this so-called nonpolitical program?

Mr. AYRES. I shall try to answer the question of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

First, we have to go back into a little history. There was an amendment offered both in this body and in the other body when Sargent Shriver was wearing two hats. I was one of those Members who felt that he should give up either the Peace Corps position or the poverty job.

Approximately 2 years later, he did give up the Peace Corps job and when he did that, he just had the poverty program about which to worry.

I do not feel that the attacks upon Sargent Shriver as to the manner in which the program was being administered were justifiable. I did not demand his removal from that position. That demand came, as the gentleman says, from the other side of the aisle.

On the other hand, I do not know of any human being who could administer this program in an efficient and perfect or efficient manner, because politics do enter into it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point, to this side of the aisle?

Mr. AYRES. I shall yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] in just a moment.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. AYRES. I yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I just have one additional question:

Does the gentleman from Ohio agree with me, however, that these attacks, whether justified or not, have hurt the program insofar as the American public is concerned?

Mr. AYRES. Yes, sir; I do not believe there is any doubt about it, because when these attacks are made on the leaders, the attacks are radiated or are felt or made all down the line to those subordinates holding positions in many of our larger or major cities who have become involved in the local political situations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. AYRES. I yield further to the distinguished Speaker, of course.

Mr. McCORMACK. With all due respect to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], for whom I have a very strong personal liking, and official, there is nothing that the gentleman said that took issue with the observation of the question I asked my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], the gentleman who now has the floor.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] used the words "politically conceived," and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] referred to the absence on the part of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], the chairman of the committee, or the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], the chairman of the Committee on Edu-

cation and Labor, in relation to Mr. Shriver.

Well, that has nothing to do with "political conception." That flows out. As far as I am concerned, I believe Mr. Shriver is performing a very good job under most trying conditions. And, the observation of our friend who has the floor, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], that this legislation was politically conceived, is what interested me.

And, I see nothing that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] said that is inconsistent with the present and most constructive attempt which I made to have our friend who has the floor tell us why he did not think it was conceived in politics.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me further?

Mr. AYRES. I yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I certainly did not want in any way to impugn or to suggest any criticism of what the distinguished Speaker had said. The program may not have been conceived in politics, but I think that certainly in its adolescence it has been exposed to the temptation of politics.

I think, if the chairman of the committee is on the floor—and I intended to ask this question when he was addressing the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, but did not want to bring up this subject prematurely—I wonder, if the chairman is here and if the chairman of the full committee could tell us just what motivated him in his attack and what his present thoughts are as to the Director of the program, and whether or not he feels that he can, with confidence, continue to support Sargent Shriver in his effort to implement this program?

I think this is something we are all entitled to hear from the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. AYRES. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, but I am certain he would let me yield to a member of the committee first.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I think you can judge a university by its graduates and you can judge faculties by the graduates of a university. Insofar as management capabilities are concerned, the Office of Economic Opportunity presided over by Mr. Shriver has produced many active well-paid graduates, paid to the tune of twice their salaries at OEO, who are now working to improve the program in the Republican-led city of New York. We train them down here and Mr. Lindsay is very willing to take them up there. So Mr. Shriver is training some very able lieutenants in the program.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding because it appears that the principal criticism coming to the program from both sides would appear to be concerned with implementation in

some areas, their views on implementation in some areas and not with conception. Because I think most of us in this body who voted for this program in the first place did so in the belief that there was a serious problem and that there was a need for a constructive and aggressive program to meet that problem.

But I want to call this to the gentleman's attention—and I supported this position at the time this was adopted—it was provided in the legislation that your Governor had to approve these programs in each instance. The only public official in my State who has individually passed judgment upon each one of these projects and who has had to put his endorsement on them before they became part of the poverty program, is the Republican Governor of the State of Oklahoma.

If there is any single public official today who must bear the major responsibility for some of the admitted failures of the poverty program in my State, it is the Republican Governor of our State.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that, of course, the Governors who are Republicans are in the minority. So there again is where a lot of politics enters into it.

Then if the Governor raised his voice and he did not necessarily have to be a Republican, such as like the Governor from your side of the aisle from Alabama, who is going to be replaced by a member of the family, and he exercised a veto, then they accused him of being a racist.

I do not know how far this politics can go, but it is not only the Republican Governors but the Democratic Governors who would want to veto something, put the matter to a veto and immediately the bureaucrats from here started coming into their State, stating that they did not know what was going on and that Washington knew much better.

We had a lot of difficulty getting the Governor's veto restored. It was not supported by the gentleman from Oklahoma, but on the other hand, do not think the Governor's position upon this is partisan on this in any way. They have had in many instances to accept the program when it proved to be a boondoggle.

Now if they are a Republican Governor, they get blamed for not vetoing it, or for not accepting it, but if it is a Democratic Governor, then, well, it is a worthwhile program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not think there is anybody in this body who is candid with the public and candid with himself, who would not admit there have been some unfortunate experiences in this brandnew and sometimes totally experimental program. I do not think anybody would deny that there have been some failures that we would have been better off not to have had and through which the program has suffered badly through the publicity about the failures. But there has been very little talk about the very significant successes that have been made in the program Headstart which has done such a terrific job in many of my communities or the program of the Neighborhood Youth

Corps which has done a tremendous job in many of my communities. No, the publicity in the metropolitan press has dealt with the failures.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to suggest how the gentleman from Oklahoma might vote, but he will have the opportunity to vote for an amendment that would transfer the Headstart program, which has been good and which can be made better, to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the one Department that has many, many employees who are trained in this field and are anxious to do the job and are quite disturbed at the salaries being paid by the Office of Economic Opportunity to these people who are doing identical work to people who are already on the Federal payroll.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman recalls last year when Congress withdrew much of the Governor's veto function or parts of the Governor's veto function, the gentleman from Oklahoma voted against the Governor's veto when we had it up on the motion to recommit the last time, so he does not evidently believe that a Governor should have the choice of vetoing on undesirable program to his State.

I would also like to say something with respect to Mr. Sargent Shriver—and I will have some more to say about him tomorrow when I present some information that I have.

I would just like to quote to you from Mr. Sar Levitan in an article entitled, "What's Happening, Baby?" As you know, Mr. Levitan is a respected economist from the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. Mr. Levitan points out the credibility gap in the OEO. He said that expenditure per enrollee, for example, is often the subject of conflicting reports. He gave examples of that. He said that public statements made by OEO officials are often sprinkled with disturbingly imprecise words such as "reached," "affected," and "served." For example, Sargent Shriver, in recent testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the accomplishments of his agency, asserted that his program has "affected the lives of 4 million impoverished Americans in the slums of 800 urban and rural communities." Shriver failed, however, to particularize the ways in which the poverty program has "affected" these people. Thus, "affected" could mean anything from giving a word of encouragement to providing a job or shelter.

Third, OEO interprets its statistics in the most favorable light possible. The OEO claimed in one study, for instance, that, of 399 work-experience trainees in 9 States who had completed their assignments at least 3 months prior to the study, two-thirds were employed at an average monthly wage of \$258. Before their selection for work experience, 60 percent of the trainees were or had been public assistance recipients for an average period of 26 months. The conclusion drawn by OEO and reported to Congress was that work experience had re-

sulted in preparing relief recipients to obtain employment and in significantly reducing the relief rolls. The report failed to note, however, that, in a period of increasing labor shortage, the number of relief recipients is likely to decline anyway. Furthermore, the first people to withdraw from relief are likely to be the same ones who would participate in a work-experience program. Thus, similar results might have been obtained even in the absence of a work-experience program.

On a more significant and broader issue, Sargent Shriver recently exhorted Congress to eliminate poverty by 1976, the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Few would quarrel with such a laudable goal. However, Shriver failed to tell Congress that the achievement of the goal would require the addition of at least \$20 billion to annual expenditures in aid of the poor. Little good is done for the body politic by official pronouncements of lofty aspirations without an indication of their costs, of their prospects of implementation, and of a realistic appraisal of the chances of success.

They are trying to give the impression that something has occurred which has not, which frustrates the poor. The poor people expected great things and have found little coming for them. No wonder we have seen disturbances.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

At that point I might add that our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has asked the Comptroller General to give him a report on what it cost for many of the employees of the OEO to send telegrams commending their boss—and that is a smart thing to do if you want to hold your job, I guess—when he was criticized by the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. So here you have a compounding of the felony by the taxpayers' money being used to send telegrams for the employees saying what a great fellow the boss was.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The distinguished senior member from the Republican side of the committee is aware of all the legislation reported from our committee. I heard him a few moments ago indicate that he supports the worthy purposes of this legislation, and he has some suggested changes that will make it possible for him to continue supporting it with his vote on final passage.

Did I correctly understand the gentleman in the well to say that one of the changes that he would require would be to transfer the Headstart program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education?

Mr. AYRES. I would assume when you say "HEW" it would be the Office of Education that would be operating it.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Let me finish the question, then. Do I correctly understand you are saying that rather than having the Office of Economic Opportunity administer the Headstart pro-

gram, as it does now, you would transfer that function to the Department of Education and Welfare under an educational program?

Mr. AYRES. I think the gentleman has hit the nail on the head, and the point that we hope to prove during this debate to the gentleman's satisfaction is that one of the reasons we feel these various programs should be transferred to this agency—

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The gentleman well knows my question. Are you suggesting that we simply transfer Headstart to some other agency, or are you specifically suggesting that we transfer it to the Office of Education under the auspices of one of the other pieces of education legislation that we have in our committee?

Mr. AYRES. No, I am suggesting that the program be transferred and operated as a separate program.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Under the Office of Education?

Mr. AYRES. I do not say that that is the exact spot for it.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Does the gentleman want the program administered by State educational agencies rather than the State poverty agencies? Is that what he is saying?

Mr. AYRES. I think in most instances we find that educators experienced in the field are more qualified to work in the field of education.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Does the gentleman in the well know that 70 percent of the Headstart programs funded last year were funded through public school agencies and 30 percent were funded through nonpublic school agencies, the largest part of which were church or religious-oriented organizations, which would be disqualified under the laws of every State in this country from handling Headstart programs if such a plan as he suggests were put into effect?

Mr. AYRES. No, I disagree with the gentleman. I am perfectly aware how it is being funded. My point is this—

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Does the gentleman know what agency handles the Headstart program?

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, this Congress seems to have the concept that if OEO administers the money, it is therefore constitutional to provide the money for church-related institutions, but if the Office of Education should be granting the money, it is unconstitutional. I do not see any sense in that at all. If OEO can grant the money to a church-related institution, why cannot the Office of Education, if the money is provided by the Office of Education to do exactly the same job as OEO is doing now, but which Office of Education does better and has a more expanded program. There is no reason why it cannot be done through a church-related agency. So far some preschool programs through OEO have been granted to church-related organizations. Only preschool programs have been granted to church-related organizations.

The church-related agencies are not involved in the first through 12th grade using OEO money.

Yet we find that OEO is virtually always behind on its grants of money. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] I see is standing. I am told that in New York on the project Headstart this summer, the portion of the money they received from title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was on time, but the portion of money from OEO did not come through until the program was practically over.

Also, can the Members imagine their local agencies working with such handicap as continued delay in the money for their programs?

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would refrain from casting further maledictions upon the new Lindsay administration in my city. It takes a little time to learn how to do things. They were 6 months late in their application to OEO.

Mr. QUIE. OEO did not come through with its money on time, I repeat. OEO did not. The officials in the city of New York made their requests to both agencies. You can see that all over the country. The gentleman from New York was with me in Los Angeles. The dioceses out there had hired the person in charge of their preschool program. They had hired her, and when the time came for implementing the preschool program, they had not yet heard from OEO and they had to delay their program.

This is constantly happening.

Since we have those programs, both preschool from OEO and from OE run by the same local agencies, there is no sense for us to run them uncoordinated, one part done through OEO and one through title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act. We can save money and confusion and have the programs run better if they are done by one Federal agency, and that agency ought to be the Office of Education.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction of the RECORD?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota said a minute ago that I voted against the motion to recommit, leaving the impression that we had a pure question of a Governor's veto, and nothing else, on the motion to recommit. The motion to recommit actually consisted largely of drastic cuts in this program and the Governor's veto was only a part of the motion to recommit. I voted against it primarily because of the drastic cuts in the motion to recommit.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. We have a number of requests for time on our side. The other side has used very little time. The Members will all have their opportunity. I know the fairness with which the gentleman from Florida has been operating.

and that he will be glad to give Members all the time that is available.

To get back to this politically conceived bill, this started with Mr. Yarmolinsky getting pushed out because he was doing a good job. Perhaps this candor was too much. Mr. Yarmolinsky was immediately drummed out of the poverty war, although he was only proposing to do the job he had been assigned by the administration—to see that this administration made a big splash before the fall elections.

Talk about political questions, we see what he said in his letter to Mr. Califano. We see exactly what he said. The letter is in the RECORD of 4 years ago. I will not waste the time of the Committee, because the Members can all read it for themselves and see exactly the politics involved. Before 1 year of the war had elapsed, it became apparent how open had become the great refuge for aspiring politicians.

You all know this to be true—whose own economic opportunities were being lavishly upgraded by high-salaried jobs and \$100 a day consultant fees.

We obtained a list of these consultants who had been lavishly endowed with the taxpayer's money, which is published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 20, 1965.

You know, Mr. Chairman, numerous Members of Congress in both parties discovered, first, former opponents and, second, current opponents and prospective opponents on that list.

Our respected colleague, the gentleman from New York, LEONARD FARSTEIN, for example, found that his opponent in the Democratic primary, William F. Haddad, was being generously supported in the Office of Economic Opportunity. Since then, I understand, Mr. Haddad has gone to other political campaigns—in Florida, New York again, and elsewhere.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. AYRES. I refuse to yield until I finish this, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Our respected colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARSTEIN] will be glad to explain that to Members, as he did here on the floor.

Perhaps we can expect to see him back in poverty one of these days, and a job may be available. Certainly that is where the big money is for those with proper political connections. In this fiscal year alone the poverty program expects to furnish over \$53 million for the salaries of its Federal officials alone.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield for 1 minute.

Mr. CAREY. I want to agree with the gentleman. There is wealth in the poverty program. There is real big money in the poverty program.

All one has to do is to buy himself a \$18 ticket on the shuttle from Washington, D.C., to New York.

Mr. Fred Hays, who was working down here at \$18,000, went up to Mr. Lindsay's administration, and is getting \$35,000.

Mr. Sviridoff, who was working for less than \$20,000, is getting \$40,000, and a chauffeur.

Mr. Chris Weeks, for the summer program, had his salary doubled by going to New York.

This of course we do not condone. This is why the Democrats put a salary limitation in the bill.

I should like to know if the gentleman in the well will go along with us on the salary limitation, so that we can cure this and stop talking about Haddad, which was back in the Farbstein-Haddad election of 1964. Let us bring this up to date and talk about Mr. Lindsay's "fat cats" in the program.

Mr. AYRES. I want to bring this up to date, in just a moment. I hope the gentleman will be as anxious to comment then.

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

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

Mr. ARENDTS. Might I ask the gentleman from New York if this amendment he proposes to offer will be retroactive?

Mr. CAREY. My dear fellow, I am sure the minority whip must know that we cannot take away from public servants what they have already been paid. We are never that vindictive.

Mr. AYRES. I believe perhaps the gentleman from New York, my good friend and distinguished colleague [Mr. CAREY], was trying to make the point that this program is so good down here, as a training ground, and so helpful, that they learn so much in their capacities here in this bureaucracy, that they are trying to peddle their wares as experts in other fields.

I am not familiar with what the gentleman stated, as to the facts concerned, but I am quite certain that such a situation would not exist or should not continue to exist.

But salaries alone do not make political organization. There are a lot of bodies in this Office of Economic Opportunity.

We read that Federal funds in the poverty program in Cincinnati, for example, are being used to finance a big register-and-vote drive. Where is this happening? In the predominantly Democratic wards.

This boldly cynical attempt to work against our former colleague—and politics is politics—

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I feel that the chairman of the committee should be here to hear his good friend speak. I know he was here to hear the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 305]

Adair	Blatnik	Carter
Albert	Bow	Celler
Aspinwall	Brock	Clausen,
Barrett	Callaway	Don H.

Clevenger	Hansen, Idaho	Philbin
Collier	Hansen, Iowa	Pirnie
Conable	Hansen, Wash.	Poage
Conyers	Hébert	Pool
Cooley	Holfield	Quillen
Corman	Horton	Rees
Craley	Hutchinson	Reifel
Cunningham	Johnson, Calif.	Reinecke
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Resnick
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Rivers, S.C.
Derwinski	Jones, N.C.	Robison
Dickinson	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Diggs	King, N.Y.	Rogers, Tex.
Donohue	Kirwan	Roncalio
Dorn	Kluczynski	St Germain
Duncan, Oreg.	Kupferman	Scott
Dyal	Landrum	Shipley
Edwards, Ala.	Long, Md.	Shriver
Ellsworth	McClory	Sikes
Evans, Colo.	McDowell	Skubitz
Everett	McEwen	Smith, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.	McMillan	Stephens
Farbstein	McVicker	Sweeney
Fascell	Macdonald	Talcott
Findley	Mailliard	Thompson, Tex.
Fino	Martin, Ala.	Toll
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	Trimble
Flynt	Mathias	Tuck
Fogarty	Michel	Tunney
Ford, Gerald R.	Miller	Vivian
Fulton, Tenn.	Monagan	Walker, Miss.
Gaimo	Moore	Watson
Gilligan	Morrison	Weltner
Goodell	Morse	White, Idaho
Gray	Moss	Whitten
Green, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Bob
Griffiths	Nedzi	Wilson, Charles H.
Gurney	Nix	Wright
Hagan, Ga.	O'Konski	
Halleck	Olsen, Mont.	
Hanna	Passman	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, 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. 15111, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 301 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absenteers to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

THE CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from Ohio had consumed 36 minutes.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

MR. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

MR. AYRES. I yield to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York.

MR. POWELL. First I want to thank my friend on the opposite side of the aisle for the great honor he has just conferred upon me. I trust I will wear it in good health the rest of my life.

In the second place, when I opened the debate, the gentleman from Ohio will remember, on this side, I proposed to make the debate as brief as possible so that all of our good colleagues could get back home and campaign on the weekend. It seems, due to quorum calls, we might be here very late tonight and also on Saturday. I should like to see this vote taken on Thursday night.

MR. AYRES. I say to my distinguished chairman that although I believe there is 36 minutes charged to me, and I have been the only speaker on our side, that 16 of those 36 minutes have been consumed by gentlemen from the other side.

MR. POWELL. I appreciate the cooperation.

MR. AYRES. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us get back to a discussion of this program which was conceived in politics.

As we were saying when the point of order was made, salaries alone do not make a political organization. Since the quorum call I have been advised that it is entirely possible the situation in New York, which was started by Mr. Haddad as an opponent to our colleague [Mr. FARSTEIN], may prove that salaries alone do not make a political organization.

Now we read that Federal funds in the poverty program in a city in my home State, Cincinnati, are being used to finance a big register-and-vote drive in the predominantly Democratic wards.

These are not graduates of a public school. These are not men and women who have come back from a Job Corps who are learning politics at the grass-roots level. These are people who are on the poverty payroll and who are supposed to help poor people. However, their manner of helping poor people, to be paid for by poverty funds, is to go door to door encouraging and even insisting that these people register and vote. In fact, I understand just now by phone call that there is a big drive going on in Cincinnati today, door to door, by the paid poverty people insisting that they get out and register and vote.

Now, why today and tomorrow and Wednesday? Because on the 28th of September registration in Ohio closes. I would like to say that this boldly cynical attempt to defeat our former colleague, Bob Taft, Jr., is being financed with the tax moneys of Republicans and Democrats alike in our State of Ohio. Personally, I am confident that the sense of fairplay of this Committee and of this House and the decency of the citizens of our State can very well bring about a backlash on such an operation.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you that if a registration drive is needed, it should be conducted in all sections, Republican and Democrat alike. In fact, we have an agency that could run this much more effectively than the employees in the poverty program. This could be handled very easily by the Census Bureau. They know how to go door to door. They know how to ask rather pertinent questions. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress reached the point where we are going to take taxpayers' money to go out and insist and encourage, and in many cases almost threaten, individuals to get them to exercise the freedom that they enjoy in this country.

This Congress has passed several pieces of legislation guaranteeing the right to vote. Now, in our State of Ohio only about 64 percent of those eligible to vote vote, but I do not think the taxpayers want to spend their money trying to convince these people that they should exercise a right they already have.

Now, that is no way to run a war on poverty. Every Member of this House knows how the poverty program is being used for politics. I am confident that the overwhelming majority want to put this program back on the right track. It should be an honest effort to help people caught in poverty to prepare for gain-

ful employment, to get jobs, and to regain the independence and the dignity that is lost through unemployment.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the straight, clear road out of poverty—the road of useful and dignified employment. We should phase out politics and get about the business of helping people who need help. This is the constructive road charted by Republican members of our committee. We know there are hundreds of thousands of young people who need help in training themselves for a good job.

That is why we have supported the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Vocational Education Act and worked hard with our Democratic colleagues to make them more and more effective.

MR. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. AYRES. I yield to my chairman.

MR. POWELL. Out of the largess of the Democrats we will give this time. The gentleman does not remember, I guess, on my own motion I suggested that we put the people of the Poverty Act under the Hatch Act.

MR. AYRES. Yes. The gentleman from New York insisted on that for quite some time.

MR. POWELL. It is in the present bill before you.

MR. AYRES. And you know that this situation exists not only in Cincinnati but in many other places. It might be advisable for you, because you are all up for reelection to check this. There is one thing I have learned, which is that practically every Member of Congress enjoys being reelected.

And, it may be that there are those solicitations going on in your area where the registration date is not closed, by this political organization, the Office of Economic Opportunity. And as the gentleman from New York pointed out, although not covered by the Hatch Act, we Republicans tried to cover them before and insisted that it be done.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that after almost 21 years of operation, there may be support to put these people under the Hatch Act.

Mr. Chairman, the President and the Secretary of Defense already recognize the expensive futility of the existing Job Corps in their plan to induct young men into the service who do not meet the educational standards of the Armed Forces, in order that they may receive, in effect, additional help.

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

MR. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

MR. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Ohio leaves the topic of violations of the Hatch Act, I would like to point out that it is a futile effort as far as putting anyone under the Hatch Act, because violations have been documented under the civil service where there have been violations, and there have been violations of the Corrupt Practices Act under the Department of Justice, and nothing has been done

about the violations that have been documented.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is also a sorry state of affairs when we see how Federal employees have their arms twisted for contributions to campaigns, which in my judgment is encouraging a violation of the Hatch Act, an act set up by the Congress of the United States, and we as Members of this body should be supporting our Federal employees in their protection against these acts, which we have not done heretofore.

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

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his observation, although I cannot help but agree with the gentleman from Minnesota that at least the impression will be left that something has been done to make a start or a step to remove this organization from a direct political organization.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the question came up as to whether this program was actually conceived in politics. I recall that I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 27, 1964, a copy of a campaign brochure that was given to our Democrat colleagues by the Democrat National Committee, which gave them scripts which they could use as they went out into the country during the Easter recess. I submit for the RECORD, the Democrat suggested press release. I have picked out from my files one of the speeches which I gave on this subject, a portion of which I quote as follows:

For the first time in our history we have a President with a concern for the impoverished and a man brilliant enough to administer such a program (Sargent Shriver).

I wonder if anyone wants to take back those words that were uttered back in 1964 when they put out these speeches, before the program was even inaugurated?

SUGGESTED PRESS RELEASE

This is a suggested press release affirming your support of President Johnson's War on Poverty:

(Name) today pledged his full support to President Johnson's War on Poverty and called upon every public official and every private citizen in the state to join him.

He called on them to urge passage of the Economic Opportunity Act proposed by the President to implement the all-out effort to drive poverty from history's richest nation.

"This program would be a milestone in our continuing search for a better life for all Americans," he said. "I shall support it by every means available at my command and I urge every public official and private citizen to join me."

He explained that the program will be a cooperative undertaking by all levels of government—Federal, State and local—and will strike at the causes of poverty, not just the consequences.

"This program is not a hand-out, not just another way to support people who cannot support themselves, but a realistic program that will give people a chance to become self-

supporting," he said. "It will give them an opportunity to be participants in our free enterprise society—and not spectators."

He outlined the major aspects of the program and emphasized that where needed these programs will apply to (state).

The program will:

Create a Job Corps which will build toward an enlistment of 100,000 young men whose background, health and education make them least fit for useful work. The Corps will provide youths who will range in age from 16-21 with education, vocational training, useful work experience and other appropriate activities in specified training centers.

Establish a Work-Training Program which will provide work and training for 200,000 American men and women between the ages of 16 and 21. This will be developed through state and local governments and non-profit agencies.

Initiate a Work-Study Program which will provide federal funds for part-time jobs for 140,000 young Americans who do not go to college because they cannot afford it.

Institute urban and rural community action programs to mobilize and utilize all public and private resources to fight poverty on a local level. These local programs will give each community the opportunity to develop its own comprehensive plan to fight its own poverty with financial assistance from the Federal government.

Recruit and train dedicated Americans who enlist as Volunteers for America in the war against poverty . . . the Peace Corps concept directed at the nation's problems.

Create special programs to combat poverty in rural areas for the purpose of raising and maintaining the income and living standards of low income rural families. These special target programs will permit farmers and workers to break through particular barriers which bar their escape from poverty.

Establish an Office of Economic Opportunity which will coordinate the national effort.

The (insert title) also said:

"As President Johnson pointed out, if we can raise the annual earnings of 10 million among the poor by only \$1,000 we will add \$14 billion a year to the national output.

"In addition we will make important reductions in public assistance payments which now cost the nation 4 billion a year, and in the large costs of fighting crime and delinquency, disease and hunger.

"It is not a matter of whether we can or should support this program.

"We must.

"The Declaration of Independence 188 years ago set forth what we as Americans believe:

"That every man, woman and child in this country has the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

"One fifth of our population, however, is, in effect, barred from this pursuit by poverty.

"The abundance, the comforts, the opportunities they see all around them are beyond their reach, and their children's reach.

"This program and our dedication to its success will help them find hope and happiness in this, the world's richest nation.

"This will represent a reaffirmation of our belief in those principles of equality of opportunity on which our nation is founded."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me at this point?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me at this point and if he should run out of time, the gentleman can take it out of our time or we shall yield additional time to him if he should run out of time.

Mr. Chairman, I wish that we could discuss the present act that is now pending before us, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], has so well pointed out, in 1964 there were 44 amendments which tried to bring together in a consensus the opinion of the Congress.

I understand that on the gentleman's side of the aisle there will be pending to this legislation 114 amendments.

Mr. AYRES. I will say to my chairman, I think we should set the groundwork as to what is the condition as it exists today, because we are still going to be operating under the old bill for quite some time. Unless every Member has the opportunity to delve into this as deeply as the members of the committee do, I believe it would be most helpful to ascertain what has been happening, why it happened, and then perhaps when the amendments are offered, the committee will have an opportunity to determine whether or not the amendments do correct what is currently acknowledged as an existing evil.

Another Republican amendment will be designed to assist further in the effort by providing special help for young men who wish to make an honorable career in the armed services of our country.

We Republicans on the committee recognize that several millions of preschool youngsters need the benefits of preschool education in order that they can begin school on an even footing with more fortunate children. We have been proposing a massive preschool program under proper and qualified educational auspices, and we shall have an amendment that would transfer Operation Headstart out of the antipoverty agency into the U.S. Office of Education, where it belongs, to be financed in coordination with the Elementary and Secondary School Act. This is much too important to leave it enmeshed in the most confused bureaucracy ever to appear in Washington.

We shall offer other amendments to place these programs in the Federal agencies where they belong, in competent hands, away from the blatant politics and unbelievable confusion of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

And I want to say this to my Democratic colleagues in this House. There is not a bigger favor you could do for President Johnson than to accept these constructive Republican proposals. They would assure better administration of the good parts of the war on poverty, better coordination with similar Federal programs costing many billions of dollars, better results for the individuals who are trapped in poverty, and the savings of many millions of the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I hope I can intrude on this because even we as good loyal Democrats do not seek here today to do favors for President Johnson. We are seeking to do our utmost for those who are in the abyss of poverty.

Mr. AYRES. I appreciate the nonpolitical statements that have been coming from that side.

These actions could do much to curb the growing threat of inflation in an overheated wartime economy, and aid the President in his announced desire to trim \$3 billion from the Federal budget.

This is where I say to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], that I was down at the White House at the signing of the minimum wage bill and I left there with the impression that we did not have any poverty.

I also heard the statements made last night on the radio by two of the President's high ranking officers of the Cabinet that we have got something called inflation and we are going to have to have bills before this Congress shortly to correct that.

Here is your chance to really help to trim nearly \$3 billion from the Federal budget, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] knows that his constituents will thank you for it.

I know of nothing that is any more threatening to this country today than inflation. Here is one place you can help. You can help your constituents, and you can help the President of the United States.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I would love to do what you suggest, that we save \$3 billion in the Federal budget. In the very first opening statement that was made by the chairman of the committee, he spoke of a way in which we can do that. We are working on the problems of poverty in this country with a very limited tool, the bill before us here today.

My distinguished colleague knows from his experience here in the many years in which he has served, that over in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare where he wants to put Headstart, there is a \$4.3 billion dependency program which we never debate in this House. He also knows that in other Federal agencies there are \$880 million in programs for the handicapped which we do not debate in this House, but we do debate this program. We can save this \$3 billion if through an effective program we can lump together all the programs in HEW and in the public welfare departments and make them into one program as has already been suggested by the chairman today.

We know how to do it. We cannot do it if we just take this one simple tool we have and make it unworkable.

Mr. AYRES. That would be decided not by the gentleman from New York personally or by myself, after all the facts are out on the table, then the House in its judgment will be able to determine whether or not this program should be continued, after amendments.

In the next few days, each one of us has an opportunity to do the right thing with the "war on poverty."

We have the chance to act responsibly with our constituents' money. We have the chance to rescue the hopes and ex-

pectations of those of our fellow citizens who are poor from the politics and bungling and other excesses which have blighted this program. We have the chance to help tighten up the Federal budget to combat an inflation which daily robs the workingman of his wages and plunges retired people into poverty. We have the chance to do what almost everyone of us knows is right.

On this side of the aisle we do not have the votes in this Congress to accomplish these objectives. We need help from the Democratic majority. I hope we get that help. Every Member who does the right thing with this legislation can share in the credit for having done a good and much needed job.

The American people will be watching as they should.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, during the quorum call that we had a moment ago I took occasion to check upon a couple of the charges that had been made in the debate here by our colleagues on the minority side. I find that the charge about the telegrams having been sent at Government expense is spurious. The telegrams were sent. They were not paid for by the Federal Government. They were paid for by the sender out of his own pocket.

Second, the charges made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] about the Conam are the same old charges he made, I believe, back on August 11, 1966. These have already been answered by OEO. There is nothing of any great significance to them, and at the proper time I shall insert in the RECORD an official answer from the OEO about them, or they will issue some statement about them, too.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I should like to take this opportunity as well to pay a particular word of tribute to the able and hardworking gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], who, at least from my own observation, has put in more time, energy, effort, and hard work on this legislation than perhaps any other Member of either the House or the other body. I think we all owe him a debt of gratitude for his dedication and work on this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation, it seems to me, represents, as much as anything else, a moral commitment on the part of the American people, as citizens of the wealthiest Nation in human history, to do something about the fact that there are, living within our own midst, millions of our fellow citizens who do not enjoy even the barest minimum standard of living. I know of no one who has suggested that the passage of this legislation this week by this body and its subsequent enactment into law will, within a year or two, do away with poverty in this country. We all know that the war on poverty is a new program. We know, too, that poverty has been an enemy that has stalked mankind for hundreds, indeed thousands, of years.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is also true, as I have just said, and as we are all aware, that the United States of America enjoys the greatest wealth of any people in the history of mankind. Certainly we ought to be imaginative enough and intelligent enough and, above all, I would hope, have enough sense of moral responsibility to our fellow citizens—we are not talking about people in Asia, Africa, Latin America, or other countries of the world—to undertake at least some minimal, modest steps to eradicate the roots of poverty within our midst.

This is not only a moral responsibility. It seems to me—and I am sure all of us would agree—that it is in keeping with the fundamental religious heritage of the American people.

So I would hope that we would give our consideration and our support to this legislation from that perspective.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been very distressed to hear my affable and able friend, the senior Republican on our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], reiterate constantly that this is nothing but a politically conceived and politically administered program. He is much too intelligent and able really to believe that.

I know that in my own home county of St. Joseph, in the State of Indiana, we have in being a wide variety of programs financed by the war on poverty. We have Project Headstart. We have the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. We have a legal services program operated by the University of Notre Dame Law School in cooperation with the St. Joseph County Bar Association. We have work-study programs for students in colleges and universities in the area. We have one of the pioneer Upward Bound programs at the University of Notre Dame. We have a migrant workers center for the Spanish-speaking Americans. We have therefore an entire spectrum of programs in my home county financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Only a few weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity of making a tour of the antipoverty projects which are going on in my own home county, where I grew up. I was deeply and favorably impressed with the sense of dedication and the zeal and the effectiveness with which these programs were being administered.

I was, therefore, a little distressed to hear my friend from Ohio say that this was a vast, politically inspired operation. I say this because the Honorable Lloyd M. Allen, of South Bend, and the Honorable Margaret Prickett, of Mishawaka, are Republican mayors. In 1964, when it was determined to have a community action program in St. Joseph County, both of these mayors, both of them Republican, undertook with other community leaders of both political parties in our area, as well as representatives of the people and areas to be served, and a representative group of professional and labor and business people, to put together a community action program.

I am a Democratic representative from that congressional district. I strongly support this program. The Republican

mayors from my home county do likewise.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Chairman, as we proceed through the several hours of debate on this bill that we will pay some attention and give our consideration to what it is proposed by the committee we should do to improve and strengthen the operation of the war on poverty, because I want to see this program successful in Republican congressional districts as well as in Democratic congressional districts, for what we are talking about is not Republican or Democratic politics: We are talking about enabling millions of our fellow Americans to have the opportunity to live their lives in dignity.

Mr. Chairman, I should like also to take a moment to pay a word of tribute to one of the ablest and most dedicated public servants in our country, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Honorable R. Sargent Shriver, and I should like to call to the attention of Members of the House an eloquent address delivered by Mr. Shriver in South Bend, Ind., on August 11, 1966, and which I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 7, 1966, at page 22010.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I should like to call to the attention of Members a series of excellent articles from the South Bend Tribune describing the war on poverty in St. Joseph County, Ind., which I have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 22, 1966, at page 23722.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as we debate the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966, we would do well to reconsider for a moment the reasons that this Nation determined 2 years ago to mount an earnest drive against poverty. We would do well to recall the tragic impact of poverty on the lives of millions of Americans that argues so persuasively for the action to eliminate poverty which we in Congress took in 1964 and again in 1965, and which we are about to take once more in 1966.

I have not seen any more convincing presentation of the strong economic and moral case for the Nation's war on poverty than that published last year by Philip M. Stern and George de Vincent, entitled "The Shame of a Nation." This remarkable photographic essay on poverty in America chronicles a journey of 27,000 miles—from Harlem to Hunter's Point in San Francisco, from Old Basin's Crossing in Florida to the Sioux reservations in the Dakotas. Turning off from the thoroughfares of affluence, the authors came across and recorded graphically the stark features of the other America. There families in West Virginia must choose between food and shoes for their children; there rat-infested slums and breakfastless school days bring hardly a ripple of surprise; there a family of nine lives without toilet or running water in a room 10 by 10.

Last year the authors, together with Mr. Stern's wife, Helen, published a small paperback study of Washington, D.C., "O, Say Can You See!" Just as this book powerfully contrasts the Washington of the picture postcards and guidebooks with the facts of daily existence

for thousands of Washingtonians, "The Shame of a Nation" brings home the expanse and the ugliness of the scar of poverty on the face of America. The conclusion is inescapable, as Vice President HUMPHREY points out in his introduction: that we must harness the "wealth, the energy, yes, and the daring and imagination to defeat poverty in America to relegate to the history books the sad and somber portraits of this volume."

Mr. Chairman, I commend this penetrating and moving study to my colleagues as a reminder of the vital importance of the legislation that is before us today.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [MR. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, we have often heard about the establishment of new governmental agencies at the Federal level and how these agencies over the years multiply and increase in size and become eventually a veritable octopus.

I believe a good example of how the OEO is on the road to doing this can be given to the Committee this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, by some information which I have received from one of my constituents.

I would like to read to the Committee, first of all, a letter I received from the Grand Island Daily Independent, a newspaper in my district of Grand Island, Nebr., dated September 3, 1966. The letter says:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARTIN: The enclosed telegram, I felt, would be of great interest to you. Frankly, it has me boiling.

I have been disturbed enough in the past with press releases from the OEO Kansas City office. One of these prompted the July editorial which I have also enclosed for your information. There have been others, in fact a release just yesterday with a statement from Shriver defending him against Congressman POWELL's charges.

Use of Western Union, however, carries this thing beyond the realm of mere irritation. That makes me mad. It would be interesting if someone in your office would be able to find out just how many such wires were sent, and how many Great Society dollars were used for this purpose.

Of course, it is a bit amusing that a Democrat set them off this way.

Sincerely,

AL SCHMAHL,
Managing Editor.

Accompanying this letter, Mr. Chairman, is a 3½-page Western Union telegram, a copy of which I have in my hand, which was sent out by the Kansas City office. I will not take time to read the entire telegram, because it will take too long, but when we go back in the House, I will ask the unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD.

The entire 3½ pages quote various people in this country as to what a great job Sargent Shriver is doing as director of this program. Let me read from the telegram:

KANSAS CITY, Mo.

The INDEPENDENT,
First and Cedar, Grand Island, Nebr.

The following is sent for your information:

Business leadership is rallying to OEO Director Sargent Shriver's defense against the statements of Congressman ADAM CLAYTON

POWELL's attack on the administrative ability of Shriver. The latest to offer his opinion is the chairman of the Xerox Corporation, Mr. Sol Linowitz, who says, "Shriver is the best administrator in Washington." "Among people who really know administration, Shriver ranks among the highest."

For the past 21 months, genuine experts in administration have evaluated the performance and administrative record of this agency. Former Cabinet members like Arthur Flemming, president of the University of Oregon:

Business leaders like Walker Cisler, chairman of the board of Detroit Edison Company, Edgar Kaiser, chairman of the board of General Electric, Charles Thornton, chairman of Litton Industries, Richard Cater, president of the Fostoria Corporation, Roger Sonnabend, president of the Hotel Corporation of America, and many others have given their endorsement.

While overall, there has been some criticism of the war on poverty, the individual programs of OEO receive overwhelming endorsement of Americans everywhere. These include Headstart, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Upward Bound, VISTA, health services, neighborhood centers, legal services. This indicates to us that there might be a general misunderstanding about the program, as opposed to program benefits.

Following is a sampling of telegrams received by Shriver:

August 30, 1966.

To Sargent Shriver, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Wash., D.C. Dear Sargent, because of the recent reported political attacks on your administration of the poverty program I wish as chairman of the Business Leadership Advisory Council for the Office of Economic Opportunity to reaffirm the confidence expressed by the chief executives of many of our country's leading corporations who are members of the council and are meeting in Washington on June 10 of this year Thomas I. Nichols, chairman of the executive committee of Olin Matheson Chemical Corporation proposed a resolution expressing the council's support and full confidence in you as Director of O.E.O. The resolution was unanimously and enthusiastically supported. I wish also to express personally to you my admiration and respect for the high degree of statesmanship and frankness with which you have conducted your responsibilities. I am desirous of continuing to support and work with you in accomplishing the objectives of O.E.O.

Walker Cisler, chairman of the board of the Detroit Edison Co.

August 31, 1966.

To Mr. Sargent Shriver, Office of Economic Opportunity, Wash., D.C.

The O.E.O., under your leadership, deserves the full support of all those who believe in the dignity of the individual and who believe in equal rights and equal opportunity and the elimination of poverty in our great Nation. As chairman of the Labor Advisory Committee, I have had the opportunity to work closely with you and I want you to know that I consider you one of our outstanding public servants and one who is dedicated to poverty. Only your continued inspired leadership will insure that the program will continue to move forward. With best regards, David Sullivan.

August 31, 1966.

To Sargent Shriver, Office of Economic Opportunity, Wash., D.C.

I regret deeply the attacks being made on you and your program. The Office of Economic Opportunity under your leadership has done more work in less time than any other national program. I hope you will not resign.

Finlay C. Allen, first general vice president, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

August 30, 1966.

To Sargent Shriver, Office of Economic Opportunity, Wash., D.C.

Because of absurd Powell comments I want you to know that my business associates and I are more enthusiastic than ever about your personal activities and those of OEO in the war on poverty.

Roger P. Sonnabend, president, Hotel Corporation of America.

Shriver noted recently that Congressman POWELL in a speech at Baltimore characterized the poverty program as "one of America's most successful and productive programs."

DON THOMASON,

*Regional Director, North Central
Region Office of Economic Opportunity.*

There are 3½ pages of this, which was sent out by the Kansas City district office of the OEO to 40 newspapers in the midwest area and the Mountain States.

On September 7, I wrote to Mr. Shriver a letter, as follows:

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: Enclosed is a copy of a letter received from one of the newspapers in my District, and also a copy of a three and a half page telegram which your Kansas City office sent to this newspaper on September 3rd.

It appears that this same telegram was sent out to hundreds, and perhaps even thousands, of newspapers throughout the country at an extremely high cost to the taxpayers.

I would like to hear from you immediately as to why this was done, and the total cost of these telegrams.

Sincerely,

DAVE MARTIN,
Member of Congress.

About a week or 10 days went by, and I did not receive any reply from Mr. Shriver. I wrote him again, and at the same time I also wrote the Comptroller General of the United States.

I received a reply from Mr. Shriver about 4 o'clock Friday afternoon by messenger. I received a letter from the Comptroller General this afternoon in regard to this matter.

Mr. Shriver states that there were 40 such telegrams sent out, and the cost of each telegram was \$77. He goes on to state:

Fortunately, this cost was not borne by the taxpayers. The telegrams were paid for with private funds.

I do not know who paid for them or how that was arrived at, but according to Mr. Shriver's letter they were paid for with private funds.

This makes a total of about \$2,900.

He goes on to say that the gentleman in the Kansas City office was carried away, and that he has since been reprimanded by him for taking this action.

Let me read further from the letter received this afternoon from the Comptroller General.

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I quote from the Comptroller General's letter:

By letter of September 14, 1966, you question the propriety of an enclosed copy of a telegram sent from the Kansas City regional office of the Office of Economic Opportunity to one of the newspapers in your district.

Your request that we advise you as to the number of similar telegrams sent throughout the country and the total cost involved.

Enclosed is a copy of a TWX message dated September 2, 1966, sent from the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington to the attention of the public affairs officers in the seven regional offices of OEO.

Let me quote from this telegraph that was sent out from Washington to the seven regional offices, the one that started the ball rolling on this telegram I received from my newspaper friend in my district. I quote from the telegram that went out from the Washington office:

Business leadership is rallying to Shriver's defense against Powell's attack on his administration. Sol Linowitz, chairman, Xerox International, says "Shriver is best administrator in Washington." Suggest these telegrams, together with story guidance be given immediately to local newspapers and editorial writers as good weekend story indicating that among people who really know administration, Shriver is tops. Remember Shriver in his statement said: "... I have never known that Congressman POWELL considered himself an expert on administration—either public or private . . ."

The telegram goes on further. This is very important, I believe. I quote it as follows:

Important we try to get this story across. For your confidential guidance, Lou Harris poll will come out Monday showing 54-46 public opinion against war on poverty, but 83% of Negro poor in favor.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point the entire letter for further information of the Members:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., September 26, 1966.
Hon. DAVE MARTIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: By letter of September 14, 1966, you question the propriety of an enclosed copy of a telegram sent from the Kansas City regional office of the Office of Economic Opportunity to one of the newspapers in your district.

You request that we advise you as to the number of similar telegrams sent throughout the country and the total cost involved.

Enclosed is a copy of a TWX message dated September 2, 1966, sent from the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington to the attention of the public affairs officers in the seven regional offices of OEO. We have not ascertained that the use of TWX facilities for sending this message necessitated the incurrence of any additional cost. The purpose for the message is set forth in its opening paragraphs as follows:

"Business leadership is rallying to Shriver's defense against Powell's attack on his administration. Sol Linowitz, chairman, Xerox International, says 'Shriver is best administrator in Washington.' Suggest these telegrams, together with story guidance be given immediately to local newspapers and editorial writers as good weekend story indicating that among people who really know administration, Shriver is tops. Remember Shriver in his statement said: "... I have never known that Congressman POWELL considered himself an expert on administration—either public or private . . ."

Important we try to get this story across. For your confidential guidance, Lou Harris poll will come out Monday showing 54-46 public opinion against war on poverty, but 83% of Negro poor in favor.

Also, majority of urban residents suggest we can counter overall lack of approval by indicating that the closer people are to the programs, the more they approve them. Also, we might suggest that while overall war on poverty effort may not be liked, just about

every individual program in it, i.e., Headstart, Upward Bound, legal services, Neighborhood Youth Corps, VISTA, health services, neighborhood centers, etc., etc., did receive approval—indicating that there is a lack of general understanding about the program as opposed to its contents."

* * * * *

"Indicated below are telegrams received in Mr. Shriver's defense."

We have been advised that of all the regional offices which received this message only the Kansas City Office pursued the matter through the use of telegrams. A list of 40 addresses to whom was sent a telegram similar to the one enclosed with your letter is also enclosed. We understand that at least one regional office—San Francisco—did nothing with respect to carrying out the purpose of the message.

The Kansas City telegrams were sent through facilities operated by the General Services Administration and it is expected that the total bill to be submitted by GSA for the services it rendered will be in the neighborhood of \$2,900. A portion of this amount is to cover GSA costs in getting the messages to Western Union distributing points and the remainder is to cover charges billed or to be billed by Western Union.

You state in your letter that you think it is entirely improper to use the taxpayers' funds for the purpose of promoting the public relations of Sargent Shriver, the Director of the Program.

We have been informally advised by Office of Economic Opportunity officials that Mr. Shriver is of the view, apart from any question of legality, that it would be inappropriate to charge public funds with the cost of these telegrams and that the administrative determination in Kansas to utilize telegraphic means of communication was most injudicious. He has, therefore, determined that appropriated funds will not be utilized to pay for the costs of the telegrams, despite advice from his General Counsel that the use of such funds for this purpose would be legal.

The determination that appropriated funds will not be charged with the costs of the telegrams in question renders academic the necessity for reaching a determination of the legal issues involved.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
*Assistant Comptroller General of the
United States.*

Then they go on with a further telegram and quote from other telegrams from executives of various companies in the country that are conducting these OEO programs throughout the country.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Would you feel those telegrams might have been politically motivated?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I do not think there is any question about it. The Comptroller General also goes on to state the total cost of the telegrams sent from the Kansas City office was approximately \$2,900. That does not include the original telegram sent from the Washington office, which was either written or composed by Mr. Shriver or one of his high-powered press agents down there to stimulate this entire activity in the regional offices throughout the country. I think this is completely wrong and a misappropriation and misuse of the taxpayers' funds. If Mr.

Shriver wanted to make a personal reply to the gentleman from New York's charges about his ability to be an administrator, he should have done it through the press and not through telegrams sent at the taxpayers' expense.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand the gentleman's statement at the outset, it was that the initial telegram cost \$2,800 or \$2,900 and it was paid out of "private funds" but sent under the OEO's name. The gentleman would be interested in the fact that these wrongdoings are now being clarified for the RECORD and perhaps the leadership of the bill or someone should try to find out what private funds are being used for the purpose of propagandizing and promoting the OEO program. Do you not think that would be an important matter to put in the RECORD?

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

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

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I think this is most important. I agree with the gentleman from Florida. I think we should get to the bottom of this.

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

Mr. AYRES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ERLENBORN. The report that you state was delivered to your office—was that over the signature of Mr. Shriver?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Yes, sir.

Mr. ERLENBORN. That indicated that the person in the Kansas City office was motivated by excessive zeal, as I recall it, or some such phrase?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. That is right.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Does the gentleman think Mr. Shriver was candid in suggesting that the Kansas City man did sign his own name through an excess of zeal when apparently his instructions came from Washington?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. That is correct. This telegram, part of which I have just read to you, suggested to the regional director that he immediately proceed to get this information out to the press in his area. So it seems to me that the manager in Kansas City was simply following instructions as received in the original telegram.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I think so, too, and it seems to me Mr. Shriver was being less than candid with you in his explanation. Does the General Accounting Office report include other district offices that sent out similar news releases?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. They have reported in this letter that I received this afternoon, the same as Mr. Shriver, that this was not done in any of the other district offices but only in Kansas City. A list of all the newspapers and radio stations that received this telegram not only covers the Midwest area along the Missouri River but also the Mountain States.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. Did not Mr. Shriver say he had reprimanded the fellow in Kansas City?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. That is correct.

Mr. BATTIN. And he is reprimanding him for doing what he was told to do.

Is this not another credibility gap? Would the gentleman say that that is a fair interpretation of the situation?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I believe that is a good interpretation.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. This is exactly what happened to the very able gentleman, Mr. Yarmolinsky. He was reprimanded and sent back to the Pentagon. Now it has gone a little further, and as we stated previously, he is back at Harvard. This seems to be par for the course. The reprimand goes through, but that is as far as it goes. But with reference to poor Mr. Yarmolinsky they went the last mile.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. If I have any further time I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I just take this time to suggest to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that if they do not stop these political attacks on the cost of the telegrams, they might find out that they are cluttering up the RECORD in political attacks, at the cost of \$90 a page, and they are going to make thriftiness out of what Sargent Shriver did in the course of their political machinations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I do not condone the misspending of any Government funds. I believe it was an unwise act to send out telegrams that have been alluded to here.

However, I can understand how things will be done in the heat of an attack such as this. But I am assured by the Office of Economic Opportunity that the Federal taxpayers have suffered no loss, because of this indiscretion on the part of some employees.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the future these things will not occur.

But as far as Mr. Shriver is concerned, I believe he is an honest, diligent, hard-working, and dedicated American, doing the best he can with a real tough problem.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point in the RECORD a letter from OEO which I have received on this subject:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1966.

Re Consolidated American Services, Inc.,
OEO Contract No. 53.

THE PROBLEM

Republican Poverty Memorandum No. 36, issued August 11, 1966, charged favoritism in awarding Con Am a contract for support services in connection Job Corps field operations. Specifically, it was alleged:

1. Four local firms recommended by Job Corps were arbitrarily by-passed in spite of their immediate capability and a Washington, D.C., base.

2. The original contract was estimated at \$500,000 and required more than \$1,300,000 to complete.

3. A senior official of Con Am (W. C. Hobbs) contributed \$1,000 to the President's Club in 1964, 1965 and 1966, with the inference that this led to the awarding of the contract.

4. Con Am had no prior experience in this type of work.

5. OEO stood the total cost of establishing and maintaining a Washington facility for Con Am.

6. With the expiration of the OEO contract, Hobbs was separated from Con Am.

These charges were made the subject of articles in "The Washington Post" and in "The New York Times" on the next date.

BACKGROUND

It was apparent that committee investigators had access to the OEO procurement file which included an auditor's report dated April 1, 1965, which isolated many of the issues utilized in the complaint. The response of the contracting officer to this audit was not contained in the procurement file, which is available to the public, but did appear in the administrative file on the contract which apparently was not reviewed by the committee investigators. The New York Times article included the contracting officer's specific denial of any earlier relationship with the Con Am official named in the complaint. He was quoted as saying, "I was unaware until you just told me that he made a political contribution to anybody."

FINDINGS

The OEO contract with Con Am was phased out as of June 30, 1966. After 18 months of service, it was estimated by Con Am officials that the company lost \$65,000. Con Am's performance on the contract which required architectural and engineering service in the field as well as logistic and transportation support was evaluated as satisfactory to good. Con Am's records have been subjected to audit on the part of Agency auditors as well as the Government Accounting Office without reference to any serious shortcomings or administrative inconsistencies. With specific reference to the allegations above:

1. The official who recommended the four local firms did so on the basis of his personal experience in dealing with them in the past. Although approached by Con Am, who showed interest in performing these services, he did not include them in the recommendation since he had no prior dealings with them. He was also thinking solely in terms of architectural and engineering service. The memorandum in which he submitted his proposals called for discussion with the contracting officer. At this discussion it became apparent that a firm was needed which could provide immediate field support to installations on the West Coast. It was also developed at this time that support for logistics and transportation would be desirable, and it was apparent that the four local Washington firms did not have the immediate capability demonstrated by Con Am.

2. The Job Corps memorandum of December 22, 1964, estimated engineering services alone on the contract would run in the neighborhood of \$1 million. The Con Am contract included logistic support services as well. The assignment of work was by task orders which assured the satisfactory performance of a particular task before additional tasks

would be assigned. The first phase of the contract only was estimated to cost \$500,000 with increments to be incorporated as required.

3. This same official, W. C. Hobbs, senior VP advised OEO that he has been a financial contributor to the Republican Party for 25 years and has given as much if not more to Republican causes in the past three years, as he had to the President's Club. He says he has the cancelled checks to prove it and will produce them on demand.

4. Con Am had a history of similar services for the Defense Department and furnished ample documentation as to its ability to perform as required.

5. According to Mr. Hobbs, senior Vice President, Con Am had other work in Washington and the cost of establishing and maintaining the Washington office was pro-rated so that OEO only paid for that part supportive of contract #53. All furnishings and other materials made available for Con Am's use have been recovered in agreement with the original understanding.

6. It is true that Hobbs and Con Am went separate ways after the expiration of the contract. Hobbs maintains, however, that this was a result in shift in company policy and his desire to set up his own business, which is currently operational.

SUMMARY

A thorough analysis of all aspects of OEO's relationship with Con Am in connection with this program does not reveal any indication or evidence of favoritism or irregularities in supervision or administration of the services provided.

To quote Bill Hobbs, "I don't need political influence to lose \$65,000."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point, and if the gentleman needs additional time, I shall see that he gets it?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman from Florida to put in the RECORD the OEO answer to the first Republican Party Poverty Memorandum on Con Am about which he spoke so that all of us can see it. I have seen a few smatterings of remarks in the press about Mr. Sugarman and what he said, but I do not see anything from Mr. Shriver. I am requesting that this be done in order that I may look at it tomorrow. I have talked to my colleague from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and we shall have a followup on the previous one, in order to have full information contained in the RECORD as the debate develops.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will accept these items, I also have here a letter, on the letterhead of the Consolidated American Services, Inc., signed by Mr. W. C. Hobbs, the gentleman who was mentioned in the unfortunate remarks made earlier today and who has been accused, as I understood it, on the floor as the official of the rather large private group, of wrongful handling of public funds.

In addition, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] to the April 25, 1966, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which our colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK], begins a very thorough discussion of this entire matter which, incidentally, was made in response to detailed charges previously made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and which are alluded to, and which the gentleman well knows are available for his own inspection or for the inspection of anyone else, that led to Representative SLACK's remarks to which the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from New York made the original charges. The facts have been categorically answered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD already.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CAREY. I yield briefly but with the observation that I hope we can get away from personalities and political observations here and get down to the practicalities of this legislation.

Mr. QUIE. I just want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that I looked over the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] and in no way did he disagree with the facts contained in the report that I gave at the Kanawha Hotel in Charleston, W. Va. In fact, the OEO themselves have thoroughly investigated my remarks and found them to be accurate—completely accurate. That is why they did not follow up rather than the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK]. So this was about the last thing that Mr. Boutin did before he went over to the SBA.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to begin by observing that there has been great effort, devotion, diligence, and excellence placed in this legislation by members of both sides of our committee. I want to begin by indicating my personal admiration for the work done by the floor manager of the bill, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], who has spared nothing of himself or his staff in bringing to the floor of this House a bill providing a sound, practical approach to these problems.

On the minority side, I want to commend those who traveled with me, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. We went firsthand into the West and Midwest and looked at citywide poverty programs in action.

There is no doubt about what we found and there should be no doubt here before the Committee today of what we are up against. The question is not what kind of job Mr. Shriver is doing—and I think he is doing a splendid job. The question is not whether he is capable of doing the job of licking poverty by himself with a limited staff. The question is whether in this day and age we, the wealthiest nation in the history of all mankind, can do anything and are we doing enough to come to grips with this pressing problem.

I concur with my colleague from Indiana that poverty has been with us

through all the ages. Back in Biblical days, Isaiah said, in chapter 3, verse 15:

What mean ye that ye beat my people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor.

Then in the beginning of this country around 1774, Oliver Goldsmith said:

Laws grind the poor and rich men rule the law.

Well, today we rule with law and I hope we can be men of wisdom and fairness and prudence and look at this legislation candidly and precisely to see what we can do with the means at hand.

We have already done a great deal and I might add that if there is anything that this program suffers from, it is probably an element of too great a success in some of its systems.

We all love Headstart. Everybody speaks well of Headstart, even those who want to transfer it to another major agency. It might become somewhat lost or indifferently treated, but even those people who advocate this admire Headstart. The trouble with Headstart is that we do not have enough money in it to do all the job that we know we can do now with all the children who can be helped. This is suffering from success.

I would remind those who do want to transfer it that, although they may mean well, they indicate a certain lack of understanding of the true grasp and thrust of the Headstart program.

Headstart is not just an education program, it is something new, innovative, imaginative beyond all understanding when we passed this legislation.

It is really a child and family development program. We bring to bear in the life of a child much more than just systematic education, the work of a good teacher, and beyond that all the strengths and skills of child development specialists. We bring in medical programs. We bring in testing programs. We bring in dental care. We find deficiencies—and we are coming up with figures showing that better than 10 percent of all the children who are examined have very, very vital deficiencies that would impair their learning progress through all their lives. Finding these things, we have followup programs that have been excellently devised and are working very well.

This, of course, we have done to help the family and to help the child. This has been done as it has never been done before. So if you want to keep this going, growing, and succeeding, you are going to leave that program right where it is. It is a tribute to the administration of Sargent Shriver and his people in OEO.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is suffering from success, because in every city where the Neighborhood Youth Corps is presently ongoing there are more eligible persons for the Neighborhood Youth Corps than we have slots into which we can place them.

I say that in at least these two cases, plus the work study and the small business assistance and rural loans, in almost every phase you can imagine, the program is suffering from the symptoms of success.

What we have done is to take the experience we have gained from our knowledge in the field and we have tried to legislate on a successful precedent basis so that we can pass into all the areas of the country successful experiences of the leading programs.

In my investigation of the cities I found, yes, that some cities were lagging; but you cannot blame that on Sargent Shriver and you cannot blame that on this law. There are juridical tangles in our cities that we cannot cure with law from Washington.

In Los Angeles there is a juridical tangle almost like the mythical kingdom of Graustark. You cannot possibly travel around the county in 1 day. I do not believe that any law we pass in Washington will cure the Los Angeles problem until good government takes over. In making that statement I do not criticize any persons in the government, but there is a county-city jurisdictional setup that makes it impossible to administer this act or this kind of program well.

The same thing might be true of my city of New York. In New York there has been undertaken a vast new program to try to bring that city to grips with the problems of poverty. This has been done, though there has been failure after failure in New York City programs, and there is still room for much improvement. But that is not the fault of Washington and it is not the fault of this legislation.

I would like to close with this observation. I shall have more to say on the subject during the debate under the 5-minute rule. I think we had better vote for this program for one very compelling reason. It is sort of like the man who goes to the hospital to visit people day after day, and says, "I have great charity. I love every patient in this hospital, and I have been loving them in all their illnesses, and I have been contributing to all their illnesses. I love these people because they are ill. I will do anything I can for their illnesses."

A proper comment might be, "Let's stop doing something for the illnesses and let's start doing something for the remedies."

I say that we have programs in this Government that we have been supporting, year in and year out, on both sides of the aisle, programs involving the illness of welfare which are costing the American taxpayers over \$4 billion a year. We have been supporting such programs on both sides of the aisle. We have been supporting the malady—dependency. Now we are calling upon the House to do something in the way of a remedy for the malady. It can be done if we continue to press this program with bipartisan support, by better training in the Youth Corps, the Job Corps, by better programs in Headstart, and better health in the rural areas and the cities. By doing this we will be doing something against the growing establishment of welfare.

As my final point, I would invite your attention to a new section in this bill, section 603, which I have succeeded in

placing in the legislation. It calls upon the Director of the OEO to encourage State agencies and coordinate Federal agencies to encourage, stimulate, and bring about literacy training for the illiterate, better job training for the untrained, and better employment opportunities for those who have not had any chance for employment because of their illiteracy or undertraining. If we can get that done, we will see welfare programs recede in every city.

We saw it recede in Chicago, where under Mayor Daley and the late Welfare Commissioner Raymond Hillyard, they rolled back the welfare program to an all-time low using the instrumentalities of the poverty program.

They did it in Chicago. Let us do it all over this country and let us start legislating the remedy for the malady instead of contributing to illness of dependency.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.]

Sixty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 306]

Adair	Friedel	Nedzi
Albert	Fulton, Tenn.	Nix
Anderson, Ill.	Garmatz	O'Brien
Anderson,	Giaimo	O'Konski
Tenn.	Gilligan	Olsen, Mont.
Aspinall	Goodell	Passman
Baring	Gray	Philbin
Barrett	Griffiths	Pirnie
Blatnik	Gurney	Poage
Bow	Hagan, Ga.	Pool
Brock	Halleck	Powell
Callaway	Hanna	Quillen
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Reid, N.Y.
Celler	Hansen, Iowa	Reifel
Clausen,	Hansen, Wash.	Reinecke
Don H.	Harvey, Ind.	Resnick
Clevenger	Hays	Rivers, S.C.
Connable	Hebert	Robison
Conyers	Holifield	Rogers, Colo.
Corman	Horton	Rogers, Tex.
Craley	Hutchinson	Roncalio
Cunningham	Johnson, Calif.	St Germain
Daddario	Jones, Mo.	Scott
Davis, Ga.	Jones, N.C.	Shipley
Derwinski	Keogh	Shriver
Dickinson	King, N.Y.	Sikes
Diggs	Kluczynski	Skubitz
Donohue	Kupferman	Smith, Va.
Dorn	Landrum	Stephens
Duncan, Oreg.	Long, Md.	Sweeney
Dyal	McClory	Teague, Tex.
Edwards, Ala.	McEwen	Thompson, Tex.
Evans, Colo.	McMillan	Toll
Everett	McVicker	Tuck
Evins, Tenn.	Maillard	Tunney
Fallon	Martin, Ala.	Tuton
Farbstein	Martin, Mass.	Van Derlin
Fascell	Mathias	Walker, Miss.
Findley	Michel	Weitner
Fino	Miller	White, Idaho
Fisher	Monagan	Whitten
Flynt	Moore	Willis
Fogarty	Morrison	Wilson, Bob
Ford,	Morse	Wilson,
Gerald R.	Moss	Charles H.
	Murray	Wright

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRICE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, 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. 15111, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 301 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.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I take this time to confer with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS]. I would hope that we would be able to finish general debate tomorrow and, as far as our side is concerned, I will say to the gentleman from Florida, we will do our very best to complete all of our speeches under general debate without having to use the time we have left, because I realize that we have used more time today than has the gentleman from Florida.

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Speaking for this side, I would be most happy to yield all the balance of my time except 2 hours, which could be used tomorrow, if your side would be willing to use all your time except 2 hours, which would be used tomorrow, and we could agree to come in tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock, and then on Wednesday we could start under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. AYRES. In view of the fact that I am not able to confer with all members on the committee, I can only say to the gentleman that we will do our very best. We will expedite our speeches, getting out all the information and facts we feel we should, but we cannot make any firm commitment as to the limitation of the balance of the time. I will say we will do our best to stay here as long as the gentleman wants to finish debate tomorrow, so the bill can be read.

Mr. GIBBONS. Since we have used only 1 hour and 44 minutes because of quorum calls, I have no authority to agree to that. I wish, however, that the gentleman would confer with his colleagues and see if it is at all possible to do what I have suggested. We are prepared to yield up all our time except 2 hours, which we would use tomorrow. Then, of course, we would expect you to yield all of your time except 2 hours. We could come in at 11 o'clock and finish debate without any undue delay or hardship on the Members.

Mr. AYRES. It would be impossible for me to make that commitment without conferring with Members on this side, and it is impossible to confer with them this evening. I suggest that we continue. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 3 minutes. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire any further time?

Mr. AYRES. Not at this time.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to come to the floor today to support the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] in his leadership on this bill. It has been a privilege to work with him this year, and I want to say here that I know of no piece of legislation that has come through the Education and Labor Committee since I

have been on it that has had the attention that H.R. 15111, the 1966 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, has had.

I know that this legislation presents a great temptation for many people to make political speeches. I have read in the newspapers for a number of months that in November one of the principal issues that we will have to discuss and defend politically, in the opinion of many observers, is this piece of legislation.

This places in front of all of us the temptation to make political speeches, and we have heard our share of them today. However, I would like to ask that we remember the real purpose of this legislation. Please, reflect for a moment on what a cruel hoax we are perpetrating on the people, looking to the Congress for some ray of hope in the war on poverty when we suggest from either side of the aisle that the war on poverty is really a very simple one that could be won if we just did one more thing in exactly the way that some one of us might think it ought to be done.

I would be indeed surprised if anyone were able to design a piece of legislation that could come to a body as diverse as this great House of Representatives and satisfy all of its Members that it was the one infallible way to conduct the war on poverty. I do not expect to see that, nor am I disappointed that it is not in prospect.

I am disappointed, however, that we are wasting time with quibbling over who sent what telegram to whom and who paid for it, when we should be talking about the people that we are trying to reach with the programs under this act.

We are going to be discussing the Job Corps at some stage in this debate which is one of the areas of this program most frequently attacked by the critics of the act in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and by press releases and speeches and statements made publicly and otherwise across the country. I hope when we begin to discuss important parts of the poverty war we will keep in mind the people who are the object of this program and the people we are trying to reach through it.

I would like to call to the attention of the House a profile that was recently done on the average person entering the Job Corps program. Let us take a look at his education. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] has already alluded to it. We find the average boy or girl who volunteers for this program has a reading score of 4.7 years of school. That gives him less than a fifth-grade reading ability.

These people are all volunteers, I might say. We do not conscript anyone for the Job Corps. These applicants are young people who, themselves, have initiated the action bringing them to a program that they hope will afford them an opportunity to become participating members of society. This person has about 7 years of "some kind" of schooling when he gets to the program.

From a health standpoint, 80 percent of them have never seen a doctor or a

dentist, either for an examination or for treatment.

All of them average, when one considers them as a group, 7 pounds underweight for their age or for their age and height combined.

When one looks at their brief backgrounds, one finds that 63 percent of them have no previous record in terms of a police record or trouble with social agencies or treatment by social agencies. This belies the statements which are made, and which have had a terrible frightening effect on many citizens of this country, that the average Job Corpsman is a fugitive from society because he is really a fugitive from justice.

Just 27 percent of the Job Corps enrollees have some record of minor anti-social behavior before they come to the Corps, and 10 percent of these people have what we consider to be a serious conviction for some infraction of society's rules.

What kind of family do they come from? Do they have a family at all?

Forty-five percent of the enrollees in the Job Corps come from broken homes. Sixty-five percent of them come from families where the head of the household is unemployed. Fifty percent of these boys and girls come from families that are on relief.

This is what my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], was alluding to a little while ago when he asked that we quit quibbling about the \$1.75 billion we are talking about in this bill in comparison to \$4.2 billion in welfare programs that the Members on both sides of the aisle vote for with such alacrity. Recognize that 50 percent of the people we are handling in this one program alone come out of homes where their idea of the way to live is to live from one relief check to the other.

We are offering boys who have enough foresight to look for a better life for themselves an opportunity for that better life through the Job Corps.

Ninety percent of the boys and girls who are entering the Job Corps have never been employed in any kind of steady employment or part-time employment before they entered the Job Corps. They have absolutely no conception of what it is like to work for a dollar and to have the satisfaction of spending a dollar that was earned by their own ability or effort.

Those who were working present even a more frightening figure. Of the 10 percent who did have some kind of employment before they came to the Job Corps the average wage they were capable of earning was 80 cents per hour.

Recent studies of followup on boys who have completed Job Corps training indicate that they are averaging \$1.68 an hour when they leave the Job Corps; that is, within a very short period thereafter.

It is not too difficult to see rather quickly what a contribution the graduate of the Job Corps is capable of making to society when he starts to earn double what he was earning before he came there, if he was in that lucky 10 percent

who had jobs. But the gains to society through the increased earning capacity of all Job Corps graduates more than repays our citizen-taxpayers for the entire cost of the Economic Opportunity Act.

This becomes even more apparent when we examine some of the indicators of progress for those young people through this program; the arrest rate of corpsmen is about one-half the national youth rate. The average wage of placed graduates is \$1.71 per hour. The average graduate gains 1.7 grades in reading ability his first 5 months of training.

Also \$34 million worth of conservation work was accomplished by these young Americans while they were undergoing training—perhaps their first—but thanks to the Corps, certainly not their last opportunity to contribute to the general welfare of their country.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 3 hours and 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 2 hours and 50 minutes remaining.

Mr. QUIE. Does the gentleman from Florida wish to yield time?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield back sufficient time right now to balance out with the other side.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the great weakness of our present administration in Washington, says Walter Lippmann, is that it depends on the policy of "the thin end of the wedge."¹ Consequently, small experiments grow into major programs, while a little inflation leads to runaway inflation. Similarly, in church-state relationships, the time to resist is when the thin edge of the wedge is applied.

Last year, therefore, I offered an amendment to the poverty amendments in an attempt to clarify what I then believed to be the intent of Congress in this area, and hoping thereby to nip in the bud a questionable practice. The Office of Economic Opportunity had at that point made a few grants to and

¹ Lippmann, Walter "The Thin End of the Wedge", *Newsweek*, February 14, 1966.

entered into a few contracts with churches and other religious organizations. Since this seemed in clear violation of the Constitution, I offered an amendment barring such grants and/or contracts in the future. With the defeat of my amendment, the Director of the OEO felt free to proceed in this direction and has done so in a multiplicity of instances. Now the wedge pries wider as the months pass by. I, therefore, shall once again in 1966, call upon the House to pass this needed amendment.

Mr. Chairman, religious liberty is enjoyed in America to an extent unparalleled anywhere else in the world. Yet we seem at present to overlook the historic evidence that our religious liberty is the direct result of the wall that was established between church and state in the last article of the Constitution and the first article of the Bill of Rights.

Professor Leo Pfeffer, chairman of the department of political science, Long Island University, and assistant general counsel for the American Jewish Congress, declared:

The last words of the last article of the Constitution prohibit any religious test (as a qualification of any office or public trust under the United States) and the first words of the first article of the Bill of Rights prohibit "any law respecting an establishment of religion." The significance of this ending and beginning is more than symbolic, it indicates unmistakably that in the minds of the fathers of our Constitution, independence of religion and government was the Alpha and Omega of democracy and freedom.²

The philosophy of separation of church and state was a new and revolutionary idea. Jefferson stated the idea most concisely in his letter to the Danbury Baptist Association in 1802 when he wrote:

Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between church and state.³

"Jefferson's phrase," as Waite has said, "was a shout of triumph after a winning fight against new world remnants of old world ecclesiasticism."⁴

The separation of church and state was a uniquely American contribution to Western civilization. Under this system, religion has achieved in the United States a high estate unequaled anywhere else in the world. The great experiment has been justified by history, and proved the proposition on which it was based—that complete separation of church and state is best for church and best for state, and secures freedom for both.

My concern for governmental propriety is matched, therefore, by my concern for the church, that it might not become

a partner to its own diminution to the level of a ward of the State, a pseudo-political lobbying agency or a mere distributor of government largess. For 2,000 years the Christian church, as a part of its high and holy mission among men, has carried out great works of benevolence through the voluntary service and giving of Christian people, and without the assistance of the OEO. Caring for widows and orphans, for the lame, the halt, and the blind by churches has never before required the receipt by churches of tax funds. Such a practice can well undermine both their strength and their freedom.

Since my church is weakened by whatever extent it has accepted tax funds and could well be compromised by becoming an agency of the secular State, if my efforts here resulted in nothing more than the cessation of grants to and/or contracts with Baptist churches, I would have rendered a service both to my church and to our country.

Pfeffer contends:

The principle of separation and freedom was conceived as a unitary principle . . . separation guarantees freedom, and freedom requires separation. The experiences in other countries indicate clearly that religious freedom is most secure where Church and State are separated and least secure where Church and State are united.⁵

It is a natural conclusion, then, that when the constitutional fathers and the generation that adopted the Constitution formalized the concept of the first amendment, they thereby imposed—and intended to impose—on future generations of Americans in church and state a great moral obligation to preserve this experiment. They knew from their experience in Europe the regrettable consequences, both practical and spiritual, when the church became dependent upon the Government for its sustenance.

Regrettably, congressional actions that appeared as an occasional intrusion on the principle of separation a generation ago have today attained the proportion of a massive assault. The twin rails of our American experiment, church and state, originally intended to follow parallel, unconflicting, and unhostile pathways, have been put on a sure collision course. An indication of this development is revealed in a statement made on December 9, 1965, by Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, to the national convention of the AFL-CIO in San Francisco. He said:

Three or four years ago it was practically impossible for a Federal agency to give direct grants to a religious group. Today we have given hundreds without violating the principle of separation of Church and State.⁶

Mr. Chairman, I ask you, what is the difference in "today" and "3 or 4 years ago"? How can it be constitutional today to give hundreds of grants to religious groups when it was unconstitutional 3 or 4 years ago? How can any direct grant by the Federal Government to religious bodies be constitutional in

view of the first amendment and consequent Supreme Court rulings?

For example, I am a Baptist, regularly contributing to the support of my own church through voluntary giving. Yet, if 1 red cent is taxed from me through force of law by my Government and given to a Baptist church, I must vigorously protest that my constitutional rights as an American citizen have been violated by my Government. How much greater the violation in the case of my Jewish neighbor or my Catholic neighbor forced by law to support through his taxes a religious enterprise in violation of his own conscience. By no device or any process, however circuitous or indirect, should he be required to support any function of my church.

Mr. Chairman, it has been observed that the "land where religious liberty and justice have been guaranteed by the separation of church and state is now facing one break after another in the historic wall of separation."⁷

It can be neither ignored nor denied that we are moving away from separation of church and state with contribution of Government funds for church support. I am as much concerned over the direction in which the facts point as I am the facts themselves. They point the wrong way. They point toward a return to a fusion of church and state. Our constant circumvention of the wall of separation of church and state can ultimately bring that wall tumbling down like the walls of Jericho. What began as a trickling stream has become a raging torrent which may one day sweep away the wall of separation between church and state erected by the first amendment. An ever-increasing stream of tax funds is flowing to religious institutions under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, the Defense Education Act, and the Economic Opportunity Act with which we are primarily concerned in this current House debate.

A survey in July 1965, admittedly far from complete, found at least 115 Government programs through which there was possible involvement in church activities or through which there could be church administration of Government programs.⁸

The number of overt violations of the establishment clause of the first amendment by the OEO is legion. Yet, no less an authority on constitutional law than the distinguished Senator SAM J. ERVIN has stated:

History makes it crystal clear that the Founding Fathers drafted and ratified this provision (the First Amendment) not merely to erect a wall of separation between the Church and the State but for the purpose of securing to every man the unencumbered right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. It is also clear that to avoid any encroachment on this right, our Founding Fathers intended to outlaw forever the Congressional appropriations of all funds for the direct or indirect sup-

² Pfeffer, Leo, *Church, State and Freedom*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1953, p. 114.

³ Writings of Thomas Jefferson (Monticello Edition) Vol. XVI, pp. 281-282.

⁴ Waite, Edward F., "Jefferson's 'Wall of Separation' What and Where", 33 Minnesota Law Review, p. 516.

⁵ Pfeffer, *op. cit.*, p. 604.

⁶ OEO Press Release, December 10, 1965 as recorded Judicial Review, S. 2097, p. 740.

⁷ Archer, Glenn, "The Growing Struggle for Religious Liberty" cited by Lowell Stanley: *Embattled Wall*, Washington, D.C.: POAU, 1966, p. 41.

⁸ Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs in Judicial Review, S. 2097, p. 686.

port of any and all religious institutions and their activities."

Observe the evidence as reported in leading secular publications:

EXHIBIT NO. 1

A showpiece of religious cooperation in the poverty aid program was presented in Washington, D.C., March 19 when Mr. Shriver announced Federal grants of \$2.8 million to religious groups for services to migrant workers. These funds are also being granted under the Economic Opportunity Act. The lion's share of the \$1,338,926 went to Michigan Migrant Opportunity, Inc.—Protestant-Catholic. The Arizona Migrant and Indian Ministry—interdenominational—got \$1,231,084.¹⁹

EXHIBIT NO. 2

In Evansville, Ind., the staffs of denominational schools were augmented by personnel reimbursed by the Federal antipoverty program. In Evansville-Vanderberg County 183 persons were to receive employment in the schools during the school year and 62 through the summer. Of these, 138 and 21, respectively, were to work in parochial schools.²⁰

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Did I understand the gentleman to say that we were using poverty funds to employ people to work in parochial schools? Or does the gentleman mean that a school building normally used for parochial school classes has been used for a poverty program, the employees of which were paid by poverty funds?

Mr. BUCHANAN. In the Evansville Sunday Courier and Press of March 14, 1965, in an article entitled "How We Can Help Up Economic Ladder," the information contained there said that 183 persons were to receive employment in the schools during the school year and 62 persons through the summer. Of these 138, 21 were to work in parochial schools and the personnel were reimbursed by the Federal antipoverty program, according to that article.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman in the well has asserted this statistic or rather has quoted this article, I assume, in support of some point that he is apparently urging. I understood that point to be that we were using poverty funds to employ people to work in parochial schools.

I am asking the gentleman point blank, is he making the assertion now that poverty funds have been used to employ people for parochial school programs? Or is he not in fact talking about the poverty programs that for want of a better place to hold them have been

held in a building otherwise and at other times used as a parochial school?

Mr. BUCHANAN. In the article from which I quoted, this was a matter of people employed in the schools during the school year and through the summer.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Perhaps I have not made my question clear.

Does the gentleman believe from reading that article that we are using poverty funds to employ people to work in parochial schools as part of that school's program?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is my impression that that is the case. I will be glad to get the article in its entirety and insert it in the Record so that the gentleman may read it and then judge for himself.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I was also concerned about the gentleman's statement, and I may say to the gentleman that I recall some months ago this year going down to Mississippi and, in Jackson, visiting a schoolhouse late at night, which was a parochial school, in which building there were being offered adult basic education courses, literacy courses, under a program financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity. This was not during school hours and this was not certainly a part of the parochial school program.

Do I understand that the gentleman would object to the use of a church related school building in such circumstances for such a program?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would say to the distinguished gentleman that we had a similar colloquy and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, also, I think, during the last debate on the poverty program.

If I believed that these grants to which Mr. Shriver referred in saying that 3 or 4 years ago it was practically impossible for a Federal agency to give direct grants to a religious group, and today we have given hundreds of grants without violating the principle of the separation of the church and State, and if I believed that this was simply the use of church buildings for Government programs, this would indeed modify my position.

As to the instance in Indiana, I shall look not only into the article but beyond the article, because I do not wish to make any unjust inferences or accusations here. Certainly there are many people who believe in the rightness of this program. But, as I understand it—and I shall develop it further and give other examples—there are church groups that are connected with the poverty program which are either receiving direct grants or grants through an organization formed by the church as a separate corporation, a buffer corporation, which, in my judgment, has the same relationship to the church as General Motors would have to the stockholders of General Motors or to the board of directors of General Motors.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Would the gentleman then say by analogy that he would be opposed to what I understand are ex-

isting programs under the Housing Act which enable church organizations to undertake sponsorship of housing for the elderly? Is the gentleman saying he opposes this kind of program? I know we have many of these in my own State, some in my own district, operated by Protestant church groups. These are church groups that are just as jealous of our constitutional heritage and the separation of church and state as is the gentleman in the well and as am I.

So I suggest to the gentleman that he is discussing very complicated and complex matters. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. I do not wish to press him. Perhaps he is not ready to make a statement, but I do hope that the gentleman will illuminate for the benefit of Members of the Committee the kinds of distinctions he has in mind.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I certainly shall. I thank the gentleman for his question. I shall put into the Record a large number of cases which to my mind constitute one of two things happening: the church acting as an agency of the Government or the Government supporting what would normally be a benevolent program of the church, though indirectly. This has gone to some extent in some places.

For example, in the New York poverty program it was reported that Mr. John Lindsay, in complaining about the state of the poverty program when he took over, referred to more than \$10 million in funds which were returned to the OEO, and stated that the reasons for these returns was that some of the money as to the OEO had been marked for church buildings.

Sargent Shriver did withdraw this money or demand the rebate of the money saying he was afraid that Congress would raise the religious issue should this program be funded. This points out the danger of churches becoming, as it were, partners of the Government with tax funds involved, and acting indirectly as agencies of the State, or the impropriety of tax funds, however indirectly or circuitously, supporting what would normally be the program of the church.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The gentleman happens to be referring to a program with which we on the committee are very familiar. As you well know, the schools in the city of New York, as in other large cities, are terribly overcrowded. As a matter of fact, there are no facilities available to operate Project Headstart for the number of children that should be covered by the program. We have a program in New York, in Harlem, Bedford Stuyvesant, to name two of the areas, where health requirements are met by putting flush toilets in to accommodate small children that are in a room that does, in fact, belong to a church but is leased from the church to the New York poverty agency for the purpose of conducting Project Headstart. Does the gentleman object to that as in

¹⁹ Judicial Review, S. 2097, p. 4.

²⁰ "Poverty War Proposal Revamped," *El Paso Times*, February 18, 1965 and *Church and State*, Vol. 18, No. 5, May, 1965, p. 14.

²¹ *Evansville Press*, March 19, 1965.

some way infringing upon the very sacred separation of church and state?

Mr. BUCHANAN. My amendment is to do one thing, to bar grants to churches and other religious organizations. From what the two gentlemen have said, I must come to the conclusion that there is basis for their support of my amendment, for this amendment deals with grants to or contracts with churches and other religious organizations.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say I support clearly his prohibition against a grant to a church, in the sense he has been using the word "grant" here today, but I must caution him that the situation I have just mentioned constitutes a contract between the poverty agency of New York and some group leasing a part of a church building from the church when it is not being used for religious purposes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If this were the extent of these arrangements, I would say to the gentleman I would greatly modify my position and probably would not be offering my amendment. I would urge the gentleman and other Members of this Committee to take the time at least to scan my remarks in the RECORD, because I have compiled this over a period of time with some care from various records, and I would urge them to look at the various cases, and consider the testimony by Sargent Shriver himself concerning grants to various churches.

I would also call to the attention of the committee that in various recent decisions of the courts this has been made crystal clear, that the State must do nothing to benefit not only one church, but any or all churches. In a series of recent decisions, the court has, as it were, tightened up the interpretations of the first amendment.

I believe the committee will do well to consider these recent court decisions, which make very clear that if and when there has been tax support for any church institution, there is grave doubt as to its constitutionality.

I will reaffirm that it is best for state and best for church for each to serve, and each to greatly serve, in its own place, fully but separately, that both might remain fully free.

EXHIBIT NO. 3

The staff of Nazareth College, Rochester, N.Y., a sectarian institution, was able to expand its staff with Federal antipoverty funds. A grant of \$4,140 provided salaries for student jobs ranging from clerk to typist to dormitory and library assistant.¹²

EXHIBIT NO. 4

In Pittsburgh, vacation programs of parish schools were to be financed with antipoverty funds. About 1,000 preschool children were to be recruited and receive training, half in parochial schools and half in public schools. The program was to cost \$200,000.¹³

¹² Democrat and Chronicle, Rochester, N.Y.: March 4, 1965.

¹³ "Needy to Get Headstart in School," Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, March 20, 1965.

EXHIBIT NO. 5

In Baton Rouge, La., the antipoverty program is in the hands of one specific denomination as is also the case in Lake Charles.¹⁴

EXHIBIT NO. 6

One church has prepared an exhaustive study entitled "The War on Poverty." This handbook turns out to be a careful exploration of the ways church agencies can participate in the antipoverty program. Many of the programs would seem to benefit the church agency as much as, or more than the poverty stricken.¹⁵

EXHIBIT NO. 7

Antipoverty programs are being used to divert Federal funds to the support of parochial schools.

William Steif of Scripps Howard reports that in Pittsburgh, \$207,000 in Federal funds have been allocated to five parochial schools; in Detroit, \$191,572 to seven parochial schools; and in New Haven, Conn., \$29,810 will be paid to one such school. The constitutional ban is supposedly avoided with the argument that the money does not go to the school but only for the benefit of the children in it.¹⁶

EXHIBIT NO. 8

In Chicago, where the competition for the economic opportunity dollar has been prolonged and bitter, some of the Headstart projects were the Woodlawn Community Minister's Association—Presbyterian, Lutheran, Baptist—Temple Mizpah, the YMCA, the Chicago affiliate of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Roman Catholic Archdiocese. The total budget for Chicago is \$3,711,910.¹⁷ The flow of Federal funds into sectarian agencies in such programs is unprecedented. Mr. Chairman, and would seem to constitute a fundamentally new church-state posture.

EXHIBIT NO. 9

According to R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, millions of dollars have been granted to Catholic and Protestant church groups throughout the United States for antipoverty projects. Shriver announced that these grants are being allocated because these churches are participating vigorously in the Nation's war on poverty. The largest single grant was \$7,500,000 which was allocated to the Roman Catholic Diocese of Natchez-Jackson, Miss., for a program intended to benefit 100,000 people.¹⁸

EXHIBIT NO. 10

William C. Selover, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, reports in an article, entitled "Federal Funds

Test Church-State Boundary," as follows:

U.S. Taxes made available to private, church-related groups some 5½ billion government dollars this year to operate various parts of more than 60 federal programs. These are mainly in the areas of education, health, housing, and antipoverty. . . . Hundreds of programs in the "war on Poverty" are being administered by church groups. The constitutionality of these programs is in for "some question," admits the general counsel of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The Christian Science Monitor has learned that in Chicago public funds are being used by local anti-poverty groups to prevent foreclosure by mortgage companies on financially defunct church properties.¹⁹

EXHIBIT NO. 11

It was reported on April 1, 1966, that the U.S. Government, after announcing its entry into a Kansas City lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of spending public funds for antipoverty programs which are run by religious groups now has quietly shifted the entire Headstart program there to public auspices.

This move renders the issues moot, and the suit has been voluntarily dismissed by the plaintiffs.

The suit, *Allendoerfer, et. al. v. Human Resources Corp., et. al.*, had been filed in June last year by 18 taxpayers. It challenged the Project Head Start Program in Kansas City, which was conducted in three parochial schools as well as in six public schools and was financed by the Federal Government. . . . Shortly after the case was filed the U.S.A. moved to appear as amicus curiae. Request to enter the suit was made by attorneys for the OEO in Washington, D.C.

When the Head Start program was shifted to public auspices, Attorney Walter A. Raymond of Kansas City, acting on behalf of the plaintiffs, dismissed the action.²⁰

If there were no violation of the Constitution why was the program "quietly" transferred to public schools? If public schools were available, why were they not used initially? Was the OEO unsure of the legality of its grants?

EXHIBIT NO. 12

In the article dealing with Project Headstart, the New York Times has written the following:

But while these technical pitfalls can be avoided, a much more serious issue beclouds an essentially sound venture. As New York's program—the largest in the Nation—clearly indicates, the principle of separation of Church and State has been ignored. The list of direct Federal grants includes, among the 59 separate recipient agencies, a large variety of church-related organizations. For example, the Education department of New York and Brooklyn Roman Catholic Diocese together will get over \$440,000, an amount exceeded only by the \$2.6 million going to the city's Board of Education. The New York City Society of the Methodist Church is listed with \$75,342, and many other churches will receive Federal grants.

The special conditions set down for Project Head Start require that "there shall be no religious instruction, proselytization or worship in connection with any program supported in whole or in part by this grant.

¹⁴ Baton Rouge State Times, March 8, 1965.

¹⁵ Church and State, Vol. 18, No. 1, January, 1965.

¹⁶ "A Pattern? Parochial Schools Aided Under Poverty Program," Washington Daily News, December 21, 1964.

¹⁷ "Daily Sets Pre-School Openings," Chicago Sun Times, March 2, 1965.

¹⁸ "Shriver Cites Churches' Role in War on Poverty," Religious News Service, September 28, 1965, p. 4.

¹⁹ Christian Science Monitor, April 27, 1966, pp. 1, 15.

²⁰ Church and State, Vol. 19, No. 5, May 1966, p. 14.

But it is surely naive and unrealistic to expect that the sectarian religious orientation, of which religious schools are justly proud, can be purged from their Head Start operation. In fact, the guidelines admit the impossibility of proper separation by requiring that facilities "shall, to the maximum feasible extent, be devoid of sectarian or religious symbols, decoration, or other sectarian identification." Who is to judge the "extent" to which sectarian symbols are compatible with Federal support?²¹

Mr. Chairman, how can you render a church religiously sterile? Its architecture, its name, its furnishings reflect its nature. When the participants in these Federal projects attend these agency churches, how are they to decide whether theirs is a governmental project administered by the church or a church project paid for by the Government? Are we to believe that their curiosity will be satisfied by telling them that neither the former nor the latter is the case? The statement of Justice Douglas that "an institution is strengthened in proselytizing when it is strengthened in any department by contributions from other than its own members"²² is most germane here. Federal programs shrouded in the garb of the church will be interpreted by the masses as church programs per se and, as a result, the government is a partner in establishment which the first amendment specifically forbids.

EXHIBIT NO. 13

The Washington Post, in an editorial titled "Shaky Start" declared:

The church-state problem is not obviated by the stipulation in the anti-poverty programs that projects using church facilities must be open to persons of all faiths, that religious instruction may not be given, and that religious symbols must be covered up. Churches are commonly open to persons of all faiths, that is . . . how they proselyte. And no amount of covering up religious symbols can avoid making the religious institution itself seem the source of benefactions financed out of public funds. For all the good intentions and good will entailed, we believe there is more danger than welfare in this partnership between church and state.²³

EXHIBIT NO. 14

Mayor Lindsay, of New York, is reported to have said that he had inherited "one of the worst" antipoverty apparatuses in the country and that the Federal Goverment had defaulted on anti-poverty money promised to the city. The mayor made his charges in explaining why the city had to return \$10.3 million to the Government. The "default" of which he spoke concerned money that the OEO had promised to give to rebuild buildings for suitable use as centers for the Headstart programs. As indicated in the earlier colloquy, Mr. Lindsay said that one factor in the Government's failure to provide funds was that some of the money asked of the OEO had been earmarked for church buildings. He said that Sargent Shriver "had called to tell him his agency was 'afraid' of Congress because of the religious issue and could not fund the program as submitted."²⁴

²¹ New York Times, May 24, 1965.

²² Judicial Review, S. 2097, p. 148.

²³ "Shaky Start", Washington Post, August 18, 1965.

²⁴ Press Summary, American Enterprise Institute, August 1, 1966.

EXHIBIT NO. 15

Mr. Chairman, in illustration of the extent of such activities, I include herewith the OEO record of some of the grants made directly to religious and sectarian bodies. And these are only those that use their official church title. Who knows how many more there may be using titles that do not convey sectarian affiliation?

It should also be noted that this exhibit contains only the Protestant and Jewish churches and church-related institutions. Unless otherwise indicated, the programs are CAP-Conduct and Administration, an overall term used by OEO.

Status of OEO programs as of June 30, 1966

ALABAMA

Bullock County: Union Springs, First Baptist Church, Headstart, summer 1965, 240 children, May 14, 1965	\$38,950
First Baptist Church, Headstart, summer 1966, 378 children, 17 classes, May 31, 1966	64,418
Jefferson County: Birmingham, First Unitarian Church, Headstart, summer 1965, 87 children, June 10, 1965	16,315
Perry County: Marion, Berean Baptist Church, Headstart, summer 1966, 120 children, May 31, 1966, 8 classes	25,791

ARIZONA

Arizona Council of Churches: Migrant and Indian Ministry, health and education projects for migrant children, Counties of Maricopa, Navajo, Pima, Pinel, Yuma, CAP, migrant worker grant section 311, June 3, 1966	632,316
Arizona Council of Churches: migrant opportunity programs: Training	246,315
Improvement program and counseling	77,290
CAP-demonstration grant, Counties of Maricopa, Pima, Pinel, Yuma, June 22, 1966	(1)

ARKANSAS

Clark County: Arkadelphia, Ouachita Baptist College, Project Upward Bound, Apr. 7, 1966	51,395
---	--------

CONNECTICUT

Middlesex County: Middletown, Wesleyan University, Project Upward Bound, Apr. 7, 1966	102,889
---	---------

FLORIDA

Pinellas County: St. Petersburg, Fla., Presbyterian College, Project Upward Bound, Apr. 15, 1966	169,551
--	---------

GEORGIA

Bibb County: Macon, Mercer University (Baptist), Project Upward Bound, Apr. 15, 1966	119,232
--	---------

DeKalb County: Atlanta, Emory University (Methodist), Project Upward Bound, Apr. 7, 1966	75,681
--	--------

Free for All Missionary Baptist Church, Headstart, summer, 1965, 226 children, May 15, 1965	26,486
---	--------

ILLINOIS

Cook County: Chicago, Lutheran Camp for Retarded	14,789
--	--------

American Friends Service Committee, Inc., Districts 1 through 13, Vista Volunteers, urban, 5 requested, 6 in service	20,100
--	--------

¹ No figure given.

² OEO, "Status of Programs as of June 30, 1966".

Status of OEO programs as of June 30, 1966—Continued

INDIANA

Richmond County: Wayne, Earlham College (Friends), Apr. 15, 1966	\$87,793
--	----------

IOWA

Decatur County: Lamoni, GraceLand College (Latter Day Saints), Project Upward Bound, Apr. 8, 1966	78,111
---	--------

Winneshiek County: Decorah, Luther College (Lutheran), Project Upward Bound, April 7, 1966	127,332
--	---------

KANSAS

Montgomery County: Independence, First Methodist Church of Independence, Headstart, 60 children, 4 classes, June 7, 1966	15,569
--	--------

LOUISIANA

Caddo Parish: St. Paul C.M.E. Church, Headstart, 30 children, May 24, 1965	5,023
--	-------

Shreveport: The Williams Memorial C.M.E. Temple, Headstart, 54 children, June 15, 1965	9,791
--	-------

Caddo Parish: Shreveport, Hollywood Heights Presbyterian Day Care Center, Headstart, 49 children, June 15, 1965	6,576
---	-------

St. Joseph Baptist Church: Headstart, 51 children, June 9, 1965	9,848
---	-------

MARYLAND

Baltimore: First Baptist Church, child care program, CAP-demonstration, Grant, Aug. 30, 1965	88,900
--	--------

Baltimore: Douglas Memorial Community Church, Headstart, 60 children, May 24, 1965	7,488
--	-------

St. James Episcopal Church: Headstart, 75 children, June 1, 1965	11,705
--	--------

Knox Presbyterian Church Community Center: Headstart, 90 children, June 10, 1965	14,496
--	--------

MICHIGAN

Wayne County: Detroit, Protestant Community Services, preparatory school, voter education, and community development, Vista volunteers, 11 requested, 11 active	36,850
---	--------

MINNESOTA

Ramsey County: St. Paul, Jewish Vocational Service, Neighborhood Youth Corps, 220 participants, Feb. 16, 1966	211,885
---	---------

MISSISSIPPI

Winston County: Louisville, Wesley Methodist Church, Headstart, full year program, Mar. 8, 1966	155,498
---	---------

Wesley Methodist Church: Headstart, 127 children, May 15, 1965	21,266
--	--------

MISSOURI

St. Louis: United Church of Christ Neighborhood Houses, supplement existing staff of three settlement houses, VISTA Volunteer—Urban—6 requested, 5 in service	16,750
---	--------

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico Council of Churches (statewide), CAP—Migrant Workers Grant, sec. 311, June 25 1965	1,360,313
---	-----------

NEW YORK

Erie County: Williamsville, Methodist Home for Children, Headstart, 30 children, May 15, 1965	5,280
---	-------

Beth Israel Medical Center, develop model medical service program, CAP—demonstration grant, Dec. 21, 1965	661,151
---	---------

Status of OEO programs as of June 30, 1966—Continued

NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina Council of Churches; Health, education, and housing programs for migrants (statewide), CAP-migrant workers grant, sec. 311, Mar. 19, 1965.

Day care program, migrant families, same grant, April 12, 1966.

Guilford County: Greensboro, Grace Lutheran Day School, Headstart, 30 children, June 10, 1965.

OHIO

Council of Churches of Christ in Greater Cleveland, Neighborhood Youth Corps, 116 participants, June 30, 1965.

Hancock County Council of Churches day care program, migrant children.

OREGON

Multnomah County: Portland, Stone Church, Inc., DBA, Christian preschools, Headstart, 46 children, June 10, 1965.

PENNSYLVANIA

Bucks County: Friends Service Association for the Delaware Valley, Inc., Neighborhood Youth Corps, 40 participants, June 11, 1965.

Friends Social Order Committee Work Corps, counseling in self-help, housing, health, employment, and municipal service, VISTA volunteers, urban, 4 requested, 4 in service.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Aiken County: Second Baptist Church, Mount Canaan Baptist Association, Headstart, 100 children, June 10, 1965.

TENNESSEE

Anderson County: Oak Ridge, Council of Church Women, Headstart, 105 children, May 10, 1965.

TEXAS

Harris County: Houston, Protestant charities, Headstart, 70 children, May 18, 1965.

VIRGINIA

City of Danville: The Society of Christ Our King, Inc., Headstart, 54 children, June 15, 1965.

Arlington County: Macedonia Baptist Church, recreation and remedial education, CAP-demonstration grant, July 6, 1965.

Chesterfield County: First Baptist Church, Headstart, 205 children, June 15, 1965.

Chesterfield County, Midlothian, First Baptist Church, Headstart, 196 children, May 31, 1966.

Total 5,313,695

It should be noted further that the above list does not take into consideration many religious groups which receive tax money via the designation of a delegate agency which may receive its Federal money from a public umbrella agency.

Such circumstance is confirmed by testimony before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee

on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, on S. 2097. Listen:

Mr. ROBERT S. JONES.²⁰ Could I just add to the example of Harvard acting as a buffer and then passing the money on to the divinity school, as they had originally intended, is the kind of operation that we find in the O.E.O., especially in the Community Action Program.

Where the money is disbursed to a quasi-public agency broadly representative of the community, a community action agency. And then this agency in turn dispenses the money in some cases to a church-related institution, a church school, to carry on a remedial program or some other program.

So that the O.E.O. does not give money directly to a church institution, but uses a buffer entity, a public or a quasi-public agency as the recipient of the funds. And I think some of us feel that this is a kind of subterfuge.²¹

Dr. JAMES LUTHER ADAMS.²² It has just recently come to my attention . . . that local committees are formed which determine the disbursement of OEO funds (in Mississippi). The funds are being dispensed only through people who take a moderate position with regard to desegregation, people who are known to have—especially Negroes—who have been known to have taken a stand, they are not receiving money. Now the curious thing is that also, according to this man's interpretation, the striking thing about it is that the people who are serving on some of these committees in Mississippi that have been set up by the Government, these people are clerics, both Protestant and Roman Catholic. Thus you have a double problem. You have the problem that Mr. Jones is speaking about, the buffer organizations, but secondly also, the opinions spreading around in certain sections of Mississippi that these buffer organizations are also being manned by people who are ecclesiastical officials.²³

Mr. DONALD M. BAKER (general counsel, Office of Economic Opportunity). Private non-profit organizations are heavily involved in these programs. * * * Our typical grantee, a community action agency, or as we sometimes refer to it, an "umbrella agency" is a group of persons broadly representative of the community, including the representatives of the public bodies, the Mayor, the city council, school board, and similar organizations, private groups, including business labor, churches, and the philanthropic agencies, and lastly, the representatives of the area to be served, or as it is sometimes shorten to, the "poor" themselves. Such an agency * * * may be a private non-profit corporation itself. Such a community action agency will occasionally operate programs directly. Generally, however, they will pick one or more, frequently a great number of that we call delegate agencies, to run specific programs. They enter into contract with the delegate agency to provide a specific service to the poor.

* * * Such a delegate agency may be a school board, a planned parenthood organization, the YMCA, the settlement house, the welfare board, or a church-related organizations.²⁴

Mr. ROBERT S. JONES is Director, Washington Office, Dept. of Social Responsibility, Unitarian-Universalist Assn. of Churches and Fellowships in North America.

Mr. JUDICIAL REVIEW, S. 2097, pp. 172-173.

Dr. ADAMS is Professor of Christian Ethics, Harvard University Divinity School.

JUDICIAL REVIEW, S. 2097, pp. 172-173.

Ibid., pp. 125-126.

Please note, however, that the general counsel of the OEO himself has questioned the constitutionality of Federal grants to churches. When asked if he felt that constitutional propriety of these grants was questionable, Mr. Baker replied:

I would prefer to say, and in fact I do believe, that the grants that we have made, and certainly every grant that I personally have reviewed, could be defended, and that a defense would be successful before the U.S. Supreme Court. I would say, in fairness, that there are many others, these are legal scholars far more learned and of greater reputation than me certainly, who would differ with me on any one of these grants. And therefore, I have to admit there is some question in the legal community.²⁵

During that same testimony before the subcommittee Mr. Baker stated:

Approximately 6 percent of the component programs are run by a church or a church-related institution. As I indicated earlier, in the Head Start Program . . . something less than 10% of them were involved, church related institutions.²⁶

Regarding possible violation of the guidelines as laid down by OEO to prohibit any violation of the first amendment by sectarian groups, Mr. Baker testified:

Human nature being what it is, I would venture to say that somewhere in this country today somebody is doing something we would prefer they didn't do.²⁷

In a one-hour television special presented by CBS on Sunday, March 27, 1966 entitled: "The Church and Poverty" commentator Stuart Novins reported that 10 percent of all poverty program projects are now in the hands of church or church-related groups.²⁸

This trend has been brought about, first, because of the theory that Federal funds presently being given to churches, and church-related agencies are used separate and apart from their sectarian budgets for secular, nonsectarian activities, and second, by the child-benefit theory which proposed the idea that the money given to churches and church-related institutions is for the welfare of the child rather than the support of the institution. I maintain that these are merely circuitous semantics which by no means satisfy the prohibitions set forth in the first amendment.

The Supreme Court has ruled judicially that the first amendment prohibits either the Federal Government or the State government from assisting institutions which blend religious and secular instruction. This being true, the OEO has based the constitutionality of its grants to sectarian groups upon the theory that Congress can separate what it calls the nonreligious, irreligious, or unreligious activities of a religious institution from its religious activities and finance the former but not the latter. This is exactly what the Supreme Court has said cannot be done. The constitu-

²⁰ Ibid., p. 136.

²¹ Ibid., p. 141.

²² Ibid., p. 144.

²³ Ibid., p. 247.

tionality rests solely upon whether the grant is made to a church or a church-related body, period.

Justice Douglas, in the case of Abington School District against Schempp, stated:

The establishment clause is not limited to precluding the state itself from conducting religious exercises. It also forbids the state to employ its facilities or funds in a way that gives any church, or all churches, greater strength in our society than it would have by relying on its members alone.²⁶

The child-benefit theory was exploded just last month in a ruling by the New York State Supreme Court in voiding a law requiring public schools to lend textbooks to nonpublic school pupils. The Court ruled that financial help to a pupil is, in fact, the same as financial help to the school. The Christian Science Monitor, in an editorial entitled "A Right Decision," which follows, approved the Court's decision:

The New York State Supreme Court has placed a bold and strong finger in one of the worst leaks threatening the dike of separation of church and state in America. Its voiding of a law requiring public schools to lend textbooks to non-public (primarily parochial) school pupils is an important step toward halting—and, hopefully, reversing—a trend which has seen a greater and greater willingness to disregard separation of church and state where public monies are concerned.

It is thought likely that New York State will appeal the decision to the United States Supreme Court in order to get a final and definitive ruling. We trust that the nation's highest court will find that the New York law is an obvious violation of the First Amendment.

We believe that the New York State Supreme Court's ruling is right and helpful for a number of reasons:

It will foster, rather than weaken, religious harmony by helping resolve the friction-causing demand that public funds go to support religious schools.

It will remind elected officials of their duty to put constitutional obligations before vote-winning compromises.

It will encourage steps to eliminate other recent moves—on the federal, state and local levels—which have diverted public funds to help church-related schools and colleges.

Both New York State in this particular instance, and the federal government in connection with many recent and similar moves were warned that their actions were in violation of the First Amendment. In both Albany and Washington, however, political pressure to provide public assistance to non-public schools was so great that the warnings were unheeded. The result, if it is upheld by the Supreme Court in Washington, is an embarrassing setback for Gov. Nelson Rockefeller and the State Legislature, both of whom supported the textbook bill.

One of the most important parts of the New York Court's decision was its ruling that financial help to a pupil is, in fact, the same as financial help to the school. This ruling, if upheld, pricks one of the most widely used arguments on behalf of devoting public funds to nonpublic schools. It could therefore, have extremely wide repercussions in many corners of the country. While painful, such repercussions could, nonetheless, help strengthen and restore the traditionally

and constitutionally founded separation between church and state.²⁶

Such arguments as the child benefit theory and the separate budget system remind me of a story about President Lincoln. Once he is reported to have asked, "If you call a horse's tail a leg, how many legs would the horse have?"

"Five legs," replied his friend.

"No," said Lincoln, "The horse would have only four legs. Calling a tail a leg does not make it one."

Too long, now, we have sought to justify assistance to sectarian bodies by the device of calling it something else. We have called it "justice to little children," "health and welfare," "poverty relief," "national defense" and "overcoming illiteracy."

What is actually being given, however, is Federal aid for the support of religious establishment which is expressly forbidden by the first amendment.

In reaching the approximately 50 decisions handed down by the Supreme Court relating to the establishment and free exercise clauses of the first amendment, and more particularly in the five or six most recent and significant cases, the Court has agreed to this conclusion: Neither a State nor the Federal Government may pass laws nor levy taxes which support religious activities either directly or indirectly.

In 1852 in Reynolds against United States, Francis Lieber was cited as an authority on the lawful relations of church and state. Lieber had said:

It belongs to American liberty to separate entirely that institution which has for its object the support and diffusion of religion, from political government.²⁷

The Supreme Court first stated judicially in 1878 that the first amendment was intended to erect "a wall of separation between church and state." Concurring, Chief Justice Waite quoted Jefferson's Danbury letter and added:

Coming as this does from an acknowledged leader of the advocates of the measure, it may be accepted as almost an authoritative declaration of the scope and effect of the amendment.²⁸

Justice Rutledge, speaking for the Court in 1947 in the Everson against Board of Education case, said:

The reasons underlying the amendments policy have not vanished with time or diminished in force . . . Public money devoted to payment of religious costs, educational or other, brings the quest for more. It brings, too, the struggle of sect against sect for the larger share or for any. Here one by numbers alone will benefit most, there another. That is precisely the history of societies which have had an established religion and dissident groups. It is the very thing Jefferson and Madison experienced and sought to guard against . . . The dominating groups will achieve the

²⁶ "A Right Decision," *Christian Science Monitor*, August 24, 1966.

²⁷ "Studies in Church-State Relations—The American Way," Washington: POAU, 1963, p. 20.

²⁸ Reynolds v. U.S., 98 U.S., p. 145.

dominating benefit; or all will embroil the state in their dissensions.²⁹

It was the decision of the Court that:

The establishment of religion clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another . . . No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa.³⁰

One year later in the McCollum against Board of Education case, Justice Frankfurter, concurring, said:

Separation means separation, not something else. Jefferson's metaphor in describing the relation between church and state speaks of a "wall of separation" not a fine line easily overstepped.³¹

In 1962, Justice Douglas, concurring in the Court's ruling in the case of Engel against Vitale, quoted Justice Rutledge whom he singled out as the author of a "durable first amendment philosophy":

There cannot be freedom of religion, safeguarded by the State, and intervention by the church or its agencies in the state's domain or dependency on its largesse. The great condition of religious liberty is that it be maintained free from sustenance as also from other interference, by the state. For when it comes to rest upon that secular foundation it vanishes with the rest . . . Public money devoted to payment of religious costs, educational or other, brings the quest for more.³²

The year 1963 brought the ruling of the Supreme Court in Abington School District case. Justice Douglas, concurring in the decision handed down on June 17 of that year, declared:

The most effective way to establish any institution is to finance it, and this truth is reflected in the appeals by church groups for public funds to finance their religious schools. Financing a church either in its strictly religious activities or in its other activities is equally unconstitutional, as I understand the establishment clause. Budgets for one activity may be technically separable from budgets for others. But the institution is an inseparable whole, a living organism, which is strengthened in any department by contributions from other than its own members.

Such contributions may not be made by the State even in a minor degree without violating the establishment clause. It is not the amount of public funds expended, . . . it is the use to which public funds are put that is controlling. For the first amendment does not say that some forms of establishment are allowed, it says that "no law representing an establishment of religion" shall be made. What may not be done directly may not be done indirectly lest the establishment clause become a mockery.³³

²⁹ *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S., p. 1.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 15-16.

³¹ *McCollum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S., pp. 203, 231.

³² *Engle v. Vitale*, 370 U.S., pp. 421-23.

³³ *Abington School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S., pp. 3-5.

Mr. Chairman, the principle is clear and undisputed that formal interrelation of church and state institutions is prohibited by the letter and spirit of these provisions. Once established, the principle should be preserved intact against indirect as well as direct abridgement. To support the doctrine of separation is not to advocate irreligion but to maintain institutionally a separation of functions the fusion of which has invariably destroyed the usefulness of both institutions according to democratic standards.

Let this Congress know full well lest anyone misunderstand that it is not easy to seal the wall between church and state once it has been pierced in the name of public welfare.

Evidently, those proponents of administration of Federal funds by religious institutions either attempt to rewrite the first amendment or to rewrite history. These same proponents have argued that the establishment clause of the first amendment only prohibits aid to a single church, or one or two established churches, but that it does not prohibit aid to all churches.

The rulings of the Supreme Court, as I have pointed out, contradict such a position. The opinions of Supreme Court Justices run conversely to any attempt to rewrite the first amendment and history.

Justice Robert H. Jackson in handing down his opinion in the 1947 *Everson* case said:

It (the first amendment) was set forth in absolute terms, and its strength is its rigidity. It was intended not only to keep the State's hands out of religion, but to keep religion's hands off the state and, above all, to keep bitter religious controversy out of public life by denying to every denomination any advantages from getting control of public policy or the public purse.⁴⁴

Justice Clark in the *Schempp* case said:

Any effort to raise this again is mere academic exercise . . . If there is anything settled in constitutional law today, I believe it is the principle that the first amendment forbids aid to all religions, no less than it forbids aid to a particular religion.⁴⁵

In 1803, Chief Justice Marshall declared:

It is a proposition too plain to be contested, that the Constitution controls any legislative act repugnant to it, or that the legislature may alter the Constitution by any ordinary act. Between these alternatives there is no middle ground. The Constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and like other acts, it is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it.⁴⁶

Mr. Chairman, is it possible that anyone here today would accuse me of naivete when I say I believe the Constitution to be a superior, paramount law? The first amendment prohibits any establishment that would blend religion and government. Jefferson called the first amendment the separation of

church and state; Madison called it separation of religion and government. It was enacted to make absolutely sure the two would never be blended. History records that when those two are blended, then religious freedom is lost. To violate the establishment clause is to violate the free exercise clause. In the words of Francisco Ruffini:

Religious liberty and separation have become in America two terms which, ideally, historically, and practically are inseparable.⁴⁷

Any fusion of the separate and distinct roles of church and state will be a detriment, both to our civil rights and our religious liberty. If this were not the case the first amendment would be an anachronism and should be repealed. Since the "mills of the gods grind slowly" we cannot see the tragic consequences of church and state fusion immediately. Yet we ought learn from the textbook of history. It took centuries for constantinianism to show its faults and more centuries to reverse them.

Dean M. Kelly, director of the Commission on Religious Liberty, National Council of Churches, had timely advice for us when he said last year:

My contention is that it suggests caution in accepting the self-appointed role of the leader of cooperating religious groups as *surrogates for government* in the saving of the poor. What makes "politicians" what they are, for better or worse—is acting as brokers of civil power, and when churches undertake that activity, they become thereby the same thing as those they replace. Men and institutions are shaped not so much by what they are as by what they do, what they live on and by, what function they perform in life's transactions.⁴⁸

Any church which performs governmental functions is to that extent a government agency, whatever it may call itself, and to that extent unfit itself to be a church, which has as a church its own unique and indispensable service to perform for society, as important as that of a government. If the present trend in the war on poverty continues the church may in this area become, to all practical purposes, a division of the state drawing more and more funds from the state, and, in turn, injecting itself increasingly into the affairs of the state, producing, as it were, a new kind of clericalism.

This is no time for Congress to stick the tongue of propriety in the cheek of discretion. It is a crucial time in which we must speak bluntly, reaffirming our faith in the Constitution. We swore to "preserve, honor, and defend" the Constitution of the United States. The cost of its inception and the price of its protection have been far too great to undermine it now by well-intended, charitable, yet unconstitutional programs.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I once again urge adoption of my amendment barring the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity from making any

grant to or contract with any church or religious organization.

Once we have sacrificed the principles of the first amendment for any cause the liberties extended in the Constitution become threatened. In this area, the Constitution clearly says what it means and, in turn, means what it says. The wisdom of the basic law of our land is reflected thereby, learned from the lessons of history.

The "wall of separation" has served well both church and state. It has protected well the citadel of freedom. Let the watchmen, therefore, now awake who sleep upon that crumbling wall. Let the workmen turn to restore its strength again. Let church and state serve separately that each may freely serve, and the people of America be guaranteed the fullness of their heritage. Through a return to the way of the Constitution, let us here vouchsafe for Americans of every persuasion a free church in a free state.

Stanley Lowell, writing of religious liberty, said:

The religious establishment will be no more palatable in its welfare garb than in the garb of inquisition. The reason: We have known something better. We have had it and enjoyed it for a century and a half. It must be preserved for generations as yet unborn as the finest portion of our heritage.⁴⁹

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring whether or not we can reach an agreement on time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] if we can reach agreement to yield back the remainder of our time on each side, until we have the total sum of 2 hours remaining on each side for tomorrow's debate, and then if we could further agree to come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Mr. QUIE if we can do that.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the chairman about the division of time right now?

The CHAIRMAN. The minority side has a balance of 2 hours and 29 minutes remaining out of the total of 4 hours, and the majority has a balance of 3 hours and 17 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Chairman, if he will yield further, that I have talked with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], and he feels this is acceptable for tomorrow.

Mr. GIBBONS. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back all of the time on this side with the exception of 2 hours which will be used tomorrow.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further, I yield back the remainder of time on this side, 29 minutes, and retain 2 hours for tomorrow for the minority.

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

⁴⁴ *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S., pp. 22, 26.

⁴⁵ *Abington v. Schempp*, 374 U.S., p. 15.

⁴⁶ *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Branch, p. 137.

⁴⁷ Ruffini, F., *Religious Liberty*, London: Williams and Norgate, 1912, p. 19.

⁴⁸ Kelly, Dean M., "Subsidiary and the Ecumenical Establishment," Ecumenical Seminars, Duquesne University, September 29, 1965.

⁴⁹ Lowell, Stanley, *Emboldened Wall*, Washington: POAU, 1966, pp. 152-153.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I want to ascertain from the gentleman who is managing the bill for the minority side if there are any other arrangements about the course, after any part of or all of the 2 hours remaining shall have been used tomorrow?

Mr. GIBBONS. There have been no arrangements reached on that, sir. Speaking for myself, I would only suggest that perhaps after completion of 4 hours' debate tomorrow, we can read the bill and then start on the 5-minute rule on Wednesday. Then let the course run, after that.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I simply want to make a legislative record, without which I would be constrained to object to any such arrangement or unanimous-consent request when placed, that there is nothing to say that the reading of the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule will or will not go over from tomorrow on completion of all general debate to Wednesday, or that it should be continued tomorrow.

I hope I made myself clear.

Mr. GIBBONS. I am not sure I understand, but I will yield myself another few minutes.

My purpose in working this out, I say to the gentleman from Missouri, is merely to save the time of the House so that we can use it for constructive debate. I believe that 2 hours tomorrow used on the other side and 2 hours on our side would be sufficient to discuss under the general debate provision of this rule the issues involved here.

Then we would move to the reading, under the 5-minute rule, and go over, so that on Wednesday we could start under the 5-minute rule and go right on through the bill.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is saying, then, that the bill would be read, but we would not embark upon the 5-minute rule tomorrow; is that correct?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Mr. GIBBONS. We would not start under the 5-minute rule for amendments tomorrow. We would just have the bill read so that we could start under the 5-minute rule. The first paragraph would be read.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I trust, in the recent agreement, we are looking a little farther down the road, to the point that there will be no disposition on the part of any Member on the other side to close up debate either on Wednesday or on Thursday. We have had some rather sad experiences, shall I say, as to closing debate in recent years. I trust the gentleman will not lend himself to closing

debate on this important matter when the 5-minute rule comes up.

Mr. GIBBONS. Speaking only for myself, because I have not discussed this with other members of our committee, I have no intention of closing off debate on Wednesday, but I should like to see us reach a final vote on the bill on Thursday. I will be willing to work here until midnight or any other time on Thursday in order to get this done.

Mr. ARENDS. Might I ask the gentleman, is that an indication on the gentleman's part that if business is still before us in the way of amendments on Thursday he would be inclined to close off debate, in order to finish the bill on Thursday night?

Mr. GIBBONS. Only very late on Thursday evening.

I wish to say, as my chairman said earlier, I just do not want to be cruel to the Members. I have no desire to delay this, or to ask for any unfair advantage or anything of that sort. I want plenty of time so that we can debate under the 5-minute rule.

I do not intend to take time. I have no amendments to offer. Neither does the committee have any amendments to offer. I know of only one amendment to come from the Democratic side. There may be others.

I do not know how many amendments the other side has, but I understand they are in the nature of a substitute. I would imagine we can work that out as we go along.

I certainly want to cooperate in every way I can.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. I might say, about our amendments, we would propose to start with the substitute, which would come up as the first amendment on Wednesday. If we are successful, then that would be the last amendment that I know of which the members of the committee and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], who is not here, would propose.

As the gentleman from Florida said, I do not know if there are other Members who have amendments that they want to offer.

However, if we are not successful on the substitute, then we would propose, as we go to each title, to try to make changes in the title conforming with the intent of the substitute.

Now, there are some provisions of the committee bill that we think are good and some that are not. So what I would attempt to do is change the ones we think are not acceptable and, of course, do nothing to hamper the ones we think are good. I would hope we could finish by sometime Thursday evening, but I hope we will not close off debate as long as there are meaningful amendments before us.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, do I understand we have reached an agreement now that on both sides we will yield back time to where we only have 2 hours

of general debate tomorrow? That has been done, as I understand it. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. In reply to the request of the gentleman from Florida, I think it would be fair to state the agreement as to yielding time is between you and the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GIBBONS. Then, of course, the only other question is to get unanimous consent to come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. As to any agreement as to when the House comes back tomorrow, that will be settled, of course, when the Committee rises.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRICE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING SEPTEMBER 27

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking during debate in Committee of the Whole may have leave to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

FOOD FOR PEACE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COOLEY, under previous order of the House, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill H.R. 14929, the Food for Peace Act of 1966.

U.S. TROOPS IN THE MEKONG DELTA AREA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks there have been reports that the administration was giving serious consideration to sending U.S. troops into the Mekong Delta region in South Vietnam where no operational U.S. land forces have been before. An article in

today's Washington Post indicates that such a decision is imminent.

Such an extension of U.S. military activities in Vietnam into an area where there are no North Vietnamese troops would be most unfortunate, especially coming so soon after Ambassador Goldberg's splendid speech at the United Nations. Surely Hanoi's prompt and predictable rejection of the Goldberg initiative should not be accepted as the final answer. A move now to extend and expand the war would make the Goldberg offer look like a phony, which is just what the Communists say it is. Such a move would largely destroy the good effects of the Goldberg initiative upon the member states at the United Nations General Assembly and upon the state of mind of the Secretary General, U Thant.

The reason given in the Post story for the projected move of American troops into the delta area is that it is needed to prevent a large part of the rice harvest from being diverted by the Vietcong, as it has been in the past.

It seems almost incredible that we could be thinking of sending American troops into this large and difficult area for such a reason. In the delta region South Vietnamese troops are opposing the Vietcong in what is essentially a civil war, with both sides receiving aid from outside. According to the Post story, "The commander of the Vietnamese 4th Corps area, which groups in the delta Provinces, has long opposed the introduction of U.S. troops," and, further: "Many Vietnamese claim the Mekong Delta, which is the greatest concentration of the country's 16 million people, is the only area not dominated by Americans, and they want to keep it that way."

It is clear that a large number of American troops would be required to protect the rice harvest and make sure that the rice gets into South Vietnamese hands. Surely it would be far less expensive, as well as far more desirable politically, for the United States to supply whatever rice may be diverted if American troops are not sent in.

Following is the text of the article in this morning's Washington Post:

DECISION NEAR ON USING GI'S TO GUARD VIET RICE

(By John Maffre)

A decision is imminent in South Vietnam on sending the first U.S. troops into the densely populated Mekong Delta in time to help guard the rice harvest and to assure that most of it reaches Saigon.

The U.S. Mission there has been holding increasingly urgent talks on this touchy political point, it was learned here. So far U.S. troops have been deployed only in three of the four military corps areas of South Vietnam.

But a decision is being forced on South Vietnamese and American authorities, AID officials here say, because the Vietcong skill at siphoning off the crop has forced a massive importation of U.S. rice for the third successive year into a country once known as the rice basket of Asia.

AID officials say a major problem is the Cambodian rice dealers, mostly Chinese, who traffic with the Vietcong to get rice to sell abroad. Officials say that Cambodia is exporting rising amounts of rice to countries in Africa—once a prime South Vietnamese

market—despite a static level of production in Cambodia.

Some Americans say that a higher level of priority must be given to the river patrol activity if there is to be any effective check on the amount of rice flowing north to Cambodia instead of east to Saigon.

The introduction of U.S. troops into the Delta would invoke not only strictly military problems but political and emotional ones that the Mission has tried to avoid.

The commander of the Vietnamese Fourth Corps area, which groups in the Delta provinces, has long opposed the introduction of U.S. troops. Despite the buildup elsewhere, the three understrength South Vietnamese divisions in the Delta are aided only by American advisers and given air support by U.S.A.F. and U.S. Army aviation units.

STATUS QUO SOUGHT

Many Vietnamese claim the Mekong Delta, which is the greatest concentration of the country's 16 million people, is the only area not dominated by Americans, and they want to keep it that way.

U.S. military leaders, on the other hand, are convinced that South Vietnam must remain in a state of siege until government or American troops or both can break the physical and economic grip which the Vietcong and their predecessors, the Vietminh, have exerted on the area since the early 1940s.

In the past three years Saigon's control area of the Delta has shrunk. There have been relatively few major military actions in the region compared to the fights north of Saigon, in the central highlands and near the 17th parallel.

The biggest military problem is that harvest protection in the vast Delta would swallow the large number of troops.

SMALL FIELDS PROTECTED

In previous years U.S. Army and Marine Corps units have protected the harvest of small, selected rice fields north of Saigon. This did not require a large troop deployment and it also paid off psychologically among the peasants who were protected.

But the Delta is a larger problem. Ideally, much of this protection should come from the National Police, which now total 55,000 and from provincial and district militiamen. But Public Safety experts here say this force is nowhere near the level or the competence needed for such a task.

Apart from shepherding the peasants as they gather rice, a major job will be to guarantee that the ramshackle trucks and barges loaded with rice can be protected on their way to the mills of Saigon or other major points in the delta.

Some AID experts here estimated that South Vietnam, which in 1963 exported about 323,000 tons of rice from its 3-million-ton production, will probably have to import more than 600,000 tons in 1966 to feed its people.

TRADE ACTIVITY AND POTENTIAL IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the opening of World Trade Week in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor made an address at the Sheraton Hotel in Santurce, P.R., on September 18, 1966. On this occasion, Secretary Connor delivered a message

from President Johnson and then added his own observations on trade activity and potential in Puerto Rico. I should like to bring this address to the attention of our colleagues who, I am sure, are interested in what we are doing tradewise in Puerto Rico and how we are seeking world markets for our industrial products.

I feel that this production, which will increase dramatically in the future, is important to the United States for its potential effect on the balance-of-payments problem. It is important to the people of Puerto Rico because it provides employment and adds to our economic base.

At this point, under unanimous consent, I include Secretary Connor's address in full:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JOHN T. CONNOR AT THE OPENING OF WORLD TRADE WEEK IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, PUERTO RICO SHERATON HOTEL, SANTURCE, P.R., SEPTEMBER 18, 1966

It is indeed a pleasure to be here—and doubly so because I have the honor to bring you a message from the President of the United States:

"To all those joining in the observance of World Trade Week in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, I extend my best personal wishes. Your dynamic spirit and well-established working partnership among business, labor and government can launch the Commonwealth and the Virgin Islands on a new era of export expansion which would benefit every citizen. The challenges are great, but the opportunities are even greater. I commend you to the required effort and am confident that in years to come the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands will look back on your achievements and say, 'Those were men who saw the future—and seized it.'"—Lyndon B. Johnson.

To see the future—and to seize it: this is indeed the overriding task facing our nation today. The realized goals of the past cannot form the blueprint for building our tomorrows. They can inspire us, they can challenge us, but they cannot be our goals. We need new vision, new foresight, and renewed determination, to plan and work for a future that is even brighter than the present.

For you to do less here in Puerto Rico would be to fail to keep faith with the magnificent advances under the leadership of Luis Munoz Marin. And it would be to fail to keep faith with the farsighted businessmen, both here and on the Mainland, who saw the opportunities which have become the reality of economic progress for the Commonwealth today.

Let me assure you that on the Mainland we are looking to the future. We have our problems certainly, but they are the welcome problems of prosperity and not the depressing problems of economic stagnation—which we have overcome in these past five years.

Some of us, it is true, seem to fear our new problems even more than the old ones. I don't know why, unless maybe the old problems had been with us so long they'd taken on a familiar look, and we were comfortable with them, like old friends. The new problems are strangers to us; they're different: we're wary of them.

But let me assure you that we are coming to grips with them, and have no intention of letting them swerve us from the path of progress on which we must walk forward. The President's forthright recommendations to Congress ten days ago are convincing evidence of this resolve, I think, and are worthy of the support of every segment of the economy.

I believe that businessmen generally will understand the reasons for, and the benefits from, the temporary suspension of the 7 percent investment tax credit and the accelerated depreciation of commercial buildings. They certainly will welcome the \$3 billion or more reduction in Federal expenditures to which the President is now committed.

As the President emphasized, he is asking for a temporary suspension for 16 months of the tax credit on equipment and depreciation allowance on buildings, not permanent repeal of these valuable incentives to business. These provisions in the tax laws are a prime necessity over the long haul, as an encouragement to business to modernize plant and equipment in order to remain competitive in both the domestic and overseas markets.

One of the most important results of the President's recommendations, aside from the primary one of banking the fires of demand, would be to help balance our international accounts in the short run. For instance, the extraordinary demand for machinery and equipment has not only promoted our producers to fill domestic orders at the expense of overseas orders, it also has resulted in very large increases in imports of such goods.

I should like also to point out that President Johnson took occasion in his message to address an appeal to both businesses and labor for cooperation in the fight against inflation.

He again asked business to postpone marginal investment projects, exercise restraint in inventory accumulation and in pricing policy, and limit profits to those appropriate for a steadily expanding economy.

He asked labor to avoid wage demands that would raise the average level of costs and prices; to adopt work rules for entry into its trades that are appropriate for a continuing full-employment economy; and to cooperate with business to raise productivity so that pay increases will be matched by production increases.

These are, I believe, sound and entirely reasonable requests of both business and labor, and they merit the wholehearted cooperation of both.

Last month the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, of which I am chairman, reached this conclusion:

"We believe that it is essential to the continued economic growth and health of the country that the present inflationary trends be stopped, and that maximum efforts should therefore be made to restrain, through voluntary procedures, unjustified wage or price behavior."

The new fiscal measures now recommended by the President will, if enacted, do much to provide an economic climate in which voluntary actions by management and labor can operate with a better chance of success. Without such cooperation, we cannot expect economic stability. Federal fiscal and monetary policies alone cannot do the job. The active concern and participation of our private sector is vitally necessary, and I hope that the leaders of business and labor in Puerto Rico will join in this effort as long as the inflationary pressures persist.

One of the requirements to maintain our sound and balanced economy is to expand exports. We not only need increased overseas sales in order to help overcome our persistent balance of payments deficit, we also need them in order to extend our position in the world market as insurance against a slowdown in the domestic sphere. Beyond that, business statesmanship dictates that we act now to establish ourselves in the growing global market because of its enormous potential, and its essentiality to the economic future of our nation.

I know that you are aware that export expansion is of particular importance to the

economic well being of your Commonwealth. Like most of the world's islands, you are heavily dependent on trade with the outside to provide the many and diverse products required to sustain a modern economy. The U.S. Mainland is your greatest market, of course, but exports to the markets of other countries can also become of vital importance to your economy. Let me suggest that perhaps it's time for government and industry to join together in mounting "Operation Export" as a sequel to the highly-successful Operation Bootstrap.

Already your Commonwealth's Department of Commerce and the Regional Export Expansion Council here are doing an outstanding job to further overseas sales. Exports to foreign countries have jumped, I know, from \$13 million in fiscal 1961 to more than \$31 million in fiscal 1965.

But I believe this is only the beginning. Your Commerce Department's Program of International Trade, with its market analyses, its increased counseling services for exporters, and the trade missions and participation in trade fairs—all are evidence of a new awakening to the potential for sales of Puerto Rican products overseas and are certain to pay handsome dividends as the momentum in this drive picks up. In fact, I would say that "Operation Export" is already underway.

I know that John Shoaf and his staff here at Santurce are doing an outstanding job in this area—and I hope that all those interested in exporting will utilize to the fullest the many services available through his office. This includes information on exhibits which the U.S. Department of Commerce sponsors at international trade fairs, as well as the independent exhibitions it stages.

I recently had the pleasure of opening one of these "solo" exhibitions in Mexico City, and I can tell you that it can only be described as superb. It was a showing of industrial equipment—metalworking tools, scientific instruments, and packaging machinery—and without question it was the finest exhibition of its kind I have ever seen. In addition, the thoroughly competent market research that preceded the exhibition paid off handsomely. Immediate sales from the floor amounted to \$2.3 million, and sales for the coming 12-month period are estimated at \$12.4 million—both record figures.

Now it's time—no, it's long past time—that Puerto Rican and Virgin Island manufacturers began to reap the profits such exhibitions offer. But to date, as far as I can learn, not a single manufacturer from the Commonwealth or the Islands has ever joined in one of these shows arranged by our Department—and I would very much like to see this World Trade Week mark the beginning of active participation in this great world-wide promotional undertaking. We have six Trade Centers which are permanent installations, and we will be staging 70 commercial exhibitions at international trade fairs in the coming year. We expect them to be the most productive on record—but we'd like to have some Puerto Rican and Virgin Island products to show off.

And let me digress here for just a moment to say that while I know that every Puerto Rican is proud of the accomplishments of his Commonwealth in the past 15 years, I'm not sure that you all realize how proud we are on the Mainland of what has happened here. We not only can bathe in the reflected glory of your accomplishments, we feel that Mainland business and labor were partners in the operation. If ever there was an example of what the creative free enterprise system can accomplish, Puerto Rico is it. And we'd like to display the resulting Puerto Rican products all over the world.

Not only will your economy benefit, the products of your Commonwealth can help build bridges of understanding everywhere for our country and our system. This is especially true among the nations of Latin

America—and this is one of the principal reasons we are all so vitally interested in the trade mission which leaves today for the Dominican Republic. I know that our people at Commerce had a hand in helping to make arrangements for the visit of this mission, and Ambassador Crimmins is looking forward eagerly to receiving its members during their stay.

Industry leaders on this mission are important "ambassadors," also. In the Dominican Republic, throughout the Caribbean, and in Central and South America, your businessmen can carry an important message of goodwill for our country. Your common Latin heritage, your knowledge of the language, and your familiarity with the ways of thought and doing business in this area—all give you an invaluable ability to build bridges of mutual trust and understanding between Americans of Anglo-Saxon origin and those of Latin background. We of this Hemisphere, with common aims and aspirations, are bound together in a common destiny, and we can make that destiny whatever we want it to be. You of Puerto Rico have an opportunity to play a leading role in this great drama of progress, and I know that we on the Mainland will be calling on you increasingly in the future to help meet the challenges along the way.

So trade missions, trade fairs and many other special aids, such as credit facilities, adequate transportation, and others, are all vital components of the total effort to increase exports. But there is also another factor—an ingredient not less important than all the others put together. I'm talking about business confidence.

Somebody once said that confidence is a plant of slow growth. He might have added that it also can't be force fed: it is something beyond the power of compulsion. The King cannot compel his subjects to trust him; nor can democratic government require its citizens to believe implicitly in all its policies.

This includes businessmen as much, if not more, than it does all other citizens. The nature of business affairs requires men to launch enterprises, great and small, that are founded largely on faith. Despite the modern analytical tools that aid businessmen in making decisions, a very large element of risk is still involved in their every undertaking.

One of the principal things that prompts businessmen to take these risks is confidence in the policies of government and in the men who run government. For in the complex socio-economic environment of modern society, we cannot escape the deep involvement of government in the affairs of business. Its all-encompassing economic policies, including both fiscal and monetary measures, must be taken into consideration in every business decision—for they are part and parcel of every business transaction. And in order for business to be able to play its most productive role in supplying the material needs of our people, it must operate under enlightened government policies that contribute every step of the way to economic stability and progress.

The giant strides of progress here, which have brought hope and opportunity to every Puerto Rican, are directly attributable to past years of business confidence in the economic climate which government helps create.

I hope these policies will be further consolidated, and even extended, in the years ahead. For they are of prime importance to exporters, and potential exporters, to foreign countries.

The reason is—and there is no denying this—exporting is a particularly venturesome game. It requires businessmen to extend their operations into strange and different markets, to offer their goods to peoples

of perhaps different tastes, different customs, sometimes different cultures. It often requires long-range planning and investment, and the development of special sales and marketing staffs. The rewards, of course, can be great, but so can the risks.

Established government policy can help encourage businessmen to take these special risks. And I hope the men who direct your government's affairs in the years to come pursue such policies and enlist popular support for them.

Generating this support is not only the job of government, but also of your educational institutions, which have the primary responsibility for education in the art and science of economics. Without a foundation in basic economic theory and the operation of the free enterprise system, our citizens can hardly be expected to understand, and act intelligently, on the complex economic issues that must be resolved by them as members of a democratic state.

Another requirement for export expansion is for labor to appreciate the problem of competing in foreign markets where the wage level is often far lower than ours. Excessive demands by our workers can negate the only factors which enable us to compete in those areas at all—the high productivity resulting from our advanced technology, and the superior design and workmanship of our products. In addition, as the trend toward a one-world market gathers momentum, we must be prepared to compete in our own domestic market with products from those low-wage countries. Moreover, we have no permanent corner on advanced technology—it is available also to them.

So we in this Nation have our work cut out for us. Someone among us must take the lead. I have remarked before that for the crowd to advance, a few must go first. Puerto Rico can be in the vanguard of that few. And I'm sure that under the dynamic leadership of Roberto Sanchez Viella, Puerto Rico will fulfill this promise.

This golden island bears the distinction of having been one of the original discoveries of the Admiral of the Ocean, Christopher Columbus. To the past, you were the New World. To the present, you are the unrivaled example of progress. To the future, you can be the men of vision who saw that future and showed the whole world how to seize its opportunities.

I am confident that you are in truth those men. And I am counting on you to prove me right.

PLEASE RESIGN, MR. HOPE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, recently there was brought to my attention an editorial, entitled "Please Resign, Mr. Hope," which appeared in the August 15, 1966, issue of a periodical known as the Contractor, a trade publication for the plumbing-heating-cooling industry. This editorial was written by Seth Shepherd, who is editor of the publication.

To state the matter plainly, the editorial seriously indicts the role of the U.S. Public Health Service in revising the National Plumbing Code. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing this editorial in the RECORD in order that the Surgeon General and the appropriate

committees of this House may proceed with this information to conduct whatever investigation they consider necessary for the protection of the public health and welfare.

[From the Contractor, Aug. 15, 1966]

PLEASE RESIGN, MR. HOPE

(By Seth Shepherd)

Mr. Malcolm C. Hope, did you write the portion of the code appendix on hospital plumbing quoted below? It appears on page 2 of the minutes of the code revision meeting of Apr. 28.

It says: "Further, these peculiar requirements should remain as separate criteria because the plumbing in such an institution is generally controlled by a state agency rather than at the local level and medical care institutions are generally well beyond the responsibilities and purview of plumbing people. Surveillance cannot be done by casual observation."

If you wrote this, Mr. Hope, you are maligning the good name and works of the plumbing industry.

This is doubly disturbing because you are not only a high official of the U.S. Public Health Service, but a direct participant—too direct, we think—in the slow-moving project to update the National Plumbing Code.

If this biased statement from Appendix C on Hospital Plumbing in the code revision is a sample of your efforts, we don't like it. Since this is to be a part of the revised national code standard, it will be widely quoted when the document is used as a pattern for writing local code ordinances. The suspicions raised by the statement could indirectly harm industry relations locally.

You can be sure that you will have many plumbing contractors criticizing the statement in view of the hundreds of successful and outstanding plumbing systems in hospitals throughout the country.

They were designed, equipped, installed and thoroughly inspected by professional, technically trained and responsible members of the plumbing industry.

In view of this, but more importantly as a result of the great concern publicly expressed recently by industry leaders over the irregularities involved in the code proceeding, why not resign now, Mr. Hope?

We mean sever immediately your ties with the code updating project and return the presiding and secretarial functions to whom they belonged in first place—the industry representatives of the three sponsoring organizations.

I do not find much to quarrel with in the Contractor's analysis—because industry journals have been filled with sharp criticisms of the tactics of the Public Health Service. These trade organs are commonly not opposed to a uniform plumbing code as such, but they are fearful of federal intervention in what has been traditionally considered a proper field for state and local legislation. Specifically, they have been sharply critical of the manner in which federal authority was used at the April 28th meeting of ASA Sectional Committee A40.

One of the sponsors, the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, over 2 months almost withdrew as a sponsor of this code revision following a bitter floor fight during its convention in Atlantic City. Certainly the overwhelming majority of that sponsoring organization do not approve the present PHS role.

On the labor side, union plumbers belong to the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada. That organization, meeting in its 29th convention in Kansas City, Missouri as recently as August 12th of this year unanimously opposed every effort to evolve a Na-

tional Plumbing Code. This resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas there have been in recent months several campaigns for a national or uniform code; and

"Whereas this would deprive states and localities of their traditional American and Constitutional responsibility to protect the health of citizens; therefore be it

"Resolved, By the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada in 29th Convention assembled, That a national or uniform plumbing code is rejected and all attempts to evolve same are hereby denounced, and the matter is remanded to the consideration of local unions for such action as each in its sovereign authority shall deem expedient and proper."

The aim of the American Standard Association in revising the National Plumbing Code is to achieve a broad scale industry consensus. What Congress should be aware of is that there is a clear-cut and rapidly growing consensus that the Public Health Service should remove itself completely from the National Plumbing Code picture.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the code revision project can reflect that consensus so long as Malcolm C. Hope and the Public Health Service are in the act.

On June 30, 1966, in a speech before this august body, I called your attention to this matter. I am hopeful that the Surgeon-General and the appropriate Committee of this House may proceed with this information to conduct whatever investigation they might consider necessary to stop this encroachment of state and local prerogatives.

PARTISAN KENNEDY FILM SHOWING STOPPED IN OHIO

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the partisan, fund-raising showing of the Kennedy film, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," has been stopped in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio. As I pointed out in the House last Wednesday, the Summit County Democratic organization of Ohio had planned to buy out the 1,600 seats in the Cuyahoga Falls State Theater for two performances the night of September 28 for \$1.50 a ticket and resell them for \$5. The purpose was to raise about \$5,000 for the Democratic candidates in the county. It was to have been the major fund-raising effort of the year.

I have been informed by Mr. Ralph Becker, general counsel for the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, that the arrangement between the Democratic organization and the local theater has been canceled. The premier showing of the film in that city will now be a purely commercial venture. Tickets will be sold for the regular price of \$1.50 at

the door. The tickets already resold for \$5 will not be honored.

It is most unfortunate that any person or organization should have tried to make partisan use of the film. A total of four such attempts have been called to my attention. All four have now been canceled.

I sincerely hope that I will not have to speak again on this subject; that all theater exhibitors and individuals now understand that the film cannot be used for partisan purposes. I only regret that there could have been any misunderstandings in the first place.

ANTIRIOT LEGISLATION

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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, if we truly have a government under law, then we should not hesitate to enact a meaningful deterrent directed at curbing riots and other recent outbreaks of violence in our major cities. Accordingly, I am today introducing a bill which would make it a Federal offense to travel in or use a facility of interstate commerce with the intent of inciting a riot or other violent civil disturbance.

My antiriot legislation is identical in language and intent to the amendment that was adopted overwhelmingly by the House when it passed the civil rights bill last month. Inasmuch as the Senate decided last week to shelve the civil rights bill, I have introduced the House-approved antiriot provision as a separate bill.

This bill would make the instigation of riots a Federal crime punishable by a fine up to \$10,000 or imprisonment for a period up to 5 years or both.

Our law enforcement officers need this legal weapon, to help them cope with and deter those who would incite riots. A government under law cannot afford to tolerate crime and violence.

EXEMPTION OF U.S. FARMERS FROM SUSPENSION OF INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture feel it is definitely in the national interest that U.S. farmers be exempted from the President's proposed suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit currently available to businessmen and farmers.

The U.S. farmer is one of the principal victims of the present inflation. It is grossly unfair that he should also be made a victim of the administration's belated attempts to combat inflation, especially when it is so clearly evident that this step could have been avoided entirely if the administration had exercised the proper fiscal restraint and had done something about its own inflationary policies a long time ago.

With farm production expenses already at an alltime high, suspension of the 7-percent tax credit on investment will have the effect of further increasing farm costs. Most businessmen control the market price of their products and can simply pass extra expense on to the consumer, but the farmer must pay extra costs from his own pocket.

If the 7-percent tax credit is suspended, farmers will have less incentive to purchase the machinery and equipment required to increase farm production. With the world food situation what it is today, and with the U.S. farmer being asked to produce for our domestic needs, war needs, and a hungry world as well, it is inconceivable that the administration should do anything to slow down or hamper this effort.

Farmers have an extremely high ratio of investment to income. Per farm income last year was about \$4,200, but the average investment per farm on the first of this year was close to \$65,000. With this kind of situation, a suspension of the tax credit would have a heavy impact on their finances.

Last year the 7-percent tax credit provision saved farmers several million dollars. The members of this task force recommend that our farmers be allowed to continue using this provision. The President's proposed suspension should include a specific exemption for U.S. farmers.

KENNEDY ROUND NEGOTIATIONS

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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the September 1966 issue of the First National City Bank monthly economic letter contains an excellent analysis of the trade negotiations now in progress under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva. The negotiations are gaining momentum during the current month and the City Bank's analysis is timely as well as realistic about the problems and prospects of these "difficult and delicate" negotiations.

With unanimous consent, the report follows:

WORLD TRADE NEGOTIATIONS: A PROGRESS REPORT

This month, after three years of disappointing progress, the major trading nations are resuming negotiations to expand international trade through reductions in tariffs and other barriers. The bargaining will, it

is expected, move into high gear since the broad authority conferred upon the President of the United States by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to negotiate tariff cuts is scheduled to expire in June 1967. Under this authority, the President may reduce U.S. tariffs—on a reciprocal basis—by as much as 50 per cent over a period of five years.

The current round of bargaining—sometimes referred to as the Kennedy Round because of efforts made by the late President to launch this great venture in international cooperation—is the sixth in the twenty-year history of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Delicate and difficult matters must be dealt with in negotiations of great complexity and far-reaching economic and political significance. Like an iceberg, these matters have sometimes, more beneath the surface than above. They affect the vital, bread-and-butter interests of many countries, including all the principal trading nations other than Russia.

The negotiations began in the spring of 1963 but failed to proceed as rapidly as had been hoped. For one thing, reductions in obstacles to trade are sought over a greater range than ever before—tariffs as well as nontariff barriers—and aim at across-the-board tariff cuts rather than item-by-item concessions. And for another, one of the major negotiating partners, the European Economic Community (EEC), requires a unanimous vote of its six member nations to determine its policies; such decisions can be made only after lengthy and hard internal bargaining and are difficult to alter. In fact, it is only now that the European Common Market, having hammered out common agricultural price and marketing policies and a joint position on GATT trade negotiations, is able to bargain.

THE TRADE AT STAKE

While some 80 countries are participating in GATT negotiations, the bulk of bargaining is among Western European nations, the United States, Canada and Japan, with Australia, New Zealand and South Africa also taking part. Concession, for a given product, to one nation is, under the most-favored-nation principle, a concession to all. Full reciprocity, however, is not to be required of less-developed countries. This concept, embodying the recognition that the less-developed nations should not have to make reductions in their trade barriers that might be inconsistent with their development efforts, breaks new ground.

For the United States, these general considerations mean, in practical reality, that the negotiations concern primarily its imports from Western European and other advanced industrial countries. As shown in the chart, such imports represent approximately three fifths of total U.S. purchases abroad. The remaining two fifths come from the less-developed nations in Latin America, Asia and Africa; this includes many products that the United States imports duty-free. The EEC constitutes a large source of U.S. imports; but, as stands out from the chart, the nations grouped in the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), Canada and Japan also carry on a large trade with the United States.

The bargaining concerns a multitude of tariff schedules that, as is well known, are difficult to compare from one country to another. From such comparisons as have been made, it emerges that U.S. tariffs are dispersed over a wide range, the Common Market tariffs are the highest on foods, and the United Kingdom tariffs the highest on industrial goods; but the average levels of all three are of roughly similar heights. Reciprocal cutting makes, therefore, good sense.

THE PATTERN OF ISSUES

On the industrial side, the governments have agreed upon a "working hypothesis" of

a 50 per cent cut in tariffs. Understandably, each nation regards certain items as so sensitive to import competition that it will wish to offer only a lesser cut or none at all. These so-called "exceptions lists," tabled in 1964, are subject to multilateral "confrontation and justification." Their length and significance vary from country to country. The lists and the negotiations about them have been confidential; but, judging from newspaper comments on both sides of the Atlantic, the exceptions cover important segments of world trade in chemicals, steel products, aluminum, pulp and paper and textiles. As U.S. negotiators have publicly stated, the list of the European Common Market is overly large, particularly in relation to the lists submitted by the other principal countries.

Related to "exceptions lists" is the question of tariff "disparities"—items on which one country has a high tariff and another a low one. This question, raised by Common Market negotiators, aims at some of the high U.S. tariffs. The gist of the argument, highly simplified, is that an equal percentage cut across the board, say by one half, would leave a 40 per cent tariff at 20 per cent, thus allowing it to remain more protective than a 10 per cent tariff reduced to 5 per cent. Moreover, the countries with a 5 per cent duty would find little left to bargain with when, one day, they would try to get others to reduce their 20 per cent tariffs. In addition, there are a number of special problems, including the calculation of U.S. tariffs for certain chemicals on the basis of the domestic selling price rather than on the value of the imported product itself.

Even more sensitive and difficult is the agricultural side of the negotiations. For more than a generation, agriculture in the United States as well as in much of the world has been treated as a "special case." There are domestic support programs which, in turn, necessitate import restrictions; and surpluses are often sold with the help of export subsidies.

Into this already complex situation a new element has been introduced by the efforts of the six EEC nations to devise a common agricultural policy—efforts that have recently resulted in agreements to establish, by mid-1968, unified markets and prices, and price supports, for all important products. Presently, there is a wide range of prices within the EEC, with Germany having, for instance, the highest grain prices and France the lowest; the new price is in-between but far above the world price. To protect agriculture, imports from outside the EEC will be subject to variable levies; the proceeds, channeled into a common fund, are to be used to promote agricultural investment or subsidize exports. The system will tend toward making outside producers residual suppliers, able to sell in the Common Market only when output there falls short of demand.

The implementation of these policies is a matter of major importance to the United States, for the Common Market—buying as it does \$1.5 billion worth of U.S. farm products annually—is the biggest single cash market for U.S. agricultural exports. It is a matter of great interest to countries like Australia, Canada, Denmark and New Zealand. Against this background, it is evident that trade negotiations that would not consider agricultural and industrial products together would be one-sided. Besides, the Common Market nations are obviously interested in access to U.S. and other markets for their manufactured goods.

Finally, nontariff barriers to trade will also be under scrutiny. In many countries, quotas hold down imports of some important products; Japan imposes "voluntary" export quotas and there is an international agreement to control the cotton textile trade. Among other barriers are customs valuation procedures, government procurement prac-

tices, internal taxation and antidumping regulations. As tariffs have been progressively reduced, the restrictive effects of these nontariff barriers are being increasingly realized. The hard core of them will not be easy to deal with because they have deep political, social, economic and fiscal roots.

THE NEED FOR POSITIVE RESULTS

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was tailored to expectations that the United Kingdom would be part of the European Common Market. It offered a formula that would have made possible the elimination of industrial tariffs where the enlarged Common Market, together with the United States, provided 80 per cent of world exports of a product, not counting trade within the Common Market and with Russia, other countries of Eastern Europe, etc. These expectations have failed to materialize and, as a result, the potential scope for trade negotiations has shrunk sharply; but it remains appreciable.

Meanwhile, the Common Market has made substantial progress toward becoming a customs union. Internal customs duties on industrial products within the Common Market have by now been brought down to 20 per cent of their original level; a further 5 per cent reduction is to be made in July 1967 and the remaining 15 per cent is to be abolished a year later. The six are also adjusting their individual tariffs to the ultimate external tariff levels; this reveals many industrial items with rates higher than some members' pre-1958 rates. The EEC, however, finds it difficult to move toward a more fully integrated economic union.

As to EFTA nations, they are making no effort to go beyond a loose association. Internal tariffs on industrial goods were reduced by a further 10 per cent last January, with the remaining 20 per cent due to be abolished at the end of this year. The EFTA requires no common tariffs against outsiders.

The Common Market is thus establishing a new pattern in its world trading relationships. During the Community's formative years, the United States was openly and consistently aiding efforts toward European integration, partly for reasons of international security, partly in the expectation that the Common Market would be outward-looking in its trade policy and that a smaller slice of a larger pie spurred by economic growth of an integrated market would be better for outsiders than a larger piece of a smaller pie. In fact, the EEC has been expansionist and, in relation to outsiders, has removed industrial quotas and extended to them some of the tariff reductions that it has made among its members. As may be seen from the chart, Common Market imports from the United States have been increasing year in year out; but the U.S. share in total EEC imports has trended downward.

REGIONALISM AND MULTILATERALISM

All things considered, there is thus less assurance today than three years ago that the present trade negotiations will bring about substantial results. Press comments cite the possibility of 20-30 per cent cuts in industrial tariffs, spread over the next five years. With regard to farm products, they envisage a mere holding of the line, though the beginnings of world arrangements might be marked out; with mounting world food shortages, old problems may well reappear with a new face. However valuable the outcome of the negotiations may be, it will be less than what was—perhaps too confidently—expected.

Not too surprisingly, therefore, thought has been given to other approaches to freer trade. Should multilateralism suffer a setback, it is said, recourse could be had to regional solutions. Thus, a North Atlantic free trade area might be established, initially linking Canada, the United States and EFTA, but with an open door to the EEC and

other industrially advanced nations, including Japan, Australia and New Zealand. The new grouping would commit members to lower gradually tariff and nontariff barriers on manufactured products. It might also offer concessions to Latin American and other less-developed nations if these countries adopt a clear course toward freeing trade among themselves through reductions in trade barriers that could later become effective also for imports from more-developed countries.

A North Atlantic free trade area along these lines might well be reckoned with as an alternative in the event that present trade negotiations were to produce but meager results because of difficulties of negotiating with the Common Market. Similarly, in such an eventuality, U.S. preferences might be established in favor of some Latin American exports, as Assistant Secretary of State Lincoln Gordon indicated recently at the meeting of the Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production at Mexico City. The objective would not be a permanent system of hemisphere preferences but rather a strategy to encourage other nations to join with the United States to give up preferential trade arrangements. The drawback is that increased regionalism might invite a reversion to divisive trade practices among nations. It might threaten to give renewed impetus to protectionism and economic nationalism. The chief casualty would be the principle of equal treatment, which has been the foundation for the remarkable growth of world trade over the past century.

The outcome of the forthcoming negotiations will thus have a major and, perhaps, decisive influence on the conduct of world trade. It will have a major direct impact on the future markets and profits of individual firms and industries. A successful round, providing for significant and balanced reductions in world trade barriers on a multilateral and fully reciprocal basis, will enlarge the scope of world trade. Perhaps even more important at a time when a steady progress toward freer trade and payments appears less assured than only a few years ago, a frank and constructive transatlantic dialogue will encourage the business community throughout the world.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MR. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the recurring questions which comes up in every election year is—

What can I do in a political campaign? I am a Federal employee and I have heard that . . .

Probably more misinformation abounds on the subject of the Hatch Act than on any other one subject with which the Federal employee is interested. We always receive a great amount of mail from those who are wondering if they can actively support or oppose individuals or issues. The Hatch Act was never meant to relegate Federal workers to a second-class citizen's status. It was developed with the idea that Federal employees should not be exploited politically nor should they be the cadre for a politi-

cal machine to promote their own special candidates.

Because of the large number of requests for information about permitted and prohibited political activities of employees of the Federal Government and their families, this memo has been prepared for the guidance of party officials and workers. It consists of the more frequently asked questions and their answers on this subject. These questions and answers are abstracted from a press release issued by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, July 5, 1966:

Q. May a Government employee make a campaign contribution to his Party?

A. Yes, but he cannot be required to do so. The contribution cannot be made in a Federal building or to some other employee who is prohibited by Federal law from accepting contributions. Of course, as a Federal employee, he cannot solicit political contributions.

Q. May a Government employee's wife who is not a Government employee help a friend campaign for political office?

A. Yes. The Hatch Act does not restrict the activities of an employee's wife or of other members of his family in any way.

Q. May a Federal employee be excused for a reasonable time to vote or to register to vote?

A. Yes. As a general rule, where the polls are not open at least three hours either before or after an employee's regular hours of work he may be granted an amount of excused leave which will permit him to report for work three hours after the polls open or leave work three hours before the polls close, whichever requires the lesser amount of time off. If an employee's voting place is beyond normal commuting distance and vote by absentee ballot is not permitted, the employee may be granted sufficient time off in order to be able to make the trip to the voting place, not to exceed a full day.

For employees who vote in jurisdictions which require registration in person, time off to register may be granted on substantially the same basis, except that no such time is granted if registration can be accomplished on a non-work day and the place of registration is within reasonable one-day round-trip travel distance of the employee's place of residence.

Q. Does the Hatch Act apply to part-time Government employees who have no regular tours of duty?

A. Yes, it applies to them on any day they perform work for the Government, and this includes the entire 24-hour period of any day worked.

Q. The Civil Service Commission enforces the Hatch Act for the competitive civil service. Does this mean that employees holding excepted positions (outside the competitive civil service) are not subject to the Act?

A. No. Excepted employees are subject to the Act, but in these cases the employing agency is responsible for enforcing it.

Q. What employees are prohibited by the Hatch Act from active participation in politics?

A. Employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government and the Government of the District of Columbia, including temporary and part-time employees. The political activity of employees of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with a Federally-financed activity is also restricted.

Q. Are any executive branch employees exempt from the restrictions of the Hatch Act?

A. Yes, there are a few specific exemptions listed in the Act. Among them are: (1) The President and Vice President of the United States; (2) Persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the office of

the President; (3) Heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) Officers who are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nation-wide administration of Federal laws. There is also partial exemption for Federal employees who live in communities in which large numbers of voters are employed by the Federal Government.

Q. What is the penalty for violation of the Hatch Act by a Federal employee?

A. The most severe penalty for violation is removal. The minimum penalty is suspension without pay for 90 days.

Q. Please explain for employees affected by the Hatch Act just what their responsibilities and rights are under the Act.

A. They have the right to vote and to express their political opinions, but are forbidden to take an active part in partisan political management or in partisan political campaigns. In connection with Federal employees' right to vote, the Commission emphasizes that political-activity restrictions do not relieve employees of their obligation as citizens to inform themselves of the issues and to register and vote.

Q. May a Federal employee serve as an election officer?

A. Yes, provided that in doing so he discharges the duties of the office from an impartial manner as prescribed by State or local law, except that he may not become a candidate for such office in a partisan election.

Q. May a Federal employee serve in an unofficial capacity at the polls as a checker, challenger, distributor, or watcher, or in any other post in behalf of a partisan political candidate or partisan political party?

A. No. He may not assist such candidate or party in any way at or near the polls.

Q. May a Federal employee use his automobile to take voters to the polls on election day, or lend it, or rent it for this use?

A. Generally, no. However, the employee's automobile may be used to transport himself and members of his immediate family to the polls. In addition, members of a car pool may stop at the polling place to cast their votes on the way to or from their places of employment.

Q. May employees covered by the Hatch Act attend political rallies and join political clubs?

A. Employees covered by the Hatch Act can attend political rallies and join political clubs, but they cannot take an active part in the conduct of the rally or operation of the club. Other things they are prohibited from doing are becoming involved in soliciting or collecting political contributions, distributing campaign material, and selling dinner tickets, or otherwise actively promoting such activities as political dinners.

Q. May employees covered by the Hatch Act wear campaign buttons in the interest of one of their favorite candidates?

A. Yes. They may also display political posters or pictures in the windows of their homes or in their automobiles.

Q. What should an employee do if he does not know whether a certain activity violates the Hatch Act?

A. Since ignorance of provisions of the law will not excuse a Government employee from penalties for violation, he should present the matter in writing to the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C. 20415 before engaging in the activity.

For additional information, the employee can write the Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C. 20415, for its press release of July 5, 1966; and for CSC Pamphlet 20, both dealing with political activities of Federal employees, or any questions can be directed to my office, 437 House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, and I will endeavor to get an answer as quickly as possible.

office, 437 House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, and I will endeavor to get an answer as quickly as possible.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. SMITH

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening at Warrenton, Va. more than 800 friends, admirers, and colleagues of the Honorable Howard W. SMITH gathered together upon the occasion of a testimonial dinner in his honor. Among the numerous honors bestowed upon Judge SMITH during the course of the evening was a tribute by the Honorable Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Governor of Virginia, which I take pleasure in inserting at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY GOV. MILLS E. GODWIN, JR.,
TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR THE HONORABLE
HOWARD W. SMITH, WARRENTON, ARMORY,
SEPTEMBER 23, 1966

We have assembled here to do what we as Virginians do best. We honor a man who has brought high honor to our State.

Testimonial dinners are not commonplace in Virginia. We do not take them lightly. We expect ability, we expect character, we expect long and distinguished service, and above all, we expect integrity in our public officials.

It is only when a man has shown these qualities in extraordinary amounts that we give him individual recognition. The people who are here tonight give ample testimony by their presence that we deal here with a very special case indeed.

There is nothing easy about holding to principle first and always in the give and take of legislative maneuver. Even more difficult is resisting the countless small temptations to avoid criticism by simply bending principle a little.

Only a man of rock-like integrity never falters. But to Judge SMITH, principle is a rock in a sometimes weary land.

A great many men claim to stand on principle. It is often a more convenient platform than their real motives. But a man who uses principle as subterfuge is soon found out. When he is, respect for him vanishes.

Many times, his congressional colleagues have disagreed with Judge SMITH. Sometimes that disagreement has been pretty violent. But he has never lost, or even endangered, their respect or their affection for him.

Few men have been as effective as he has in pursuing national interests as he saw them. Congress has never had a more powerful minority than Judge SMITH.

I might add that no other man has made the judicious use of a dairy farm an instrument of national policy.

Although he must learn to live with it, a man in public life is sensitive to criticism. It is not easy to take a position which is certain to bring heaping abuse and scalding anger. Only stern principle will sustain a man to take such a stand.

But if Judge SMITH can stand firm, he seldom stands still. In support of a friend, he is tireless. I know this from personal experience. At no small sacrifice to himself, he was one of my warmest supporters.

More than that, he was, and is, a close personal friend, one to whom I have turned on many an occasion for the advice so many of us value so highly.

Virginia has produced many outstanding men. A long procession of them has held a wide variety of our public offices. All of them have been good men. Some of them have been great men.

But we would say of only a few, there will never be another like him. Beyond question, Judge SMITH must be counted among their number.

RAILROADS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. McFALL. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the job of supplying our fighting men in Vietnam is one of the biggest supply efforts ever undertaken by the military. In many respects, it surpasses that of World War II because the conflict is taking place 7,000 miles away.

A study of this massive supply line shows that the railroad industry is playing a major role in the movement of supplies and equipment—and playing it without fanfare.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, I have long been aware of the excellent record the railroads have made and I now wish to specifically call my colleagues' attention to an article in *Modern Railroads*, a Cahners publication, which spells this out in accurate detail.

The railroads can take pride in the job they are doing in moving the great bulk of this freight to the port regions. And, as Harry Tennant, author of the article, points out, the job is being done without neglecting commercial operations—a factor of untold value to this country's economy.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this article at this point in the RECORD:

RAILROADS DELIVER THE GOODS FOR VIETNAM—MOVING 44 PERCENT OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S DOMESTIC TON-MILES, RAILROADS DO A SUPERB JOB MOVING GOODS TO PORT AREAS, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME CARRYING ON THE NATION'S COMMERCIAL BUSINESS

(By Harry L. Tennant)

The Vietnam struggle, like three other major wars of the century, has found the railroads quietly and methodically moving the goods to port and airbase areas while at the same time carrying on the nation's commercial business. Perhaps the latter has been emphasized far more than the complex task of getting supplies to the nearly 400,000 U.S. and allied troops in Southeast Asia. This is understandable when one considers the growing concern over inflation and the questions of plant expansion, industry mergers and half a dozen other page-one developments.

The railroads, plagued by a boxcar shortage dating back to World War II, have nonetheless done a superb job of delivering the goods on time to port regions where it is transferred to ships bound for Vietnam. And in doing this they have moved all types of traffic. One top Defense official said the car-

riers had moved enough material to outfit a modern U.S. city of 200,000 population in addition to weapons, ammunition and military supplies. The carriers have also been busy rushing heavy construction materials, which, it is more or less admitted, will be used for permanent construction projects.

Rail men themselves hesitate to spell out the success of this major effort—in fact, some individuals are clearly unaware of the industry's role in the crucial contest. But Defense Department experts are quick with their praise, citing in particular the efficient movement of freight to port areas.

The coordinated plan through which the railroads have worked so efficiently with the Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service is a highly specialized one. Military traffic managers throughout the country advise the carriers as to what they need and when—and according to the evidence, they have been getting what they want when they want it.

Significantly, recent Congressional hearings on the shortage of freight cars did not include any complaints from the military. Some weeks ago Gen. Raymond C. Conroy, who directs the MTM TS Western Area, expressed some concern over the shortage, but that agency's commander, Gen. John J. Lane, while acknowledging the lack of commercial cars, assured him the Defense Department was getting all the rail car shipping space needed. The fact that the new replacement cars are of greater carrying capacity will do the job, he said, along with the aid of piggy-back and containerization.

"Since a limited engagement, such as prompted the present build-up, does not require any significant diversion of certain types of shipping," Gen. Lane stated, "the Defense Freight Railway Interchange Fleet could be augmented to meet the increase in car requirements and at the same time permit control of their movement and supply. This increase in the fleet could be brought about by leasing cars from the carriers, the mobilization of service-owned, intra-plant equipment into the interchange fleet, or limited purchase of selected types of equipment."

The military does, however, anticipate some problems with cars for the shipment of sulphuric acid; MTM TS is moving speedily to thwart a possible shortage. Highly essential in production of ammunition, sulphuric acid is handled by the interchange fleet. Plans call for purchase of some 200 cars at a cost of more than \$6 million. MTM TS hopes to have delivery within six months—the first installment to include 69 cars and the second 131. There are presently 129 sulphuric acid cars in the interchange fleet, each carrying 7500 gallons. The new cars will carry 20,000 gallons each.

The port jams at the Vietnam end of the line and the earlier shortage of ships, necessitating the withdrawal of vessels from the mothball fleet, have given Defense officials a headache. But Vincent F. Caputo, director for transportation and warehousing policy and chief troubleshooter for Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, finds no fault with the railroad effort. Mr. Caputo explains that, although the Vietnam build-up has been carried out on a "crash" basis, it has not been necessary for the Interstate Commerce Commission to hand down emergency orders covering shipment of military goods. The railroads have assumed the responsibility and DOD has not needed such orders. One Defense Department traffic expert described it this way, "If there has been any difficulty, it has been at the port areas after the railroads have delivered the goods and their responsibility has ended."

A possible new plan which would alter the present traffic management pattern has been discussed. It would involve movement of most Vietnam cargo by containers with a

steamship company managing the traffic from inland points. However, some rail men are not too happy about the idea of having any part of the rail effort directed by a steamship company representative.

Defense experts are tight lipped when it comes to describing specific materials carried by the railroads. But they are more talkative concerning the number of cars in use. For instance, they say rail car requirements for defense needs for the first six months of this year will total about 51,690. This is considerably higher than the 36,481 actually used in the same period last year.

The magnitude of this complex job can be seen from an assortment of DOD reports. In the final five months of last year, a total of 2,006,254 tons of war goods was sent to Vietnam from Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific Coast ports. These shipments were divided something as follows: Atlantic, 355,875 tons; Gulf 342,802 tons; Pacific 1,307,577 tons. On a percentage basis, approximately 70.1 percent of the war goods being shipped to Vietnam and other Southeast Asia points moves out of Pacific Coast ports, 15.8 percent from Atlantic ports and 14.1 percent from ports along the Gulf.

Perhaps the best understanding of rail shipments destined for our military forces will be found in a set of comparisons prepared by DOD. These figures cover all forms of domestic transportation broken down by commodity groups. While they do not apply specifically to Vietnam, they do give some idea of railroad participation.

A tally of military shipments for DOD, excluding Logair, Quicktrans and household goods, shows a total of 506,401 shipments valued at \$85,700,048 for the third quarter of this fiscal year (January-March, 1966). Of this total for all commodities, 5803 shipments valued at \$445,418 were transported by the railroads as less-than-carload freight, while carload freight shipments added up to 28,968 with a value of \$35,294,054. There were 142,144 Railway Express Agency shipments valued at \$2,348,135; 4410 "Drive-away, etc." shipments having a value of \$2,147,805; 187,679 less-than-truckload shipments with a value of \$10,939,907; 49,728 truckload shipments valued at \$23,725,545; and 4862 shipments by bus with a value of \$15,109. In addition, there were 52,638 commercial aviation shipments valued at \$3,031,279; 488 shipments via domestic water carrier valued at \$792,540; 26,558 freight forwarder shipments with a value of \$3,241,723 and 672 pipeline shipments valued at \$3,000,758. Defense also listed as "mixed methods" 2451 shipments valued at \$717,775.

The most significant movement of war materials comes about through the operations of the Defense Freight Railway Interchange Fleet. The latest DFRIF inventory shows that the Army owns 5276 cars, a large percentage of which are used for Vietnam purposes. The inventory is as follows:

General purpose tank cars	2,590
Special purpose tank cars	756
Heavy-duty flatcars	931
Defense freight boxcars	896
Other boxcars	95
Gondola cars	8

Total 5,276

Through its use, the fleet (a) earns revenue by which it defrays its maintenance expenses, (b) is kept in a state of complete readiness, (c) saves its users demurrage charges, and (d) minimizes costs connected with loading, unloading, blocking and bracing of boxcars.

MTM TS is responsible for control, distribution and use of the equipment assigned to DFRIF. Operating pools are set up on the basis of requests received for cars by number and frequency of use. Loaded cars are routed by an MTM TS regional office. Empty cars

are moved free on commercial bills of lading after MTMTS authorization.

DOD advises MTMTS with forecasts of DFRIF service car requirements according to provisions outlined by the traffic agency to the services. In event the needs given to MTMTS are in excess of fleet capabilities, the appropriate Defense Department agency will decide upon priorities.

Generally, it is expected that DFRIF cars—except for those in reserve pools and in exercise status—will be loaded and unloaded by users in the time frames used for commercial traffic, and in no case more than ten days.

Revenues received from the railroads for use of DFRIF cars finance, during the year in which paid, expenses incurred for AAR light running repairs, overhaul and rebuild, maintenance assessments for excess empty car mileage and in-leasing charges.

Mileage revenues are not to purchase capital equipment or capital improvements, which are procured only from funds budgeted by MTMTS for that purpose.

MTMTS is responsible for all maintenance of the equipment assigned to the DFRIF, including contracting for and inspection of all maintenance services.

Procurement responsibility for railway equipment is assigned to the Department of the Army. MTMTS, in acquiring new equipment, complies with Army procurement regulations. In addition, MTMTS is responsible for the acquisition of all interchange freight rail equipment and accountable for capital equipment assigned the DFRIF.

Disposition of interchange rail equipment is also the responsibility of MTMTS. Cars are disposed of only when they are found to be (a) excess to the fleet peacetime and mobilization requirements; (b) damaged and/or destroyed beyond economic repair; or (c) unsafe for further interchange service.

All of this adds up to a big job for the railroads. Each day of the war some 170 ships loaded largely with freight delivered by the railroads leave the three port areas for Vietnam. This does not include war goods delivered to military air bases for direct flights to Southeast Asia or to points where the cargo is picked up by commercial airlines holding Defense transportation contracts.

The fact that the goods have been delivered without the necessity for stiff wartime orders reflects credit to the railroads who have gone about their work quietly and without fanfare.

WORK VIRTUE IS OVERRATED

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Florida has been proud to have many outstanding Governors in her executive mansion but there has never been a Governor so proud of his State and as loyal a Democrat as my good friend, former Governor, Fuller Warren. I just recently came across a letter to the editor in the Tallahassee Democrat where Governor Warren pointed out certain caustic comments on the misconduct of the Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission at this point to insert, following my remarks, the article by Governor Warren so that

my colleagues and my fellow countrymen may have the opportunity to read these observations:

WORK VIRTUE IS OVERRATED

EDITOR, THE DEMOCRAT:

Col. E. E. Callaway of Bristol is one of the most brilliant men in Florida. He also is an affable, educated gentleman for whom I have warm personal regard.

But some of his ideas about people and economics are medieval—almost antediluvian. In his latest letter (Sept. 7) to the Editor of the Tallahassee Democrat, Col. Callaway alleged that many Americans "have been made to believe that to really work is a disgrace."

I doubt the accuracy of this allegation. I am sure it is not accurate as to the many fine and industrious people of Liberty and Calhoun Counties, where Col. Callaway does business. From infancy, I have known the hard-working people of these two counties. Most of them start working as children and continue to do so into old age. I doubt that even one citizen of these two counties "believes that to really work is a disgrace."

During all the years I lived in Blountstown and visited in Bristol, I didn't know even one person who "believed that to really work was a disgrace." I knew a few loafers who were believed to be opposed to work. But it is very probable that they had hookworms or malaria and, therefore, didn't have enough energy to "really work."

I, myself, started to work (11 hours a day) for wages at the age of eight and kept at it until I managed to escape, many years later, from its fatiguing clutches. Nearly every boy of my age in Blountstown started working before he was 12 and kept on toiling and sweating until he managed to get something easier to do.

The virtues of hard work are vastly overrated—mostly by rich Republicans who don't have to work.

For more than a century most Americans toiled long hours for little pay, piling up vast wealth for a few phony aristocrats to squander in high living. That undemocratic system crashed under Republican rule in 1929, and 15 million Americans couldn't get jobs, no matter how desperately they wanted to work.

The aroused and patriotic people of this nation put Democrats in control of this country, and for 30 years nearly everybody who was able to work has been able to get a job at a living wage. Those who are too sick or too old to work are provided for by a benevolent, humane government with a heart. Old and feeble women don't have to peddle apples on street corners, hungry children don't have to beg for food, businessmen don't have to jump out windows of tall buildings, as so many did during the Republican reign of 35 years ago.

Times are so good, prosperity is so pervasive that Col. Callaway has become a panoplied plutocrat with ample leisure to pen polemics against the emancipation of working people.

FULLER WARREN.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider a resolution to estab-

lish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct which I feel is long overdue. Since the recent notoriety which has been given to the action of many of our fellow colleagues, I feel that this committee should be established as soon as possible to clear up any matter that may be in violation of the law or any act which tends to bring the House into disrepute. This committee will have the full authority to investigate the conduct of us all and the employees of this Chamber and I welcome it.

Since I will bring this bill to the floor from the Rules Committee, I have received a great volume of mail in support of this bill and I would like to at this time, following my remarks, place a letter from Joseph A. Sperry, secretary of the North Tampa Chamber of Commerce, and resolution passed by the chamber of commerce commanding the efforts of my fellow colleagues, SAM GIBBONS and CHARLES E. BENNETT.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the letter by Mr. Sperry and the resolution passed on September 15 by the North Tampa Chamber of Commerce be included at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NORTH TAMPA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Tampa, Fla., September 20, 1966.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: I am enclosing copy of resolution passed unanimously by the general membership of the North Tampa Chamber of Commerce at their regular monthly business meeting Thursday, September 15, commanding Representatives SAM GIBBONS and CHARLES BENNETT for their efforts to provide for the House of Representatives of the United States Congress a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. SPERRY, Secretary.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

Be it resolved by the Board of Governors of the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce, That Representative SAM GIBBONS and Representative CHARLES BENNETT are commended for their efforts to provide for the House of Representatives of the United States Congress a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

The Board makes this commendation because:

1. Although such a committee does exist within the structure of the Senate of the United States there is no such provision within the House of Representatives.

2. There are from time to time allegations and charges of misconduct levied against members of the House of Representatives, which can neither be substantiated nor refuted because no machinery exists to handle the complaint or investigation.

3. This situation provides no means of determining the accuracy or falseness of charges of misconduct by House members and employees and no means of eliminating those whose acts are contrary to the best image of the United States.

4. Although the United States Constitution establishes that Congress has the power to judge the conduct of its members and to punish or expel members for misbehavior, they have been notably reluctant to accomplish this task. Bills presented by Representatives GIBBONS and BENNETT will provide the necessary administrative machinery. Be it further

Resolved by the Board of Governors of the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce, That

copies be sent to Representatives GIBBONS and BENNETT, and the Florida delegation in Congress requesting their support, to the news media and to all other interested persons.

Endorsed by the North Tampa Chamber of Commerce.

JOSEPH A. SPEERY, Secretary.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1966.

"MEGALOPOLIS UNBOUND: THE SUPERCITY AND THE TRANSPORTATION OF TOMORROW," BY SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to compliment a distinguished Member of the other body, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island, on the recent publication of his book entitled "Megalopolis Unbound: The Supercity and the Transportation of Tomorrow," published by Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., of New York.

This book is a most significant addition to the literature on transportation problems confronting us in our increasingly urbanized society.

The principal and most immediate recommendation in Senator PELL's book is that we make more intelligent use of the great potential for public service offered by our existing railroads.

But Senator PELL goes far beyond this basic plea to argue persuasively for a sound systems approach to public transportation which will assure a rational balance of transportation facilities, particularly in our highly urbanized megalopolitan areas.

This means, Senator PELL believes, that we should make some attempt to coordinate ground transportation facilities with air transportation facilities and promote sensible public policies which will encourage the most efficient use of each mode of transportation.

The Senator broaches a number of innovative proposals. He suggests, for example, systems of differential tolls on our highway system, which would be designed to diminish congestion at peak hours and on peak days, providing there are other sensible alternatives available in the form of improved rail transit or other more advanced forms of high-speed ground transportation which may evolve in the years to come.

Senator PELL's book also describes the prospects for wholly new systems of ground transportation which may include wheelless vehicles supported on columns of air, traveling through tubular guideways and equipped to make high speed transfers to local transit systems.

Research, for such new systems and approaches to transportation, he tells us, is now underway under the auspices of the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965, which came into being

largely as a result of his own energetic campaign to improve our regional transportation facilities.

Mr. Speaker, Senator PELL's book was reviewed last Sunday in the "Book Review" section of the New York Times. The reviewer, architect and city planner Clive Entwistle, called "Megalopolis Unbound" "a heartening demonstration of what one determined and farsighted Senator can do." I would like to insert the review in the RECORD at this point:

ROADS TO RUIN

(By Clive Entwistle)

(Note.—Mr. Entwistle, an architect and city-planner, is the author of "Holopolis: The Systems Concept of the Whole City.")

"The Urban Transportation Problem," by J. R. Meyer, J. F. Kain and M. Wohl. 427 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, for the Rand Corporation. \$11.95.

"Megalopolis Unbound: The Supercity and the Transportation of Tomorrow," By CLAIBORNE PELL. Illustrated. 248 pp. New York: Frederick A. Praeger. \$5.95.

The new science of ecology has shown that habitat is primary in determining the life of every organism, and man is no exception. These two books deal with the chief factor—modes of transportation—in the blind rise of that habitat in which an increasing number of Americans will pass their lives: megalopolis. This amorphous fusion of urban and suburban settlements, first identified by Jean Gottman in the Northeastern region of the United States, is the prototype toward which other vast tracts of the American land are now tending without benefit of assessment or conscious direction.

All cities in history have up to now been built on one level, their buildings, streets and open spaces competing for the same surface. This works tolerably well up to about 100,000 inhabitants, a size seldom exceeded before the advent of the railroads in the last century. It was the greatly increased nourishment from the hinterland afforded by rails which allowed cities to swell to sizes at which the one-level form broke down. Open spaces were obliterated. Traffic increasingly congested streets first laid out when the city was a village. People found themselves tied by their jobs to an environment wholly unsuited to human needs.

At this stage the low-cost automobile made its appearance, and, led by mother, young families began to drive out of the masonry prison, back toward nature. Father could keep his job, and mother could raise her children. Inchoate megalopolis had been born. Far less than a city, if less far from nature, the suburb has satisfied (barely) one need only: that of play space and a pitance of greenery for children. When the children grow up, mother and father often move back to the city.

The question is, then, whether our environment is to continue to be formed, or unformed, arbitrarily by our present modes of transportation. These modes must themselves be studied, if their effects and possibilities are to be actively used rather than passively suffered. Among the obvious candidates to do such studies are those corporations that have specialized in the new discipline of systems theory (the study of wholes and the functioning of their parts in relation to performance objectives), especially corporations in the field of that perennial accelerator of new techniques: weapons systems.

Thus, many corporations that have depended chiefly on the Department of Defense for their revenues have recently volunteered their special research and development skills in the service of the peaceful arts, especially those of city-building and urban equipment, the dollar expenditures on which exceed even

those on defense. The sales-pitch is topical and telling: City-planning could profit from the design and comparison of economic decision-models, and from the application of systems theory, with its apparently objective methods, to a field traditionally dominated by subjective tastes and fashions. These techniques have worked well for war and Secretary McNamara; they should work equally well for peace and Secretary Weaver.

The argument is unquestionably valid for the development of a new pattern of urban life. It is therefore with hopeful anticipation that one approaches this Rand study; by the sweep of its title it promises fulfillment of the total systems approach we have been led to expect.

It soon becomes apparent that a Defense Department background may be unsuited to the study of environmental problems, and for a fairly obvious reason: A weapons system can be related to hard and quantifiable physical objectives, but the multiplicity of human values inherent in city-planning are not easily quantifiable.

Thus in the Rand study of urban transportation, which uncompromisingly pleads a special case for the bus-automobile as opposed to the mass-transit solutions, there appeared at first reading to be no mention of its concomitant drawback: air-pollution. In this time of extreme and growing public and medical concern with the progressive poisoning of urban air, to which the automobile is the chief contributor (33 billion cubic feet of toxic gases in the United States in 1965), such an omission seems incredible. A page by page search revealed this single reference: ". . . with rising public concern over air pollution and noise. . . .," a concern that is clearly not shared by the authors.

The only reference to automobile accidents in the index, under "Accident Costs," is in a footnote referring to insurance rates, a necessary item in calculating automobile operating-cost. The cost of automobile accidents in terms of human suffering, now amounting to a fantastic 4 million injuries and 48,000 deaths a year and always increasing, not being regarded as a quantifiable factor, cannot apparently be entered in the equations strung through this "objective" study.

This methodological limitation appears to make nonsense of the claim of the director of the study (a project started in 1960, of which this book is one part), Charles Zwick, who reassuringly states in his preface that "the ultimate goal is to improve urban living, not to eliminate congestion, or to maintain investment in . . . transportation facilities as such."

Not only does this study fail to deal with matters of primary human significance in the domain of urban transportation; it exhibits a partiality toward the bus-automobile mode, as opposed to that of rail mass-transit, so evident and consistent that the reader is slightly embarrassed to note that this very long, one cannot say substantial, work, was financed by the Ford Foundation. One would have been happier had it been the Ford Motor Company.

The authors' screaming silence on the vital matters of air-pollution and highway carnage apart, there are examples of special pleading, implicit and explicit, on almost every page, as Messrs. Meyer, Kain and Wohl go about affirming the desirable ascendancy of the automobile in urban transportation.

In calculating the comparative cost of commuting by automobile, which is after all the foundation on which this entire work is erected, the extraordinary assumption is made, and made almost parenthetically, that ownership costs (the largest single component in automobile transit), will be reduced to 4 cents a vehicle-mile by one of the following expedients. One will buy a second car specially developed for commuting needs to cost \$1,600 and last 12 years in continuous use. Alternatively, one will buy a used car

for \$200 and drive it continuously for three and a half years: No evidence is advanced to suggest that the driving public is likely to accept such vehicles for the cause or urban economics, and the tenor of all Detroit advertising strongly suggests that the public would not, even if these proposals were feasible.

On page 244, apropos of advertising, we learn that the favorable cost performance of the automobile system is not too surprising because there are *no costs of advertising*. (The total outlay for advertising in 1955 for the six major oil companies and the five major auto companies was over half a billion dollars.) This favorable economic factor is presumably to be set off as a relative gain compared with the lavish advertising budget of, say, the New York subway system. It is hard to decide, when reading such statements, if the authors are pulling the reader's leg, or that of their sponsors.

Corollary proposals needed to insure the triumph of the bus-automobile system are described as the piercing of ring highway tunnels around central business districts (at about \$36,000,000 per six-lane mile, almost three times the cost of a two-track subway in average soils); the construction of four-story parking garages that will pre-empt 38 per cent of the total land downtown; the exclusion of trucks and buses from line-haul auto routes; the construction of expressways for the exclusive use of buses (presumably for about four hours peak daily use). And also, of course, for intercity travel the inevitable Futuristic electronic highway (another separate system inaccessible to cars not equipped for it), in which one may read, play cards, and presumably spoon with two hands free—advantages that trains have offered in greater security these 80 years.

At about this point the logical consideration occurs to the reader that these immense proposed expenditures and revolutionary technological programs depend entirely for their justification on the inevitability and continued extension of our suburbs, themselves a direct product of the automobile. We are clearly in the presence of a "positive feedback, open-ended process": more automobiles—more suburbs—more capillary road networks—more automobiles, et seq.

A common objection to the spread of automobile suburbia voiced by the man in the street of large cities derives from the continual and accelerated retreat of the countryside beyond the urban fringe. Thus the built-up area around New York City is expected to increase by a further 2,800 square miles beyond its present 2,600 square miles during the next 20 years. The authors peremptorily silence this anxiety, pointing out that "there is plenty of land in America" (the same line that is stressed editorially in an earlier Ford-financed study, "Cities and Space").

This argument reveals the authors' profound misunderstanding of the total problem. The countryside is not made any more accessible to the three out of four Americans who dwell in cities by knowledge of the fact that there exist several million square miles of prairie and mountains elsewhere on the continent.

The oil and automobile industries include seven out of the ten most powerful corporations in America, hence in the world. Strong pressures are being brought to bear to confirm and extend the spread of suburbia, since this particular urban pattern alone guarantees the continued growth of both industries.

The Rand study, of course, presents the galloping growth of suburbia as an immutable Trend, blessed with the holy sanction of being What People Want, though in point of fact, since they are offered no viable alternative, all the extension of suburbs proves is that people want a roof over their heads. Insofar as demand is expressing an alterna-

tive, it may be gauged by the fact that in the early 1950's apartments constituted less than 10 per cent of all housing starts, whereas the *national* average in 1964 was 37.4 per cent. In metropolitan areas (with which we are here concerned) the figures are very much higher: 61 per cent in New York, 72 per cent Washington. This is the more powerful as a trend indicator because the apartment dweller in our present obsolescent cities buys little more than propinquity, and pays a very high price for it.

One can confidently assert that the total recasting of central cities in molds more closely related to human needs could offer every amenity that the suburbs are believed to offer but do not, together with many others that they never could. Suburban extension would then not only cease, but begin to be abandoned and reclaimed like the ghost towns of the West.

There is an obvious philosophical absurdity underlying the frame of reference of this study, of a type common in the whole field of urban studies, in which one can include not only physical planning, but every component and problem of the total urban system: physical health, education, delinquency (i.e. juvenile boredom), transportation time-cost, sociological structure, urban economics, and of course diseconomics (the chief characteristic of existing metropolises) through cultural, esthetic and spiritual values.

This absurdity resides in the fact that it is futile to design, analyze and advocate sub-systems prior to considering and developing an appropriate system for the city and its institutions as a whole. This is a necessary principle of which Rand in its competence is most certainly aware. Thus they would hardly undertake to design, say, a launching tower for a missile prior to the design of the missile itself, nor would one begin design of the missile before defining its performance objectives.

The reason this basic principle is so blithely neglected in the case of city studies is no doubt a function of the wide spectrum of disciplines that must be embraced before even a significant research and development program can be written, and the essentially unquantifiable nature of many, indeed of the most important of them. Yet in neglect of this necessary principle, astronomic sums are wasted every year by both foundations and government agencies in the award of study contracts that are *a priori* destined to produce not useless but harmful results in the progress of our civilization.

Thus if one does not single out the Rand study for its futility, one does so on account of an undertone of cynicism that is happily uncommon, in the world of city-planning, and that, to any reader even slightly conscious of the gravity of the human issues that are ultimately at stake, is repellent.

This cynicism, whilst generalized, is especially apparent in the attack made against present and proposed subsidization of railroads, and the authors' corollary plea for the continued and increased subsidization of highways. The injustice of this attack becomes clear when one reflects that in 1963 alone, the Federal expenditure on highways totaled more than \$3.5-billion, and on airports between 1947 and 1963 \$1.5-billion, whereas railroads are wholly self-supporting. Special taxes are levied on road users (the vast majority of Americans) to pay these subsidies, but none on rail users.

This disparity is further exaggerated by the fact that the railways pay property tax on their rights of way (some \$200-million per annum), whereas roads are not only tax free, but annually remove large areas of land from the tax rolls, especially in the case of urban freeways.

Finally, although railroads are the poor relations of the transportation family, they are still subject to stringent public regulation regarding fare rates, discontinuance of

trains, etc. These were imposed on them by an angered nation in the latter days of their hegemony, a just if prolonged punishment for a venality and lack of social scruple directly comparable to that increasingly exhibited by the oil and automobile industries of our own day (which possibly await a comparable punishment by a public force in the people's good time). Assuming that rails have purged their sentence and learned their bitter lesson, it would be reasonable to reconsider their potential utility to the traveling public.

This change of public sentiment from outrage to sympathy is embodied in the High-Speed-Ground-Transportation Act, signed into law by President Johnson on Sept. 30, 1965. It affords \$90-million to be spent in three years for research, development and demonstration of advanced ground transportation systems and is the undoubted progeny of Senator CLAIRBORNE PELL of Rhode Island.

In "Megalopolis Unbound" Senator PELL also makes a special plea, but he does so on the basis of broad known facts rather than the convenient hypotheses selected by Rand in the automobile *Schlarraffenland* which they survey. Thus his more amateur presentation carries intellectual conviction whereas Rand's strings of equations add up to rhetoric.

PELL's book is an account of a successful and useful crusade inspired by the author's personal experience and comparison between some of the better European railroads and those of the Northeastern region of the United States that he rides between Rhode Island and Washington.

In France and Germany trains glide fast, whisperingly quiet, and safely from city to city, whatever the weather. It is a sensible and pleasant way to travel a few hundred miles. Senator PELL's dream was not merely to import these techniques, but to make the leap-frogging move ahead at which America excels when importing new technologies. And to judge by the open-minded and imaginative report just issued by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, financed with funds provided under the bill that he sponsored, it seems that Senator PELL's wildest dreams are likely to be realized. It may here be noted that we are dealing with transit between cities, rather than within them, so that the prior consideration of the urban whole is less critical. Nevertheless, this aspect of the problem is considered by M.I.T. at least impartially, if finally without commitment.

Building on the slender basis of a lunch with Arthur Krock, Washington columnist of The New York Times, which resulted in front-page exposure and immediate public interest, PELL wrote a private bill and introduced it to the Senate in 1962. He piloted his nursing through many vicissitudes, and by sheer persistence and harassment, which neither Presidents Kennedy nor Johnson were to escape, his bill was enacted. The account of his personal role in this process is perhaps overextended for the general reader, though in the circumstances the lapse is easily understood.

"Megalopolis Unbound" is a heartening demonstration of what one determined and farsighted Senator can do for his contemporaries, for the good of future generations, and for himself. Would that another might do the same for the more complex problem of the city as a whole. All humanity could be in his debt.

NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS SHOULD HAVE VOICE IN COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to commend the Members of the House Committee on Education and Labor for the many long hours spent on investigations, hearings, and deliberations before bringing this very complex but important piece of legislation to the floor. As we all know, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966 is commonly known to every one in America as the poverty bill.

This program known as the war on poverty has been waged for about 1½ years. Its success is largely due to the brilliant and enlightened leadership of Director Sargent Shriver. The committee points out in its report that it is attempting, in this legislation, to take advantage of the experience gained during these last 18 months. Therefore, this bill gives maximum advantage to those programs offering the greatest opportunity for success. In so doing, the report states, committee members feel the cycle of poverty can be broken by beginning first with young children; therefore, the authorization for Operation Headstart has been vastly expanded with its child development and family strengthening program. Headstart will receive \$352 million in fiscal year 1967 compared with \$180 million in fiscal year 1966.

The committee also feels that it should encourage the present healthy demand for workers by expanding job training programs, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the work experience program of title V, and the new program to be conducted under title II, urban and rural community action programs, for subprofessional training in the public service areas. I agree fully with the committee's thesis that the quickest and the most logical road from poverty to prosperity is a good job and hard work.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that too much, actually, more than half, of the authorizations under the community action title II are for the ongoing so-called packaged programs; whereas the degree of flexibility for new and thoughtful programs by local community action groups will be limited. My calculations show only \$411 million in authorizations for community action nonpackaged programs for fiscal year 1967 compared with \$447.8 million for fiscal year 1966, a reduction of some \$36.8 million. Packaged programs specifically earmarked in the bill will consume more than half of the community action program authorization of \$832 million, or \$421 million.

Mr. Speaker, the administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity would like to see a maximum degree of flexibility in community action programs. I think that neighborhood organizations should have the right to have their voices heard on programs that they consider unique for their particular neighborhoods. Unless we have the

maximum degree of flexibility that Congress authorized in the initial war-on-poverty legislation, these neighborhood organizations will not be heard as loudly as in the past, because the present bill not only impinges on the authorizations for new and unique programs, but cuts from 15 percent to 5 percent money for demonstration projects which might have a wider applicability after being tried for the first time in the community of conception.

AMBASSADOR GEORGE J. FELDMAN PRAISED BY MALTESE NEWSPAPER FOR PROMOTING MALTESE-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Maltese English-language daily newspaper, the Malta Bulletin, recently published an editorial on Maltese-United States friendship and praised the actions of American Ambassador George J. Feldman to the Republic of Malta. Mr. Feldman was appointed last year by President Johnson as the first U.S. Ambassador to an independent Malta.

The Malta Bulletin said of Ambassador Feldman in the editorial:

It was perhaps his grasp of the situation here, his appreciation and likeness of the people, his understanding of Malta's need of aid that has contributed to a reciprocal trust, between the two nations, both on their own, bulwarks of the freedom of the world, ready to keep at bay those who would vanquish the torch of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Feldman's representation to the Republic of Malta has brought great credit to the U.S. Diplomatic Service. It is always gratifying to read in editorials like that printed in the Malta Bulletin that American efforts to help other nations are appreciated.

Before becoming Ambassador to Malta, Mr. Feldman served as an adviser to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and as a director of Comsat, the Federal Government satellite corporation, having been named to both positions by our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. An outstanding member of the legal profession, Ambassador Feldman was born in Dorchester, Mass., and graduated from Boston University Law School. He served as secretary to the late distinguished U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable David I. Walsh. Ambassador Feldman performed notably as an attorney with the Federal Trade Commission, and this experience led him to the authorship of many articles and books on the Robinson-Patman Act.

Ambassador Feldman subsequently served as general counsel for the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. In 1958 he became general counsel for the House Select Committee on Science and As-

tronautics, which conducted hearings on the American space program, and led directly to the establishing on the permanent Committee on Science and Astronautics. Our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, was chairman of the select committee and our revered former Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., was minority leader. Ambassador Feldman is married to the former Miss Marion Schulman of New York, and has two children, Margo and George, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, I include the entire editorial on Ambassador Feldman and Maltese-United States friendship, taken from the Malta Bulletin, of September 1, 1966, in the RECORD:

MALTESE-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP

There is no greater comfort than the knowledge that the friendship between the United States and Malta has been increasing under the Nationalist government. Although there has been sympathy from the great democracy across the Atlantic, fewer people than anywhere else there, knew where Malta was, let alone anything about Malta, in spite of the concentration of many Maltese in some areas.

With independence, and the personal friendship struck between the Prime Minister and the late U.S. President Mr. Kennedy, and other high U.S. officials and later with President Johnson the relationship between the two countries have grown closer. But without a doubt the more striking contribution toward closer United States and Government of Malta and its people of all classes has come from the personal interest of the United States ambassador to Malta, Mr. George Feldman, the first to be appointed to independent Malta.

It was perhaps his grasp of the situation here, his appreciation and likeness of the people, his understanding of Malta's need of aid that has contributed to a reciprocal trust, between the two nations, both on their own, bulwarks of the freedom of the world, ready to keep at bay those who would vanquish the torch of liberty. It was not only in the social sphere that Mr. and Mrs. Feldman left their mark. Their patronage of several praiseworthy events are well known. But the ambassador's interest extended into the need of helping Malta, under the existing circumstances.

It is an open secret that the visit of the United States Sixth Fleet Units to Malta have been mainly through his personal efforts and contacts in the United States official quarters, and his activities have gone even beyond that. He has taken an even greater interest for U.S. businessmen to come to Malta and see the possibility of setting up their industries here, and if the Phoenix machinery is still spinning round, this has come through the U.S. interest.

The calls on the Prime Minister of Malta have recently taken a more assiduous term; it will be unwise and imprudent of conjecture what has passed between Dr. Borg Olivier and Mr. Feldman; but there is no denying the fact that both understand that Malta's economy is passing through a rough time, rendered even more precarious by the British White Paper on Defence. Whilst the Development Plan takes shape, some other form of aid has to come through to help us out of the economic doldrums.

The visits of the U.S. Sixth Fleet units, their possibility of repairs of more U.S. ships at the Drydocks are as welcome as ever. The contribution to the island's economy is not a mean one. This hope has been expressed by Ambassador Feldman that more U.S. ships will make use of Malta. The indirect contribution is more than welcome. It is the happy understanding between the Prime

Minister and the U.S. ambassador that has made it possible, even if it is to the chagrin of those who see in the presence of U.S. ships in and around Malta the continuation of Malta's place within the Western Alliance.

THE NEW RULES ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, because I have received many requests for copies of the new rules adopted by the House Education and Labor Committee last week, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the new rules adopted by our committee on September 22, 1966, by a vote of 27 to 1.

REVISED RULES OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, ADOPTED AT REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETING, SEPTEMBER 22, 1966

Rule 1. Meetings—Regular meetings of the Committee on Education and Labor shall be held Thursdays at 9:45 a.m. while Congress is in Session. Meetings may also be held at such other times as may be set by the Chairman, or by written petition of a majority of the committee, duly filed with the Clerk of the Committee. No meeting of the Committee, other than the regularly scheduled meetings, may be held without each member being given prior written notice of at least 24 hours before the meeting unless otherwise specified by the majority of those present. Such meetings shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman, or in the absence of the Chairman, by the ranking majority member of the Committee present.

Rule 2. Rules, Procedure—No change in present Committee rules.

Rule 3. Journal, Roll calls—No change in present Committee rules.

Rule 4. Subcommittees—(revised from present Committee rules). There shall be six standing subcommittees as follows: The General Subcommittee on Education, the General Subcommittee on Labor, the Special Subcommittee on Education, the Special Subcommittee on Labor, the Select Subcommittee on Education, the Select Subcommittee on Labor, plus such other special or select subcommittees as the Committee shall determine to be appropriate.

The jurisdiction of such subcommittees shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

General Subcommittee on Education—education through the high school level, and vocational education.

General Subcommittee on Labor—wages or hours of labor.

Special Subcommittee on Education—education beyond the high school level.

Special Subcommittee on Labor—relationships between employers and employees and their representatives.

Select Subcommittee on Education—special education programs.

Select Subcommittee on Labor—safety and health of the employees and compensation for their injuries; manpower development.

The majority members of the Committee may provide for the appointment of such other subcommittees as they may deem advisable.

Rule 5. Appointments to Subcommittee—No change in present Committee rules.

Rule 6. Ratio of Subcommittees—No change in present Committee rules.

Rule 7. Subcommittee Chairmanship—No change in present Committee rules.

Rule 8. Subcommittee Meetings in the Main Hearing Room—No change in present Committee rules.

Rule 9. Subcommittee Rules—No change in present Committee rules.

Rule 10. Committee staffs—(Revised from present Committee rules).

The professional and clerical staff of the Committee on Education and Labor shall be appointed as follows:

A. Professional and clerical members of subcommittee staff shall be appointed and their remuneration determined by the chairman of that subcommittee within the budget approved for the subcommittee by the full Committee;

B. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority members of the Committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee;

C. The professional and clerical employees of the Committee not assigned to a standing subcommittee or to the minority under the above provisions shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the Chairman in consultation with and with the approval of the majority members of the Committee within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee.

Rule 11. Supervision, Duties of Committee Staffs—(Revised from present Committee Rules).

The professional and clerical staff of a subcommittee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman of that subcommittee. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate. The professional and clerical staff of the Committee not assigned to a subcommittee or to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Staff Director, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he determines appropriate. The Staff Director shall be appointed, and may be removed, and his remuneration determined by the majority members of the Committee.

Staff members shall not engage in any other work other than Committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.*

Rule 12. Powers, Duties of Subcommittees—(Revised from present Committee Rules.)

Subcommittees are authorized to hold hearings, receive exhibits, hear witnesses, and report to the Committee for final action, together with such recommendations as may be agreed upon by the subcommittee. No such meetings or hearings, however, shall be held outside of Washington or during a recess or adjournment of the House without the prior authorization of the Committee Chairman or a majority of a quorum of the subcommittee. A majority of any subcommittee shall constitute a quorum thereof for business; provided, however, that any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony, and further provided that all members of the subcommittee have been given reasonable notice of the meeting.

Rule 13. Bills, Resolutions Reported—(Revised from present Committee Rules.)

Whenever the Committee has ordered a bill or resolution to be reported to the House,

the Chairman of the Committee, the Chairman of the Subcommittee reporting the bill or resolution to the full Committee, or any member authorized by the Committee to do so, may report such bill or resolutions to the House and take the necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote, without further authority from the Committee.

Rule 14. Proxies—No change in present Committee rules.

Rule 15. Scope of Committee Work—No change in present Committee rules.

Rule 16. Reference of Legislation and Committee Agenda—

Every bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter referred to the Committee or initiated by the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman of the full Committee to the appropriate standing subcommittee within one week from the date of its receipt to the Committee unless the Committee shall order that it be held for the full Committee's direct consideration, or order that it be referred to a particular subcommittee.

Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until three days shall have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittee chairmen, at which time such proposed referral shall be made unless one or more subcommittee chairmen shall have given written notice to the Chairman of the full Committee and to the chairman of each subcommittee that he intends to question such proposed referral at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee, or at a special meeting of the Committee called for that purpose at which time referral shall be made by the majority members of the Committee.

All bills shall be referred under this rule to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee. A bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled therefrom at any time by a vote of the majority members of the committee for the committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed upon the agenda of the Committee as of the time they are reported and shall be considered by the full Committee in the order in which they were reported unless the Committee shall by majority vote otherwise direct. Provided, that no bill reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full Committee unless it has been in the hands of all members at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, together with a comparison with present law and a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change, and a section-by-section justification.

No Committee report shall be filed until copies of the proposed report have been available to all Members at least 36 hours prior. No material change shall be made in the report distributed to Members unless agreed to by majority vote.

Rule 17. Budget—Committee Budget and Expenses—The Chairman, in consultation with the majority members of the Committee, shall for each session of the Congress prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel under the Committee's direction and supervision, and for necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the full Committee, and, after consultation with the minority membership, shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel under their direction and supervision. The Chairman of each standing subcommittee, in consultation with the majority members thereof, shall prepare a supplemental budget to include funds for each additional staff, and for such travel, investigations, etc., as may be required for the work of his subcommittee. Thereafter, the clerk shall combine such proposals into a consolidated committee

*Refers to existing Rules of the House.

budget, and shall present the same to the Committee for its approval or other action. The Chairman shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the Committee duly authorized by the House. After said budget shall have been adopted, no change shall be made in such budget unless first approved by the Committee. Chairmen of the standing subcommittees may authorize necessary travel when authorized in accordance with these rules and investigative expenses within the limits of their portion of the consolidated budget as approved by the House, and the Chairman, at the request of the subcommittee chairman, shall execute necessary vouchers therefor.

Once monthly, at the regularly scheduled meeting, the Chairman shall submit to the Committee, in writing, for its approval, or other action, a full and detailed accounting of all expenditures made during the period since the last such accounting from the amount budgeted to the full Committee. Such report shall show the amount and purpose of each expenditure and the budget item to which such expenditure is attributed.

Rule 18. Recommendation of Rule for Appointment of Conferencees.

Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferencees, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferencees the names of those members of the Subcommittee which handled the legislation in the order of their seniority upon such Subcommittee and such other Committee members as the Chairman may designate.

Rule 19. Scheduling and Authenticating of these Rules.

These rules shall become effective immediately upon adoption and an authenticated copy containing the signatures of Members of this Committee who voted for these Rules shall be immediately delivered to the Speaker of the House, the Chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the Chairman of the Committee on Rules, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader, and the Minority Leaders.

Those Ad Hoc subcommittees in existence upon the adoption of these Rules, to wit, the Subcommittee on Training and Education of the Handicapped, De Facto School Segregation, Task Force on International Education, and Subcommittee on the Committee's Centennial, shall remain in existence during the remainder of this Session of Congress.

The adoption of these Rules shall in no way enlarge or modify the scope of the Committee on Education and Labor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOWARD (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. TUCK (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today on account of official business.

Mr. MONAGAN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today through October 4, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Iran.

Mr. NEDZI (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today through October 4, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Iran.

Mr. POAGE (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today through October 4, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Iran.

Mr. WRIGHT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today through October 4, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Iran.

Mr. DADDARIO (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today through October 4, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Iran.

Mr. PIRNIE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through October 4, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Iran.

Mr. McCLORY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through October 4, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Iran.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through October 4, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Iran.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through October 4, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Iran.

Mr. MEEDS, for September 27 and 28, on account of official business.

Mr. RONCALIO, for the week of September 26, on account of official business.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER), for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of this week, on account of official business.

Mr. DYAL (at the request of Mr. BOLLING), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. EDMONDSON, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, September 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GIBBONS during the Committee of the Whole on the Con Am Services OEO contract and to include a letter.

Mr. BUCHANAN during debate in the Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIE to revise and extend his remarks in general debate today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. QUIE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

Mr. KUPFERMAN.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Bow in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McFALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MACKIE.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. EDWARD of California.

Mr. BURKE in two instances.

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. 212. An act to designate a navigation lock and flood control structure of the central and southern Florida flood control project in the State of Florida as the W. P. Franklin lock and control structure; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5852. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the basis on which certain dependency and indemnity compensation will be computed;

H.R. 7850. An act to amend section 1822 (a) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to direct loan and insured loan cases;

H.R. 8699. An act for the relief of Mule Creek Oil Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation;

H.R. 11927. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under the veterans' loan program;

H.R. 12119. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to replace the existing 14th Street Bridge, also known as the Highway Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12352. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property to Pinellas County, Fla.;

H.R. 12664. An act to retrocede to the State of Colorado exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over the real property comprising the Fort Lyon Veterans' Hospital reservation;

H.R. 13012. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H.R. 16868. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1844, in order to clarify the corporate name of Georgetown University, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16940. An act to amend the provisions of the Act of April 8, 1935, relating to the board of trustees of Trinity College of Washington, D.C.; and

H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution to give effect to the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Character, approved at Beirut in 1948.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2393 An act to provide for additional positions to certain departments and agencies, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 22, 1966

H.R. 9976. An act to amend the Act of September 2, 1964; and

H.R. 16330. An act 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.

On September 26, 1966

H.R. 5852. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the basis on which certain dependency and indemnity compensation will be computed;

H.R. 7850. An act to amend section 1822 (a) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to direct loan and insured loan cases;

H.R. 8699. An act for the relief of Mule Creek Oil Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation;

H.R. 11927. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under the veterans' loan programs;

H.R. 12119. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to replace the existing 14th Street Bridge, also known as the Highway Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12352. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property to Pinellas County, Fla.;

H.R. 12664. An act to retrocede to the State of Colorado exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over the real property comprising the Fort Lyon Veterans' Hospital reservation;

H.R. 13012. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H.R. 16863. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1844, in order to clarify the corporate name of Georgetown University, and for other purposes; and

H.H. 16940. An act to amend the provisions of the Act of April 8, 1935, relating to the board of trustees of Trinity College of Washington, D.C.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 27, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.
ETC.**

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

2743. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report of Federal Contributions, Personnel and Administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2744. A letter from the Acting Assistant Executive, OASA (Research and Development), Department of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army

research and development contracts awarded during the period January 1 through June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82-557; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2745. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of Department of the Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement covering the period January 1 through June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-188; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2746. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting a report of Federal Contributions Program, Equipment and Facilities, for the quarter ending June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2747. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 53d Annual Report of the Public Service Commission for the calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2748. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a report of foreign excess property disposed of during fiscal year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 81-152; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2749. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting a report of unauthorized use of management and investigations of resources funds for new construction, Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2750. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting a report of review of financial administration of selected grants for health services made to State of Indiana, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2751. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 26, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Hudson River channel, New York and New Jersey, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1955; to the Committee on Public Works.

2752. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics for the calendar year ended December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 14, 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of September 22, 1966, the following bills were reported on September 23, 1966:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1022. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 3423, an act to provide for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2069). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1023. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 3708, an act to assist comprehensive city demonstration programs

for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in those areas, to assist and encourage planned metropolitan development, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2070). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1024. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 51, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2071). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1025. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 13161, a bill to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for our elementary and secondary schools (Rept. No. 2072). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1026. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16076, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act (Rept. No. 2073). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1027. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 17685, a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (Rept. No. 2074). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 14929. An act to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2075). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 15440. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2076). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of September 22, 1966, the following bill was reported on September 24, 1966:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 17899. A bill to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, to increase the maximum amount of insured accounts or deposits to \$15,000, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted September 26, 1966]

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. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 1308. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 1556. An act to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to delegate certain of its functions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operation. Thirty-eighth report entitled

"Better Management Needed of Medical Research on Aging" (Rept. No. 2080). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Thirty-ninth report entitled "Use of Polygraphs as 'Lie Detectors' by the Federal Government" (Pt. 2) (Rept. No. 2081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Select Committee on Small Business. Report entitled "The Effect of Corn Marketing by the Commodity Credit Corporation Upon Small Business" (Rept. No. 2082). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3715. An act to improve the aids to navigation services of the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 2083). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. S. 3748. An act to provide that the Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Mich., shall be named the "Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Patrick V. McNamara, a U.S. Senator from the State of Michigan from 1955 to 1966 (Rept. 2084). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1275. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Elva L.*, owned by Harold Bunker, of Matinicus, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges (Rept. No. 2085). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 9531. A bill to establish a contiguous fisheries zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2086). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 17607. A bill to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property; with amendment (Rept. No. 2087). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 17954. A bill to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Graduate School for Advanced Studies in American Government for selected individuals of outstanding ability to pursue advanced studies in American political theory, methods, and institutions in preparation for public service with the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 17955. A bill to achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities among the levels of government in order to improve the operation of our Federal system in an increasingly complex society, to improve the administration of grants-in-aid to the States, to permit provision of reimbursable technical services to State and local government, to establish coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration of grants and loans for urban development, to provide for the acquisition, use, and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies in conformity with local government programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 17956. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions paid to retired law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 17958. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (by request):

H.R. 17959. A bill to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to increase the amount of capital available for student loan funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 17960. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist the States in conducting continuing programs of planning for the need for health-care facilities in the State and for assuring that certain amounts payable to health-care facilities pursuant to titles XVIII and XIX of such act will be expended in accordance with such programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 17961. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 17962. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize certain research grants for prevention of industrial water pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 17963. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17964. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 17965. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 17966. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of soil and water conservation expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 17967. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 17968. A bill to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 17969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 17970. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to

deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 17971. A bill to provide for the admission into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 17972. A bill to amend section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to permit grants after construction is commenced for basic water and sewer facilities which qualify for such grants but cannot receive them prior to construction because of the unavailability of funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 17973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 17974. 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 Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 17975. A bill to provide compensation in the case in which a law enforcement officer is killed or disabled in the course of his duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 17976. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 17977. A bill to authorize the merger of two or more professional football leagues, and to protect football contests between secondary schools from professional football telecasts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17978. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 17979. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose a limitation upon the time for the institution of deportation proceedings, and a limitation upon the time for the loss of U.S. nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 17980. A bill to authorize and request the President to award a Presidential Unit Citation to the 761st Tank Battalion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 17981. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to permit the waiver of certain retirement or annuity payments under programs administered by the Federal Government, and to waive certain overpayments of veterans pensions resulting from enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1308. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 1018. Concurrent resolution to urge negotiation under the General Agree-

ment on Tariffs and Trade, article 28, for relief of tariff on machines used in making pulp, paper, and paperboard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H. Con. Res. 1019. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to invoking the rights of article XXVIII of GATT; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 1028. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 1029. Resolution providing an additional stationery allowance for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 17982. A bill for the relief of Sally Mohammed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 17983. A bill for the relief of Miss Carmelina Colabello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 17984. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain medical equipment for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 17985. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of treasure-trove discovered by Real Eight Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 17986. A bill for the relief of certain claimants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 17987. A bill for the relief of Young II Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 17988. A bill for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 17989. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Provenza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 17990. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17991. A bill for the relief of George Niskopoulos and Amalia Niskopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17992. A bill for the relief of Maria L. Bettencourt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 17993. A bill for the relief of Antonietta Liccari (nee) Nardulli, Nadia Liccari, and Giuseppina Liccari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 17994. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Peregrina Tabor Imperial, Miss Ninya Tabor Imperial, and Miss Marietta Tabor Imperial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 17995. A bill for the relief of Forest Fiber Products Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Res. 1030. Resolution opposing the granting of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

433. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Carlisle, Pa., relative to fingerprinting of every U.S. citizen, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE, a Senator from the State of Maine.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation: To Thee we lift our hearts in prayer, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite hearts.

Help us in all things to be masters of ourselves that we may be servants of all.

Wilt Thou crown our deliberations with Thy wisdom and with spacious thinking to fit these epic days.

As heralds of Thy love, send us forth across all barriers of race and creed, bearing to yearning hearts, as a holy sacrament, the bread of human kindness and the red wine of willing sacrifice.

May our individual lives be as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. In this global contest beyond the light and darkness, make us as individuals the kind of persons which Thou can use as the instruments of Thy purpose for all mankind. Thus, may we—

Rise up, O men of God,

Have done with lesser things.

Give heart and mind and soul and strength,

To serve the King of kings.

Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 26, 1966.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE, a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MUSKIE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 22, 1966, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of September 22, 1966,

The following reports of a committee were submitted on September 23, 1966:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. Res. 305. Concurrent resolution providing for the appointment of a special subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to study encroachments by the executive and judicial branches upon the powers of the Congress; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 3817. A bill to authorize the merger of two or more professional football leagues, and to protect football contests between secondary schools from professional football telecasts (Rept. No. 1654).

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Con. Res. 109. An original concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of certain hearings of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full under the heading "Concurrent Resolution.")

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of September 22, 1966,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations With Togo (Ex. E, 89th Cong., 2d sess.), reported it favorably, on report (Ex. Rept. 8) thereon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On September 21, 1966:

S. 2268. An act relating to the composition of the District of Columbia court of general sessions; and

S. 3051. An act granting the consent of Congress to the compact between Missouri and Kansas creating the Kansas City Area Transportation District and the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority.

On September 24, 1966:

S. 3625. An act to designate the dam being constructed on the Allegheny River, Pa., as the "Kinzua Dam," and the lake to be formed by such dam in Pennsylvania and New York as the "Allegheny Reservoir."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2540) to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3,

1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 483) to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowances of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 11555. An act to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico; and

H.R. 17195. An act to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 2393. An act to provide for additional positions to certain departments and agencies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5852. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the basis on which certain dependency and indemnity compensation will be computed;

H.R. 7850. An act to amend section 1822(a) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to direct loan and insured loan cases;

H.R. 8699. An act for the relief of Mule Creek Oil Co., Inc., a Delaware corporation;

H.R. 11927. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under the veterans' loan programs;

H.R. 12119. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to replace the existing 14th Street Bridge, also known as the Highway Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12352. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property to Pinellas County, Fla.;

H.R. 12664. An act to retrocede to the State of Colorado exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over the real property comprising the Fort Lyon Veterans' Hospital reservation;

H.R. 13012. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H.R. 16863. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1844, in order to clarify the corporate name of Georgetown University, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16940. An act to amend the provisions of the act of April 8, 1935, relating to the board of trustees of Trinity College of Washington, D.C.; and

H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution to give effect to the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Character, approved at Beirut in 1948.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 11555. An act to provide a border highway along the United States bank of the Rio Grande River in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico; placed on the calendar.

H.R. 17195. An act to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the reserve components of the armed forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 2138. A bill to consent to an agreement between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, providing for an access highway to the Northwest Angle in the State of Minnesota, and to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to pay Minnesota's share of the cost of such highway (Rept. No. 1655); and

S. 3247. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1656).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. MORTON and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 3857. A bill to amend section 334(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the basis of property received by a corporation upon liquidation of a subsidiary; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 3858. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to extend certain temporary provisions and to require provision of assistance under plans for aid to families with dependent children where dependency is due to unemployment of a parent; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. RIBICOFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO AID TO CERTAIN FAMILIES WITH NEEDY CHILDREN

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act. The bill consists of two amendments to the public assistance programs of the act.

The first amendment provides for a 5-year extension of the provisions of the

Public Welfare Amendments of 1962. Under existing law these amendments expire on June 30, 1967. My amendment would extend these provisions until June 30, 1972.

The second amendment provides that the provisions in the law for assistance to the needy children of unemployed parents must be included in each State plan for aid to families with dependent children. Under the existing law, a State may elect to provide assistance to children where a parent is dead, disabled, or absent from the home, or where the parent is unemployed. A number of States and the Congress acting for the District of Columbia, have not taken advantage of the 1962 provision to extend aid to the needy children of unemployed parents. My amendment provides that every State, and the District of Columbia, must put into operation by July 1, 1969, the program for aiding needy children, where the parent is unemployed.

This will enable ample and serious consideration to be given to the problem of aid to needy children when we consider the extension of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3858) to amend the Social Security Act to extend certain temporary provisions and to require provision of assistance under plans for aid to families with dependent children where dependency is due to unemployment of a parent, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

TROOP DEPLOYMENT IN EUROPE AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 934

Mr. CLARK submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the resolution (S. Res. 300) to express the sense of the Senate with respect to troop deployment in Europe, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 935

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 14745, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which is now before the Senate.

The President's budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recommended \$10,083,184,500. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, in its consideration of H.R. 14745, appropriated \$10,473,309,500, which is an increase of \$390,125,000 over the President's recommendation. My amendment, if adopted, will reduce the moneys sought to be appropriated in the bill to substan-

tially what the President recommended in his budget. The amount of the reduction would be \$426,164,000.

The important discussion among the people of the Nation, the Members of Congress, and the President's Cabinet deals with the subject of inflation. The thinking is uniform that to curb the growth of the forces of inflation, the first place to start is by a reduction of Federal spending. The bill before the Senate fails to give heed to the aforementioned principle, but even makes things worse by increasing the amount of spending recommended by the President.

I ask that the amendment be printed and lie at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Kansas [MR. PEARSON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3854) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Dr. William C. Menninger for his pioneering work in the field of mental health.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under rule VIII, I ask unanimous consent to waive the call of the calendar on measures that are not objected to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DIRECTOR OF THE MINT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eva B. Adams, of Nevada, to be Director of the Mint for a term of 5 years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presi-

dent be notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1599 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MODERNIZATION OF THE FEDERAL SEED ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 15662) to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275) as amended which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 2, line 19, after the word "section", to strike out "of" and insert "for"; on page 3, line 9, after the word "Not", to strike out "Stated:" and insert "Stated:"; in line 12, after the word "the", to strike out "label" and insert "label:"; in line 20, after "U.S.C.", to strike out "1571 (B)" and insert "1571 (b)"; on page 4, line 13, after "(i)", to strike out "The" and insert "the"; on page 8, line 17, after the word "including", to strike out "noxious weed" and insert "noxious-weed"; on page 10, line 1, after "Sec. 12.", to insert "(a)"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(b)"; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)"; on page 11, line 6, after the word "as", to strike out "stated" and insert "stated"; in line 9, after "(4)", to strike out "Any" and insert "any"; in line 21, after "(5)", to strike out "Any" and insert "any"; on page 14, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "pure"; and, in line 24, after the word "time", to insert "to time".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1632), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This bill would simplify, modernize, and otherwise improve the Federal Seed Act.

It would—

(1) Delete specific references to Alaska and Hawaii, since they are now States;

(2) Delete a long statutory list of agricultural seeds which has been superseded by regulations authorized by law;

(3) Substitute "soybeans", "flax", "carrot" and "radish" (which represent single species) for "wheat", "oat", "vetch", and "sweet-clover" (which represent more than one species) as examples of names of kinds of seed, since the use of wheat, oat, vetch, and sweetclover as examples prevents the Secretary from requiring separate kind names for each of the species represented by those names;

(4) Require agricultural seed generally labeled as to variety either to be so labeled or to be labeled so as to make it clear that the variety is not stated on the label;

(5) Require hybrid agricultural or vegetable seed (except lawn and turf mixtures in containers of 50 pounds or less) to be labeled as hybrid, since hybrid seed will not ordinarily produce seed suitable for planting;

(6) Require inoculated seed to be labeled as to the date the inoculant is no longer claimed effective;

(7) In the case of containers of more than 1 pound, remove the requirement that seed of below standard germination bear the words "below standard," since purchasers in that quantity understand the actual germination data shown;

(8) Remove the 9-month limit on the expanded period the Secretary may allow between germination test and introduction into commerce, since new packaging provides longer viability;

(9) Permit lawn and turf mixture in containers of 50 pounds or less to omit statements concerning germination of other agricultural seed components and origin, since these are not significant to lawn and turf seed purchasers;

(10) Include seed treatment among the items on which records must be kept so that compliance can be determined;

(11) Provide for "reasonable" instead of "all proper" precautions being taken to insure proper identification of certain seeds (not considered a material change);

(12) Provide that seed would not be deemed mislabeled as to treatment if the substance used was indistinguishable from the substance intended to be used. This provision is intended to protect not only persons treating the seed, but also purchasers who relabel and are unable to distinguish the treated seed from seed treated with the substance shown by the label;

(13) Require imported seed to be labeled as to each 5 percent component of agricultural seed, and to designate as hybrid each 5 percent hybrid component;

(14) Require imported seed that has been treated to show the same information as to treatment required of seed in interstate commerce;

(15) Permit selective (rather than universal) testing of imported seed for pure live seed content, so as to avoid delays in importation. (The importer may, at his cost, have any lot tested. All seed in interstate commerce must be correctly labeled, so the general public is protected.);

(16) Permit importation of seed not meeting pure live seed, or staining, requirements, where it is to be used only for seed production by or for the importer;

(17) Repeal the statutory tolerances on noxious-weed seeds in imported seed, since tolerances are also provided in the testing operation, resulting in a double tolerance at the present time; and

(18) Amend the definition of interstate commerce to apply to labeling for treatment in the same manner as to labeling for variety and origin.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amendments (except for the deleting "pure" in sec. 18) correct typographical errors, punctuation, citations, and subsection designation. The deletion of "pure" in section 18 is required because the Department has informed the committee

that it is impossible to determine the pure live seed content of a component in a mixture, there being no way of identifying the chaff and other inert matter.

AMENDMENT OF THE CONSOLIDATED FARMER'S HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1961

The bill (H.R. 15510) to amend the Consolidated Farmer's Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to hold prepayments made to the Secretary by insured loan borrowers and transmit them to the holder of the note in installments as they become due was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1633), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill permits the Department of Agriculture, in servicing an insured loan, to hold amounts prepaid by the borrower and transmit them to the noteholder as they become due. Under existing law all prepayments must be transmitted to the noteholder not later than the first annual installment due date following their receipt.

The objective is to make the loans attractive to investors by providing for a constant predictable flow of payments. The interest accruing on any prepayment between the date it is received by the Department and the date it is transmitted to the noteholder is borne by the Government. However, this does not necessarily represent a loss to the Government since it has the use of the funds during that period.

In many instances, cumulative prepayments are sufficient to preclude any payment being required on the note for several years. Many investors object strenuously when they do not receive at least the amount of accrued interest on each installment due date. Some also object because under present regulations the amount of annual earnings on their investment cannot be predicted with any certainty. If a borrower makes a large prepayment, this reduces the lenders interest earnings in future years. The proposed amendment would make it possible to advise investors of the exact amount of interest and principal they will receive each year except for final payments in full. The proposed amendment would make these insured loans more attractive to investors because they would receive only the regular annual installments as they fall due, regardless of the aggregate amount of prepayments except final payments.

Prepayments not needed to meet installments when due would be retained in the insurance fund. The fund would bear the burden of paying interest accrued from the date of the prepayment to the date of transmittal to the holder. However, such interest cost would be minimized to the extent that prepayments held in the fund would be used to pay off borrowings from the Treasury, with the accompanying savings of interest on such borrowings, or to the extent that they would be invested in interest-bearing obligations of the United States.

GILMOUR C. MACDONALD, COLONEL, U.S. AIR FORCE (RETIRED)

The bill (H.R. 7546) for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S.

Air Force (retired) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1653), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to waive any statute of limitations and confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any legal or equitable claim filed by Gilmour C. MacDonald for compensation for the use during World War II and the Korean conflict of a tubular caltrop tire-puncturing device allegedly invented by him.

STATEMENT

The House report in its favorable action on H.R. 7546, relates the following:

"The bill, H.R. 7546, was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on June 9, 1966, at which time the subcommittee heard testimony in support of the bill and testimony in opposition by representatives of the Air Force. At that hearing the attorney for the claimant and the claimant himself testified as to the circumstances under which Mr. MacDonald disclosed his idea of a caltrop tire-puncturing device to the United States through the National Inventors Council. As is noted in the Department of the Air Force report, on September 30, 1940, the National Inventors Council received a letter from Gilmour C. MacDonald suggesting a design for a tubular caltrop device to be used for military purposes. Enclosed with the letter were photographs of the device. At the time of this submission Mr. MacDonald had not yet entered upon active duty with the Army. The Air Force report further noted that on November 25, 1940, the claimant also submitted a similar letter with photographs of the same device to the Field Service Section, Material Division of the Army Corps at Wright Field, Ohio.

"The information submitted to the committee and the exhibits of the device displayed to the committee at the hearing establish the fact that a caltrop is a four-pointed metal device so constructed that three of the points form a base on the ground and the other sharpened point extends directly upward. Colonel MacDonald's design was constructed of tubular material for the purpose of deflating the tires of enemy vehicles or aircraft. One of the points relied upon by Colonel MacDonald in connection with his claim is that the tubular construction could cause tire deflation even if there was a self-sealing feature to the tire.

"The Air Force report details the circumstances and some of the history concerning the matter and it is apparent that Colonel MacDonald has over the years sought to assert his claim by some administrative action; however, the Air Force report observed that as far back as 1948, the review of the matter by the Departments of the Air Force and Army resulted in the determination that there was no apparent statutory authority to settle the claim. However, the committee feels that this course of action shows that Colonel MacDonald was diligent in seeking to maintain his right to claim compensation and that, therefore, the committee is justified in recommending a waiver of any applicable statute of limitations which might be asserted to bar his claim.

"The committee feels that a jurisdictional bill is the only fair and logical way to resolve this matter. There are difficult legal and factual questions concerning the claim which can best be resolved by the Court of

Claims. Each year that court considers a large number of claims involving patents and it is, therefore, logical that this forum be selected for the consideration of this case."

The committee, after consideration of all of the foregoing, concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 7546, be considered favorably.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES SITUATED IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The bill (H.R. 11253) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Pennsylvania was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1652), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Attorney General to convey approximately 2.73 acres of land to the White Deer Baptist Church of Allenwood, Pa., upon payment to the United States of the fair market value of the land.

STATEMENT

In reference to this claim, the House relates the following:

"The Department of Justice in its report to the committee on the bill stated that it would have no objection to the enactment of the bill.

"The White Deer Baptist Church of Allenwood, Pa., occupies a church site of 1.59 acres, which is entirely surrounded except for access to a road by the 4,226-acre Federal prison camp at Allenwood. The land described in the bill would expand the church site on three sides so as to make it possible for the church to furnish parking facilities for its members. Further, the information supplied to the committee indicates that the present boundaries of the land are such that one corner of the church building is within inches of the boundary.

"In its report to the committee, the Justice Department indicated that the description contained in the bill was not as precise as might be desired. In the course of the consideration of the bill, the members of the committee inquired into the matter of the description and have concluded that the description in the bill is adequate for the purpose of authorizing a conveyance of the land which is the purpose of the bill. The precise description would be contained in any conveyance by the United States executed under the authority of the legislation. The principal difference between the description in the bill and the Department report is that the Justice Department would seek to except the land now owned by the church by a metes and bounds description.

"This exception is already referred to in section 1 of the bill. It is felt that the actual conveyance of the land by deed from the United States can make this exception in accordance with the authority expressly provided in the bill, and it is further suggested that such a conveyance be made on the basis of an actual survey of the land which will accurately fix the boundaries so defined.

"In view of the fact that the Department of Justice does not object to the conveyance and the bill provides that the conveyance

shall be made upon payment of the fair market value as determined by the Attorney General, the committee has determined that the authorization is to the best interest of the Government and the church."

The committee has reviewed the foregoing and the attachments hereto, and concurs in the action of the House of Representatives, and recommends that the bill, H.R. 11253, be considered favorably.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 5912) for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The bill (S. 3353) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the transfer of three paintings to the Federal Republic of Germany in trust for the Weimar Museum was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3353

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1246; 50 U.S.C. App., sec. 39), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of subsections (a) through (d) of this section, the Attorney General is hereby authorized to transfer the three paintings vested under Vesting Order Numbered 8107, dated January 28, 1947, to the Federal Republic of Germany, to be held in trust for eventual transfer to the Weimar Museum, Weimar, State of Thuringia, Germany, in accord with the terms of an agreement to be made between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1635), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Attorney General on behalf of the United States to transfer certain paintings to the Federal Republic of Germany to be held in trust for eventual transfer to the Weimar Museum, Weimar, State of Thuringia, Germany, in accordance with the terms of an agreement which will be made between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany if the legislation is enacted.

STATEMENT

The bill is recommended by both the Department of State and the Attorney General of the United States.

The three paintings consist of "Self Portrait" by Rembrandt, "Portrait of a Man" by Terborch and "Portrait of a Young Woman" by Tischbein and are of substantial artistic and historical importance, as well as being valuable.

Photographs of the three paintings, before and after restoration, are currently in the committee files. The following is in brief the recent history of the paintings:

The paintings, which are the subject of this legislation, were stolen on April 18, 1922, from the Weimar Museum by two German soldiers, both unidentified. At a later stage they were purchased by a German merchant seaman who brought them to this country in 1934 where they were acquired by a U.S. citizen who resided in Dayton, Ohio. The Office of Alien Property, learning in 1946 of the presence of these paintings in the United States and their background, vested the paintings on the basis that the paintings were German owned.

Under existing legislation the Department of Justice cannot return the paintings to Germany even though they were stolen, but is required to sell them and deposit the proceeds in the war claims fund. The Department of State is of the view that it would be prejudicial to our foreign relations to sell these paintings, which are part of the German cultural heritage. The paintings, as valuable works of art, should go back to the German people. Since they cannot be returned under present U.S. laws, a view concurred in by the Department of Justice, it is necessary that return be authorized by this legislation which the committee recommends favorably to the Senate.

Since the Weimar Museum is in East Germany, and is subject to a regime which the U.S. Government does not recognize as a legitimate government, the legislation provides for the return of the paintings to the Federal Republic of Germany to be held in trust for eventual return to the Weimar Museum. This committee has received from the State Department draft copies of the proposed exchange of notes copies of which are attached hereto, under which the Federal Republic of Germany would agree with the United States to hold the paintings in trust for such eventual return. These notes would be exchanged between the two Governments as soon as the legislation is enacted.

Evidence before the committee indicated a rather nebulous cloud on the title of the Rembrandt "Self Portrait." This cloud arises from an arbitral decision of the highest state court of Thuringia some 48 years ago which, being in East Germany, is not available for examination. Since the committee is precluded from examination of the East German court records it could not make its own determination of the title dispute, if any. For this reason the committee recommended that the proposed exchange of notes between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany be revised so as to permit the resolution of this possible title dispute by the proper German forum. It is noted that presently, under the sovereign laws of the United States, absolute fee simple title of the three paintings resides in the U.S. Government. However, the committee was reluctant to use the sovereignty of the United States as a means of precluding any just claim by a German civilian. The committee therefore suggested that the paintings be put in the same position, after time of the original theft from the Weimar Museum.

The Department of State has been in communication with the representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany. They fully concur in the proposed legislation and the exchange of notes containing the suggested committee revision.

In normal course, these paintings would have been sold by the Attorney General at public sale and the proceeds transferred to the Treasury for deposit to the war claims fund. Since these paintings, however, are valuable works of art which form a part of the cultural heritage of the German people,

it is felt that the disposition by sale would be prejudicial to the foreign relations of the United States.

Legally, if it is considered that a public sale of this vested property does not serve the public interest of the United States then this legislation is necessary to return the paintings to Germany for the following reasons:

Although the Attorney General has broad powers to deal with vested property under section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, these powers may be limited by section 39 of the act. Section 39(a) has long prohibited returns of vested property to Germany and its nationals; and the amendment of section 39 by Public Law 87-846 of October 22, 1962, further requires that the net proceeds remaining upon completion of the administration, liquidation and disposition of vested property shall be covered into the Treasury for deposit in the war claims fund. There is doubt, therefore, that the Attorney General could transfer title to these paintings to the Federal Republic of Germany without enabling legislation such as S. 3353.

The Office of Alien Property received confirmation of the paintings' authenticity and information on their ownership in a letter of September 27, 1946, from Wilhelm R. W. Koehler. A copy of this letter has been furnished to the committee. Mr. Koehler was director of the Weimar Museum when the paintings were stolen, and he was in 1946 associated with the Fogg Museum of Art at Harvard University. He reported that the Weimar Museum was a public institution the administration of which was directly dependent on the Ministry for Culture of the State of Thuringia. He said unequivocally that the museum owned the Terborch and Tischbein paintings. With respect to the Rembrandt self-portrait he reported that it was originally the property of the Grand Duke of Sachsen-Weimar and was loaned by him to the museum in 1909 along with other works of art. It remained his property until after the revolution of 1918. At that time, the highest court of Thuringia, acting as an arbitration committee, decreed that the loaned works of art, including the Rembrandt, should go to the State of Thuringia.

Under the Trading With the Enemy Act it made no difference to the exercise of the power to vest if the paintings were owned by a German governmental institution or by one or a group of German nationals resident in Germany. Germany property was vestible. Moreover, it was clear that the American purchaser of the stolen paintings had not obtained good title to them either under the law of the State of New York where they had been purchased, nor under the law of the State of Ohio where they were located. Accordingly, on February 28, 1947, vesting order No. 8107 vested title to the paintings in the Attorney General to be held for the United States. The paintings were then shipped to Washington, D.C., where they have been stored in the vaults of the National Gallery of Art.

The monetary value of the three paintings is not readily assessable. It should be noted, however, that the failure to credit to the war claims fund whatever value may fairly be attributed to them would not substantially prejudice the rights of any claimant to that fund, deposits to which currently exceed \$464 million.

The committee has received assurance from the Department of State that prior to transfer of these paintings to the Federal Republic of Germany there will be a public showing at the National Gallery of Art for the artistic and cultural benefit of the citizens of the United States.

In view of the foregoing the committee recommends favorable enactment of S. 3353.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 28, ENTITLED "JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE" WITH RESPECT TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1665) to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" of the United States Code to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in special jurisdictional cases and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 1492 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

§ 2509. Congressional reference cases

"Any bill, except a bill for a pension, may be referred by either House of Congress to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims for a report in conformity with section 2509 of this title."

Sec. 2. Section 2509 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

§ 2509. Congressional reference cases

(a) Whenever a bill, except a bill for a pension, is referred by either House of Congress to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to section 1492 of this title, the chief commissioner shall designate a trial commissioner for the case and a panel of three commissioners of the court to serve as a reviewing body. One member of the review panel shall be designated as presiding commissioner of the panel.

(b) Proceedings in a congressional reference case shall be under rules and regulations prescribed for the purpose by the chief commissioner who is hereby authorized and directed to require the application of the pertinent rules of practice of the Court of Claims insofar as feasible. Each trial commissioner and each review panel shall have authority to do and perform any acts which may be necessary or proper for the efficient performance of their duties, including the power of subpoena and the power to administer oaths and affirmations. None of the rules, rulings, findings, or conclusions authorized by this section shall be subject to judicial review.

(c) The trial commissioner to whom a congressional reference case is assigned by the chief commissioner shall proceed in accordance with the applicable rules to determine the facts, including facts relating to delay or laches, facts bearing upon the question whether the bar of any statute of limitation should be removed, or facts claimed to excuse the claimant for not having resorted to any established legal remedy. He shall append to his findings of fact conclusions sufficient to inform Congress whether the demand is a legal or equitable claim or a gratuity, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

(d) The findings and conclusions of the trial commissioner shall be submitted by him, together with the record in the case, to the review panel of commissioners for review by it pursuant to such rules as may be provided for the purpose, which shall include provisions for submitting the report of the trial commissioner to the parties for consideration, exception, and argument before the panel. The panel, by majority vote, shall adopt or modify the findings or the conclusions of the trial commissioner.

(e) The panel shall submit its report to the chief commissioner for transmission to the appropriate House of Congress.

(f) Any act or failure to act or other conduct by a party, a witness, or an attorney which would call for the imposition of sanctions under the rules of practice of the Court

of Claims shall be noted by the panel or the trial commissioner at the time of occurrence thereof and upon failure of the delinquent or offending party, witness, or attorney to make prompt compliance with the order of the panel or the trial commissioner a full statement of the circumstances shall be incorporated in the report of the panel.

(g) The Court of Claims is hereby authorized and directed, under such regulations as it may prescribe, to provide the facilities and services of the office of the clerk of the court for the filing, processing, hearing, and dispatch of congressional reference cases and to include within its annual appropriations the costs thereof and other costs of administration, including (but without limitation to the items herein listed) the salaries and traveling expenses of the commissioners serving as trial commissioners and panel members, mailing and service of process, necessary physical facilities, equipment, and supplies, and personnel (including secretaries and law clerks)."

Sec. 3. Section 792(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Court shall designate one of the commissioners to serve at the will of the court as chief commissioner."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend title 28, entitled 'Judiciary and Judicial Procedure', of the United States Code to provide for the reporting of congressional reference cases by commissioners of the United States Court of Claims."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1643), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide a procedure whereby complex issues of fact raised by claims for private relief bills may be referred to commissioners of the Court of Claims for an advisory report to the Congress.

STATEMENT

Each year a number of claims for private relief legislation come to the Congress that raise complex issues of fact which must be resolved before the Congress can determine whether the relief requested ought to be granted. The relevant committees of the Congress have usually found that they lack the time, facilities and expertise necessary to hear the evidence and make the determinations of these issues. Congress has therefore traditionally sought to make use of other means to hear these issues, while retaining for itself the prerogative of granting or denying the relief sought.

Until recently, the procedure followed in such cases was for one House of Congress to refer any such private relief bill to the Court of Claims for a report on the facts and advisory conclusions as to whether the relief requested should be granted. 28 U.S.C., sections 1492, 2509. On the basis of the Court of Claims' report on each of the "Congressional reference cases," Congress would then decide whether or not to enact the private relief bill.

In 1962, however, in the case of *Glidden Co. v. Zdanok*, 370 U.S. 530, the Supreme Court held that the Court of Claims was a court of the United States within the mean-

ing of article III of the Constitution. It is well settled that an article III court may only decide cases and controversies, and may not render merely advisory opinions that other branches of the Government are free to disregard. Accordingly, the effect of the decision in *Glidden* that the Court of Claims is an article III court was to preclude the continued exercise by that court of the advisory jurisdiction on congressional reference cases as provided by 28 U.S.C. sections 1492 and 2509. Since the *Glidden* decision the Court of Claims has regretfully declined to accept any further congressional reference cases.

H.R. 1665 was introduced in order to provide an alternative means of handling congressional reference cases. The bill as passed by the House of Representatives provides that the Court of Claims, upon reference by resolution of one House of Congress, would have jurisdiction, notwithstanding any statute of limitations, to render judgment for the amount, if any, determined to be legally or equitably due from the United States. The Department of Justice raised several substantial objections to this approach to the problem, both before the House Committee on the Judiciary and before the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery at a hearing held on June 10, 1965.

The Department put forth two major constitutional arguments against H.R. 1665 in its original form: (1) It would allow only one House of Congress, without Presidential approval, to perform two actions traditionally requiring normal legislative procedures—conferencing jurisdiction upon a court of the United States, and waiving the statute of limitations for a particular case, and (2) it would call upon a court of the United States to perform essentially legislative functions by permitting the Court of Claims to decide whether as a matter of policy and equity the United States ought to pay money to a claimant when there might not be any sum legally due.

The committee believes that there is merit in these contentions of the Department of Justice, particularly with respect to the latter of the two objections. It is difficult to justify granting to a court the power to confer what has traditionally been regarded as legislative grace. It is for Congress to decide, after being fully informed of the facts, whether the equities of a particular situation are such that rules of law of general application ought to be suspended for that one case. For these reasons, the staff of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery has endeavored for the past several months to devise a substitute measure, satisfactory to both the Department of Justice and the Court of Claims, which would retain the advisory feature of present law. The amended bill would achieve this purpose and has the acceptance of the Department of Justice and the Court of Claims.

The amended bill provides for reference of claims for private relief bills by resolution of one House of Congress to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims, who would appoint both a trial commissioner to hear the evidence and prepare suggested findings, and a panel of three commissioners of the court to sit as a reviewing body and report its findings and recommendations to the appropriate House of Congress. The report of this panel of Commissioners to the Congress is wholly advisory, and the power to grant legislative grace by passing the relief bill remains solely in the hands of the Congress. The committee is of the opinion that this approach is preferable both on constitutional grounds and for reasons of policy.

In the letter of the Deputy Attorney General to Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, dated August 22, 1966, the Department of Justice questions the need for this legislation. The Deputy Attorney

General also recommends that private relief legislation be used sparingly, and that general legislation is always preferable. Your committee feels that it is in order to make some comment about these observations.

The contention that general legislation is preferable and should be sufficient to cover all cases attributes to the legislative branch a degree of omniscience and prescience that this committee is unwilling to claim for itself. It is impossible, particularly in legislation regulating the relationship between the Government and private parties, to take account of all eventualities.

It should also be remembered that in the special area with which private relief legislation deals, factors that in other areas ameliorate the possible harsh effects of general laws may not exist. Government officials are understandably unwilling to spend the taxpayers' money in situations in which they are not clearly authorized by statute to do so, whereas in a comparable situation a private party might well decide that, although under the law his obligation is not clear, he will pay another person what he feels that equity and fair play dictate he pay. Conversely, a Government official—despite his personal view of the equities of a particular situation—will be extremely reluctant to fail to press the Government's rights under a general statute, while a private party might decide that in good conscience he should forgo what is legally his due.

In addition, in applying statutes regulating the rights and obligations of the Government the courts have less freedom to adjust their decisions to the equities of particular situations than they do in developing the common law of relationships among private parties. For all these reasons, the committee is of the opinion that private relief legislation is both useful and necessary, and that this legislation is needed in order to facilitate congressional action on such private legislation.

The committee does agree with the Deputy Attorney General, however, that general legislation, where feasible, is preferable to private relief legislation, and that the Congress should exercise restraint in the utilization of this legislation, referring claims for private relief to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims only when complex issues of fact must be resolved as a prerequisite for relief.

Accordingly, the committee recommends that the bill H.R. 1665, as amended, be considered favorably.

ARTURO D. LAGASCA, JR.

The bill (S. 2462) for the relief of Arturo D. Lagasca, Jr. was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2462

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Arturo D. Lagasca, Jr., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1644), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Arturo D. Lagasca, Jr. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

DR. ANSELMO S. ALVAREZ-GOMEZ

The bill (S. 2513) for the relief of Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2513

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 16, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1645), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez as of June 16, 1961. The beneficiary was lawfully admitted for permanent residence on October 30, 1963, and the bill will credit her prior residence in a nonimmigrant status toward the naturalization requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

DR. MARIA YOLANDA RAFAELA MIRANDA Y MONTEAGUDO

The bill (S. 2543) for the relief of Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2543

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 30, 1960.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1646), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo as of September 30, 1960. The beneficiary was lawfully admitted for permanent residence on March 3, 1963, and the bill will credit her prior residence in a nonimmigrant status toward the naturalization requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

DR. HILDA W. PEREZ DE GONZALEZ

The bill (S. 2587) for the relief of Dr. Hilda W. Perez de Gonzalez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2587

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Hilda W. Perez de Gonzalez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 24, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1647), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Hilda W. Perez de Gonzalez as of May 24, 1961. The beneficiary was lawfully admitted for permanent residence on October 30, 1963, and the bill will credit her prior residence in a nonimmigrant status toward the naturalization requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

DR. JULIO VALDES-RODRIGUEZ

The bill (S. 2754) for the relief of Dr. Julio Valdes-Rodriguez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2754

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Julio Valdes-Rodriguez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 9, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1648), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Julio Valdes-Rodriguez as of April 9, 1962. The beneficiary was lawfully admitted for permanent residence on August 17, 1965, and the bill will credit his prior residence in a nonimmigrant status toward the naturalization requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

DR. ALBERTO FERNANDEZ-BRAVO Y AMAT

The bill (S. 2757) for the relief of Dr. Alberto Fernandez-Bravo y Amat was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2757

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the

purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Alberto Fernandez-Bravo y Amat shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 3, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1649), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. RAFAEL JACINTO NOBO Y PIVIDAL

The bill (S. 2762) for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2762

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 28, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1650), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo) as of June 28, 1961. The beneficiary was lawfully admitted for permanent residence on September 28, 1962, and the bill will credit his prior residence in a nonimmigrant status toward the naturalization requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 46-year-old native and citizen of Cuba, who was admitted to the United States as a visitor on June 28, 1961. He was granted an indefinite time within which to depart from the United States. The beneficiary obtained an immigrant visa in Canada, and was thereafter lawfully admitted to this country for permanent residence on September 28, 1962. The beneficiary desires to practice medicine in the State of Florida, but he cannot take the requisite examination until he acquires U.S. citizenship.

DR. MARCIAL ALFREDO MARTI PRIETO

The bill (S. 2763) for the relief of Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti Prieto (Alfredo Marti) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2763

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality

Act, Doctor Marcial Alfredo Marti Prieto (Alfredo Marti) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 15, 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1651), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti Prieto (Alfredo Marti) as of July 15, 1961. The beneficiary was lawfully admitted for permanent residence on August 21, 1962, and the bill will credit his prior residence in a nonimmigrant status toward the naturalization requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

DR. HECTOR JESUS SANCHEZ-HERNANDEZ

The bill (S. 3016) for the relief of Dr. Hector Jesus Sanchez-Hernandez was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3016

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Hector Jesus Sanchez-Hernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 25, 1960.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1636), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

SETSUKO WILSON

The bill (S. 3300) for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3300

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka) may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1637), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has been convicted for violation of the narcotics law and larceny in behalf of the wife of a U.S. citizen member of the U.S. Air Force.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 33-year-old native and citizen of Japan who is the wife of a U.S. citizen member of the U.S. Air Force whom she married in Japan on December 9, 1963. She presently resides in Japan with her husband who has been stationed there since May 1962. The beneficiary has been found ineligible to receive a visa as one previously convicted of larceny and a narcotics law violation. Without the waiver provided for in the bill, the beneficiary will be unable to accompany her citizen husband to the United States when he is reassigned.

WEN SHI YU

The bill (S. 3566) for the relief of Wen Shi Yu was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3566

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wen Shi Yu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 5, 1957.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1639), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

DR. DEAN H. GOSELIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2040) for the relief of Dr. Dean H. Gosselin which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, line 5, after the word "amended", to strike out "(42 U.S.C. 213(a)(2))" and insert "(42 U.S.C. 213a (a)(2))"; in line 7, after the word "which", to strike out "exist at the time he is so considered" and insert "existed at the time he was separated from active duty"; and, in line 10, after the word "duty.", to strike out "If retired for disability, Dr. Gosselin's retired pay shall commence on the date of such retirement." and insert "If Doctor Gosselin is found eligible for disability retirement, his retirement and retired pay shall be effective from and after July 7, 1964.;" so as to make the bill read:

S. 2040

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds that Doctor Dean H. Gosselin, a commissioned officer in the United States Public Health Service, was separated

from active duty on July 6, 1964, that within three months of such date he was found to have a brain tumor which has totally disabled him, that the condition which has resulted in this disability was initially incurred while he was on active duty, and that the Public Health Service is now precluded by law from considering him for disability retirement.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Public Health Service may consider Doctor Gosselin for disability retirement in accordance with chapter 61, title 10, United States Code, and section 221(a) (2) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 213a(a)(2)), based upon those disabilities, and the degree thereof, which existed at the time he was separated from active duty and which are determined to have been incurred in line of duty. If Doctor Gosselin is found eligible for disability retirement, his retirement and retired pay shall be effective from and after July 7, 1964.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1638), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to authorize the Public Health Service to consider Dr. Dean H. Gosselin, a former commissioned officer, for disability retirement under chapter 61, title 10, United States Code, and section 221(a) (2) of the Public Health Service Act based on those disabilities, and degrees thereof, which existed at the time he was separated from the Public Health Service, and which are determined to have been incurred in line of duty. If so retired, Dr. Gosselin's retired pay would become effective on and after July 7, 1964.

STATEMENT

Under chapter 61, title 10, United States Code, as such chapter is extended to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service by section 221(a) (2) of the Public Health Service Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to direct the disability retirement of a commissioned officer only while the officer is still on active duty. Thus as Dr. Gosselin was separated from active duty on July 6, 1964, there is no existing provision of law which would authorize him to be considered for retirement after that date. Within 3 months from such separation, Dr. Gosselin was found to have a brain tumor which has totally disabled him from any gainful employment.

Dr. Gosselin was given a physical examination shortly before his separation. The report of this examination indicates certain conditions which, in retrospect, can now be determined to be related to the presence of the tumor. Since Dr. Gosselin's physical examination upon entry into active duty does not indicate the presence of such conditions, it can be concluded that the tumor was incurred during Dr. Gosselin's period of active duty with the Public Health Service.

If Dr. Gosselin had been on active duty in the Army, Navy, or Air Force, those services could, subsequent to his separation, have considered him for disability retirement under their authority to correct military records (ch. 79, title 10, United States Code). The Public Health Service does not, however, have similar authority.

The bill, as amended, is intended to provide Dr. Gosselin with the same opportunity for consideration for retirement that he would have had if he had been a commissioned officer in one of the military services, and if Dr. Gosselin is found eligible for disability retirement, his retirement and retired pay shall be effective from and after July 7, 1964. That is the date after his separation from the Public Health Service.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in its report to the chairman of this committee recommending favorable consideration of this legislation, advised the committee that that agency intends to propose general legislation which would give the Public Health Service authority to correct its records so that in the future the benefits made available to Dr. Gosselin by S. 2040 will be available to all Public Health Service officers.

The committee is in agreement with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that this legislation should be favorably considered. The committee believes that it is only right and just that Dr. Gosselin's claim be determined on its merits. Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of S. 2040, as amended.

ENTRY OF A MINOR CHILD ADOPTED BY A U.S. CITIZEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2467) to effect entry of a minor child adopted by a U.S. citizen which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Rosa Agostino may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Katherine Ferrier, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Rosa Agostino."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1640), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of a child who is to be adopted by a U.S. citizen and her lawfully resident alien spouse. The bill has been amended to conform the language to the new provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The bill has been amended further to reflect the beneficiary's name in the title of the bill.

ZOPIA ZYCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3209) for the relief of Zopia Zych which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 4, after the word "amended", to strike out "Zopia Zych"

and insert "Zofia Zych"; and in line 8, after the word "Act", to strike out the comma and "subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Zofia Zych may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the said Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. John Jadack, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Zofia Zych."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1641), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of a child to be adopted by citizens of the United States. The amendments are technical in nature.

THEODORA TOYA (LAMBRINI) BEZATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3358) for the relief of Theodora Toya (Lambrini) Bezates which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Theodora Bezates may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of that Act, and a petition may be filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Gus Bezates, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Theodora Bezates."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1642), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in an immediate relative status of the adopted daughter of citizens of the United States. The bill has been amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization to reflect the beneficiary's correct name. The other changes are technical in nature.

MERGER OF TWO OR MORE PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3817) to authorize the merger of two or more professional football leagues, and to protect football contests between secondary schools from professional football telecasts which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "by", to strike out "inserting a new section 1 as follows" and insert "amending the first section thereof to read as follows"; after line 6, to strike out: "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled."

On page 2, line 14, after the word "to", to strike out "any" and insert "a"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "shere" and insert "if"; in line 18, after the word "operating", to insert a comma and "and the provisions of which are directly relevant thereto"; in line 21, after the numeral "1", to strike out "in line 2 of" and insert "where such words appear the second time in"; in line 23, after the word "by", to strike out "inserting a new section 3" and insert "amending section 3 to read"; at the beginning of line 25, to insert "Sec. 3.;" on page 3, line 22, after the word "a", to strike out "daily"; and, in line 23, after the word "to", to strike out "March" and insert "August"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 732; 15 U.S.C. 1291), is amended—

(1) by amending the first section thereof to read as follows:

"That the antitrust laws, as defined in section 1 of the Act of October 15, 1914, as amended (38 Stat. 730), or in the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (38 Stat. 717), shall not apply:

"(a) to any joint agreement by or among persons engaging in or conducting the organized professional team sports of football, baseball, basketball, or hockey, by which any league or clubs participating in professional football, baseball, basketball, or hockey contests sells or otherwise transfers all or any part of the rights of such league's member clubs in the sponsored telecasting of the games of football, baseball, basketball, or hockey, as the case may be, engaged in or conducted by such clubs.

"(b) to a joint agreement by which the member clubs of two or more professional football leagues combine their operations in an expanded single league, if such agreement increases rather than decreases the number of professional football clubs so operating and the provisions of which are directly relevant thereto."

(2) by inserting "(a)" after the words "section 1" where such words appear the second time in section 2;

(3) by amending section 3 to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Section 1(a) of this Act shall not apply to any joint agreement described in section 1 of this Act which permits the telecasting of all or a substantial part of any professional football game on any Friday after 6 o'clock postmeridian or on any Saturday during the period beginning on the second Friday in September and ending on the second Saturday in December in any year from any telecasting station located within seventy-five miles of the game site of any intercol-

legiate or interscholastic football contest scheduled to be played on such a date if—

"(1) such intercollegiate football contest is between institutions of higher learning both of which confer degrees upon students following completion of sufficient credit hours to equal a four-year course, or

"(2) in the case of an interscholastic football contest, such contest is between secondary schools, both of which are accredited or certified under the laws of the State or States in which they are situated and offer courses continuing through the twelfth grade of the standard school curriculum, or the equivalent, and

"(3) such intercollegiate or interscholastic football contest and such game site were announced through publication in a newspaper of general circulation prior to August 1 of such year as being regularly scheduled for such day and place."

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1654), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation as amended is to exempt from the antitrust laws the merger of two or more professional football leagues in a single combined league and to provide protection to interscholastic football contests from the telecasting of professional football games at those times traditionally used for the playing of such interscholastic contests.

STATEMENT

The proposed legislation is necessary to permit the planned merger of the American Football League and the National Football League into a single professional football league. The proposed legislation would permit the two leagues to combine their operations without fear that the antitrust laws would apply to that act.

An essential element in this planned merger seeking congressional sanction and upon which it is conditioned, is that the merger results in increasing, rather than decreasing, the number of professional football clubs operating in the United States.

The committee is advised that the plan for an expanded league assures that all 24 of the existing professional football teams will continue to operate in their present locations. The committee was further advised absent the merger, there was danger that some of the less favorably situated franchises in both existing leagues faced dissolution or transfers to other cities.

One of the results of the merger will be the bringing of professional football teams to new cities. In addition to the two new teams added this year—Miami and Atlanta—the merger calls for two additional franchises by 1968 and two more franchises later.

The agreement provides for a world championship game in January 1967 between the leaders of the two existing leagues. In addition, it is provided that there will be preseason contests beginning in 1967 between teams in the two leagues and regular season interleague play beginning in 1970. The merger will improve player strength and financial resources of weaker teams in both leagues.

The committee discussed the effect of the proposed merger on the football players and agreed that the proposed legislation did not in any way diminish their existing rights.

The committee was advised that while bonuses to college players will be reduced, such action will make possible relatively higher salaries for players generally, based on proven ability in professional football,

will eliminate inequities which were said to be demoralizing established players, and will substantially increase player salary minimums. The retention of all existing teams and the addition of new franchises will increase the overall employment opportunities for professional football players and coaches.

The committee realizes the concern of professional football at this time for congressional action. An organized professional sports league is entitled to have reservations about proceeding with such measures in the absence of clarifying legislation. Possible injunctive actions or potential treble damage liability, accumulating with each step taken, may make the entire plan impracticable.

The proposed bill would not extend to the combined league any greater antitrust immunity than that now existing for the existing professional football leagues. The proposed legislation does not seek to resolve any of the antitrust problems of professional football or the other professional team sports.

It is the intent of the committee that the new league will commence operations with no greater antitrust immunity than the existing individual leagues now enjoy. The sole effect of this legislation is to permit the combination of the two leagues to go forward without fear of antitrust challenge based upon a joint agreement between the member clubs of two leagues to combine in a single league and to conduct their affairs as members of a single league.

The proposed legislation also extends to high schools the same protection from the telecasting of professional football games that has already been accorded to the colleges. That protection prohibits the telecasting of a professional football game from a telecasting station located within 75 miles of the game site of a college or high school game. The protection extends from 6 o'clock p.m., on the second Friday in September until the second Saturday in December.

In the committee discussion it was pointed out that the existing law does not prohibit the telecasting of a game by an individual football club independently of the league. The high schools and colleges have expressed concern that this practice by an individual club might increase in the future to the detriment of attendance of high school and college games on Friday nights and Saturdays.

The committee was informed that during the last 11 years there have been only five telecasts of a league game on a Friday night. These five games were not nationally telecast, but to an individual city.

The committee views the practice of telecasting professional football games at the times traditionally used for the playing of high school and college games as a serious threat to the scholastic athletic programs. The committee intends to maintain a close scrutiny on this practice with a view of determining at a later date whether further legislation is necessary to circumscribe such a practice.

The committee is of the opinion that the merger of the two football leagues and the protection given high school football contests would be of benefit to the public and organized professional football, and recommends that S. 3817, as amended, be considered favorably.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

more employees. (Joint Congressional Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 17, p. 22390) . . . This was the greatest and fastest increase on record . . . The cost to the taxpayers for salaries of these new employees is more than \$1 billion a year.

(10) Your \$10 bill: What \$10 would buy in 1933 takes \$25.10 today . . . What \$10 would buy in 1940 takes \$23.20 today . . . What \$10 would buy in 1957-59 takes \$11.33 today . . . And it has been getting worse. (Consumer Price Index, Bureau of Labor Statistics 8/22/66)

(11) Government spending: How fast is the Democrat Administration putting you and your country in debt? . . . An astounding \$40,000 a minute! . . . Since the Democrat Administration took office in 1961, the Government has spent approximately \$40 billion more than it has taken in. . . . This amounts to going in debt at the rate of \$40,000 a minute or about \$2.5 million per hour on the basis of a 40-hour week . . . These facts were not contested by any Democrat, nor by anyone else, when presented to the Senate. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 17, p. 22389)

(12) The cost of living today & tomorrow: Living costs today are 251% of what they were in 1933 . . . And 23% of what they were in 1940 . . . And since 1957-59, the latest base period used for the Consumer Price Index, the cost of living has jumped 13.3%. . . . In addition, the cost of living increase in the first 7 months of 1966 was the biggest such jump in 8 years. (All figures from Bureau of Labor Statistics 9/16/66)

(13) Negro getting jobless deal: The Democrats have a civil rights propaganda script prepared down to the last hurrah . . . They boast and brag about what they have done for the American Negro . . . The fact is the Democrats are just shopping for votes . . . The real truth is: month after month during the past year the Democrat Administration has failed to reduce unemployment among Negroes and Negroes should be told the truth . . . In August, the jobless rate among Negroes increased to 8.2% compared with 7.7% a year ago. . . . The \$2 billion poverty program hasn't reduced Negro unemployment one bit in the poverty sections of 100 cities. . . . In these cities the unemployment rate of Negroes has jumped to 9.4%. . . . The national jobless rate for white workers was 3.4%. . . . All one hears from the White House is the overall unemployment rate of 3.9%. (All figures from Bureau of Labor Statistics report 9/2/66)

(14) Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country: It will take you about 10 seconds to repeat this famous sentence. . . . And in that 10 seconds the Johnson Administration will have hired a new Federal employee! . . . This startling rate, based on a 40-hour week in the last month of fiscal year 1966 (June), amounts to 450 new Government employees every hour, or the hiring of 3,600 extra employees added to the Federal payroll each working day. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 18, p. 17702) . . . The Johnson Administration now has 2,785,129 persons on the public payroll (Report of Joint Congressional Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures 9/1/66) . . . This total is bigger than the peak during the Korean War. . . . The Federal payroll is now costing \$20 billion a year!

(15) Red ink: Red ink should be made with a deodorant for the Johnson Administration to hide the stench of its deficit. . . . In his state of the Union message on Jan. 4, 1965, Mr. Johnson declared: "We will continue along the path toward a balanced budget in a balanced economy." . . . Anyone who believed that can stand on his head. . . . When the President said continue along the path, what he meant was the path

of a budget deficit of \$3.43 billion for the 1965 fiscal year. . . . And for the next fiscal year, his deficit was \$10.2 billion. . . . The President publicly announced this was "only" a \$2.3 billion budget deficit, but as was pointed out time and again in the Senate he arrived at this figure by use of gimmicks no other President used in fooling the people. . . . This was shown in detail once again in Senate debate as late as September 12. . . . No Democrat disputed it. . . . And does anyone really and truly think we have a "balanced economy" under this Administration?

(16) The cost of living—what could happen: The cost of living today is rising at an annual rate of nearly three times the yearly gain that prevailed in 1960-65. (The Wall Street Journal 8/22/66) . . . If living costs continue to climb as they have in the past, people now 40 years old could at age 65 pay \$2.19 for a dozen oranges, 72 cents for a head of lettuce, \$3.10 for a pound of round steak and \$5.92 for a pound of lamb chops. (Readers Digest Sept. 1966)

(17) Water & job & illusion of progress: There once was a Roman official by the name of Petronius Arbiter who wrote during the time of Nero that "we tend to meet any new situation by reorganizing, and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency, and demoralization" . . . In looking around the Johnson Administration today it is difficult to decide which example to use to show how old Arbiter knew his business . . . but as long as water and water pollution are big issues, we'll use those . . . and what do you find? . . . The Great Society has got the following Departments and agencies doing the same task: 10 Cabinet Departments plus 27 separate agencies plus 3 agencies in the Executive Office of the President plus 8 independent agencies which report directly to the President . . . today there are almost 50 agencies and Departments working on water. (Library of Congress & House Interior Committee Minority Investigations) . . . the only Cabinet officer not yet involved in the water problem is the Postmaster General . . . the Water Pollution Control Administration recently was taken from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and given to Interior . . . then two more agencies were created in its place . . . maybe this is the reason the Administration talks a lot but has done little about water although Congress has voted millions to cope with the problem . . . and, then too, maybe all those new Federal employees Mr. Johnson has been hiring are being put to work on water—or trying to walk on it.

(18) Streamline a la the Great Society: Last Spring the White House decided to "streamline" the National Institutes of Health . . . it did, by increasing the number of the Institutes' offices, branches, and sections from 106 to 146. (The Wall Street Journal March 18, 1966) . . . then the White House decided to "modernize" the Public Health Service by creating five new bureaus.

(19) Law and order: The Kansas City Star published several stories about the general breakdown of law and order . . . one of them fairly put the finger on a possible cause . . . it did so by quoting one of the "demonstrating" students . . . He was asked why some students had abandoned historical "panty raids" and similar college pranks for open and riotous rebellion . . . "Why," he replied, "you could get kicked out of school for conducting a panty raid and things of that kind, but no one is ever kicked out or punished for demonstrating . . ."

(20) The farmer: It is like a young farmer in one of the Dakotas once said he found out: farming is one business where you don't go to work—you wake up surrounded by it. . . . But during the Johnson Administration farmers have been constantly surrounded and harassed by loud talk—coming out of

both sides of the mouth—from the White House on down to the Secretary of Agriculture . . . First, it was made to appear the farmer was living high on the hog . . . then, it was intimated the farmer was to blame for higher food prices . . . when the lie was thrown in their teeth, there was only one thing for the Great Society and Agriculture Secretary to do . . . Mr. Freeman advised Democrat candidates at a meeting in Washington, D.C., July 28, 1966, to "slip, slide and duck any question of higher consumer prices." (Dispatch of July 28 to the Chicago Tribune, published July 29, 1966) . . . he even set class against class by telling the candidates that if they really found themselves in a bind they should take the side of the farmer and not the housewife because the farmer was organized . . . thus, in all its cynical approach for votes, the Johnson Administration exposed itself . . . has the Administration told the real facts about farming? Not on your corn picker it hasn't . . . the truth is: (1) from June 1965 to June 1966, farm income dropped \$1 billion (Department of Commerce report 8/16/66) . . . (2) in July farm income declined another \$300 million, the fourth straight monthly loss . . . (3) the farmer is the only segment of our population which had an income loss (Commerce Department) . . . (4) official figures also show farm production costs have gone up \$4 billion since 1960 . . . (5) total farm debt is 60% higher than 5 years ago . . . (6) in the past 5½ years about 700,000 farms have gone out of business and farm population has dropped 3 million . . . (7) parity prices have been driven down from an average of 84.5% under the Eisenhower Administration to 79% this year.

(21) Housewives: Now that everyone knows the standing of housewives insofar as the Administration is concerned (see Point No. 20 above), there must have been something the Great Society has done to help win them over . . . and after searching, it must be made public in all fairness that there has been something . . . the White House takes credit for the reduction and even the elimination of the tariff on foreign-made clothespins . . . and also, last April, Mr. Johnson got 8 countries to stop exporting to the United States wigs which contain hair originating in Red China . . . Wigs in Washington, D.C., said U.S. Customs agents would be able to tell whether a wig has Chinese hair because it would be Red.

(22) The war—cost in blood: The Pentagon reported September 22 that as of September 17, 1966, American casualties in Viet Nam totalled 34,850 since Jan. 1, 1961 . . . the total killed for all causes was 6,098 . . . in addition, there are 308 of our boys missing and at least 74 known to be captives . . . this makes the Viet Nam War the fifth most costly war in casualties in American history . . . surpassing the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War.

(23) The war—American boys in Vietnam: As of September 22, the United States had 311,400 fighting men in Viet Nam . . . This was the official public figure given out by the Pentagon . . . it knew nothing, for public use, about more troops en route such as the 4,000 troops which, for example, just sailed from Tacoma, Wash., for Viet Nam—even though the Tacoma (Wash.) News Tribune splashed pictures over page 1 of the troopships and men departing . . . In addition to the men in Viet Nam, there are between 40,000 and 50,000 men of the Seventh Fleet offshore . . . and finally, on September 4, the Administration officially announced the United States also had at least 25,000 troops in Thailand—a fact which many persons already knew.

(24) The war—cost in money: As has been proved in so many of its dealings with the American public, the Johnson Administration attempts to play "cute" on this and exercises

its newsmanagement. . . . After Secretary of Defense McNamara announced the cost of the war was running about \$1 billion a month, the Democrat Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee flatly contradicted him and said the cost was nearer \$2 billion. . . . The second ranking Republican member of the Senate Appropriations Committee stated on September 21 the war cost was \$2 billion monthly. . . . when Mr. Johnson was asked at his press conference September 21 what the cost was, he refused to give a figure (The Washington Post 9/22/66 p. K-1 press conference transcript).

. . . instead, Mr. Johnson told reporters to go look up figures in congressional hearings . . . either Mr. Johnson can't or won't give the American people an estimate of what the war is costing or he actually doesn't know. . . . About the same time he was holding his press conference, the Treasury Department announced "the actual monthly budgetary" cost of the war \$1.2 billion but was rising. (Chicago Tribune 9/22/66 p. 3) . . . the newspaper said the Treasury figure was "the average increase" over last year.

(25) The war—background: The family of Mr. and Mrs. Lucio Agustin were reunited recently at Tipler Hospital in Honolulu . . . their 2 sons arrived from Viet Nam . . . each minus a leg due to enemy action in separate battles. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 13, p. 16984) . . . With accounts such as this one becoming more and more frequent, any reflections or discussions on the Viet Nam War need concern only the facts. . . . And here are the facts: 1. Americans have now fought in Viet Nam more than 4 years . . . 2. In May 1950 the Truman Administration decided to take positive economic and military steps to help France in Indochina. (Department of State Publications 7308 & 7839) . . . 3. In August 1950 the first American military men—advisers on use of new U.S. equipment—arrived in Viet Nam . . . 4. From 1954 until the end of the Eisenhower Administration, Americans remained on the scene strictly as advisers. They were not actually involved in the fighting and numbered at all times fewer than 1,000 . . . 5. U.S. troop strength was increased by the Democrat Administration; between 1962 and 1963, more troops were sent and saw action . . . 6. Mr. Johnson became President in November 1963 and in the following year more troops were sent and the Americans began to take the brunt of the fighting . . . 7. Under 2 Democratic Administrations the United States has been fighting longer in Viet Nam than in any other war in our history . . . these and other documented facts were issued by the U.S. Senatorial Campaign Committee on September 1 and the Republican Conference of the House of Representatives issued this week a 34-page-booklet account of the Viet Nam War, documented by chapter and verse.

(26) The interest pinch right under the White House nose: Within the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area is Fairfax County, Va. . . . On September 21 the county Board of Supervisors sold \$7.5 million worth of school construction bonds . . . in order to sell the bonds they agreed to pay a whopping \$4.5 million in interest! . . . this is 60.8% of the principal sum. (The Washington Post 9/22/66)

(27) Interest rates: Where is there a Democrat who will go before the people and proudly proclaim that Johnson interest rates are the highest in 45 years, and in many cases, the highest in our history? . . . In 1960 consumers paid \$7.3 billion interest and by 1965 this figure had risen to \$11.1 billion. . . . And, so sharply have interest rates risen this year, that for the second quarter of 1966, consumers' interest payments were running at an annual rate of more than \$12.5 billion. . . . This is a gigantic 71 percent. . . . It comes out of the workingman's pockets. . . . From the family which buys

an automobile on time. . . . From the family which buys a washing machine or furnishings or household equipment. . . . Also, these same consumers carry their share of interest on the national debt (\$1 billion a month) and on other indebtedness they do not personally contract. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 15, p. 20264). . . . It was charged in the Senate August 22 by a Democrat that the Johnson Administration had permitted the interest rate to climb in "efforts to woo the bigwigs." . . . No Democrat arose to dispute this charge and it still stands.

(28) Some results of Johnson high interest rates: The soaring interest rates have created a big slump in home building (a 20% or more drop in some areas) . . . a slump thus was produced in the lumber market . . . a slump then was produced in the building supply market . . . and people, unable to buy new homes because of high interest rates and the demand for bigger down payments, look for places to rent . . . rents are increased and thus the inflationary spiral is fed . . . and the higher the rents go, the harder people will feel the pinch. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 15, p. 20266)

(29) The farmer and Johnson high interest rates: American farmers, who borrow money to carry themselves along until they can buy equipment and other material necessary to operate farms, suddenly have been faced with a 30% increase in interest costs . . . this amounts to a 3% increase in farm production costs (on the average, interest is 10% of farm costs) . . . thus, the farmer is faced with a loss, or with the need to increase prices. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 15, p. 20265). . . . The President's own assistant majority leader in the Senate condemned his own Administration for this.

(30) Strikes: There were 2,145 strikes and work stoppages involving more than 1 million workers in the first 6 months of this year . . . this constituted the largest number of strikes and involved the largest number of workers in more than 10 years. (U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 8/9/66) . . . In this field of national concern, the White House again proved that Americans cannot believe the Administration because in his State of the Union address last January, Mr. Johnson said: "I also intend to ask Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading State and local authority, will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest." . . . That was in January; today we are in the fall of the year . . . nothing else has been heard from Mr. Johnson. . . . Labor is thoroughly disenchanted with the Administration for having allowed the cost of living to zoom higher than the so-called wage guidelines which are now dead. . . . The New York Daily News commented August 2 that "the way the Administration has messed up the airlines strike problem was almost unbelievably inept." This strike caused an estimated \$1 billion loss in business and wages. . . . In addition to strikes in major industries, dancers of the National Ballet Company in Washington, D.C., went on strike and after 4 days won a salary increase of \$25 a week. (Washington Daily News 9/10/66).

. . . A nationwide strike by telephone installers was averted September 7 by a 7% wage increase. (The Baltimore Sun 9/8/66) . . . and during the next 18 months labor contracts expire in the automobile, railroad, communications, electrical manufacturing, construction, trucking, farm equipment, rubber, food processing, and other industries. . . . The New York Times said editorially August 8, ". . . drift has replaced direction in the Administration's approach to maintenance of wage-price stability."

(31) High society of the Great Society: The Johnson-Humphrey Administration feels

the need to get away from it all and dance away the problems of war and inflation, etc. . . . The White House backed the high society Opera Ball in May. . . . they took over one of the Smithsonian Institution's buildings. . . . before the ball started, they sprayed the "ballroom" with Guerlain's eau de cologne for men, "Habit Rouge." . . . it took 8 bottles to scent up the place. . . . it was here that Presidential ministerial press assistant Bill Moyers starred in dancing the frug. . . . and it was here the wife of a high State Department official was sent home to put a slip under her "see-through" gown. . . . At the beginning of the year, The Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times carried an account showing that in 12 months the President and Mrs. Johnson entertained 30,230 guests at 138 parties—an average of one party about every two days during the year. . . . when this appeared, the White House instituted news management and refused to let reporters attend some of the parties this year. . . . veteran New York Timesman Arthur Krock wrote on May 1 that night revelry had infused "official society" in Washington to a degree never recalled by party veterans. . . . he quoted one party-goer as saying it was all "like a surrealistic dream" with "some of the wildest, most uninhibited music ever heard."

(32) Bricks, rocks, bottles, fists, clubs, tear gas and bayonets: burning, looting, rioting, shooting and death: It is July . . . and warm and humid in the early evening . . . a time for some folks to sit out on the steps of their brownstone house or apartment . . . dinner is over, parents watch their children play hide and seek, or capture the flag, or hopscotch, or jump-the-rope . . . and the ice cream man comes by . . . a young couple decides to walk around the block . . . a mother leans out a window and shouts for her kids to stop fighting or she'll call their father—who is sleeping peacefully on the sofa. . . . But not this kind of peace in July of the year 1966 and another year of the Great Society . . . instead people in the Brownsville-East New York section of Brooklyn, N.Y., U.S.A., are carrying furniture on their backs, moving some on rollers across and down streets and sidewalks, carrying possessions stuffed into pillow cases, hurrying their puzzled children along before them. . . . What is happening? . . . Fear! . . . People are not safe on the streets at night, or even in daylight . . . fear was driving "many families from the neighborhood before there were any new outbreaks of racial violence." (The New York Times 7/24/66) . . . and that about tells the story . . . they were American refugees, just like the ones we have seen so many times in pictures from abroad . . . the story of riots and street warfare from California to New York, from Illinois to Mississippi has been told during the past 2 years on page 1 of every newspaper in the land and over every tv and radio station . . . and in the United States Senate, a Democrat Senator sends the President a telegram appealing for stronger leadership! (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 13, pp. 16794-16795) . . . and the Vice President tosses off a few remarks that if he had to live in a slum he had "enough spark to lead a mighty good revolt." (Washington Daily News 7/20/66) . . . Guerrilla warfare has escalated in America under the Great Society . . . What must people abroad think of Americans? Indeed, what must Americans think of their Great Society?

(33) A new notorious American political saying: One of the most cold-blooded political utterances in the 1930's was "We will Spend and Spend, Tax and Tax, Elect and Elect." It is attributed to Harry Hopkins, top Presidential assistant in another Democrat Administration. ("American Sayings" by Henry F. Woods, 1936; George Stinson's "A Book About American Politics," 1938, which reports Hopkins said this to Max

Gordon) . . . Today, in the Johnson Administration, there is a new one, to wit: "Aw, come on, What does someone in New York care about the war in Viet Nam?" by Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester. (Quoted by CBS correspondent Morley Safer in the Overseas Press Club magazine, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 8, p. 10468) . . . The answer as to what does someone in New York care about the war in Viet Nam is this: Up to August 1 more than 300 killed-in-action notifications to next of kin were delivered in New York to parents, wives, children.

(34) Credibility gap: News management is one of the hallmarks of our Government today. . . . CBS News Chief Walter Cronkite suggested in a speech February 22 that it be termed for what it really is—"lying" (Address before the Inland Press Association, Chicago) . . . there are so many instances and examples cited by news correspondents, and so many others placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that a book could be filled—which at least one correspondent is doing . . . but here are 2 examples which are sufficient . . . the first is a quote from Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester (it was he who said Dec. 6, 1962 the Government had a right to lie) . . . one of his latest is: "Look, if you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid. Did you hear that?—stupid." (quoted by CBS Correspondent Morley Safer in the Overseas Press Club magazine and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 8, p. 10468) . . . another example was the testimony before a Congressional Committee by Poverty Program Director Sargent Shriver . . . On March 8, 1966 he testified in reply to a question that since the previous summer fewer than 50 ineligibles had been discovered in the Neighborhood Youth Corps . . . the very next day, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz was asked the same question. . . . AND HIS ANSWER WAS "5,000, plus or minus, a fairly small plus or minus" . . . this is a sample of the Credibility Gap—a gap between 50 and 5,000.

(35) Small business: All of us know of a locally owned corner drug store, or a shoe repair shop, or a clothing store, or grocery store—small businesses all . . . last week the Johnson Administration directed that some million-dollar and multimillion-dollar industries and businesses be classed as small business . . . examples are the small automobile manufacturers and rubber companies . . . thus they could apply for loans and aid from the independent Small Business Administration . . . this latest move is part of a bigger Administration plan which had been aimed at destroying the Small Business Administration . . . the White House "small business be damned" attitude was exposed in the Senate and not a single Democrat refuted the charges. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 3, p. 2930) . . . Mr. Johnson had failed, up to that time, to fill the vacancy of SBA Administrator, and because funds were permitted to dry up, hundreds, if not thousands of small business loan applications gathered dust . . . what the President wanted to do was turn small business over to the gigantic Commerce Department . . . as the weeks went by, Democrats began joining the Republicans to force the President to stop his plans . . . and they were . . . except today bigger and bigger businesses are being classed as small business . . . as the Senate was told, 69 percent of individual contributions to the Democrats in the last presidential campaign each consisted of \$500 or more while the bulk of Republican contributions was from the truly small giver (Congressional Quarterly report of Jan. 21, 1966) . . . now we know why the Johnson Administration has a record of embracing big business.

(36) U.S. prestige abroad: Some undercover advice reportedly being given our diplo-

matic personnel is that if they are in the foreign service "don't live within a stone's throw of the U.S. Embassy" . . . another bit of advice has been to save money by building all our foreign embassy buildings without windows . . . this isn't as funny as it may sound because only on September 20 it was revealed, in official testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, the State Department was looking for something stronger than glass to use overseas, or some better protective devices to ward off attacks. (The Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1966, p. A-18) . . . the way things are going under the Johnson Administration, it almost seems that any day now the United States can hold a conference of its allies in a telephone booth. . . . On February 18, 1965, the senior Republican of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee received at his request from the State Department a list of damaging attacks on U.S. buildings abroad . . . it listed 52 in 2½ years . . . and after President Johnson's State of the Union address on January 4 of that year there were 14 assaults in 2 months, making 67 since July 1962 . . . the rate of attacks ran about 2 a month . . . since that time (July 1962 to Jan. 1, 1965), there have been at least 25 more . . . the American flag has been torn down, or burned, or stamped upon, or spit upon, or torn from a U.S. Ambassador's car in Central American countries, European countries, Asia, Scandinavia, and effigies of the President burned . . . our information libraries have been burned and sacked . . . even in Canada, our Montreal consulate was dynamited . . . in New Zealand, our flag was torn down in one demonstration . . . and one of the biggest tragedies of this decade has been the breakup of NATO during the Johnson Administration.

(37) Crisis of confidence: As New York Timesman James Reston wrote last May 17 the President is confronted "with a crisis of confidence" . . . Mr. Reston was referring mainly to newsmanagement and decision-making . . . but he well could apply it to integrity . . . so much of the Fast Deal, so much of the cover-up, and so many policies of "easy ethics" have been revealed that a cry has been raised in the Senate for truth in government. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 1, p. 421) . . . in recent weeks there have been dozens of scandals, connected with membership in the \$1,000 President's Club and the \$10,000 President's Club, that it took one Senator 38 pages to just list some of them . . . for example, on Aug. 12, 1966 (the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 14, p. 19203) 89 housing projects were listed for which the FHA gave sponsors a valuation of more than \$17 million, while the actual worth was only \$9.5 million . . . millions were made in windfall profits . . . many of the builders were members of the President's Club. . . . Then, there was the case of a big brewery company executive giving \$10,000 to the President's Club, followed in a few weeks by the Justice Department dropping an antitrust suit against the company. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 27, 1966, p. 17245) . . . there has been the Bobby Baker scandal (court case postponed until after election), there was the Billie Sol Estes scandal, the salad oil scandal, the multibillion TFX warplane scandal, various Defense Department scandals, bank charter scandals, shortages in supplies and equipment for our Viet Nam soldiers, dozens of poverty program scandals, the Philadelphia mint scandal, the Boston veterans hospital scandal, the D.C. stadium scandal—and on and on and on, a list as long as your arm or both arms. There has been nothing like it in our history. It has been politics for profit. As one Senator declared: "If these are the standards of morality being established by the Great Society then God help America."

(38) Where is it all going to end?: Well, in some things it appears just the beginning. . . . On January 1, Federal taxes will

increase by about \$1 billion, even if the Administration doesn't ask for an increase in income taxes . . . the one billion is the approximate bite increased Social Security taxes will take next year for increases in retirement, disability, and other benefits. (Associated Press Dispatch, The Sunday Star 8/28/66 p. A-3) . . . And just this week, the Treasury Department issued its regular statement on receipts and expenditures . . . it showed our public debt as of August 31 was \$324.4 billion—a jump of \$4.5 billion in two months! . . . and the latest cost of living figures show that \$1 saved in 1950 already has lost 25% of its purchase value . . . and a person who made, or saved \$5,000 just 6 years ago needs 10% additional just to break even today.

When is the Johnson Administration going to face reality? . . . is it saving the bad news for after the election? . . . the request for a hefty income tax increase? . . . the request for additional big appropriations to carry on the war? . . . the decision for changing the tempo of the war? . . . the American people are forced to wait on the pleasure of the Administration, and meanwhile:

The October draft call is increased by 3,000 to 49,200.

An employee of the Bureau of Standards completes a survey of the use of paper clips, finding that only 20,000 of 100,000 are being used properly.

Lance Corporal Walter B. Bogan of Dayton, Ohio, grunted on a jungle trail in Viet Nam as he shouldered his battle equipment: "In a year I will be 19," he said to nobody in particular, "and then I will be able to drink beer in Ohio." (The Washington Post 9/18/66)

And in Washington, D.C., last Sunday, September 18, the Rev. Philip J. Dixon told his congregation at church services: "We need less the vision of a Great Society and more the vision of a Good Society."

WALL STREET JOURNAL RIPS INTO SUSPENSION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the lead editorial in Thursday's Wall Street Journal does a superlative job of tearing the arguments for the suspension of the investment credit to ribbons.

It points out that by ending the incentives to invest, the suspension undermines the very basis for meeting inflationary pressures: the expansion of the capacity to meet rising demand.

It shows that the suspension will get at a very small part of the gross national product, that the timing is bad because any consequences are likely to be felt a year or so from now when the economy may need stimulation rather than inflation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MASTERY OF NONSENSE

It just doesn't make economic sense—that's one industrialist's blunt characterization of the Administration's proposal to suspend the investment tax credit, and he is not alone in his appraisal. Indeed, a good many people find the scheme typical of the kind of misguided intervention that is becoming increasingly popular in Washington.

The intended effect of the suspension, if Congress goes along, is of course to cut down capital spending in the interest of fighting

inflation. Yet surely it is obvious, U.S. Steel's Roger Blough said in a talk at the National Industrial Conference Board convocation, "that an increased volume of production—through the building of new facilities—will enlarge our national supply of goods in the face of rising demand for these goods, and will thus tend to prevent the bidding up of prices."

"It is also obvious," he continued, "that replacing this obsolete plant and equipment with modern, highly efficient facilities will yield lower production costs and help offset rising wage costs, thereby not only diminishing the upward pressure on prices, but improving our national competitive position in world markets in aid of our persistent balance-of-payments deficit."

The attempt to discourage these activities with the tax-credit suspension is not the only part of the plan that strikes Mr. Blough and others as foolish. He added that "to single out private capital investment—which represents only a very small fraction of the GNP—as the big coal in the fire that is causing the overheating that now disturbs us, doesn't make sense either." Rather, the big cause of the inflation has been the Government's inflationary economic policy.

Other businessmen voice other objections, particularly about the timing of the move; it's thought that any substantial anti-inflationary effect of the suspension would not be felt for months to come. If so, it could occur at a time when the economy was already turning down as an unsurprising result of the years of relentless inflating.

Thus those who see a recession in the fairly near future figure that the Government's snatching away of the credit now could reinforce a slump later. In the meantime, Leonard E. Kust of Westinghouse predicts "a chaotic situation in production planning which will be wasteful and disruptive."

Now we suppose it can be argued that the original enactment of the tax credit was equally an instance of Federal intervention, designed then to stimulate investment and the economy generally. And broadly speaking, we happen to think it better to have tax rates pegged at reasonable levels instead of resorting to special incentive devices of this nature.

The fact nonetheless remains that the credit was granted, with no intimation that it would be taken back at the whim of officialdom. Whether its actual impact on capital spending turns out to be great or small, it symptomizes a messy way of trying to manage the economy.

In this respect it parallels other interventions of recent years. A glaring case of upside-down economics is the curbing of investing and lending abroad for the ostensible purpose of improving the balance of payments. In reality, the restrictions hit at a long-term plus in the payments picture, the return on foreign investment. No less, they hit at America's traditional advocacy of freedom in international markets.

Lurking in the background, in addition to all the other tinkering, is the implicit threat of Federal wage-price controls if other means fail to contain the inflation. That type of direct interference, frequently deplored but nonetheless discussed, would be worse than senseless; it would be an admission of defeat for a purported policy of noninflationary economic growth in a free society.

It is a cliché of the times that a considerable amount of State intervention is necessary in modern economies. For our part, we would concede only that the proponents of unlimited Government are determined to have it that way. The odd thing, given their point of view, is that the more assiduously the planners try to manage the economy the more they reveal their lack of mastery of the art.

TAX INCENTIVE SUSPENSION WRONG MEDICINE AS NEW ORDERS SLIP

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday's Washington Post called attention to the fact that new orders for industrial equipment declined last month, before there was any hint that the President would recommend or the Congress would enact legislation to suspend the incentives for investment in just this kind of equipment.

As the Washington Post editorial states one month's figures should not be persuasive, but this development points up again why this is the wrong medicine to meet the indisputable fact that prices are rising.

As Secretary Fowler said with convincing documentation last March, the suspension of the investment credit will not have its prime effect for a year. Prices are rising now. A weapon to slow inflation a year from now will not do much if any good this year; and the future—especially the year-from-now future—cannot be clearly perceived by any economist. Anyone who says he knows what will be the status of prices, employment, and business activity next September, is a charlatan or an incompetent.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORDERS SLIP

Will the Administration's latest fiscal measures be obsolete before they are enacted? Congress is being asked to suspend the 7 per cent investment-tax credit in order to reduce inflationary pressures in industries that produce machinery and other business equipment. The contention is that capital goods suppliers will be less likely to boost prices if their backlog of unfilled orders are no longer swelled by a tax incentive. But the fact is that new orders for industrial equipment declined by \$4 billion in August. If they continue to decline, a shrinkage of the backlog must follow.

Relying upon a single month's statistic which suggests a reversal of trend can be hazardous. But Congress will assume a very grave risk if it hastily enacts a measure which may reduce the volume of investment long after the pressures now affecting the capital goods industries subside. The House Ways and Means Committee passed up an opportunity to make a careful survey of the outlook in the capital goods industries. The Senate Finance Committee should not make the same mistake.

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW HIGHLY RECOMMENDED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have had the pleasure of viewing on a number of occasions a most thought-provoking and illuminating television program called *Youth Wants To Know*. This program features discussion on current issues between a panel of high school students and public figures. Frequently, the guest is a Member of Congress.

In the Washington area, *Youth Wants To Know* can be seen on WETA-TV, the

educational television station for the national capital region. The students' questions are penetrating, intelligent, and, more often than not, evoke lively discussion of some of the most important problems we face today. I do not think we can emphasize too greatly the tremendous importance of having our young people participate in public discussion of crucial issues.

As we all know, educational television is nonprofit in character and often must depend on public service grants for financial support. *Youth Wants To Know* is made possible by Continental Grain Foundation and its president, Michel Firbourg. I heartily recommend this program to my colleagues.

INCREASED IMPORTS HURT DAIRY INCOME

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for many months now I have been fighting for an expanded and extended school milk program not only as vital to child nutrition, but also as a key step in the efforts we should be making to improve dairy income.

However, the demonstrable good being done by the school milk program, which stimulates the consumption of "nature's perfect food," is being undone by rising dairy imports. Imports during 1965-66 more than doubled over 1964-65. At a time when the demand for milk is beginning to catch up with the supply, these imports are acting as a counterweight to rising dairy income.

Furthermore, each pound of butter and cheese imported in past years has forced the Federal Government to purchase an equal amount of the domestic product under our price support program. In fact, since 1959 the taxpayer has paid twice the value of every pound of dairy imports.

Mr. President, I intend to go on fighting for the school milk program. To be fair to the dairy farmer benefiting from the program I must also oppose this country's present free and easy dairy import policy. This is why I have introduced legislation limiting dairy imports to their 1960-64 levels. I intend to work hard for passage of this proposal.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE BY SENATOR HOLLAND IN THE SENATE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, today marks the 20th anniversary of the admission to membership in this body of one of our most beloved, most dedicated, and most effective Senators. I refer to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Florida, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

I did not have the privilege of knowing Senator HOLLAND personally before I became a Member of this body, although I was well acquainted with his remarkable record. Since coming to this body I have been privileged to number him among those loyal friends who occupy one of the softest spots in my heart.

Senator HOLLAND is a remarkable man with a remarkable record. This is true, in my judgment, because he has, added

to his remarkable natural gifts and talents, an equal amount of dedication and energy. As a consequence of the combination of these things he has made an unexcelled record as a skillful athlete, as a brilliant student, as a gallant soldier, as an effective teacher, as an able trial lawyer, as a wise legal counselor, as a citizen and churchman, as a diligent prosecuting attorney, as a just judge, as a State legislator, as a great Governor of a great Commonwealth, and as one of the most beloved, dedicated, and effective Members of the Senate.

I shall not undertake to detail his record in these respects. I would like to say, however, that I think he has become one of the most beloved of our Senators, one of the most dedicated of our Senators, and one of our most effective Senators by reason of certain attributes of his.

In the first place, he is a man who is dedicated to his job; he is dedicated to the people of his State and the Nation.

In addition to his great dedication to whatever task may confront him, I think that the senior Senator from Florida displays to a most remarkable degree a spirit of industry. He is not afraid of hard work. Before he reaches a decision with respect to any momentous question he informs himself, regardless of the effort, energy, or time it may take him to do so.

Furthermore, he is blessed by nature and by education with a remarkable intellect. He not only reaches an opinion which is an informed opinion, but he reaches an opinion which is an intelligent opinion.

He has in as high degree as any man I am privileged to know that quality which we define, for lack of more adequate words, as intellectual integrity. In the performance of his public duties, he not only reaches an informed and intelligent decision, but he also reaches an intellectually honest decision. Then, he displays, as he displayed during his service in the First World War, an unsurpassed courage; and courage which is, in many respects, a higher degree of courage than physical courage, and that is moral and political courage.

The country is indeed fortunate to have in the membership of the Senate such a dedicated, intelligent, intellectually honest, and courageous Senator as is the Senator from Florida.

I shall now make one statement with which I know the Senator from Florida will agree wholeheartedly, and that is that the most fortunate day in his life was not the day he was inaugurated Governor of Florida, and it was not the day that he became a Member of this body, but it was the day on which he was wedded to his charming wife, Mary Groover, who has stood beside him in all of his joys and in all of his sorrows, and who has been the greatest encouragement to him in the making of the remarkable personal and public record which has characterized his activities.

In the final analysis it can be truly said of SPESSARD HOLLAND that he never sells the truth to serve the hour.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to be permitted to associate myself with all of the things that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has said about the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

During the many years that I have been here I have often had cause to reflect that the finest reward for service in the Senate is the friendships we make and the men whom we come to know during our service in this body.

Mr. President, I am very proud to claim SPESSARD L. HOLLAND as a personal friend. He is truly a great Senator. He is a Senator of the United States in the great tradition.

I have had occasion to work closely with him in committees and on the floor of this body. In an age when pressure groups boast of the influence they exercise in legislative bodies and in the executive branch of the Government, this man still proudly asserts his total and complete independence in reaching a conclusion on every issue that comes before this body.

In an age when we hear about arm twisting and the Executive influence on the legislative body, he proudly pursues an independent course dictated solely by his own judgment and by his own conscience.

Mr. President, character is the hallmark of SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, and into that character is blended courage, integrity, knowledge, tremendous energy, great tenacity, love of country beyond description, and every other element that goes into the making of a patriot, statesman, and a real man.

I am proud, Mr. President, of my State and the people that I represent; and I am proud that SPESSARD L. HOLLAND is a descendant, on one line, at least, of a native of the State of Georgia.

The Senator from North Carolina has wisely said that SPESSARD L. HOLLAND's wisdom was never more manifest than in his selection of a wife and helpmate, the lovely Mary Agnes Groover Holland. She is a great person in her own right, and I know what she has contributed to this man's career.

Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to salute the Senator from Florida. His contributions to his State and Nation are too numerous to detail. Florida has made many contributions to the political life of our land. Many of her sons and daughters have distinguished themselves in the field of government. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND is the peer of them all.

I cannot wish or ask any greater boon for the future of this country than that this man's character, his rugged honesty, and his ability may be emulated by others who will serve here, and that he will be here in propria persona on the floor of the Senate for many years to come.

I salute him as a friend and acclaim him for his career as soldier, educator, Governor, statesman, and fearless defender of our Constitution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief biography of SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND which has been prepared by one who knows him very well and which touches upon the high points of this man's career.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND,
SENIOR UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM
FLORIDA

SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND, Florida's senior United States Senator, who was Governor of Florida throughout World War II, was born in Bartow, Florida, July 10, 1892. His parents were Benjamin Franklin Holland, a Georgian and a Confederate veteran, and Fannie Virginia (Spessard) Holland, of Virginia. They came to Florida in 1881 and 1888, respectively.

HOLLAND was nominated to the United States Senate on May 7, 1946, defeating three opponents in the first primary by more than 72,000 votes. He is the second Governor in the history of the state to be elected and to serve in the United States Senate, and the first native Floridian to serve as both Governor and United States Senator. He succeeded the late Senator Charles O. Andrews, who was not a candidate for re-election because of ill health, and was appointed on September 25, 1946, by Governor Millard Caldwell to complete the unexpired term of Senator Andrews who died on September 18, 1946. HOLLAND commenced his first elected six-year term in the United States Senate on January 3, 1947.

Following successful campaigns for second and third Senate terms in 1952 and 1958, Senator HOLLAND was elected to a fourth term in 1964. In this race he carried all of Florida's 67 counties in the primary. In the subsequent general election he carried all but one county and led the entire ticket, and the 997,585 votes he received were the greatest number ever polled by a single candidate in the history of Florida politics.

Senator HOLLAND, who in private life has variously been a school teacher, citrus grower and practicing attorney, is a product of the Bartow public schools. He was graduated from Summerlin Institute (now Bartow High School) in 1909. In 1912 he graduated, magna cum laude, from Emory College (now Emory University), Atlanta, Ga. He is a 1916 graduate of the University of Florida law school. While at the University of Florida he served as the first elected president of the student body.

Shoalistically, Senator HOLLAND earned membership in Phi Beta Kappa. He also qualified for a Rhodes Scholarship, but was prevented from accepting it by the outbreak of World War I.

A versatile athlete in his youth, HOLLAND lettered in football, baseball, basketball and track while in college. In 1916 he was offered, but rejected, a contract by Connie Mack to join the pitching staff of the Philadelphia Athletics.

Senator HOLLAND enlisted in the Army when this nation entered World War I and was later commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the Coast Artillery, serving briefly at Key West before going overseas. In France he successfully sought a transfer to the Army Air Corps. As an aerial observer with the 24th Aero Squadron he saw action on four fronts—the Meuse-Argonne, Champaign, St. Mihiel and Lneville theaters. During this period he officially downed an enemy plane and had his own plane shot down by an enemy aircraft. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross in 1918 for "extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an armed enemy" and held the rank of Captain at the end of the war.

In 1919 Senator HOLLAND was married to Miss Mary Groover, a native of Fort White, Florida, and the daughter of a practicing physician in Lakeland. They have two sons, two daughters, and thirteen grandchildren. Both sons saw combat action in the Pacific during World War II—one as a Marine Corps officer and the other as a Navy air gunner—and both now practice law in Florida.

Discharged from the Air Corps in July, 1919, HOLLAND resumed law practice briefly in Bartow before his appointment as Prosecuting Attorney for Polk County. In 1920 he was elected County Judge and served in this position for eight years before returning to the practice of law where he formed a partnership with W. F. Bevis. The firm is still in existence under the name of Holland, Bevis, Smith, Kibler and Hall.

STATE SENATOR

In 1932 HOLLAND was elected to the State Senate and served in that office for eight years. In that capacity he sponsored various measures for the reduction of taxes; opposed a sales tax; sponsored legislation repealing the gross receipts tax; supported a Constitutional Amendment prohibiting ad valorem tax for state purposes; assisted in drafting the Florida School Code; sponsored acts to improve the state school system, increase teachers' salaries, and to provide teachers' retirement benefits; authored various citrus laws including the Citrus Advertising Act, Citrus Commission Act and others; supported the Workmen's Compensation Act, old age assistance bills, and Unemployment Insurance Act; sponsored Fair Trade Act, Soil Conservation Districts Act, and the Cooperative Market Act. He was among the leaders in the successful 1937 effort to abolish the poll tax.

GOVERNOR

HOLLAND was elected Governor in 1940 and his administration as Florida's 28th Governor from January 1941 to January 1945 was marked by accomplishments in many fields, although it was burdened with problems presented by the war emergency. Four Constitutional Amendments sponsored by HOLLAND and adopted during his term were: (1) the Gasoline Tax Amendment, by which the county roadbond structure was strengthened, millions of dollars were saved in greatly reduced interest rates, county credit was renewed in many instances, and more of the gas revenue was made available for the roads; (2) the Intangible Tax Amendment, which lowered the intangible tax ceiling from five to two mills, attracting capital to the state and strengthening the appeal of the Constitutional provision prohibiting the levying of an income tax; (3) a provision allowing, in an emergency, for a shortened period for amending the Constitution; and (4) an amendment creating a non-political Fresh Water Fish and Game Commission.

Grants to the needy aged and the blind were greatly increased through enlarging the state's "take" on pari-mutuel bets at the horse tracks. The average assistance to the aged was raised from \$12.01 to \$28.00 a month.

He recommended the repeal of the gross receipts tax and it was repealed.

The bonded debt of the Everglades Drainage District was stabilized in his administration when HOLLAND succeeded in negotiations for refunding, resulting in a saving of more than \$12,000,000 and added future savings through reduction in the interest rate.

The State's property tax structure was strengthened through legislation, recommended by HOLLAND, to make uniform assessments at actual value and to strengthen tax collections. These laws greatly improved the financial condition of counties and school districts and made possible an increase in teachers' salaries, averaging 40 per cent.

As a member of the Southern Governors' Committee on Freight Rates, he was one of

the leaders in the successful fight for reducing Southern freight rates. He also was a member of the Executive Committee on the National Governors' Conference.

HOLLAND left the state's school system in much sounder financial condition than it was when he assumed office. The teachers' retirement system was put into effect in January 1941, immediately after his inauguration. Appropriations for free text books for pupils were doubled. He left substantial balances in the General Revenue Fund and the State Road Fund.

UNITED STATES SENATOR

There are only two or three members of the United States Senate who have missed fewer votes than Senator HOLLAND. Since coming to the Senate he has missed less than five per cent of all the votes taken. His absences during voting have occurred almost without exception during periods when he was excused from the Senate to be out of the city on official business. And in such cases he has either been paired on the votes or has made his position on the issues involved a matter of public record.

Senator HOLLAND is a member of three Standing Committees of the Senate. These are Agriculture and Forestry where he ranks second in seniority among the 11 majority members; Appropriations where he ranks eighth among 18 majority members; and Aeronautical and Space Sciences where he stands ninth among 10 majority members.

HOLLAND purposely chose membership on the committees which he thought would permit the greatest opportunities for service to his state, and in the cases of the Agriculture and Appropriations Committees he waited in order to gain the seniority required for membership of these bodies.

When Senate rules were changed two years ago to permit service on three Senate Standing Committees, HOLLAND asked for and was given membership on the relatively new and important Space Committee, the activities of which are of increasing benefit to Florida.

With reference to Senate subcommittee assignments, Senator HOLLAND is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry's Subcommittee for Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification; he is also a member of the full Committee's Subcommittee for Agricultural Production, Marketing and Stabilization of Prices. On the Appropriations Committee, which also has the responsibility for handling foreign aid, he is chairman of that body's Subcommittee for the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies; and is a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for (1) Deficiencies and supplements; (2) Independent Offices; (3) Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies; (4) Public Works; (5) State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies.

In addition to his Standing Committee and Subcommittee posts, HOLLAND holds membership on the Senate Democratic Steering Committee and on the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Throughout his Senate career Senator HOLLAND has consistently urged and strongly supported a legislative policy of economy and fiscal responsibility in federal government operations. He has opposed the pre-emption of states' rights by the Federal government, and has supported legislation protective to the free enterprise system. He believes that the individual communities and states must maintain their rightful autonomy and independence by refusing federal aid except in those areas in which the federal government has a valid responsibility.

Although his legislative accomplishments have been many, Senator HOLLAND is probably best known for the following:

The Tidelands Act which restored to the individual states their property rights in the submerged coastal belts lying within states' boundaries bordering the Atlantic and Pacific

Oceans and the Gulf of Mexico. Although active in the issue even before coming to the Senate, HOLLAND became the Senate's leader in the Tidelands struggle in 1951 when requested by the National Organization of Attorneys General and the late Senator Pat McCarran to assume this responsibility. He first introduced appropriate legislation in 1948 and again in 1951 and 1953. It ultimately passed both Houses and was signed by President Eisenhower in May, 1953 to become Public Law 31 of the 83rd Congress under the title "Submerged Lands Act of 1953." The constitutionality of the law was later challenged by the Supreme Court. At the request of Florida's Attorney General, Senator HOLLAND joined him in arguing Florida's case in the Supreme Court in October, 1959. The Court ruled in favor of the state, thus returning to it bottom lands of untold value for a distance of three marine leagues off of the state's Gulf Coast.

Poll tax amendment for the purpose of eliminating the payment of the poll tax as a requirement of voting in federal elections was first introduced by Senator HOLLAND in 1949 and in every session of Congress thereafter. Both Houses finally passed it by overwhelming majorities in 1962 and referred it to the 50 states for ratification. On January 23, 1964 South Dakota was the last of the required 38 states to approve it, and thus on that date the Holland amendment became the 24th Amendment to the Federal Constitution.

Central and Southern Florida Flood Control became an active interest of Senator HOLLAND's in 1946. The first phase of the project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1948, when \$16.3 million was authorized for the first phase work and continuing studies. The total cost of the program at that time was estimated at \$70 million, of which the federal government would contribute \$58 million. In 1950 the appropriation of another \$20 million was authorized, and in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1954 Congress authorized the remaining project, adding \$7 million to earlier appropriations. The 1958 Act modified the formula for local contributions and authorized an additional \$40 million. The over-all project cost is presently estimated at \$242.6 million for the federal government and \$89,010,000 in non-federal costs. The 4.2 to 1 benefit-cost ratio is remarkably high, and the project will protect 15,634 square miles of residential-agricultural-industrial area in 18 counties against floods, droughts and fire. Senator HOLLAND has been consistently successful in obtaining budgeted appropriations for the project.

Everglades National Park boundaries were finalized through legislation cosponsored by Senator HOLLAND who actively worked toward the acquisition of this national park since his days as Governor and State Senator.

Interstate highways have received legislative assistance from Senator HOLLAND who supported the Highway Act of 1956 which launched the 41,000-mile national network of Interstate and Defense Highways and increased to 90 per cent the federal contribution to interstate roads. The mileage allocated to Florida under the national system totals 1,173 miles of interstate roads exclusive of a limited access interstate freeway along the Florida west coast to Miami. In 1963 Senator HOLLAND introduced a bill to extend Interstate Highway 75 from Tampa to Miami.

Rivers and harbors projects have received substantial assistance from Senator HOLLAND through his membership on the Appropriations Committee. Among the vital state projects to which appropriations have been made as a result of HOLLAND's specific efforts are the following: Miami Harbor, Canaveral Harbor, Port Everglades Harbor, Apalachicola River Channel Improvement, East and West

Coast Intracoastal Waterways, Bakers Haul-over Inlet, Palm Beach Harbor, Pensacola Harbor, Tampa Harbor and Jacksonville Harbor. In the course of authorizing and appropriating funds for these improvements Senator HOLLAND has been highly successful in getting projects included in the federal budget, restoring in the Senate projects which have been lost in the House, and holding appropriations in Senate-House conferences following the passage of bills in differing amounts.

Cross-Florida barge canal is among the most recent public works projects for the state to which Senator HOLLAND has contributed effectively. Almost single-handedly he secured the first pre-construction planning funds in the amount of \$205,000 for this vital waterway after some senior members of the House Appropriations Committee scuttled the efforts of Florida House members to get such appropriations approved. In 1963, and with the full cooperation of the Florida House delegation, he was instrumental in obtaining in a supplemental appropriations bill \$1 million for the start of construction on the Barge Canal.

Alaska and Hawaii statehood was strongly supported through to completion by Senator HOLLAND. In the case of Alaska, he co-sponsored enabling legislation through four consecutive Congresses, and he was the first Southern Senator to espouse statehood for Hawaii.

Migratory labor bills have variously been introduced, co-sponsored or supported by Senator HOLLAND who can validly share credit for the enactment of much of the legislation benefiting these workers in recent years.

Florida's agriculture and cattle industries have benefited greatly from Senator HOLLAND's tenure in the Senate. Because of his extensive knowledge in these fields, and his appreciation of their importance to a healthy state and national economy, Senator HOLLAND has been responsible for the appropriation of much of the federal money which has been invested in them since 1949. He has been particularly helpful in obtaining assistance for agricultural research and development, the eradication of pests damaging to vegetables, citrus and livestock, and for improved methods of weather forecasting.

ACADEMIC HONORS

In recognition of his academic attainments and continuing interest in public and private education at all levels, Senator HOLLAND has had conferred upon him the following honorary degrees: LL.D.—Rollins College, Florida Southern College, Emory University, Florida State University, University of Miami; D.C.L.—University of Florida; H.H.D.—University of Tampa.

Senator HOLLAND either presently serves or has in the past served on the following: Board of Trustees at Florida Southern College, Emory University, and Florida Presbyterian College; Board of Visitors at the United States Naval Academy and the United States Air Academy; member of the Executive Council and past president, University of Florida Alumni Association.

In addition to membership in Phi Beta Kappa, Senator HOLLAND holds membership in the following social and honorary professional fraternities: Alpha Tau Omega, Phi Kappa Phi, and Phi Delta Phi.

His other religious, fraternal and professional affiliations include: Methodist Church; Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, United States of America, 33rd Degree; Order of the Shrine; American Legion; Veterans of Foreign Wars; Sons of the American Revolution; Kiwanis; Elks.

PERSONAL DATA

Nature study and bird watching is a hobby shared by Senator and Mrs. Holland who

spend as much time as possible in this pursuit in the rural outskirts of Virginia and Maryland, during that part of each year they spend in the Nation's Capital. Both are authorities on these subjects. In addition, Senator HOLLAND is recognized as an expert in the field of Florida history, and through the years has accumulated an impressive personal library on the subject. He has retained his boyhood love of the outdoors, and hunts and fishes as often as time will permit. He is also an avid follower of professional baseball although Senate duties restrict his game attendance.

During some four decades of public service to his state and the nation, Senator HOLLAND has received numerous national and regional awards for his achievements in the fields of agriculture, conservation, sound government, and highway improvement. These include recognition from: American Good Government Society; Americans for Constitutional Action; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Road Builders Association; National Rivers and Harbors Congress; Reserve Officers Association of the U.S.; Florida State Chamber of Commerce (1963 Statesmanship Award); Florida Council of 100; Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association; Florida Citrus Mutual; Florida Cattlemen's Association; Florida Department, American Veterans of World War II; Florida Flower Association; Florida Taxpayers Association; Canal Authority of the State of Florida; State Association of County Commissioners of Florida; Florida Retailers Associations; Propeller Club of the United States (Port of Tampa).

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Montana, and then I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to join in this expression of congratulation and tribute to Senator HOLLAND on the occasion of his 20th anniversary in the Senate. Twenty years may be a long time, but it must seem as yesterday to the senior Senator from Florida, whose career of public service dates back to 1920 when he became a county judge.

SPESSARD HOLLAND is one of the hardest working Members of the Senate. His is a great attendance record on the floor and in committee and he is one of the most able of parliamentarians. He is an expert on agricultural questions and a number of related matters. Most of all he is an expert on the needs of the State of Florida.

His is an exceptional legal mind and I salute what, in my judgment, is his great and historic contribution to the Nation as a whole. It was he who led the Senate to the adoption of the 24th amendment to the Constitution—the antipoll tax—now called the Holland amendment which the distinguished Senator from Florida authored and for which he fought for many years.

No Senator has been more solicitous of the interests of his State, whether those interests be agriculture, or space, recreation or public works. He has been returned time and again to the Senate by the people of Florida, the last time by a margin of nearly a million votes which must be something of a record for statewide contests.

So, again, I congratulate the senior Senator from Florida and his wife, Mary

on their 20th anniversary and look forward to his presence, his unfailing courtesy, his consideration, and his cooperation in the work of the Senate for many years to come.

I am proud that they call me friend. Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for yielding to me.

Mr. President, let me speak in a slightly different tone regarding my good friend SPESSARD HOLLAND. I believe that my first memory of him was in 1942 when he came to Boston as a member of the Conference of Governors. He and his good wife, Mary, were among the most delightful comrades that we had at that conference. They seemed to enjoy everything that we tried to do for them in the way of hospitality. Our friendship has remained firm ever since that day.

When he came to the Senate 2 years after I did, we renewed our friendship, and we have maintained it ever since. In fact, yesterday, he and I talked briefly about his 20th anniversary in the Senate, but I did not tell him at that time that I understood speeches would be made in the Chamber in his honor today.

SPESSARD HOLLAND was a good Governor. When I knew him in that capacity he represented well his State of Florida, but also the convictions of his conscience.

In the Senate, personally, and as a fellow colleague, I have always found him to be independent. I have found him to be frank in his answers. He was either with us or against us. If he was against us, he always told us clearly why and why he took that point of view.

He has always been courageous. As the majority leader just stated, he led persistently the cause for a constitutional amendment to eliminate the poll tax. In addition to his great courage, he is thorough and conscientious in his work in the Senate. As such, he is not only a very able Senator representing his State of Florida—a constantly growing State—but he is also a truly national Senator, in that fundamentally his first concern is always directed toward the best interests of the country as a whole, in whatever capacity he may be acting and whatever the issue may be at the time.

May I also pay tribute to his good wife, Mary, who has helped in so many ways over the years. She is a personal friend of my wife, and we have had many pleasant times together with the Hollands.

I am very happy to join with his many colleagues in paying tribute to him today. I do it as a friend as well as a colleague.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I count it a privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from the neighboring State of Florida, SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND.

Since September 25, 1946, when the Governor of Florida appointed SPESSARD HOLLAND to the Senate, I have had the

honor to serve side by side with him in this body. We have stood together on many programs vital to our part of the country. We have fought shoulder to shoulder in many a battle for the preservation of the traditional rights of our States.

On five subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, we share a great number of common responsibilities. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am a member; while I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, of which he is a most valued member.

We are both colleagues on Subcommittees of Public Works, Independent Offices, and Deficiencies and Supplements.

These 20 years—these years of cooperation in common efforts—these years of committee service together, have made me deeply aware of the exceptional qualities and capabilities of the distinguished statesman we honor here today.

His keen intelligence, his courage, coupled with his splendid scholarly background of experience, make him one of the most respected and redoubtable debaters and Members of this Chamber.

His command of our mother tongue, his reverence for dignity and purity in its employment, mark him as a champion of eloquence. That eloquence is his instrument for either advancing or protecting the causes in which he believes.

SPESSARD HOLLAND is a man who knows where he stands and knows the reason for his stand. No one ever need be in doubt about his position, as every Member knows who has locked in legislative struggle with him on matters dear to his heart or crucial to his State.

He is a stanch and able advocate, and a brilliant defender. He is a man to have on one's side in a battle over great issues.

I salute SPESSARD HOLLAND on this memorable occasion.

I thank him for all the help he has given me and, through me, to the people of Alabama through the years. I am grateful to him for the many courtesies he has shown me.

I join in the beautiful tribute which has been paid to his very gracious and lovely wife, Mary, his wonderful helpmate, who has done so much for him, and who has contributed so much to the causes which he has championed.

My sincerest best wishes and my heartfelt thanks go to both of them.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am delighted to have an opportunity to express my admiration for our colleague, SPESSARD HOLLAND, and to congratulate him on the 20th anniversary of his invaluable service in the U.S. Senate. There is a phrase which comes to my mind when I think of the senior Senator from the great State of Florida, and that phrase is "southern gentleman." The significant meaning of that phrase comes to us through tradition, principle, reputation, and knowledge. He is a man whose word is as good as his bond. He is

gentle and forthright. He is a devoted family man. As a neighbor, he is friendly, loyal, helpful, understanding, and compassionate. As a patriot, he is fearless, courageous, and self-sacrificing. I have seen all these characteristics in the activities of this beloved colleague—a true southern gentleman.

Although Florida and Wyoming represent farflung corners of this great Nation, this distinguished Senator and I have many mutual interests. We are ATO brothers, Masons, 33d-degree Shriners, veterans of the First World War. We each have served in our State legislative bodies. We have had the privilege of serving as Governors of our respective States prior to coming to the U.S. Senate. Senator HOLLAND has an outstanding record as an advocate of improved educational facilities.

By virtue of his experience, he has firsthand knowledge of every level of the school system—even to serving on the board of trustees of several colleges and universities—and drafting legislation for a more effective educational program in his State.

He is a strong believer and proponent in the preservation of our natural resources. We share a keen interest in the appropriate development of historical areas as national shrines and parks.

Senator HOLLAND has shown his concern for public welfare work and solutions for this need in his own State and in the Nation.

I am sure the people of Florida must feel a tremendous pride in the pages of the Sunshine State's illustrious history fashioned by the dedicated and distinguished performance of SPESSARD HOLLAND. His is an enviable record—a challenge not only to the citizens and public officials of his own State but to each of us in this body. This remarkable statesman has been a convincing and persuasive legislator, oftentimes taking a position which was not popular with his party leaders, but history records the soundness of his judgment.

To this honored friend, brother, and colleague, my prayer is that our Nation will long have the benefit of his wise counsel and the hope that the future will bring him a full measure of happiness and satisfaction in a job well done.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield now to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I doubt whether one could mention any Member of the Senate who has had such a satisfying adventure in the course of his life as has the distinguished Senator from Florida, SPESSARD HOLLAND. When I say that I apply it not only to his public service, but to his private life as well.

It is probably telling no tales out of school to say that on his next birthday he will be 75 years of age. He has grown with age so graciously that I almost envy him.

He brings to us not only a public service that is distinctive, but he has been married for 47 years. I pray and hope that the Lord will look with kindness on him and his wife, Mary, so that they can observe their 50th wedding anniversary 3 years from now.

He has been blessed with four children. That has been a great adventure in itself.

But his public career has been an adventure because he started out as a teacher. The distinguished majority leader mentioned that he became a county judge, but he was a teacher before he became a county judge.

Then he became a county judge. At one time he was a prosecutor. Then he was in the State senate. He had a distinguished war record—it had to be World War II—I was going to say World War I, but that would not comport with his appearance.

In the intimacy of our friendships, we often forget the record they have made in service. He has distinguished himself beyond and above the call of duty, because he has been honored by his country with the Distinguished Service Cross. Having been in the First World War on the western front, I know what the Distinguished Service Cross means.

The Senator from Florida was a State senator, then Governor, and then came to the U.S. Senate. That is as full and eventful and satisfying an adventure as any man can contemplate. So he brings to this body that great record of service.

Senator HOLLAND is not only diligent, but painstaking—sometimes I have thought it was almost to a fault—but it is done in the public interest and in public service.

There is an overlay of courage unmatched by any Member of the Senate. SPESSARD HOLLAND has been a very distinguished Member of this body.

SPESSARD, I join with your colleagues in hoping that you will be with us a long, long time and that you will be sustained in health and will continue to give us the benefit of your wisdom and your graciousness and your insight for as long as you may want.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I consider it a genuine privilege and honor to join in congratulating not only Senator HOLLAND but also his charming wife. I want to emphasize three points after agreeing with the fine statements that have been made about him.

First I wish to mention the welcome and helpfulness and attention given to Mrs. Stennis and to me by Mrs. Holland and Senator HOLLAND when we first came here. It was not just an ordinary welcome, but it was going the extra mile and farther, and performing a real help and service to a newcomer.

I mention especially one quality which is a habit rather than a particular virtue, but Senator HOLLAND brings a thoroughness and completeness in his approach to a mastery of the subject of a bill or a policy or anything else he may be dealing with. He employs a bulldog thoroughness to grasp a subject and to stay with it until he has mastered it. Then he gives it his highest effort and, having reached a conclusion, he retains it until the end. That is one of the greatest virtues a man can have.

I say that as one who has not always agreed with everything the Senator from Florida has done. I say it as one who has disagreed on some major principles. At the same time, that is the cardinal principle to which Senator HOLLAND has been devoted. He studies each matter so that he can be accurate to the best of his ability, and so he can give a reliable opinion, on the principle which I have just described.

I hope he will be with us many more years, as long as he may wish.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to say a few words in tribute to my good friend, SPESSARD HOLLAND, the senior Senator from Florida.

We have many things in common. With the exception of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, upon which I do not serve, we happen to serve on the same committees. I have been serving on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for almost 30 years and he has served 18 years on that committee. As chairman of that committee, I wish to say that he is a most valued member, he is a hard worker and serves well.

We are also both members of the Appropriations Committee; and on that committee I do not know of a more diligent worker than my good friend from Florida. In addition, he is a member of the Steering Committee of the Senate, on which I serve, and also of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, on which I also serve. Therefore, particularly as I listen to these fine tributes to Senator HOLLAND, I feel that I am in mighty fine company.

In addition to membership on committees, the Senator and I have a number of other things in common. He was a teacher; so was I. He was a prosecuting attorney; so was I.

And I do not wish to overlook one other thing we have in common—our lovely grandchildren.

The Senator from Florida is fortunate in having 13 grandchildren. So have I—exactly 13. The only difference is that he has four children from whom those grandchildren spring, and I have only one son. So probably that is the only way in which I exceed his excellence, for the time being, at least. I do not know how many granddaughters he has. It may be that we have the same number. But for his information, I have 10 grandsons and 3 granddaughters—and I am happy to say that I was able to spend last Saturday, September 24, with them on a fishing trip in celebration of my 76th birthday.

I am sure that Senator HOLLAND, like most of us, has sought to serve on committees where he could best serve the people; and having been a farmer and a citrus grower, and also the Governor of his State, he has worked diligently and well for the protection and preservation of two of our most precious national resources—land and water. I am proud to have had the privilege of working side by side with him in attempting to protect and preserve those resources, not

only for the great States of Florida and Louisiana, but for the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, the Senator has a fine, lovely wife, of whom I am very fond. I take great pleasure, now and then, in sending her a small box of pralines. I believe she likes them some, and it is a delight for me to be able to please her. She is an exceptional lady. I admire her greatly and cherish her friendship. I have no doubt but that she has been an inspiration to her famous husband.

Senator HOLLAND's record as chief executive of Florida and his accomplishments as a member of the Florida State Legislature are indeed impressive. He has trod the corridors of power, in Tallahassee and Washington, with that sure-footedness and determination of purpose which make him a great public servant and an honorable statesman.

He has served his country superbly in times of peace as well as in war.

Mr. President, I am in wholehearted accord with all the excellent tributes that have been made in behalf of my good friend and neighbor, SPESSARD HOLLAND, of Florida. I wish him continued good health and a long span of life so that he can continue to extend his great talents in further serving the people of our country.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, if I may interject myself at this point before I yield to the next speaker, I should just like to go on record as testifying that, with the exception of their respective grandchildren, I have no two friends who are younger in heart than the distinguished senior Senator from Florida and distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

Since I also have the honor of occupying the status of a grandfather, I can appreciate the story about the man who got on the crowded airplane and asked each passenger in turn, "Are you a grandparent?"

All of them said yes, until he got to the last passenger, who said no, that he was not a grandparent.

Whereupon the man said, "Well, move over; I want to tell you about my grandchildren."

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and then I will yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should feel profoundly delinquent unless I joined in the tributes being paid to our distinguished colleague, SPESSARD HOLLAND, the Senator from Florida.

My personal contact with him began in January 1957. It has been my fortune, since I have been in the Senate, always to be seated in the immediate vicinity of the chair which he occupies. Throughout the 10 years of our association, I have formed clear and distinct impressions of him as a man, a soldier, a legislator, and Governor of the State of Florida, and finally as a U.S. Senator, during the last 20 years.

I have observed in him those qualities which we would all like to find residing in ourselves, but always rejoice whenever we find them in another individual. I speak of the virtues of courage, devotion

to family and to country, affability exhibited in the midst of arguments dealing with issues that come up on the floor, industry in the performance of work, and willingness to cast aside political expediency and favor constructive courses and ideals of service to be followed in the interests of our country.

With respect to these several virtues which I have mentioned, I do not believe any Senator can doubt the possession of the virtue of courage by SPESSARD HOLLAND.

I have watched you, SPESSARD, for 10 years, and I can say with some degree of certainty that you definitely cast aside political expediency in favor of serving your country. There have been times when courage was needed to follow the course which you followed, knowing that what was being done was politically inexpedient.

You have been an affable and a friendly proponent of the cause. Your industry has already been described by Senators who preceded me.

In my judgment, if the hours of attendance on the floor of the Senate were counted, the name of SPESSARD HOLLAND would be at the top of the list. You have fought for the preservation of the taxpayers' money. You have not subscribed to fantastic and extravagant programs. You have striven heroically to make certain that there will be bequeathed to our descendants an inheritance substantially as large as that which we received from our predecessors.

Your character as a man in private life, apart from your service as a Senator, has been clean and upright and, above all worthy of emulation by each of us.

On this day, the 20th anniversary of your entrance into the membership of the U.S. Senate, I express felicitations to you, and I join with my colleagues in affectionately paying tribute to your dear wife and to you.

I wish for you many, many more years of good health and continued service in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the very fine complimentary and well-deserved remarks regarding our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Our distinguished colleague has rendered valuable service in the Senate for 20 years. He has served with great distinction and great honor. As has been mentioned, for over 50 years, the senior Senator from Florida has had the honor and privilege to hold many positions of honor and trust on behalf of the citizens of the great State of Florida.

It can be truly said that the distinguished senior Senator from Florida has never betrayed that trust. Those of us who have been privileged to serve with him know him as a man of principle and integrity and great courage.

The senior Senator from Florida never hesitates to oppose legislation that he believes is not in the interest of his State and his Nation. His interest and knowledge of the problems of agriculture have been of great value to the American farmers.

The farmers of my State of Kansas are indebted to him for the passage of legislation that has helped them secure an increasing share of the national income. I can personally testify to that fact.

Mrs. Carlson and I have for many years enjoyed the friendship of SPESSARD and Mrs. Holland. We regard them as our very personal friends.

We have been fortunate enough to live in the same building for many years.

We have always held them in the highest regard. We wish for them many years of service to their State and Nation.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute today to one of the most distinguished Members of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND, senior U.S. Senator from the State of Florida. Yesterday, Sunday, September 25, 1966, marked the 20th year of Senator HOLLAND's service to the people of the State of Florida and the Nation in the U.S. Senate.

Senator HOLLAND was nominated to run for election to the U.S. Senate on May 7, 1946, defeating three opponents in the first primary by more than 72,000 votes. He is the second Governor in the history of the State of Florida to be elected and to serve in the U.S. Senate.

He was appointed on September 25, 1946, to fill the unexpired term of Senator Charles O. Andrews, who died September 18, 1946. He is the first native Floridian to serve as both Governor and U.S. Senator. He was born in Bartow, Fla., July 10, 1892. His parents were Benjamin Franklin Holland, a Confederate veteran from the State of Georgia, and Fannie Virginia—Spessard—Holland, of Virginia. They came to Florida in the 1880's.

Senator HOLLAND has had a varied background, having been a school-teacher, citrus grower, and practicing attorney. He is a product of the public schools of Bartow, Fla. In 1912, he graduated, magna cum laude, from Emory College—now Emory University—Atlanta, Ga. He is a 1916 graduate of the University of Florida Law School. His many scholastic achievements include membership in Phi Beta Kappa, and he also qualified for a Rhodes scholarship, but was prevented from accepting it by the outbreak of World War I.

Mr. President, few men have been privileged to serve their country in so many different capacities as has the senior Senator from the State of Florida. Even fewer have compiled such a distinguished record of achievement in their fields of endeavor. Senator HOLLAND served his State as Governor during those trying days of World War II, when Florida, exposed to possible attack by sea, was one of the prime areas of defense and training in our war effort.

His accomplishments in the U.S. Senate are too numerous to mention them all, but one of his major efforts is the Tidelands Act, which restored to the individual States their property rights in

the submerged coastal belts lying within States' boundaries bordering the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the Gulf of Mexico. It passed both Houses and was signed by President Eisenhower in May 1953, to become Public Law 31 of the 83d Congress under the title "Submerged Lands Act of 1953."

For many years, Senator HOLLAND introduced in the U.S. Senate a constitutional amendment to eliminate the payment of a poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections. Senator HOLLAND's perseverance and legislative ability was responsible for this amendment being adopted by both Houses of Congress, and subsequently ratified by the States. It is now the 24th amendment to the Constitution. Passage of the constitutional amendment in Congress was secured at a time when efforts were being made to do away with the poll tax as a requirement for voting by simple legislation. Although I did not support the proposed constitutional amendment, being of the opinion that each State should make this determination, I think that this instance provides outstanding testimony to the dedication of Senator HOLLAND to the Constitution of the United States.

If the poll tax was to be eliminated, the only proper constitutional way for it to be done was through the adoption of a constitutional amendment.

In all of his many endeavors, Senator HOLLAND has devoted the full measure of his considerable energy and talent. Senator HOLLAND is a man of high principles and moral integrity and his devotion to constitutional government is unsurpassed.

He has served the people of the State of Florida in many capacities, including State legislature, Governor, and U.S. Senator. Also, he served in the Armed Forces during World War I and compiled an enviable record, having been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross in 1918, for "extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an armed enemy."

Senator HOLLAND is a devoted husband and father. He and his lovely wife, Mary, have four children—two sons and two daughters—and I know that his family is very proud of him, as he is of them. Mrs. Holland is a beautiful, charming, and lovely lady. She has stood beside her husband and fortified him throughout the years, and has been a dynamic inspiration to him.

I have the highest esteem for SPESSARD HOLLAND, both as a public servant and as an individual. I am pleased to join in saluting him on his 20th anniversary as a Member of the U.S. Senate. As a friend, he is loyal and true; as a Senator, he is able and profound.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks made earlier by the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] in paying tribute

to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida. It was my privilege to know Senator HOLLAND long prior to the time I came to the U.S. Senate. He is a man for whom I have had great respect, confidence, and admiration during the years it has been my privilege to know him.

I am proud today to be able to join in this tribute to him on his 20th anniversary as a Member of the U.S. Senate. He is one of the ablest and finest men with whom I have had the privilege to come in contact. I am pleased by the association I now am enjoying with him as a Member of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, 20 years ago—on September 25, 1946—one of Florida's most distinguished citizens came to this august Senate Chamber. In the ensuing years, he has both contributed to and upheld the traditions of this body.

SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND came to this body to fill the vacancy created by the death of another great Floridian Senator, Charles O. Andrews. Since then, Senator HOLLAND has been elected four times in his own right—each time by decisive margins.

He is to Florida what he is to his colleagues in the Senate—and what, indeed, he is to all men—a man of dignity, principle, and integrity. You know where SPESSARD HOLLAND stands, for he is always forthright and candid.

Just about 1 year ago, Senator HOLLAND told an interviewer:

I think of myself as a constitutionalist. I try to be reasonably consistent with a sound pattern. I sleep nights. My people have stuck with me.

I think those brief words encapsulate the philosophy which has guided my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida, throughout his long public career.

In my opinion, his devotion to principle has won him friends at home of both liberal and conservative persuasion.

Certainly, the long career of my colleague attests to his popularity at the polls. He has been a prosecuting attorney and a county judge, a member of the State Senate of Florida and, of course, served as Governor of Florida from 1941 to 1945.

In each of these tasks, he applied the same measure of diligence that he has given to his senatorial duties for these past 20 years. SPESSARD HOLLAND has been indefatigable and unflagging in his attention to the many responsibilities of office.

No better testimony can be offered than the record of his 14-year fight to strike down the poll tax in Federal elections. The 24th amendment to the Constitution stands as a monument to his efforts.

Similarly, he was in the forefront of the Tidelands Act battle which gave to the States the offshore mineral and oil rights to a distance of three leagues. Characteristically, when that legislation was challenged in the U.S. Supreme Court, Senator HOLLAND took part in the case on behalf of Florida—and won.

I have served with Senator HOLLAND for nearly 16 years and have found him

always steadfast, always ready to give a helping hand.

I am proud to join my colleagues in paying well-deserved tribute to my friend and senior Senator, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is indeed a great privilege and pleasure today to join the many friends and colleagues of SPESSARD HOLLAND in congratulating him on completing 20 years of service in the Senate of the United States.

This is indeed a momentous occasion and an important milestone in the long and distinguished career of my friend and associate, the senior Senator from Florida. For two decades, Senator HOLLAND has tirelessly and devotedly dedicated himself to outstanding service to his State and Nation. And prior to coming to the U.S. Senate, he held various high positions of public trust in the State of Florida. Following illustrious service in the Air Corps during World War I, for which he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross in recognition of "extraordinary heroism," SPESSARD HOLLAND practiced law and became judge of Polk County, Fla. Later, he served in the State senate, and in 1940 he was elected Governor of his State, compiling a record of great progress and economic advancement during the war years.

With unparalleled distinction, Senator HOLLAND has devoted almost all his adult life to public service. In the Senate, he is loved and respected for his statesmanlike conduct and for his dedication to the sound principles of constitutional government. He is a firm advocate of fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government and a champion of the free enterprise system. It is my pleasure to serve with Senator HOLLAND on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where he is a ranking Democrat and one of the committee's hardest working members.

It is noteworthy, I think, that Senator HOLLAND has lasting ties with my State of Georgia. His father was a Georgian, and he was graduated magna cum laude from Emory College, now Emory University, in Atlanta, and presently serves on the board of trustees of that institution.

I salute Senator HOLLAND today and wish for him many more years of service and happiness.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is a sincere pleasure to join with other friends, colleagues, and well wishers in congratulating SPESSARD HOLLAND on the 20th anniversary of his service in the U.S. Senate. In these two decades of service in the Senate, SPESSARD has grown in stature and in influence as a public official who places devotion to his country first and whose successful efforts as a valiant fighter for Florida and its far-flung interests make him an asset to his State and a credit to the entire country which he loves so much and serves so well.

SPESSARD HOLLAND serves as chairman of the Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee on which I serve. I have sat with him through countless hours of hearings, of deliberations in executive session as we write in the specific money

items, and in conferences with our counterparts of the House of Representatives. I speak from long experience and close observation when I say that SPESSARD treats the members of both political parties and all sections of the country with equal courtesy and fairness. There is no streak of meanness and no taint of narrow partisanship in the courtly character of SPESSARD HOLLAND. He is persistent but never pugnacious. He is a thrifty economizer but never a shortsighted pennypincher.

Of SPESSARD HOLLAND it can truly be said he has his eyes on the stars and his feet on the ground. He is not the captive of a party label, nor does he consider the Senate to be the supine handmaiden of the White House—whether its temporary occupant be a Democrat or a Republican. He has the independence of mind and the courage of conviction which impel him to measure legislation by its merit rather than by its sponsorship or the vehemence of its supporters. Happy 20th anniversary, SPESSARD, and many happy returns of the day.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on this happy occasion, I extend my warmest congratulations to my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who yesterday completed 20 years in the U.S. Senate.

Such a notable achievement is indeed worthy of celebration, and I am delighted to pay him the high honor and just tribute he has so richly earned.

Athlete, schoolteacher, lawyer, veteran holding the Distinguished Service Cross, citrus grower, judge, Governor, State senator, U.S. Senator—SPESSARD HOLLAND has had an outstanding career, highlighted by 40 years of service to his native State of Florida and to his Nation.

Polk County prosecuting attorney from 1919-20, county judge for 8 years, State senator for 8 years, Governor of Florida for 4 years, U.S. Senator for 20 years—his is a record matched by few in American politics.

Except for the office of prosecuting attorney, all other offices he has held are elective. To win and retain the faith, trust, and confidence of his fellow Floridians over a span of 40 years attests to SPESSARD HOLLAND's great intellectual capacity, integrity, diligence, effectiveness, leadership, and personable character.

Those of us privileged to serve with him in this, the Nation's highest legislative body, likewise attest to these admirable attributes.

We in Hawaii have an additional, special reason to honor SPESSARD HOLLAND, for he was the first Southern Senator to espouse statehood for Hawaii. Later, on that momentous day in March 1959, he cast his vote to bring the mid-Pacific islands comprising Hawaii into the Union of States.

Without such support, Hawaii would still be only a territorial possession of the United States, and Hawaii would still be voteless in Congress.

As one of the Senators privileged to represent Hawaii, where the southernmost part of the United States now is located, I extend "mahalo"—thanks—to the first Southern Senator to advocate

statehood for Hawaii. I do so in behalf of the more than 700,000 people in Hawaii.

We have other reasons to be grateful to SPESSARD HOLLAND. As chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee and as second-ranking majority member of the Committee on Agriculture, SPESSARD HOLLAND has taken a keen interest in Hawaii's leading industry, agriculture, and in its problems.

With his help, Hawaii has obtained assistance for research on a mechanical coffee harvester, for coffee marketing research, for improved reporting of farm statistics, for soil conservation, irrigation, and watershed projects, to name just a few.

So it is fitting that Hawaii join her sister States in lauding the life and attainments of the distinguished Senator from Florida, who has been our stanch friend.

All commendation and felicitations to SPESSARD HOLLAND as he completes two decades of dedicated service in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, as one of the newer Members of the Senate, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks that have been made commanding the service of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Although he is beginning the 21st year of his service in this body, his career includes nearly half a century of public service—a career that has been notable in many different capacities.

The Senator from Florida is that rare combination of teacher, lawyer, patriot, and public servant whose sound judgment and dedication to constitutional principles have rightfully earned for him the respect and admiration of every Member of the Senate.

As a prosecuting attorney, as a judge, as a State senator, as a Governor, and for 20 years as a U.S. Senator, the Senator from Florida has amply justified the confidence placed in him by the people of his State.

In an age when individual achievement is often downgraded in some quarters, it is a privilege to serve with a man who is entitled to wear both a Phi Beta Kappa key and his Nation's second highest decoration for extraordinary heroism in time of war.

The Senator from Florida truly deserves the recognition he is receiving on this 20th anniversary of his service in the Senate, and we look forward to his valuable contributions for many more years.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying a most deserved tribute to the senior Senator from Florida, the Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

Before I came to the Senate 6 years ago, I felt as though I already knew Senator HOLLAND; because he had served as Governor of Florida at the time I was stationed for a year at the Air Force base at Orlando during World War II. I can still recall reading and hearing many favorable comments about then Governor HOLLAND.

It had been both a privilege and a joy for Mrs. Miller and me to be able to call Senator and Mrs. Holland our friends.

They have been warm and understanding, always willing to be helpful in sharing their wisdom with the new and younger Members of the Senate and their wives.

At the time I commenced my service in the Senate, I was told that Senator HOLLAND was "a great Senator." Since that time, the years of association with him have confirmed that statement many times over.

The people of Florida and, indeed, of the United States can be thankful that Senator HOLLAND is serving his State and the Nation in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, SPESSARD HOLLAND, in his 20 years of devoted, conscientious service as a Member of this body, has given to the State of Florida consistent, effective representation.

The prosperous agriculture that is so important a part of the economic framework of his State owes a large debt of gratitude to the distinguished senior Senator.

For example, I recall that in 1951 the Florida citrus industry was in trouble. Senator HOLLAND took his subcommittee to Florida, where extensive hearings were held. It was out of these hearings, and largely through his leadership, that the Florida citrus industry diverted a large share of its crops to frozen concentrates. This shift in emphasis allowed the citrus people to sell their products profitably without relying on Federal price supports.

Senator HOLLAND also made a substantial contribution to American farm policy during the 1950's through his espousal of flexible supports for farm products.

More recently, as chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, he has worked tirelessly with the complex and difficult problems of agricultural programs.

I congratulate the senior Senator from Florida on his 20th anniversary and look forward to continued cooperation on important legislation affecting American farm policy.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished career of Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND. A native son of Florida, he established an impressive record of service prior to entering the U.S. Senate—service including positions as a county prosecutor, a county judge, a State senator, and Governor of Florida.

With this background, he entered the U.S. Senate 20 years ago, a man already thoroughly experienced, tested, and proven able to meet the demands of effective public service. Over his long tenure in the U.S. Senate, his excellent reputation has continued to grow. He is known and respected as a man of strong conviction, high integrity and good judgment. The State of Florida and the Nation owe a debt of gratitude to Senator HOLLAND for his years of outstanding service. The tributes he receives today from his colleagues are richly deserved.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am delighted to join my colleagues in paying deserved tribute to my good friend from

Florida on the occasion of his 20th anniversary of service in the U.S. Senate.

I have had many occasions to work with the distinguished Senator and have come to know him quite well over the years. He is a man of wit and wisdom, of energy and devotion, and of sincerity and integrity. Perhaps the highest tribute I could pay him is to bestow upon him the title of "statesman." Webster's dictionary defines the word "statesman" as:

A man versed in the principles and art of government; one who shows wisdom in treating or directing public matters; a man occupied with the affairs of government and influential in shaping its policy.

It would seem that the writer of that definition had SPESSARD HOLLAND in mind, for it fits him perfectly.

Edmund Burke said:

A disposition to preserve, and an ability to improve, taken together, would be my standard of a statesman.

The Senator from Florida fully meets this standard, and I know the good citizens of his State join with his colleagues here in the Senate in saying "Happy anniversary, SPESSARD."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, today is not only an important milestone in the life and career of a dear friend of mine, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], but also an important day for the U.S. Senate itself. Many great men have graced these Chambers and have left deep imprints on the history of the United States, but one of the truly outstanding Members during my time is the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] whom we are honoring today on this the 20th anniversary of his being sworn in as U.S. Senator.

Our friend Senator HOLLAND is a tremendously able man and recognized as one of our very best lawyers. He not only has a great legal mind, but he has the resourcefulness, the tenacity, and the aggressiveness to fight and fight hard for the things that he believes in. The State of Florida is fortunate to have a man of this caliber represent their interests. The entire Nation, I am sure, is grateful for the manner in which he conducts himself as a Senator and the great contributions he has made in almost every field of legislation. His has been a wholesome impact, too, on the policies of our Government, from the President on down.

Our friend SPESSARD has successfully sponsored and successfully opposed more legislation by far than the average Member of the Senate. I have particular reference to legislation which he sponsored such as tidelands oil, the reorganization of the Farm Credit Administration, and the great improvements he made possible through rewriting the Farmers Home Administration lending authorities.

I have come to know Senator HOLLAND and to appreciate him most because of my close association with him on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and on the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations of which he is the chairman and I am the ranking Republican. I would be less than honest if I did not

say that we have had some differences, but they were honest differences. I hasten to add that whenever I have made a good case for my point of view, the Senator from Florida has always been a stalwart supporter and effective proponent of the causes I have advocated. I have never been involved in a lawsuit in my life, but I have often thought that if I should, the first person I would contact to fight my case would be the Senator from Florida.

My friend SPESSARD HOLLAND can be a very formidable adversary, but always he is a perfect gentleman on the floor of the Senate or elsewhere. These are only a few of the many, many fine qualities that have endeared him to everyone who has been privileged to be associated with him. He has served the people of Florida well as prosecuting attorney, county judge, State senator, Governor, and U.S. Senator. I salute my friend on this great occasion and express the fond hope that he may continue to serve as Senator from Florida for many years to come. I will always have the deepest respect and admiration for his gracious wife Mary and him.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to add my voice to those of my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the finest gentlemen it has ever been my good fortune to meet.

During my first 2 years in the Senate, I have had occasion to work with him on some of the specific problems which especially affect his State and mine. I will forever be thankful to him for his help, wisdom and guidance, and I will always hold him in the highest esteem for his courage, determination, and dedication to proper principles.

He is a man of matchless integrity, experience, and judgment who places the problems of his people at all times ahead of any personal considerations and whose long and distinguished record of public service needs no mere words of mine to bring him well-deserved and merited public acclaim.

The best that I can hope for the future of our great Nation is that she may always have the dedicated statesmen and servants of the caliber of SPESSARD HOLLAND to shoulder the burdens of the Republic in the years ahead. Senator HOLLAND, I salute you on this your 20th birthday in the Senate and pray that the Senate of the United States may be graced with your presence and enjoy the fruits of your wisdom and experience for many, many years to come.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who speak today in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of service in the Senate by the senior Senator from Florida, SPESSARD HOLLAND.

Serving in the Senate, Mr. President, we can become acquainted with our colleagues in two different ways. We can become personal friends with other Senators and, thus, can enjoy their company much the same as we would good friends from all walks of life.

On the other hand, we have a unique opportunity to observe our colleagues and to get to know them best as Senators; as the representatives of the people of the

various States of the Union. We can, therefore, learn to know a Senator and his worth to his community, to his constituents, and to the Nation.

I wish to speak about Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND. He is, in my estimation, one of those rare people who makes a Senator of the type that every schoolchild in this country thinks of; the prototype—the perfect example—of what people believe a Senator should be.

Mr. President, there is rarely a bill of any importance up for debate on the Senate floor, to which Senator HOLLAND does not make a contribution. But of even greater importance, his contribution invariably is buttressed by an obvious preparation on the subject matter of which he speaks. And, his presentation in debate, whether in the form of questions, answers or independent argument, is always interesting to hear, important to legislative history and, which is the immediately hoped for result of debate, persuasive.

Mr. President, the descriptive word which I have always felt to be the most desirable one applicable to any man is "respect." That, I have for SPESSARD HOLLAND in an eminently high degree.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], paying tribute to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], on the occasion of his 20th anniversary in the Senate, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER

I do not want to miss this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying special tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, on the occasion of his 20th anniversary in the Senate.

One of my first impressions upon entering this great body was of the effectiveness of SPESSARD HOLLAND as a legislator, and of his stature as a gentleman. This early impression has not changed, but has been reaffirmed repeatedly.

It has been my pleasure to cast my vote in the same columns with Senator HOLLAND on many, many occasions—regardless of our varying party affiliations. His voting always reflects his regard for his country, as well as his concern for the well-being of his constituents in Florida. Many times as we cast similar votes—I recall especially his active role in defense of right to work laws—I have made a note of his firm commitment to principle and his independence of judgment.

May he continue to uphold the interests of his State and Nation as diligently and effectively as he has during his past four terms.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to join in this well-deserved salute to the senior Senator from Florida on the occasion of his 20th anniversary of service in the U.S. Senate.

Throughout his long and distinguished career, Senator HOLLAND has brought to the public service a high sense of integrity, a fine and highly trained legal mind, and a broad sympathy for all the problems of the people of his State.

Florida is the fastest growing State in the Union. It is characterized by divergent interests, and the presence of people of many and varied backgrounds. A Southern State with the old traditions

of the South, it has also been progressive in meeting the challenges of these new times. Surely it has not been the easiest of States to represent, but Senator HOLLAND has met these diverse challenges and ably represented his people.

Of particular importance has been his interest in constitutional problems. He has evidenced a belief that social reforms must be made, but they must be made in a constitutional way. This quality of his service is exemplified by his fatherhood of the 24th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, abolishing the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections. His interest in the effort to reform the electoral college has also been notable. He was a leader in the fight to maintain the rights of the States and of the people over their own legislative apportionment.

It has been my good fortune to serve under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Florida on the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. Despite the rapid growth and urbanization of his State, Senator HOLLAND has continued to give unstintingly of his energy in this field of agricultural appropriations, and also on farm legislation generally, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Additionally, it has been my pleasure to hear the Senator on the occasions of his appearances before the Senate Judiciary Committee or its subcommittees.

It is a sincere pleasure to extend to the Senator my own good wishes for many more years of health and active service to the Nation and to the people of his State.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am delighted to join my colleagues in paying well-deserved tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida on his 20th anniversary of service in the U.S. Senate.

It has been my privilege to know and work with Senator HOLLAND since I came to the Senate in 1954. Throughout these 12 years I have had ample opportunity to observe him in action, and I say without qualification that he represents the finest in legislative skill and thoughtful statesmanship. A man of resolute conviction, at all times tempered with good judgment, his voice commands attention and respect, whether in the public forum of the Senate floor or behind the closed doors of committee deliberations. A tireless worker, he brings to every subject no matter how complex a thorough knowledge and a penetrating insight.

During the past 5 years we have worked together on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and I have had even greater opportunity to observe the high competence of this outstanding Member of the Senate. The people of Florida, indeed all Americans, are fortunate to have his services. It is men of Senator HOLLAND's integrity who make this body a responsible sounding board of political thought and action.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I came to the Senate about 6 weeks after Senator HOLLAND did. I have had the high privilege of serving with him and being closely associated with him in the Senate during that time.

I can say, as I know every other Senator could say, I know of no Senator more dedicated to the cause of good, sound legislation, more thorough and hard working, than the senior Senator from Florida.

So I am glad to join, even though tardily, with my colleagues in paying tribute to Senator HOLLAND on his completion of 20 years' service in the Senate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have known Senator HOLLAND for many years, and I am gratified to be an associate of his in this Chamber. His mother, Fannie Virginia Speppard, was a native West Virginian, and SPESSARD has told me of the many times he has visited in our Mountain State for recreation and enjoyment. The Florida Senator has spoken in West Virginia, at my request, and our citizens have responded enthusiastically to his message.

Mr. President, few men have been in the Senate for as long as the senior Senator from Florida of whom it could be said that their service was consistently superior—but this is a statement which I make with certainty about SPESSARD HOLLAND.

I am delighted to join those who have extolled his many virtues on the occasion of his 20th anniversary here, and I speak now of my admiration for my distinguished colleague and my friend.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is late—but it could never be too late—for me to add my voice to the voices of my colleagues who have already spoken out on the floor of the Senate as Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND commences his 21st year of service in this body.

It is said that seniority counts much in the Senate. It does. But seniority which the senior Senator from Florida has certainly now attained cannot really be meaningful unless the man who possesses it has those qualities which would make his outstanding wherever he served. SPESSARD HOLLAND has those qualities. He came to the Senate already possessed of a distinguished record. He made his mark early here because of a willingness to work and an ability to work. These qualities were intermingled with what the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] directly described as "intellectual integrity." I have known few men in my life who possess it as does Senator HOLLAND. Blessed with a fine mind, he reaches a conclusion only after the most diligent study and consideration; once having reached it, he states his case for all to hear whether the cause he embraces is popular or otherwise.

Of course we Alaskans have a very special reason to regard SPESSARD HOLLAND as a man of perception, of judgment, and as one willing and able to fight, and fight hard for that in which he believes. For Senator HOLLAND was among the first to announce himself as being a proponent of statehood for Alaska. When he did—and even thereafter—statehood for a territory seemingly so remote and popular conceptions of which were so mixed up with romantic fictions and misunderstandings seemed to be an impos-

sibility. It was difficult to generate interest in the subject, even more difficult than to ward off indifference and downright opposition. By the intellectual processes which led him to his decision, SPESSARD HOLLAND made the decision that the Nation, as well as Alaska, would be benefited by the grant of statehood. He never deviated from that belief. Many people in many places had a part in making Alaska a State. Alaskans have not forgotten, and never will, that Senator HOLLAND was among the leaders of the movement and it was his powerful voice, his continuing advocacy, that played a large part in the successful outcome of the long fight when the Senate voted statehood for Alaska on June 30, 1958.

Many others in paying tribute to Senator HOLLAND have in praising him likewise praised his wonderful wife Mary. Let me count myself as one of these. They make a splendid team, one that reflects credit upon the State of Florida and one of which the other 99 Members of this body in which SPESSARD HOLLAND serves are rightfully proud.

Wherever I may be—wherever—on September 26, 1976, I shall want to join in person or otherwise in saluting the southern gentleman, SPESSARD HOLLAND, as he completes 30 years of service in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when this session of the 89th Congress closes, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida will witness the end of his 10th Congress. For 20 admirable years, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND has represented the people of Florida with as much diligence and vigor as any electorate could expect. He has been a concerned and able spokesman for his people as well as a dedicated servant of the national public.

His career in public service extends over 47 years and in that time he has served as a prosecuting attorney, county Judge, State senator, Governor of Florida, and of course, a respected colleague of this body. In the course of that time he has worked successfully for the abolition of the poll tax—first in Florida, and then as an amendment to the Federal Constitution, which I was privileged to cosponsor with him—for old-age assistance and workmen's compensation, for increased teacher benefits and salaries, for special aid to the blind, for economic development in Florida, and a continuing list of vital legislation.

SPESSARD HOLLAND, a member of Phi Beta Kappa, was offered a Rhodes scholarship and also a place on the pitching staff of the Philadelphia Athletics but passed them both by to serve his country. A statesman, athlete, and scholar, SPESSARD HOLLAND has become known in the Senate for his ability as a parliamentarian, his deep understanding of the problems of American farmers, and his extraordinary attendance record. But probably of most satisfaction to him is the respect he has garnered as an able and intelligent representative of the people of Florida who have four times enthusiastically returned him to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I did not know SPESSARD HOLLAND this well until last year when I was placed on the Committee on Appropriations. On that committee, watching him on the Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies, and in other capacities, I have never seen a man in this body who is more diligent in attendance and thorough in the work of the committee, whether there is any other Member present or not, than the distinguished Senator from Florida. He meticulously examines each item.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to SPESSARD HOLLAND for his service. Inasmuch as this has been my first opportunity to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations, I wish to pay tribute to his diligence, ability, and understanding.

Mr. President, I believe SPESSARD LINSEY HOLLAND deserves the tribute of this Senate as he completes his second decade, his 5th of a century here. This is not a farewell. He is not leaving; but it is a landmark in the history of the Senate. I am happy to be able to pay tribute to a man who is not leaving, but who will be back with us.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to respond briefly, I can only wish that these 20 years of service could have merited all the wonderful things that have been said by my distinguished colleagues. I know that they do not merit all these kind things. Nevertheless, I am so deeply appreciative that they would be spoken on the floor of the Senate that I must voice my appreciation here and say that I am glad to have them in the RECORD of our Senate proceedings. I am tremendously proud to have them there.

There is one thing I can say that I am proud of, beyond even that, and that is that in these 20 years, I have been able to claim the friendship of so many fine persons, so many great Senators, so many dedicated public servants. I think that when all is said and done, the friendships made in the Senate and the comradeships which exist here and afterward, and which show from the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are dearly to be prized, and I certainly prize them most dearly. I am glad that several Senators have spoken of the friendships which are made here, because I think they are perhaps the dearest things that happen to us during our stay in this body.

I am proud of something else that has been said. While my colleagues have spoken all too generously about me, I am glad that they have made repeated reference to my dear wife, Mary. Nothing that they could say would be extravagant in their statements of praise of her, because she has had to put up with much during my many years of public service. No one knows that better than I. I am glad that she has received, so very properly, her full share of credit, and it should be a much fuller share than any that I am entitled to receive.

I do voice my deep gratitude to my distinguished colleagues for every kind word that they have spoken—overgenerously—but I am sure that, above all, it

speaks of their esteem and their friendship; and that I prize more than I could prize any treasures that could ever be mentioned.

I thank the Senate.

IF SENATOR JOHN J. WILLIAMS WERE PRESIDENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Wyoming State Tribune of September 20 editorialized on a subject which to me is absolutely fascinating: the benefits which might accrue to the Nation if the distinguished Senator from Delaware, JOHN WILLIAMS, were President of the United States.

Alluding to a recent floor speech by Senator WILLIAMS, the editor of the Wyoming State Tribune, James M. Flinchum, wrote:

It is a pity that JOHN J. WILLIAMS is not President of the United States at this very moment if for no other reason than to put this program into effect and restore some balance to the country's economic system.

Mr. Flinchum then summarized the points and program which Senator WILLIAMS explained in his speech, and concludes:

It is too, too bad that JOHN J. WILLIAMS is not President of the United States . . . for we have no doubt that he would have the courage and initiative—to say nothing of the dedication and foresight—to put it into effect.

Mr. President, if our distinguished colleague from Delaware should desire to throw his hat into the ring in 1968, I should be delighted to nominate him, although I feel that the attainment of this high elective office is not in his mind at this time. I dare say that if it were, he would have an excellent chance of success. If he were at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the Nation could breathe much easier than it does today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF WILLIAMS WERE PRESIDENT

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, whose poking and prying into neglected corners has unearthed much governmental neglect and wrong-doing, is called the "watchdog" of the U.S. Senate. We think there is a better description of the 62-year-old Delaware Republican, a farmboy and onetime grain dealer who has served 20 years in the Senate. He is the wisest of the nation's wise men.

Last week Senator WILLIAMS outlined a 7-step proposal for solving what currently amounts to the country's knottiest domestic problem: The inflated economy. It is a pity that JOHN J. WILLIAMS is not President of the United States at this very moment if for no other reason than to put this program into effect and restore some balance to the country's economic system.

Here is what JOHN WILLIAMS told the senators the government should do:

"First, repeal the present 4 1/4 percent ceiling on interest that can be paid on government bonds with maturities over 5 years. The retention of this unrealistic ceiling has had the effect of monetizing our debt.

"Second, repeal the FNMA Participation Sales Act—Public Law 89-429. This is the proposal under which we sell our assets, a procedure which everyone now admits has boosted interest rates an extra one-half percent.

"Third, a stringent program for reduced government expenditures backed by both executive and congressional action.

"Fourth, enact a legislative directive which would force a reduction of at least 200,000 in federal employment. This could be accomplished by attrition and without any suspensions merely by a policy of not hiring any new replacements for normal resignations and retirements.

"Fifth, repeal outright, effective as of the date of enactment, the 7 percent investment credit with the understanding that this incentive will be reinstated at the termination of the war.

"Sixth, enact legislation creating a special type of bond to be designated as a retirement bond, with 10-, 20-, and 30-year maturity, bearing interest at rates not less than 4½ per cent and deferred on a formula similar to that now applicable to Series E bonds. The sale of these bonds would have a dual effect to promote savings and to siphon money from the spending stream of an overheated economy.

"Seventh, enact effective Jan. 1, 1967, a 5-per cent across the board tax increase applicable to both individuals and corporations with the understanding that this increase will terminate at the end of the war."

The 4½ per cent ceiling on long term government bonds is unrealistic and has cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars in interest charges, WILLIAMS points out, by forcing the government to put all of its financing into short term securities of less than five years, "thereby monetising the debt."

Repeal of the FNMA Participation Sales Act represents, according to WILLIAMS, "an unsound and an unnecessarily expensive" means of financing the public debt. Its sole purpose, he charges, is to conceal the real public debt from the voters. Some of these short-term government obligations now being sold on the public market are bringing as high as 6.05 per cent interest and have maturity dates only three and four years away.

In cutting back government expenditures, WILLIAMS believes Congress should direct the President to rescind all proposed public works construction projects unless they are first certified as being necessary to the national defense or that suspension of them would jeopardize the public interest. This would mean, says Mr. WILLIAMS, holding in abeyance all nondefense projects until after the war and would follow a similar step taken by President Truman, by executive order, during the Korean War.

As for federal employment, WILLIAMS points out that President Johnson last December announced plans to reduce the number of federal employees by at least 25,000 by the end of fiscal year 1966 which ended June 30. Despite that promise, however, instead of reducing the total number by 25,000, the government actually added 190,325 between Dec. 1, 1965, and June 30, 1966, and in the following month—July—added another 47,000 to the payroll.

Rather than suspend the 7 per cent investment tax credit for one year, which would be worse than no suspension at all, it should be suspended for the duration of the war, WILLIAMS believes. A one-year suspension would create a business expansion vacuum and when the suspension was terminated, the rush to fill the vacuum would create a greater expansion boom than would have occurred previously.

The 4½ per cent retirement bonds proposed by WILLIAMS would siphon off money from the nation's economy and direct it into savings. At the same time it would enable the government to finance its operations at more reasonable interest rates than it is now paying.

The 5 per cent across the board tax increase, WILLIAMS admits, would be a shock

to every American, and would cause many hardships. But, he points out, "let us remember there is a war going on and American boys in Viet Nam and their families also are experiencing hardships. For far too long we have been living beyond our income and operating under a planned inflation economy. It is time we all tighten our belts and get down to the problem of winning this war, at the same time taking such action as will prevent our liberties and freedoms from being destroyed by the ravages of inflation at home."

It is a wise, intelligent, and salutary program. It is too, too bad that JOHN J. WILLIAMS is not President of the United States at this moment, for we have no doubt he would have the courage and initiative—to say nothing of the dedication and foresight—to put it into effect.

DEATH OF THOMAS E. SHIELDS, UPI PHOTOGRAPHER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I learn from this morning's paper that an old friend of the Senate, Thomas E. Shields, a photographer with United Press International for the past 10 years, died yesterday at the age of 36 at the National Institutes of Health.

Tom Shields was a good friend to many of us. He covered the Hill. He covered the White House. He covered various departments in the executive branch of Government. He was also well known for his sports photography and his sports writing.

We will miss Tom Shields very much. He added so much to the welfare of all of us. He was kindly, considerate, and thoughtful. He was a man who lived the kind of life all of us admire and respect.

He was a devoutly religious man. He was a member of the Knights of Columbus, and a teacher at the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. He was a member of the congregation of Our Lady of Sorrows Catholic Church in Takoma Park.

He is survived by his wife, Antoinette, and four children, Thomas Edward, Sheron, Patrician Ann, and Caroline.

On behalf of Mrs. Mansfield and myself, I wish to extend to Mrs. Shields our deepest condolences and our most profound sorrow.

May his soul rest in peace.

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES AND S.K. & F. FOREIGN FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am proud to report to the Senate that three fine young people from a great medical school in my State, the Northwestern University Medical School at Evanston, have just completed a summer of service to the underprivileged in three of the world's underdeveloped areas.

These 3 young men were among 35 junior and senior medical students in 33 medical schools from 24 States who worked overseas during the past summer under a foreign fellowship program jointly sponsored by the Association of American Medical Colleges and Smith Kline & French Laboratories.

The role of the Philadelphia pharmaceutical house is to provide the funds that support the work of these medical

ambassadors in mission hospitals and outpost health facilities around the world. The Association of American Medical Colleges administers the program and selects the fellows.

The grants cover the cost of travel, accident insurance, passports and visas, and provide \$1,600 for an unmarried student, \$2,500 for a husband-wife team when the wife is qualified as a nurse or medical technician.

Thus, David T. Purtalo, of Duluth, Minn., a junior at Northwestern Medical School, was accompanied by his wife, Ruth, during his 10-week tour of duty at the Raleigh Fitkin Memorial Hospital, Manzini, Swaziland, South Africa.

The other two Northwestern men, also juniors, are Daryl R. Erickson, Bismarck, N. Dak., who worked at the Manorom Christian Hospital, Manorom, Thailand, and Fred D. Stahmann, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., assigned to the Hospital Luthérien à Manambaro, Fort Dauphin, Malagasy Republic.

The Senate and the American people can be proud of these dedicated young medical scientists and of the 35 others, including 3 other nurse-technician wives, who gave of themselves to help the less fortunate.

They must have a feeling of real accomplishment as a result of their good will missions overseas, and they certainly bring home with them, from a professional view, unusual clinical experience and new familiarity with medical, cultural, and social problems different from our own.

Mr. President, there is a growing need for the American business community to involve itself more in our national effort to aid developing countries. Both the greatest opportunity and the greatest challenge may well be found in the health field and there is plenty of room for the private sector to play a part.

The Smith Kline & French foreign fellowship program, now in its seventh year, is a splendid example of what private initiative of businessmen and educators can accomplish. Since 1960, 215 fellowships have been awarded in this program for work and study in 48 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Oceania. More than \$400,000 was invested in these young men and women who wanted to invest their time and their skills in helping others.

This one company's program could fairly be compared to "a drop in the bucket" in terms of the tremendous need, but in terms of service to the people it touches, it can have enormous impact.

I call this to the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, in the hope that others will be encouraged, by this fine example, to act.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point the list of this year's S.K. & F. foreign fellows, with the names of their medical schools and the foreign missions, clinics, or hospitals at which they served.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Judith Ferne Berkfalk, Rush City, Minnesota, Junior in University of Minnesota Medical School—Harisinga Hospital, Harisinga, Assam, India.

Paul Ayres Blake, Dumont, New Jersey, junior in Boston University School of Medicine—Institut Medical Evangelique, Kimpese, Republic of Congo.

Richard Samuel Bransford, Houston, Texas, junior in Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine—Kijabe Mission Hospital, Kijabe, Kenya.

Reginald John Brooker, Chamblee, Georgia, junior in Emory University School of Medicine—Murori Hospital, Bujumbura, Burundi.

Paul Stanley Clayton, Gainesville, Florida, junior in University of Florida College of Medicine, and his wife, Mary—The Doctors' Clinic, Marbel, Cotabato, Philippines.

Cynthia Wentworth Cooke, Needham Heights, Massachusetts, junior in University of Wisconsin Medical School—Clinic of Instituto Linguistico, Pucallpa, Peru.

Thomas Edward Dill, Grovetown, Georgia, junior in Medical College of Georgia—Hospital Vozandes, Shell Mara, Ecuador.

David William Eckert, Des Moines, Washington, junior in University of Washington Medical School—Ethel Lucas Memorial Hospital, Acornhoek, East Transvaal, South Africa.

Daryl Roy Erickson, Bismarck, North Dakota, junior in Northwestern University Medical School—Manorom Christian Hospital, Manorom, Thailand.

John Rees Goellner, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, junior in University of Iowa College of Medicine—Institut Medical Evangelique, Kimpese, Republic of Congo.

Robert Finlay Greene, San Jose, California, junior in University of California at San Francisco School of Medicine—Kola Ndoto Hospital, Shinyanga, Tanzania.

Robert Carl Haakenson, Maxbass, North Dakota, senior in Louisiana State University School of Medicine, and his wife, Michal Ann—Selek Ieka Hospital, Axum, Tigre, Ethiopia.

John David Harris, Irwin, Pennsylvania, senior in University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine—United Mission Hospital, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Joel Denton Hollingshead, Sebring, Florida, senior in Ohio State University College of Medicine, and his wife, Judith—Garkida General Hospital, Garkida, Nigeria.

Ronald William Horkheimer, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, junior in Marquette University School of Medicine—Our Lady of Lourdes Hospital, Yelwa, Nigeria.

Roy Keith Hunteman, Indianapolis, Indiana, junior in Indiana University School of Medicine—Creighton-Freeman Christian Hospital, Vrindaban, India.

Linda-Jane Irwin, Honolulu, Hawaii, junior in University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston—Vaiola Hospital, Nuku'alofa, Kingdom of Tonga.

Melvyn Theodore Korobkin, Santa Monica, California, junior in Yale University School of Medicine—Kuluva Hospital, Arua, Uganda.

Lewis Kerford Martin, III, Roanoke, Virginia, junior in University of Virginia School of Medicine—Friends Hospital, Tiriki, Kenya.

Alice Marie Martinson, Gulfport, Mississippi, junior in George Washington University School of Medicine—General Hospital, Kuala Lipis, Malaysia.

Mary Dianne McCarthy, Akron, Ohio, senior in Western Reserve University School of Medicine—Maria Assumpta Hospital, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.

Judith Lynn McKay, Fayetteville, North Carolina, junior in Tufts University School of Medicine—Bishop Shanahan Hospital, Nsukka, Nigeria.

John Barton McMullan, Jr., Mobile, Alabama, junior in University of Mississippi School of Medicine—Manorom Christian Hospital, Manorom, Thailand.

Melvyn John Michaelian, Alhambra, California, junior in University of Southern Calif-

ornia School of Medicine—Baptist Mission Hospital, Ferkessédougou, Ivory Coast.

Garland Doty Murphy, III, El Dorado, Arkansas, junior in University of Arkansas School of Medicine—Mobile Medical Clinic, Jinja, Uganda and Kisumu, Kenya.

Darrel Dean Newkirk, Hot Springs, Arkansas, junior in Tulane University School of Medicine—Baptist Hospital, Mbeya, Tanzania.

Albert John Popp, Perry, New York, junior in Albany Medical College—MARIA Clinic, Kapangan, Philippines.

David Theodore Purtlo, Duluth, Minnesota, junior in Northwestern University School of Medicine, and his wife, Ruth—Raleigh Fitkin Memorial Hospital, Manzini, Swaziland, South Africa.

Audrey Yvonne Reid, Mandeville, Jamaica, junior in Howard University College of Medicine—Preventive Health Services, Buganda, Uganda.

William Patrick Soles, Orem, Utah, junior in Cornell University Medical College—St. Michael's Hospital, Lulindi, Tanzania.

Fred Dale Stahmann, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, junior in Northwestern University Medical School—Hospital Lutherien a Manambaro, Fort Dauphin, Malagasy Republic.

Robert Preston Watkins, Jr., Belvedere, California, junior in Baylor University College of Medicine—Adebaba Yesus Clinic, Gondar, Ethiopia.

Stephen Frank Winer, Huntington Woods, Michigan, junior in Wayne State University School of Medicine—Rural Health Centre of Christian Medical College, Vellore, India.

Elizabeth Ann Wright, Kernville, California, junior in University of Kentucky School of Medicine—Nehora Health Center, Hevel Lachish, Israel.

Sybil Ann Yudin, Brooklyn, New York, junior in State University of New York, Upstate Medical Center, Syracuse—Instituto de Medicina Infantil de Pernambuco, Recife, Brazil.

NEW VOICE IN ASIA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the recent visit of President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines to the United States left many Americans with the illusion that our policies in southeast Asia are wholeheartedly supported by the governments of nations in that part of the world. The news media gave less attention to the fact that President Marcos was going home loaded with U.S. dollars after receiving assurances that more than \$45 million in additional aid for his country would be forthcoming as gifts of our taxpayers' money promised him by our President.

While here, the Philippine President also gratuitously and arrogantly called for our continuing military containment of Communist China. Of course, until now, his country has not sent one combat soldier to our aid in the Vietnam fighting. Coming from him this is a fantastic and presumptuous proposal.

Mr. President, in his column entitled "Johnson Finds New Voice of Asia," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of September 23, 1966, Clayton Fritchey clearly and concisely analyzed the fallacies regarding President Marcos's views and regarding our official policy toward some leaders in southeast Asia. Clayton Fritchey is one of the Nation's outstanding journalists and foreign policy analysts, and I ask unanimous consent that his excellent column be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON FINDS NEW VOICE OF ASIA (By Clayton Fritchey)

According to President Johnson, "the new voice of Asia" is Ferdinand Marcos, the president of the Philippines, but before Marcos takes this too seriously it might be helpful to point out that our chief executive has a weakness for impromptu coronations.

On a visit to South Viet Nam a few years ago, Johnson was so impressed by President Ngo Dinh Diem, whose tyrannical reign later ended by assassination, that he called him the Churchill of Asia. And then at his Hawaii meeting with Vietnamese leaders last spring, he crowned Premier Ngo Cao Ky as Saigon's new saviour of democracy.

There is no record of these gentlemen having blushed, though it may be that they also look upon themselves as men of destiny, who have been called upon to show America what its role in Asia should be.

If that is the case, the United States is going to be very busy in the Far East for generations to come, for both Marcos and Ky have ambitious plans for our armed forces, and possibly even more extravagant plans for the U.S. Treasury and the American taxpayers.

Ky's scenario calls for continuing the present war for five or ten more years, or preferably, trying to shorten it by invading North Viet Nam and probably taking on Communist China.

Now comes Marcos, in a speech to Congress, with his scheme for an American "cordon sanitaire," which calls for U.S. military encirclement of China on all but its Russian sides.

The Johnson administration from time to time at least talks about the desirability of conciliation and coexistence with China, but our new "Asian voice" didn't waste time on nonsense like that.

China, Marcos told Congress, "must abandon and foreswear its policy of exporting violence and fomenting disorder among its neighbors. Until we (notice the "we") receive assurances to this end, the policy of military containment of China must continue."

When this "cordon sanitaire" has been effectively established around the eastern and southern flanks of China," Marcos informs us, Peking will become docile and start behaving itself.

It could, of course, turn out that way, but would docility be the U.S. reaction if the situation were reversed, and America found itself encircled by Chinese fleets on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and a menacing Chinese air force poised on our land borders? Or would the U.S. react as it did when the Soviet Union sent missiles to Cuba?

The main theme of the Marcos state visit was summed up in a page-one newspaper box. It said, "President Marcos expressed support for U.S. policy in Asia . . . A White House communique pledged new U.S. support for a variety of Philippine programs . . . Details on Page 6."

It is hardly necessary to read the details. President Marcos is going home loaded with U.S. dollars. "American leadership has never been solely military," he said, and added delicately, "more accurately it has consistently been spiritual." There is nothing more spiritual than a gift of \$45 million.

Despite his gratitude, however, Marcos tactfully but pointedly made it clear that he has reservations about the way the struggle in South Viet Nam is being waged.

In the Philippines, he pointed out with some pride, a successful war against Communist subversion was fought without the help of any foreign troops.

He noted that the Philippine campaign was based as much on "total friendship to the people," as "total war against the Communists." Marcos thinks the non-military aspects of war in Viet Nam are "an apparent failure."

Unlike Ky, however, the more sophisticated Marcos sees the United States, in the long run, as a Pacific sea and air power rather than as an Asian land power, and this, of course, is a vital distinction that all American presidents have made except Johnson.

Marcos would have the U.S. ultimately withdraw its military power "to existing bases in the outlying islands and archipelagos—Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, and the Philippines."

"Together with the U.S. Seventh Fleet," he says, "this line of defense could be rendered completely impregnable, while offering needed support to any mainland nation that may be threatened by Communist power."

The administration line is that it must plunge on in Viet Nam, for otherwise the United States would have to retreat to San Francisco. Apparently Marcos, like other Asian leaders, does not quite see how the greatest sea and air power in the world can be chased out of the Pacific, irrespective of Viet Nam.

PLANNED LAWLESSNESS THREATENS TO GET OUT OF HAND

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the U.S. News & World Report, in its September 19, 1966, issue, presented the full text of an article, "The Effects of Planned, Mass Disobedience of Our Laws," written by retired Associate Justice Charles E. Whittaker of the U.S. Supreme Court, as published in the September 1966 FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WARNING FROM A NOTED JURIST: "PLANNED LAWLESSNESS THREATENS TO GET OUT OF HAND"

Following is full text of an article, "The Effects of Planned, Mass Disobedience of Our Laws," by retired Associate Justice Charles E. Whittaker of the U.S. Supreme Court, as published in the September, 1966, "FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin":

"Can any thoughtful person reasonably believe that a disorderly society can survive? In all recorded history, none ever has. On the contrary: History shows that every society which became lawless soon succumbed, and that the first evidences of each society's decay appeared in the toleration of disobedience of its laws and the judgments of its courts.

"These are ancient and universal lessons. Yet, in recent times, all of us have daily seen and heard an ever-increasing number of accounts that show, with unmistakable clarity, the rapid spread of a planned course of lawlessness in our land that threatens seriously to get out of hand, and, hence, to destroy law and order.

"While, of course, all of our crime is not due to any one cause, it can hardly be denied that a large part of our current rash and rapid spread of lawlessness has derived from planned and organized mass disrespect for, and defiance of, the law and the courts, induced by the irresponsible and inflammatory preachers of some self-appointed leaders of minority groups 'to obey the good laws, but to violate the bad ones'—which, of course, simply advocates violation of the laws they do not like, or, in other words, the taking of the law into their own hands.

"And this is precisely what their followers have done and are doing—all under the banner of 'peaceable civil disobedience,' which their leaders have claimed to be protected by the peaceable-assembly-and-petition provisions of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

"In truth, that conduct is neither 'peaceable' nor 'civil' in nature, nor is it protected by the First Amendment, as we shall see.

"In furtherance of that philosophy, some of those leaders have indicted their followers to assemble at a focal point, from far and wide—often, unfortunately, with the encouragement and physical support and also frequently at the expense, of well-meaning but misguided church organizations—into large and loosely assembled groups, which, at least, resemble mobs, to wage what they call 'demonstrations' to force the concession of what they demand as their 'rights' in defiance of legal processes, the courts, and all constituted authority.

"Because of general familiarity with the pattern, only a word as to the nature of those 'demonstrations' is needed.

"In the beginning, they consisted of episodic group invasions and temporary appropriations of private stores, first by sitting down and later by lying down therein, and eventually by blocking the entrances thereto with their bodies—conduct which has always been known as criminal trespass.

"Seeing that those trespasses were applauded by many, even in high places, and were generally not punished, but, rather, were compelled to be appeased and rewarded, those leaders and their incited groups quickly enlarged the scope of their activities by massing and marching on the sidewalks, streets and highways—frequently blocking and appropriating them to a degree that precluded their intended public uses.

"And that conduct, too, being nearly always appeased, the pattern has rapidly spread, as one might expect, pretty generally throughout the land, even into most of our university campuses, and, what should be even more alarming—if such is possible—the pattern has now been adopted, and is being followed, by mobs who attempt to thwart the efforts of our Government to conscript the military forces deemed necessary by responsible officials for national purposes—as witness the repeated and brazen burnings of draft cards in such frenzied mobs—and to prevent success of the military's effort to transport troops and their necessary equipment and supplies to critical points, by blocking the movement of such trains with their bodies and otherwise.

"There is now hardly any facet of our society that has not been assaulted—and none is immune from assault—by this pattern of lawlessness.

"'Crime,' says Webster, means: 'any act or omission forbidden by law and punishable upon conviction.' It can hardly be denied that many of those trespasses violated, at least, the criminal-trespass laws of the jurisdictions involved; that those laws imposed penalties for their violation, and, hence, that those trespasses constituted 'crimes.'

"In the first place, that conduct cannot honestly be termed 'peaceable' for its avowed purpose was and is to force direct action outside the law, and, hence, was lawless, and, of course, inherently disturbing to the peace of others. One can hardly deny the truth of the statement written by Mr. Justice Black, joined by two other Justices in June, 1964, that 'force leads to violence, violence to mob conflicts, and these to rule by the strongest groups with control of the most deadly weapons.'

"In the second place, that conduct cannot honestly be termed 'civil disobedience,' for the simple reason that willful violation of the criminal laws is not 'civil disobedience,' but is 'criminal disobedience.'

"And lastly, that criminal conduct is not protected by the peaceable-assembly-and-petition provisions of the First Amendment. That amendment reads: 'Congress shall make no law . . . abridging . . . the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.' Surely, nothing in that language grants a license to any man, or group of men, to violate our criminal laws. Rather, as Mr. Justice Roberts wrote upon the subject in 1939: 'The privilege of a citizen of the United States to use the streets and parks for communication of views on national questions must be regulated in the interest of all; it is not absolute, but is relative, and must be exercised in subordination to the general comfort and convenience, and in consonance with peace and good order . . .' [Italic added.]

"And, as to such demonstrations being an exercise of the First Amendment's right to petition for a redress of grievances, would not every thinking person agree with the statement recently made by the president of Yale University in a speech at Detroit, that the current rash of 'demonstrations' makes 'a ludicrous mockery of the democratic debating process'?

"The pattern of forcing demands by mass or mob actions, outside the law and the courts, has proved—as certainly we should have expected—to be tailor-made for infiltration, use, and take-over by rabble rousers and Communists who are avowedly bent on the breakdown of law, order and morality of our society—and, hence, on its destruction.

"Even though those results may not have been contemplated, and surely weren't wished, by those Americans who so advocated and participated—either conspiratorially, financially, or physically—in such disobedience of our laws, nevertheless they did advocate that philosophy, and they did put its processes into action, and however well—even if ignorantly—motivated, cannot now escape responsibility for its results.

"A sampling of what this pattern of organized mass lawlessness has brought to some of our universities may be seen through a few brief quotations.

The California State superintendent of public instruction, in commenting about conditions on the campus at Berkeley, recently said: 'Demonstrations there provided a vehicle for infiltration by rabble rousers, red-hots and Communists, and resulted in assaults, kidnappings and imprisonment of police officers, the commandeering of public address systems and their use in spewing over the campus the most filthy four-letter words, and the general breakdown of law and order.'

"An Associated Press dispatch of May 19, in speaking of lawless demonstrations in progress at the University of Wisconsin, said that one of the 'leaders,' there openly espoused, from a public rostrum on the campus, that 'the students should band together to bring down the Government by any means.' It also said that the 'demonstrations' there had now been infiltrated and were being led by 'eight to a dozen' ringleaders who are operating under 'pretty good cover,' and at least some of them are known members of the DuBois Clubs of America, which J. Edgar Hoover (Director of the FBI) has described as a 'new Communist-oriented youth organization.'

OPEN DEFiance OF LAW AND ORDER

"These 'demonstrations' have even invaded Howard University—the largest Negro university in our country. In a recent interview, its president, Dr. James M. Nabrit (currently on leave as a special representative to the United Nations), says that he is meeting on his campus 'open defiance of law and order,' which he characterized as a part of a campaign 'to bring the university into general disrepute.' He warned that even though those 'demonstrators' parade under the banner of civil rights, 'they do not believe in civil rights for anyone. They are children of law-

lessness and disciples of destruction. They are people who cloak themselves in the roles of civil rights but plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship. They must, he said, be unmasked for the frauds that they are, and must be fought in every arena."

"A relatively recent issue of 'The Kansas City Star' contained several articles about the general breakdown of law and order on our college campuses. One of them fairly puts the finger on the cause. It did so by quoting one of the 'demonstrating' students. He was asked why some students had abandoned historical 'panty raids' and similar college pranks for open and riotous rebellion. 'Why,' he said, 'you could get kicked out of school for conducting a panty raid and things of that kind, but no one is ever kicked out or punished for demonstrating for something like civil rights.' It is thus plain that the students, knowing just as everyone else knows that riotous conduct in the name of 'civil rights' is not being punished, but is being tolerated, have been thus encouraged to continue and spread their riotous actions.

"These lawless activities, nauseating as they are, can hardly be surprising, for they are plainly some of the results that we should have known would inevitably come from tolerating open and direct preachers to defy and violate the law.

"Another recent article quoted some comments of J. Edgar Hoover about the effects of spreading crime upon the personal safety of our citizens. He said: 'There is too much concern (in this country) . . . for the "rights" of an individual who commits a crime. I think he is entitled to his (legal rights), but I think the citizens of this country ought to be able to walk all the streets of our cities without being mugged, raped, or robbed. But', he said, 'we can't do that today.' And he added: 'All through the country, almost without exception, this condition prevails.'

"The April 10, 1965, issue of the magazine 'America' contained an article on the imperative need for certain and severe punishment of crime, which made many pertinent observations, including this one: '(Government) has no right to turn the cheek of its citizens. Instead, it is gravely obligated—by the very purpose of its existence—to see to their protection.'

"To this, I say amen.

"There are, of course, first duties of citizenship, but there are also first duties of government. It is undoubtedly true, as recited in the theme of the recent presidentially proclaimed Law Day, 1965, that 'A Citizen's First Duty Is to Uphold the Law,' but it is also a first duty of government to enforce the law.

"Because some of our citizens will not voluntarily perform their 'first duty' to uphold the law, our governments, State and federal, are, as said in the article quoted from 'America,' 'gravely obligated—by the very purpose of (their) existence—to see to (the protection of the people)' by, at least, making them obey the law.

"All of us have often been told, and many of us have preached, that crime does not pay, but the recent rash and spread of law defiance, and the successes—even though tenuous and temporary—of that philosophy in obtaining goals, seem to compel a reappraisal of that concept, for, from what we currently see happening, one can reasonably believe that certain types of crime are being permitted to pay.

"Probably because of a rather widespread recognition that, at times and in certain sectors, some Negroes have suffered unconstitutional discriminations, and because many of us have been sympathetic to the ends they seek—and have not, therefore, thought very much about the destructive means they have embarked upon to attain those ends—there has been a rather general public apathy to-

ward their preachers to violate, and their practices in violating, our laws.

But whatever may have been the provocations—and, doubtless, there have been some—no man, or any group or race of men, can be permitted in a government of laws to take the law, or what they think ought to be the law, into their own hands, for that is anarchy, which always results in chaos.

"The fact that the provocations may have been themselves constitutionally unlawful cannot justify unlawful means for their resolution. Both types of conduct are wrong—constitutionally wrong, the one as much as the other. And, obviously, two wrongs cannot make a right.

"All discriminations that violate the Constitution and laws of the United States are readily redressable in our courts, which have always been open to all citizens. And no one has any room to doubt that, if he will resort to those courts, and have the patience to await their processes—as we all must do in an ordered society—all his constitutional and legal rights will be vouchsafed to him, whatever his creed or color.

"But there has been impatience with the judicial processes, manifested by the recent hue and cry for 'action now—not the delays of the law.' Obviously, that cliché, too, calls for direct action in disobedience of the laws, the judgments of the courts, and of all constituted authority.

"It is true that legal processes, being refined and deliberative processes, are slow. But, like the mills of the gods, though they grind slowly, they grind exceedingly fine, and their judgments are most likely to be just.

"In all events, that is the civilized and American way—and there is no other orderly way—peaceably and fairly to decide the issues that arise among us, and to have an ordered liberty.

"The great pity here is that these minority groups are, by their unilateral mass actions outside of and in defiance of the law, actually eroding and destroying the legal processes which alone can ever assure to them, or permanently maintain for them, due process and equal protection of the laws, and that can, thus, protect them from discriminations and abuses by majorities.

"Last May, Mr. Lewis F. Powell, then president of the American Bar Association, in a speech dedicating the new Missouri Bar Center at Jefferson City, said: 'Many centuries of human misery show that once a society departs from the rule of law, and every man becomes the judge of which laws he will obey, only the strongest remain free.'

"I think we must all agree with that statement, and with his conclusion that 'America needs a genuine revival of respect for law and orderly processes, a reawakening of individual responsibility, a new impatience with those who violate and circumvent our laws, and a determined insistence that laws be enforced, courts respected and due process followed.'

"We must take the laws into our hearts rather than into our hands, and seek redress in the courts rather than in the streets if we are to survive as a civilized nation.

"FIRST DUTY: 'PROTECT THE PEOPLE'

"The remedy is as plain as the threat. It is simply to insist that our governments, State and federal, reassume and discharge their 'first duty' of protecting the people against lawless invasions upon their persons and property by the impartial and vigorous enforcement of our criminal laws and by the swift, certain and substantial punishment thereunder of all persons whose conduct violates those laws—and to do so immediately, and hopefully before planned and organized crime has spread beyond the capacities of our peacekeeping machinery to control and suppress.

"These are not platitudes, but are fundamentals and vital, as every thinking man

should see, to the survival of our civilized and cultured society. In no other way can we orderly resolve the issues that confront and divide us, or live together in peace and harmony as a civilized nation of brothers under the fatherhood of God."

THE RISING COST OF MEDICAL CARE

MR. PEARSON. Mr. President, an August 24 newspaper published an article entitled "L.B.J. Orders Inquiry Into Medical Costs." The news account stated that President Johnson had ordered the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor to investigate jointly the rising cost of medical care. The President purports to have figures that show that medical costs rose 7 percent last month; that during the past year hospital charges rose 11.7 percent; and that medical and dental service fees increased by 4.4 percent. It was implied that these increases were in anticipation of, or, as a result of, the implementation of medicare last July.

In connection with the order by the President, I have, since August 24, corresponded with hundreds of doctors, dentists, and hospital administrators and associations in the State of Kansas in an attempt to determine to what degree there there have been increasing medical costs in my State.

Mr. President, the findings thus far have been forwarded to the appropriate agencies, and I now desire to make the results of the survey known to the students of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My inquiries dealt with three divisions of medical costs—hospitalization, doctors' fees, and drugs.

Hospital costs were reported up in most instances in Kansas. However, hospitals in a few Kansas communities such as Newton, Westmoreland, Colby, and Cedar Vale reported little or no increase in costs in the last few months or even the last several years. One hospital in Iola, Kans., reported a 66-cent-per-day decrease in costs from the past year. However, these hospitals did report that their costs, and therefore their patients' costs, would probably go up in the near future—especially in light of the recently passed minimum wage legislation.

National averages show that hospital costs have been going up at the rate of 6 to 8 percent per year for the last 10 years. Kansas has generally followed this average increase. However, figures from the Kansas Hospital Association show a cost increase of \$3.44 per day or 9 percent during the past year to \$37.24 per day. This figure is still below the national average hospital cost per day, which is \$44.48. Most of the hospital administrators who answered my inquiry did not believe that Kansas hospital costs had increased as much as the 11.7 percent figure quoted by the President. However, an administrator in Shawnee Mission, Kans., after averaging the cost increases at his hospital with those at 12 other selected Kansas hospitals, said that the average increase exceeded 11.7 percent for the past year.

Many reasons were given by the administrators and doctors for these increasing costs. Inflation was generally listed as the most important factor. Labor costs are up. And it must be noted that labor costs amount to about 67 percent of the total hospital costs. Many Kansas hospitals have always relied, to a great extent, on voluntary workers and on those who were willing to work for a minimal salary. In recent years, wages have been necessarily increased by the hospitals in order to keep the help. But it was argued that the new minimum wage law will force this cost up far above what it is now. Once semi-skilled and unskilled hospital wage rates go up, the nursing and professional wage rates, I am told, increase in order to keep a balance between the two.

Here is one example given of how the 1966 minimum wage law will increase Kansas hospital costs: A Coffeyville, Kans., hospital, which now pays a bottom wage of \$1.05 per hour, estimates that with the increased wages to unskilled workers at \$1.60 per hour, the correspondingly higher wages to nursing and professional employees, and the increased costs of materials and supplies, their hospital patient cost will increase a minimum of \$15 per day by 1970.

Labor costs do not constitute the only increase. Food costs are also up. Wichita, Kans. hospitals report a cost increase of 24.2 percent this year based upon the price of 55 major food items purchased by the hospitals. Supplies and equipment costs have been increasing steadily at the rate of about 10 percent a year. Construction and maintenance costs are up. Interest rates are reaching a prohibitive rate for hospitals which are having to build more to accommodate the ever increasing numbers of people who demand hospital services. And this requirement for capital improvements is coming at a time when private philanthropy to hospitals is far from adequate to meet the need. Insurance costs which were once unknown to hospitals because of their immunity to lawsuits are going up.

There are still other reasons given for increasing hospital costs. An increasing standard of health care is always being demanded by the public. This demand calls for better equipment and for better trained technicians. More research is required all the time. The public demands better accommodations during their hospital stay than they once did. They want TV, a telephone, air conditioning, et cetera. They are unwilling to stay in a ward. They desire a private or a semiprivate room. All of these things have added to the cost structure of the hospital and have increased the patient's cost while he is in the hospital.

Next, I report on answers received regarding medical fees. A few Kansas doctors reported no increase in fees for several years, even though overhead had been rising steadily. It might be noted that most doctors so reporting were living in smaller communities throughout the State. Most doctors did report an increase in fees within the last 1, 2, or 3 years. But they report that these increases were long overdue, and that the

only reason for the increase was to offset their increased expenses such as rent, salaries, payroll taxes, insurance, supplies, and equipment—plus their own cost of living.

The fee increase most often reported was that for an office call. Typical figures reported were from \$3 to \$4, or from \$4 to \$5. A few increases were reported in surgical fees. But in many instances, surgical and obstetrical fees remained as they had been for 10, 20, even 30 years. Many doctors mentioned that with the exception of the physicians, in the few metropolitan areas of Kansas, doctors had been reluctant to increase fees for many, many years because the people either could not or would not accept the increased fees. The doctors often stated that they had previously offset much of their increasing overhead by working longer hours and seeing more patients. But now they had absorbed as much additional overhead as possible—sometimes as much as 50 percent in the last 10 to 15 years—until they were forced to increase fees.

Not one doctor felt that medicare had a direct relationship to the increased fees. A good number mentioned that it would result in increased costs to the physician because of the additional secretarial help necessary to process the paperwork for medicare patients, even in small private offices. This increased cost might enhance the need for a fee increase at a future date.

One thing mentioned was by many doctors which might appear to be a fee increase, but which it was claimed really is not. Before medicare, most doctors in Kansas, as probably everywhere in our country, charged patients on the basis of their ability to pay. People who could not afford expensive medical treatment were charged reduced, or "token" fees, or many times no fee at all. However, these people, who are now eligible for medicare, are now charged the standard fee because of the medicare tax and fee arrangement. This could appear to be an increase in fees. This practice is, in some instances, hurting others at the same time. Some doctors and clinics reported entering into an agreement with the insurance carrier of medicare in Kansas to the effect that the physician would not charge younger indigents or welfare patients any less than they charged a medicare patient. Therefore, these people who formerly received medical care at a reduced fee and who are not yet eligible for medicare are now having to pay the standard fee for care.

I also inquired into the rising costs of drugs in the State of Kansas. Although returns were not as heavy on this point, the figures showed that overall drug costs were up slightly in my State because of the many new drugs available to the public today. However, many specific drug items which have been in use for a while have decreased in cost. A few of the smaller Kansas communities reported a general decrease in overall drug prices.

Mr. President, in conclusion, the responses received indicate that medical costs of all types—especially hospital costs—appear to be rising in Kansas as

they are in most other States in our country. But, as the answers to my inquiries of doctors and hospital administrators in the State of Kansas would tend to point out, these increases are not so great as the other cost increases our economy is experiencing today.

SENATOR PEARSON ON REDUCTION OF U.S. FORCES IN EUROPE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it was my misfortune not to have been on the floor last Thursday at the time the junior Senator from Kansas made an address on the reduction of U.S. forces in Europe, as contained on page 23665 of the RECORD.

This speech was one of the fine talks made on the floor of the Senate this year. In a relatively few words the able Senator sums up the problem, and I join the majority leader's statement of appreciation for "the thought, the logic and the understanding which went into the speech."

In this connection, let us all note that during the first half of 1966 the exports of West Germany to the United States increased one-third over what they had the first 6 months of 1965—an increase of some \$202.8 million; and although our exports increased to Germany, the net against us was over 18 percent.

Again let me commend one of the better talks made on the Senate floor this year.

PRESERVING A FOREST FOR RECREATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have long felt that the new Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area of West Virginia will become one of the country's leading vacationlands in coming years.

I have extended invitations far and wide for visitors to enjoy the scenic and vacation sites in this area. I am happy to make that invitation again now as I have recently in an article entitled "Preserving a Forest for Recreation" which appears in the September edition of American Forests magazine.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed, as follows:

PRESERVING A FOREST FOR RECREATION
(By ROBERT C. BYRD, U.S. Senator, West Virginia)

Perhaps next year, and certainly in the years to follow many of the scores of millions of people who will crowd the cities of the Atlantic Coast will enjoy one of the newest and best recreation areas in the United States. This is the 100,000-acre Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area which was established in 1965 for the enjoyment of our city dwellers.

This new recreation area sprawls over hills and valleys of Monongahela National Forest along the eastern edge of West Virginia, bringing together some of nature's finest displays of beauty and geological attractions. To coin a phrase, this area holds something of interest for everyone—swimmers, boaters, hunters, fishermen, historians, nature lovers and for those who just want the enjoyment of a tree-shaded mountain.

One of the most exciting aspects of Spruce Knob, to me, will be its soothing effects on the people in our cities who are now faced daily with a population explosion, water and air pollution, traffic jams and the myriad of other problems which wear on the human nervous system.

At a safe freeway-driving-speed it is only three or four hours away from Washington, D.C., and it has been estimated that it is within 350 miles for some 65 million people—more than one-third of the nation's total population today. The U.S. Forest Service expects at least one million visitors a year to the area in the next few years and ultimately some five million a year will enjoy its relaxing qualities.

I have long recognized the need for a major recreation area of this type in the eastern part of our country, and the potential of the Monongahela National Forest was too great to let slip by. I was happy to sponsor the legislation which created the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, and I was pleased to have the full support of members of such an outstanding organization as The American Forestry Association. It was approved by Congress and signed into law by President Johnson in September, 1965.

The principal attractions, around which the entire development will revolve, are Spruce Knob and Seneca Rocks. Spruce Knob is the highest point in West Virginia, rising to a peak of 4,860 feet and offering a panoramic view of numerous smaller hills all covered with stately trees and colorful wildflowers. Soon to go up near that peak will be an observatory tower, standing about 25 feet high, all of native stone, and affording visitors a more extensive view of the hills, valleys, streams, and rock formations.

Before I catalogue some of the many attractions for visitors, permit me to note another feature of this recreation site. Perhaps it is the important feature of the development because it was the foundation of the things to follow. It concerns the success of rehabilitating an area which had been destroyed by fire, leaving scarred and blackened what are now scenic and tree-covered hills.

The Monongahela Forest as we know it today, was, in the early 1900's, called the "Monongahela Burn."

It burned many times until the U.S. Forest Service stepped in to acquire the land, to plant new trees and to salvage the historical monuments for others to enjoy today. It represents a wise and valuable rehabilitation of nature's resources which can be used for many millions of persons today.

Now, pack the family camping equipment in the car and let's leave for Spruce Knob. U.S. Highways 33, 50, 219, and 250 will lead you to the area. Once you have arrived, you may want to pitch your family tent and unpack your camping equipment at one of the many grounds reserved for this activity.

What to do first? If you are hikers, try Seneca Rocks, which rise 1,000 feet above a branch of the Potomac River and which are considered one of the most spectacular and interesting natural wonders east of the Mississippi. They are sometimes compared in appearance to a ruined castle, but they record the geological history of the country.

Is there an explorer in your group? He will like "Smoke Hole Cave!" This is a former Indian home and is located on a mountain top and is outstanding for its maze of corridors and side rooms, representing Indian efforts toward securing multiroom dwellings.

Have you ever thought of living underground? The Seneca Caverns are believed to have been the home of a special Indian Princess. They are a series of subterranean rooms, located only a few miles from the highest peak in the State and are decorated with various formations of stalactites and stalagmites which have been fashioned by drops of water trickling through the roof of

the caverns for thousands of years. The deepest room is 165 feet below the earth. Well-lighted for tourists, they contain the Statue of Liberty, Niagara Falls, and the Metropolitan Opera, to name just a few of the interesting formations.

Would you like to fish? Try "Big Spring." This is situated at the base of Cave Mountain and is considered one of the most historic fishing grounds in the country. The Shawnee Indians first used the area as their principal source of food but were driven out by the Seneca Indians, who eventually ruled all of the region bordering the river.

Then there are the major tributaries of the Potomac River—the South Branch and the North and South Forks of the South Branch—which give life to the Potomac Valley. Feeding into these streams are dozens of clear, cold, spring-fed streams flowing from forested watersheds, creating scenic attractions as they cascade out of the high mountains into the valley below. As it winds its way down between the rocky cliffs of the gorge, the South Fork creates some of the most spectacular fishing water and scenic beauty to be found in the eastern United States. The South Branch is noted for fishing and white river water canoeing.

How about a day of just sightseeing? Of the section famous as the "Smoke Hole Country," one writer recently said, "The Smoke Hole country lies in almost untouched beauty, a haven of escape, a shangrila of all things—trees, flowers, animal life, scenic vistas, and climate. It provides a retreat from the disturbing noises of expanding American industrialism."

Does "Hermit Island" strike an inviting sound? We have one on Spruce Knob. It encompasses slightly more than 4 acres in size and during a visit there in 1933, one botanist found 283 species of flora, indicating the abundance and variety of plants at this level. Many nature-study groups make treks into the valley to collect rare plants. Game and fish are numerous and varied, but, strangely enough, there are only a few insects and no objectionable vermin.

Would you like to see some tall trees? The high country around Spruce Knob is a bit of Canada transplanted into the West Virginia countryside, with native red spruce and other forest tree species being unique in the typically Appalachian hardwood area. They grow beyond the 30-foot levels.

This is a "National" recreation area because these natural assets belong to us all. Thomas Jefferson wrote that the view at Harper's Ferry was worth a voyage across the Atlantic. Well, then, I will say that it is worth traveling a little farther to see the top of West Virginia, the Smoke Holes, Seneca caverns, and the great rocks standing above narrow valleys.

I believe the charm of this scene was best captured many years ago by a visitor who came to Spruce Knob, saw the wonders before him and wrote a one-line description. It Was: "Paradise Discovered, October 23, 1725."

After just a short visit, it won't be difficult to repeat the same line.

NEW ALUMINUM FISHING VESSEL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, earlier this week the Aluminum Association presented to Members of Congress and officials of the Federal Government plans for an aluminum trawler convertible to five uses. With only slight modifications the new aluminum vessel can be used as a double-rigged shrimp trawler, a stern-fishing trawler, a tuna long-liner, a purse seiner, or a pocket-size factory ship.

One of the primary considerations in designing the vessel was the recently enacted fishing vessel construction differential subsidy law of which I was a co-

sponsor. This legislation provides funds up to 50 percent of new fishing vessel costs if owner, vessels, and the fishery in which the vessels will operate meet certain requirements. The program is administered by the Bureau of Loans and Grants of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

In addition to tailoring the new aluminum vessel to the subsidy program, the Aluminum Association has made available detailed plans and specifications for construction at a modest fee of \$250 per vessel built.

Mr. President, the importance of this effort being made by the Aluminum Association to meet one of the most important needs of our fishing industry, that is modernization of the fleet, is exemplified by the fact that in 1965 the Russian fishing catch was 5.6 metric tons or 3.3 million tons more than that of the U.S. fishermen. The United States imported 55 percent of its fish consumption last year including \$505,000 worth of Soviet fishing products. The new 86-foot, all-aluminum convertible fishing vessel design is being offered as a possible solution for the U.S. fishing industry in its international competition for food from the sea.

One of the advantages of aluminum hull construction is greater capacity. For example, the Aluminum Association's 86-foot vessel will carry 38 more tons of fish than a comparable steel craft, when loaded to maximum draft. Homebound with equal payloads, the aluminum vessel is a knot or more faster than a steel counterpart, as she is on the outward-bound run. Normal range for the aluminum version is 1,050 nautical miles more than the steel boat.

According to the Aluminum Association the 11.5-percent higher cost of aluminum construction will be more than offset by economies of the aluminum craft in greater payload capacity and versatility. In addition, the short payout times quickly amortize costs of aluminum construction.

At the recent presentation, the Aluminum Association's representative, M. C. Crockett stated:

Aluminum construction has proven feasible for Navy, Coast Guard, commercial and pleasure vessels and may well be the answer to the U.S. fishing industry's search for greater efficiency, profits and fish production.

Mr. President, whether there are new fishing boats constructed of aluminum, steel, wood, or fiberglass, it is my hope that the modernization of our fishing fleet will continue at an ever-increasing rate so that U.S. fishermen can compete on the high seas with the Soviets and other foreign fishermen for the vast resources that are out there for the taking. The new convertible aluminum trawler is a welcome addition to the efficient, modern designs from which our fishermen may choose.

INTERNATIONAL ANTIDUMPING CODE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a memorandum on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 relating to the proposed negotiation

of an international antidumping code, and I have been requested that it be brought to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 22, 1966.

MEMORANDUM

Re: Legislative History of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 as it Bears Upon the Legal Invalidity of the Proposed Negotiation of an International Antidumping Code

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 Office of the Special Representative at the current Kennedy Round of trade negotiations in Geneva under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

This memorandum analyzes the legislative history of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to the legal authority of the Office of the Special Representative to hold such hearings or to conduct such negotiations. The authority of the Office of the Special Representative derives solely from the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The legislative history demonstrates clearly that there is no legal authority under the Trade Expansion Act for the negotiation of an international antidumping code. The United States Senate, in S. Con. Res. 100, recently reaffirmed that the Trade Expansion Act was not intended to and did not encompass the area of antidumping.

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. The legislative history demonstrates clearly that the negotiation of an international antidumping code is legally invalid for this failure to follow the procedural safeguards. These procedural safeguards were viewed as vital and essential to the Act since they provided the only restraint from the otherwise broad authority delegated to the President.

1. THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962 DEMONSTRATES CLEARLY THAT THERE IS NO LEGAL AUTHORITY FOR THE NEGOTIATION OF AN ANTIDUMPING CODE

An international antidumping code would necessarily require modification or revision of the Antidumping Act of 1921. Legislative history of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act understandably is meager on the relationship of this statute to the Antidumping Act since the latter clearly dealt with matters of domestic economic regulation of unfair competition that fall beyond the purview of the former.

"The purpose of the proposed bill (forerunner of the Antidumping Act) is to prevent the stifling of domestic industries by the dumping of foreign merchandise. Over 20 years ago, by the enactment of the Sherman Antitrust Law, Congress recognized the necessity of legislation to prevent unfair methods of competition and monopoly within the United States, but effective legislation to prevent discriminations and unfair practices from abroad, to [sic] destroy [sic] competition and control [sic] prices, has not been enacted." H.R. Rep. No. 479, 66th Cong., 1st Sess., 1 (1919).

However, the references that do appear demonstrate conclusively that Congress did not contemplate any implicit revision of or

capacity to revise the Antidumping Act in the 1962 act or within the authority delegated to the President thereunder. The Senate Finance Committee Report specifically stated:

"Section 257(h) provides that section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and import restrictions imposed thereunder shall be unaffected by the bill. *Other laws not to be affected include the Antidumping Act* and section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930, which relates to countervailing duties" (S. Rep. No. 2059, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., 19 (1962)). (Emphasis added.)

It thus becomes clear that "special dumping duties" imposed pursuant to the Antidumping Act are not comprehended within the phrase "duty or other import restriction" found throughout the Trade Expansion Act.

An exchange between Secretary of Treasury Dillon and Congressman Utt in the Hearings Before the House Committee on Ways and Means considering the proposed 1962 act reinforces the view that, in the contemplation both of the Administration which proposed the bill, and of the Congress which enacted it into law, the Trade Expansion Act did not in any way touch upon the Antidumping Act:

"Secretary DILLON. Treasury is responsible for carrying out antidumping activities. I do not think this bill affects the antidumping legislation at all.

"Mr. UTT. I was wondering if you could point out to me where the antidumping legislation is still in force?

"Secretary DILLON. I think that is a totally separate pieces of legislation. It never was part of the trade agreements legislation. It is a separate piece.

"Mr. UTT. We have several sections entitled 'Repeals.' I am wondering if any of those sections on antidumping are repealed by reference?

"Secretary DILLON. So far as I know, nothing is. I cannot give you a positive answer, but as far as I am informed, it is my understanding there is no change at all in the antidumping procedures so far as this bill is concerned." Hearings on H.R. 9900 Before the House Committee on Ways and Means, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 2, at 897-98 (1962).

Another Administration spokesman, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, gave broad assurances that the government would not act under the 1962 legislation so as to undermine other statutory protection against unfair foreign competition:

"And I am resolved that the Government shall take no action in the field of tariff policy that will work undue hardship to U.S. industry, workers, and farmers through *unfair foreign competition*." Hearings on H.R. 9900 Before the House Committee on Ways and Means, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 1, at 81 (1962). (Emphasis added.)

Section 201 of the 1962 Act confers authority upon the President to modify "other import restrictions" as well as duties under specified circumstances but the legislative history suggests that the term "other import restrictions" refers primarily to quotas:

"He [the President] can also impose additional import restrictions (e.g. quotas)." H.R. Rep. No. 1818, 87th Cong., 2d Sess. 2 (1962).

"The basic grant of authority also permits the modification of existing import restrictions other than duties, while at the same time authorizing the imposition of additional import restrictions (e.g. quotas)." Id. at 14.

Although there are occasional instances within the legislative history of efforts to expand the term "other import restrictions" beyond mere quotas, it is significant that no such effort can be found which alludes to antidumping regulations:

"What are they [other import restrictions]? Embargoes, quotas, import licenses,

currency manipulations, quarantines, and a decision that goods must be delivered within 5 days after they are manufactured." 108 Cong. Rec. 18674 (daily ed. Sept. 18, 1962) (remarks of Senator CURTIS).

A memorandum on the 1962 act prepared by the United States Tariff Commission and submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee suggests a very limited delegation of authority to the President to modify duties or other import restrictions. This limited authority is inconsistent with the bald assertion of power by the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations to revise or modify the Antidumping Act of 1921 even if some justification could be found for treating antidumping regulations as coming within the scope of "duty or other import restriction."

"The existing authority to proclaim modifications of existing duties is apparently intended to permit the President to make rate and classification changes *within and subordinate to the statutory structure* of the tariff classification schedules, and not to permit him to change the scope of *any statutory provisions*. In any event, whatever the President's ultimate authority under section 350(a)(1) may be, he has so confined his proclaimed 'modifications.' It is assumed that there would be no departure from past practice in exercising the authority under the new legislation." Hearings on H.R. 9900 Before the House Committee on Ways and Means, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 2, at 923 (1962). (Emphasis added.)

2. THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962 DEMONSTRATES CLEARLY THAT NEGOTIATIONS OF AN INTERNATIONAL ANTIDUMPING CODE IS ILLEGAL BECAUSE THE PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS PROVIDED BY THE STATUTE HAVE NOT BEEN FOLLOWED

Apart from the fact that there is no authority under the 1962 act for the Proposed Hearings on an International Antidumping Code, these hearings are legally invalid for the additional reason that statutorily imposed procedural safeguards have not been followed. The legislative history fully confirms the importance impliedly attached to these safeguards by their explicit prescription in section 221 of the act. The President acknowledged retention of most of the "peril point" procedural safeguards in his proposed legislation:

"The four basic stages of the traditional peril point procedures and safeguards will be retained and improved:

"The President will refer to the Tariff Commission the list of proposed items for negotiations;

"The Tariff Commission will conduct hearings to determine the effect of concessions on these products;

"The Commission will make a report to the President, specifically based, as such reports are based now, upon its findings of how new imports might lead to the idling of productive facilities, the inability of domestic producers to operate at a profit, and the unemployment of workers as the result of anticipated reductions in duties; . . ." Message from the President of the United States Relative to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program, Hearings on H.R. 9900 Before the House Committee on Ways and Means, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 1, at 7 (1962).

Not one of these procedural requirements has been satisfied with respect to the proposed negotiation of an international antidumping code.

Congress was apprised of the fact that the support of organized labor for the 1962 act was dependent upon strict adherence to these procedural safeguards:

"The tariff-cutting authority the President would use is discretionary and flexible, but the safeguards which the bill establishes against injury to American workers, busi-

ness, and farmers who may be affected by increased imports are mandatory and inflexible. These safeguards are provided at every stage of the tariff-negotiating process. We regard these safeguards as essential features of the trade expansion program without which it would not have our support." Supporting Memorandum of AFL-CIO on the Trade Expansion Program (H.R. 9900), Hearings on H.R. 9900 Before the House Committee on Ways and Means, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 2, at 1159 (1962).

The statutory language ought to be sufficient to make the point, but the legislative history removes any conceivable doubt on whether Congress shared labor's view as to the mandatory nature of the procedural safeguards incorporated in the statute:

"This authority [to make changes in the import restrictions of the United States] is circumscribed and conditioned by certain required determinations the President *must* make and procedural steps he must follow (sec. 201(a)(2))." H.R. Rep. No. 1818, 87th Cong., 2d Sess. 14 (1962). (Emphasis added.)

Similarly, testimony of Acting Secretary of State George W. Ball before the House Committee on Ways and Means makes it clear beyond peradventure that the Administration that proposed this bill joined Congress in complete consensus on the essential pre-requisite status of these procedures:

"The new law contemplates that the Tariff Commission would be consulted and that it would make an economic study and that the advice would be available to the President as a condition to his proposing to enter into any trade agreement" Hearings on H.R. 9900 Before the House Committee on Ways and Means, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 6, at 3883 (1962). (Emphasis added.)

It would be redundant to recite the numerous expressions found in the legislative history voicing concern that the procedural safeguards serve as essential restraints upon the broad authority delegated to the President under this act. However, one statement admirably exemplifies the tenor of all in focusing upon the ultimate act of faith on the part of the legislature that the Executive will respect the democratic concept of government by law:

"We come to a basic point, are we going to trust the Executive or are we not? I grant that that lies at the base of a great deal of the problems that face all of us today. I myself say that we must look at the Executive not from the standpoint of the individual or his political party but we must look at it from the standpoint of government by law, if you please: What are the correct procedures, the functions of this grant of executive authority? Where does the Congress fit in? In my judgment there is no question but what we in Congress must delegate authority to the Executive, and what we should be paying attention to, as I think this committee has done, is the guidelines that we have put in to restrict or confine the Executive in the exercise of the authority." 108 Cong. Rec. 11151 (daily ed. June 28, 1962) (remarks of Congressman CURTIS).

COVINGTON & BURLING.

Counsel To: Cement Industry Committee for Tariff and Antidumping.

FREDONIA, KANS., BUILDS ITS OWN AIRPORT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it is indeed refreshing to find in my State of Kansas a community which not only believes in doing things on its own, but does them—even if it means building its own airport. This may sound strange, or even less than conceivable. But such is the case in Fredonia, Kans.

There, I am told, the citizens themselves erected an airport, estimated to cost \$40,000 to \$60,000, for only \$7,800. It is almost unbelievable, but is nevertheless fact. The major factor here, however, was a unity of purpose, desire, and determination by the citizens of Fredonia.

Mr. President, a keyman behind the project was Charles Scanlan, who steered the people in their efforts. It was Mr. Scanlan who convinced his city's leaders that funds which had been derived from leasing the city-owned land earmarked for the airport—after 10 years, a total of \$9,000—could be spent by the city to erect the airport themselves. It was felt a local bond issue to finance the project, which engineers estimated would cost between \$40,000 and \$60,000, would have been an excessive burden on the taxpayers of Fredonia.

Instead, Scanlan gathered about 25 interested persons who became the project crew. They prepared the area themselves, acquired base rock at cost, and contracted for laying the surface with a minimum bid. The lights were acquired from a company in Ohio—22 lights were purchased—for \$500. These lights are equipped with photocells to come on automatically. A 100,000-candlepower beacon with a 30-mile visibility range was purchased from the same firm for \$249.

Mr. President, when completed, the city had a 30- by 2,620-foot paved runway, other needed improvements for an airport, all in 90 days. It fully meets the FAA standards.

Mr. President, I feel this is one of the most responsible cooperative efforts ever undertaken by a community—in Kansas or elsewhere. Rather than seek another Federal handout, these people took it upon themselves to do the job economically, efficiently, and proudly.

It should be noted that this community of 3,300 not only helped itself immediately by providing easier aircraft access to Fredonia, but opened the door for future industrial growth.

While Fredonia may not be large in size or population, it has amply demonstrated it is a giant in spirit and dedication when it comes to working for the betterment of its people.

BUILDING PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Public Works met in executive session on Tuesday, September 20, and considered a number of building prospectuses submitted to it by the executive branch, under the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of projects approved by the committee be printed at this point in the RECORD. The list contains 32 prospectuses approved by the committee, comprising 34 new buildings and the extension, alteration, or modification of 8 existing buildings.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Building prospectuses location and project	[In thousands of dollars]
Arizona, Tucson: Post office building	5,121
Federal office building	4,434
Arkansas, Batesville: Post office, courthouse and Federal office building	1,841
California:	
W. Los Angeles, post office	621
San Ysidro, border station	4,730
Florida, Jacksonville: Post office	7,643
Georgia:	
Atlanta:	
Courthouse, Federal office building	27,353
Post office	21,816
Post office courthouse (CR)	2,312
Griffin, post office, Federal office building	1,567
Rome, post office, courthouse	3,320
Waycross, post office, courthouse, Federal office building	2,519
Illinois:	
Alton, Courthouse, Federal office building	1,460
Carbondale:	
Post office	2,005
Post office (CR)	250
Chicago research center	3,508
Maine, Waterville: Post office, Federal office building	1,420
Mississippi, Oxford: Post office, courthouse, Federal office building	2,994
Missouri, St. Louis: Post office (estimated)	20,889
New Hampshire, Manchester: Post office, Federal office building	7,531
New York:	
Champlain, border station	4,201
Hyde Park, FDR Library (extension)	1,711
New York, Post Office (extension)	79,553
Syracuse:	
Post Office	10,868
Courthouse, Federal office building	13,690
North Carolina, Charlotte:	
Post Office	4,637
Post Office, courthouse (CR)	1,624
Ohio, Mansfield: Post Office, Federal office building	4,990
Rhode Island, Woonsocket: Post Office, Federal office building	1,627
South Carolina, Florence: Post Office, courthouse, Federal office building	4,603
South Dakota, Rapid City:	
Post Office	2,636
Federal office building	2,007
Virgin Islands, Charlotte Amalie: Post Office, courthouse, Federal office building	3,965
Virginia, Roanoke:	
Post Office	3,017
Federal office building	5,534
Post Office, courthouse (CR)	255
Washington, Wenatchee: Post Office, Federal office building (rev.)	4,308
West Virginia, Morgantown: Post Office, Federal office building	3,059
Wisconsin, La Crosse: Post Office, courthouse	3,568
Washington, D.C.:	
Federal Triangle completion, Grand Plaza and Pennsylvania Avenue annex	41,301
Internal Revenue Service (extension)	26,656
South Portal, Federal office building	28,568
Total	376,712

OUT OF HAND

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Williamson Daily News of Friday, September 9, 1966, carried an editorial, entitled "Out of Hand."

I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUT OF HAND

Civil Rights demonstrations have taken a new and predictable turn.

In an attempt to induce a Milwaukee Circuit Court Judge to resign from the all white Fraternal Order of Eagles, members of the Milwaukee Youth Council of the NAACP demonstrated in front of his home. And, of course, counter demonstrations were staged by whites, the situation prompting the Governor to seek a court order limiting participation in such affairs.

More significant was the action of the State Industrial Commission in arranging a fact-finding hearing to inquire into the discriminatory practices of private clubs.

Here is an indication of how far out of line the so-called Civil Rights movement has gotten. Taking the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision as an arbitrary starting point, it began as a crusade to win for Negro citizens enjoyment of the full rights of citizenship they are entitled to—freedom to register and vote, to attend the same public schools white children attend, to enjoy on a basis of equality public facilities paid for in full or in part by the common taxpayer.

These were and are legitimate objectives, appealing to the sense of justice of every citizen. But those promoting and, in at least some cases, profiting financially from the "movement" were not content. Equality of treatment was not enough. They sought special privilege. Being admitted to the same neighborhood schools open to all other children did not satisfy them. They demanded the distribution of school children all over a Community or District, regardless of place of residence, for the purpose of achieving a proportionate racial mix. Access to employment on a non-discriminatory basis was not enough. Demands were made for the reservation of jobs for Negroes on the basis of their population representation. Non-discrimination in public housing was not enough. The demand was and is for law denying the owner of private property the right to restrict his choice of tenants. The right of access to goods and services offered the public by private interests—such as hotels, stores and restaurants—was not enough. The demand was and is for statutory denial of a man's right to sell his own house only to whom he chooses.

And now, as witness the incidents in Milwaukee, the demand is for denial of the right of individuals to join together in a club or other association limited to those they mutually desire to mingle with.

Where will it stop?

AMERICA'S POLICE OFFICERS: 20TH CENTURY CRISIS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, "The Wanderer," a national Catholic weekly, of August 4, 1966, carried an editorial titled "America's Police Officers: 20th Century Crisis."

I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

AMERICA'S POLICE OFFICERS: 20TH CENTURY CRISIS

(By Ted Humes)

Last winter, Patrolman James Laffey of the Pittsburgh Police Department stopped four youths in a car in the city's Schenley Park in the heart of the city's Civic and Medical Center. They had been acting suspiciously and Officer Laffey observed a case of beer in the back of the car. He asked for the driver's owner card and driver's license.

What he got instead was a vicious beating administered by all four of the youths who savagely punched him in the face, then took turns beating and kicking him in the face, head and body. They then fled through the park, with their lights off, crashing through a barricade to escape.

After regaining consciousness, Officer Laffey managed to give the youth's car license number over his patrol car radio. He was then taken to Montefiore Hospital with severe head, face and body lacerations, a concussion, and a broken nose. His medical expenses came to almost \$2,000.

However, Patrolman Laffey was luckier than a fellow police officer in nearby Mercer County. There a rookie patrolman, Rodney Wentling, 22, was checking out a stolen car parked in a used car lot in Greenville, Pa. As he approached the car in which three teenagers, ages 13, 15, and 15 were seated, a blast from a rifle killed him instantly.

The most recent of a series of tragedies involving law officers occurred in Pittsburgh's Central Police Station where a young officer, Joseph Gaetano, was returning a prisoner to his cell from arraignment. Because the charge was not a felony, Officer Gaetano did not handcuff the prisoner, even though police regulations regarding handcuffing of prisoners in transit is mandatory. Officer Gaetano felt he was giving him a "break." He paid for this humanitarian impulse with his life. The prisoner seized Gaetano's revolver in the elevator and killed him instantly. Like Wentling, before him, Patrolman Gaetano was young, married, had no children. A whole lifetime before him.

Except for Officer Laffey, the disposition of these cases is now in the hands of the respective police fraternal organizations, which will administer a modest monthly widow's pension to the survivors.

Two police officers killed, one severely beaten—in the space of a few months. This is no more nor less than what happens on the average metropolitan police force in a given period. The number of peace officers killed and assaulted in the line of duty is growing with alarming frequency. And, while policemen are being killed, assaulted and maimed, respect for the profession seems to diminish by the same ratio, while political justices compound the problem by their inordinate solicitude for the alleged rights of felons which makes it all but impossible to prove the commission of a crime short of catching the criminal in the act. And even then, easy is the word. Police are unable to arrest looters who are carting out goods from sacked stores before their very eyes.

And what price does a police officer pay for serving in one of mankind's noblest, neediest professions? He is taunted and jeered at by professional do-gooders and civil rights activists and the social engineers who wring their hands unctuously for the perpetrators of foul deeds and put the blame on "society." He is compelled to assume a posture of stoic indifference when hooligans and beatnik rabble burn draft cards, hoist enemy flags, display their vulgarisms and utter their obscenities in public. He must

permit himself to be kicked and mauled and spat upon and vilified when he carries limp and ragged activists into a van load of howling beatniks. He must stand idly by and be insulted by criminal elements who keep abreast of the latest Supreme Court decisions; he must stand by and watch with a heavy heart while a convicted rapist walks out of jail to beat and assault another victim because of some minor defect which some sharp-eyed public defender spotted in his arrest or arraignment.

Above all he must not lay a hand on the hoodlum, even if he is coming at him with a broken beer bottle, lest he feel the fury of CORE, the ADA, the American Civil Liberties Union and the professional bleeding hearts who infest the body politic.

And if he does happen to kill a crazed man wielding a gun or a knife, he is apt as not to wind up on a "Wanted for Murder" poster of a civil rights organization, as one unfortunate New York officer discovered when it was a question of his life or the knife wielder's.

Or before a Civilian Police Review Board—made up of a 'jury of his peers' with just the 'right' racial and religious makeup—some of the town's leading citizens, lawyers, teachers, perhaps a minister and a bond salesman—citizens who can be trusted not to know what it feels like to stop a vehicle full of drunken youths or arrest a rioter carrying out a television set from a burning store.

And what of the monetary rewards for America's first line of defense? While nobody in his right mind joins the police force to be able to retire to Bar Harbour, they do expect a living wage. Certainly as much as the 'social worker' and the 'social expert,' the 'case worker,' the 'war on poverty administrator.'

The average police officer in Pittsburgh, for example, if he manages to live through 25 turbulent years, can content himself with a pension of about \$285 a month. During his career, he will take home an average of \$80 to \$90 a week after deductions. His pension fund deduction alone comes to almost \$40 a month—no Federal pension to cushion it. Unlike the Federal bureaucrat, to whom a generous Congress has seen fit to give fringe benefits unparalleled for similar occupations in all of American industry, there are no generous 'matching' funds for the cop on the beat. His hospitalization deductions are also considerably higher than the average for other industrial workers in his area. Meantime hordes of 'poverty' workers, 'planners' and 'social careerists' will earn ten, fourteen and eighteen thousand dollars for innumerable 'studies' and 'reports' and 'workshops,' most of which when put together don't amount to a Tinker's Dam.

For breaking up mobs of surly pickets and civil rights demonstrators, for transporting homicidal prisoners, for entering darkened warehouses and jewelry stores when a door is ajar, for manning a street post when howling mobs have fired the stores and are pelting bricks and Molotov Cocktails from rooftops, not to mention the ever-present abuse whenever he tries to make an arrest, the average cop in America makes less than the proverbial Ditchdigger. And yet the Pittsburgh Civil Service Commission recently rejected thirty percent of the applicants for police jobs because they were not "tempermentally or psychologically suited for such a complex undertaking as police officer!"

As a result, many policemen have to moonlight; working in warehouses, guarding shopping centers, driving trucks, or laying tile and brick on weekends.

St. Michael, patron saint of policemen, must surely weep when he contemplates the plight of the men behind the shining badges.

Denied the same bargaining rights that accrue to the organized lay groups, without the benefit of vociferous professional educationists and lobbyists such as the NEA, forbidden to dramatize their plight like the NMU for the New York Transit Workers, policemen must rely instead upon an awakened citizenry already staggering under the financial burdens imposed upon it by the Great Society, and the all too many cynical politicians and demagogues which serve it.

The Great Society is pouring millions of dollars of slush money into the Nation's cities for every imaginable purpose; for poverty and "head start", anti-pollution and public housing, highways and hospitals, planning and more "planning."

These Federal bounties have spawned an entire new cult of "planners" and "social scientists" who conduct endless studies, prepare voluminous reports where they end up in the government's labyrinthine files. The extravagance and waste in connection with the "anti-poverty" program is a national scandal, as "poverty warriors" receive double in salaries what capable men and women receive in other comparable activities.

Policemen, least of all, are looking for a guaranteed income, or Federal subsidies. But when government abandons its traditional role of protecting life and property, preventing fraud and violence and emphasizes instead the attainment of a worldly Utopia through an all-embracing Welfare State, somebody has to be sacrificed, in this case our police officers.

Thus while HEW's social engineers become the pampered favorites of the Great Society, while "poverty" has become a full-time career and relief chiseling takes its place as an accepted norm in American life, the convulsive effects of pyramiding crime and racial disturbances tear at the very fabric of our society; a society which by its apathy and indifference hastens our decay by imposing upon its peace officers impossible conditions to combat the decadence.

REACTION OF SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTER ANDREI GROMYKO TO THE PROPOSED PEACE OFFENSIVE BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on last Saturday I expressed to the press my disappointment in Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko's reaction to Ambassador Goldberg's most recent peace offensive.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement, which sums up my reaction, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

I am disappointed in the reaction of Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to the proposed peace offensive put before the United Nations by Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, speaking for President Johnson and the United States. If I may paraphrase Mr. Gromyko's remark in reverse, "There were many signs testifying to the seriousness of the intention of Washington to seek a settlement" in the Vietnam war. Personally, I can see much room for discussion of a constructive nature which would seek to bring the struggle in Vietnam to an honorable conclusion.

Mr. Gromyko, who could, if the Soviet Union so desired, play a very constructive part in settling this problem, has chosen instead not to do so. Mr. Gromyko reiterates the four point proposal for negotiation put

forward by North Vietnam as the proper basis for ending the war.

First of these is "unconditional cessation of bombing of North Vietnam." Ambassador Goldberg has stated that the United States would cease bombing of North Vietnam if "in public or private" North Vietnam would give evidence that it would begin to withdraw its forces from South Vietnam.

The second point is "withdrawal of forces of the United States and its allies from South Vietnam." Ambassador Goldberg has indicated, and so has the President, that we are not only prepared to do so, but in fact, to initiate a phased withdrawal of U.S. troops if North Vietnam would do so, and a complete withdrawal of U.S. troops once peace was achieved and guaranteed in that country and area.

The third North Vietnamese point is "removal of all foreign armaments from South Vietnam." The President has stated many times that he would be prepared to do this once peace was achieved and Ambassador Goldberg reiterated that statement on yesterday.

The fourth point, "granting the Vietnamese people a chance to solve their own problems" has been proposed on numerous occasions by both the President and Ambassador Goldberg, all to no avail.

It appears to me that the Soviet Foreign Minister has continued to adopt a frozen point of view and an unbending attitude. In contrast, I would point out that once again Ambassador Goldberg stated the position of the United States when he declared in his speech "we have not been and are not now inflexible in our position." In other words, the United States has stated that it is flexible to any reasonable suggestion which will be forthcoming, which would seek to bring to an honorable conclusion the conflict which exists at the present time in Vietnam.

It is, indeed, regrettable that the Soviet Union, one of the two co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference, did not see fit to match the proposals of Ambassador Goldberg. It is unfortunate that in the United Nations a forum to seek ways and means towards a settlement of disputes that the conciliatory, flexible and anything but naive offer of Ambassador Goldberg was not accepted in the spirit in which it was intended.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 14745, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, reported with amendments.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the full approval and the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare [Mr. HILL], I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of routine morning business tomorrow, there be a time limitation on amendments of 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the proponent of the amendment; that 4 hours of debate be allowed on the bill; and that the agreement be in the usual form.

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

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, September 27, 1966, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14745), making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]: Provided, That in the event he is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: Provided further, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: Provided, That the said leaders, or either of them may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill on a brief matter I want to raise. I know how busy he is. I want to relieve him from further attendance at the earliest possible moment. Following that, I shall make a brief statement on the bill itself, setting forth my complete support of the Senator from Alabama and the bill.

LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL: OREGON RESEARCH INSTITUTE PROBLEM

Mr. President, there is one matter I would like to discuss with the manager of the bill. It concerns a problem which was brought to my attention by Mr. Richard Hammersley, who is director of administrative services of the Oregon Research Institute, on September 13.

Mr. Hammersley called to my attention through a thoughtful letter the problem that his organization and similar organizations would face in the 1967 appropriations act were the prohibition contained in the 1966 act to be retained in law.

As Senators know, Federal research grants presently go to three types of institutions: one, educational institutions; two hospitals or service organizations where fundamental research is a secondary function; and three, independent nonprofit research organizations engaged in the promotion of products such as the Salk vaccine where fundamental research is also a secondary function.

The Oregon Research Institute, however, is in a fourth category. It differs in three respects from other institutions. First, its activities are directed almost entirely into fundamental as opposed to applied research. Second, it is concerned with the advancement of the frontiers of scientific knowledge rather than the promotion of a specific product. Third, it does not exist to perform a service for a State or local agency or private or public group, and therefore it receives no support from such agencies for its work.

The Oregon Research Institute exists solely to perform research for the purpose of advancing knowledge and therefore depends almost exclusively upon benefactors who are willing to bear the full costs of such activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have the letter of September 13 which I have been paraphrasing printed in the RECORD in full, together with the attachments thereto.

There being no objection, the letter and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
Eugene, Oreg., September 13, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Charles Lee.)

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Oregon Research Institute in Eugene, Oregon, has pending a grant for research in personality assessment (MH 12972-01), in the amount of 1.7 million dollars, to be expended over a period of seven years (September 1966 through August 1973).

Federal research grants go to three types of institutions generally: (1) educational institutions; (2) hospitals or service organizations where fundamental research is a secondary function; and (3) independent non-profit research organizations engaging in the promotion of a product such as the Salk vaccine, where fundamental research is also a secondary function.

Oregon Research Institute is in still a fourth category, differing in three respects from other institutions. First, Oregon Research Institute's energies are directed almost entirely into fundamental, as opposed

to applied research. Second, Oregon Research Institute is concerned with the advancement of scientific knowledge rather than rendering a specific service to the public, or promotion of a specific product. Third, Oregon Research Institute does not exist to perform a service, such as education, training, medical care, etc., for a state or local agency, or for any private or public group, and it therefore receives no support from such agencies for its work. Oregon Research Institute exists solely to perform research for the purpose of advancing knowledge, and therefore depends almost exclusively upon benefactors who are willing to bear the full cost of such activity.

It would seem that the original intent of Congress in passing the 1966 Appropriations Act was to require institutions which already have a broad funding base to contribute private funds to any federal research grant approved. Such institutions would be: an institution of higher education receiving monies from endowment funds, from the state government, and from private contributions; hospitals receiving funds from patients, endowments, and other private contributions; or research institutions which concern themselves with general research and sell a specific product, i.e., a psychological inventory or a patent medicine.

To alleviate this inequitable situation, Oregon Research Institute respectfully proposes that in drafting the 1967 Appropriations Act, institutions in the category that Oregon Research Institute finds itself be excepted from the cost sharing provision which was for the first time written into the 1966 Appropriations Act. This could be done by using such language as follows: (the provision as it now exists)—“excepting those research institutions in which seventy-five per cent of all activity is fundamental research.” The definition of fundamental research would be: research, the primary objective of which is the advancement of scientific knowledge rather than the generation of a commercial or marketable product or idea or the performance of a service for a fee.

This would leave included in the cost sharing category those institutions for which the provision in the 1966 Appropriations Act was written, i.e., hospitals, institutions of higher education, and research organizations where fundamental research is a secondary concern. Those institutions primarily dedicated to the advancement of scientific knowledge will not be penalized.

Enclosed you will find PHS policy statements with regard to the cost sharing provision, and Oregon Research Institute position statement with regard to cost sharing, and an informational sheet giving an overview of the on-going research at Oregon Research Institute.

It is my understanding that the 1967 Appropriations Act is still pending in the Senate at this time. If per chance this request is not timely, it is hoped that some other remedy can be found to alleviate this inequity, possibly a private bill.

With best regards,
D. RICHARD HAMMERSLEY,
Director of Administrative Services, Oregon Research Institute.

OREGON RESEARCH INSTITUTE—A PRINTED GUIDE

At its inception in 1960 Oregon Research Institute was an independent nonprofit research center with only one Ph. D. psychologist; it now has six: (Gordon G. Rechel, Lewis R. Goldberg, Paul J. Hoffman [Director], Richard R. Jones, Leonard G. Rorer, Paul Slovic). The psychologists at ORI work on questions of basic theoretical importance to behavioral scientists. Those who approach ORI with commercial problems are referred elsewhere. However, the staff of ORI contributes time to provide graduate students and other researchers throughout the state

with consultation and assistance in experimental design, data analysis, and data processing.

Oregon Research Institute is neither large nor old. It has no long-standing traditions to which it points with pride. It has no bureaucracy to bind it and no commercial operations to which it is tied. On the contrary, ORI is young and vigorous, and it emphasizes flexibility, innovation, and independence.

A Board of Directors sets the policy for the operation of ORI and appoints the Director. The Board meets regularly to approve research proposals, staff appointments, and financial issues. Serving on the Board of Directors at the present time are an attorney, a director of a large institute at the University of Oregon, a C.P.A., a local businessman, a Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon, and the Director of ORI. The members of the Board volunteer their time and service to the Institute.

While ORI welcomes investigators interested in any area of the behavioral sciences, its Board has chosen to give priority to the establishment of extreme competence in a few areas, rather than to the superficial coverage of many fields. Therefore, special attention has been given to the overlapping areas of human judgment and personality assessment. Both areas share a common dependence on high-speed digital computers, and, as a result, ORI has necessarily developed a high level of competence with regard to computer technology.

In the past year, Oregon Research Institute has formed an Advisory Board of behavioral scientists who have expressed their willingness to help provide guidelines for ORI's research programs and administrative policies. The following individuals are, at present, members of this Advisory Board:

Dr. Clyde Coombs, University of Michigan.
Dr. Ward Edwards, University of Michigan.
Dr. Eugene Galanter, University of Washington.

Dr. Harold Guetzkow, Northwestern University.

Dr. Lloyd Humphrey, University of Illinois.
Dr. Paul E. Meehl, University of Minnesota.
Dr. Samuel Messick, Educational Testing Service.

Dr. Anatol Rapoport, University of Michigan.

Dr. Daniel I. Slobin, University of California.

Dr. Keith Smith, University of Michigan.
Dr. Silvan Tomkins, City University of New York.

ORI's independence is an important asset. Since it is not a small unit in a larger organization, there is no danger that its programs may be hampered by policies imposed from the outside. ORI's operating procedure may be formulated with regard to its own research programs and need not contain the inefficiencies that inevitably result when operating procedures must be adapted to many diverse activities. As a relatively small organization, it is remarkably free of the bureaucratic inefficiency almost inevitably found in large organizations.

Also, it is important that research is ORI's only product, and that its reputation depends entirely on the quality of that product. For its staff members, mediocre research cannot be offset by exceptional teaching or administrative ability. ORI's staff do not have any conflicts over whether their time should be devoted to research or some other aspect of their job; there is no other aspect to their job.

At present ORI's research activities are funded by four project grants and one contract. These are: (1) an NIH grant (MH-04430) entitled, “The Paramorphic Representation of Clinical Judgment,” to Paul J. Hoffman (Principal Investigator), Leonard G. Rorer (Co-Principal Investigator), and Gordon G. Bechtel, Lewis R. Goldberg and Paul

Slovic (Co-Investigators); (2) an NIH grant (MH-08160) entitled "Learning Clinical Inference," to Leonard G. Rorer (Principal Investigator) and Lewis R. Goldberg and Paul Slovic (Co-Principal Investigators); (3) an NIH grant (MH-12122) entitled, "Contextual Determinants of Choice and Judgment," to Paul Slovic (Principal Investigator); (4) the currently active NIH grant (MH-10822) to the ORI staff for a teleprocessing facility; and (5) a contract from the Peace Corps.

Three additional proposals are pending. These are (1) an NIH program grant (MH-12972) "Research Program in Personality Assessment" (approval expected in September, 1966) to Lewis R. Goldberg (Principal Investigator), Gordon G. Bechtel, Paul J. Hoffman, Richard R. Jones, Leonard G. Rorer, and Paul Slovic (Co-Principal Investigators), and Jerry S. Wiggins (Co-Investigator); (2) an NIH grant (MH-12855) "The Integration and Extension of Itemmetric Research in Personality Assessment" to Lewis R. Goldberg (Principal Investigator) and Richard R. Jones, Leonard G. Rorer, and Jerry S. Wiggins (Co-Principal Investigators); and (3) an NIH grant (MH-12122-01) "The Assessment of Risk-Taking Behavior" to Paul Slovic (Principal Investigator).

In order to convey something of the nature and flavor of ORI's research program, some of its ongoing and recently completed projects will be described briefly.

MH-04439. THE PARAMORPHIC REPRESENTATION OF CLINICAL JUDGMENT

This program of research has two major purposes. The first of these concerns the development of mathematical models which can be effectively utilized in describing the judgment process. Specifically, emphasis will be placed upon empirical studies, wherein the "judge" makes decisions on the basis of controlled sets of information made available to him. Statistical analyses will then make possible a description of the manner in which the information was combined by the judge, and various models (e.g., linear, interactional) will be compared for their adequacy of descriptions.

The second purpose of the research concerns individual differences among judges, criteria of judgment ability, implicit perceptual organizations of the informational variables, and similar psychological factors which may be involved in judgment processes, as described by mathematical models. One important developing concern will be with the manner of presentation of information as it affects the judgment model and judgment accuracy. Primacy and recency effects will be studied, as well as effects due to kind and amount of information presented. Attention may eventually turn to basic problems in concept formation, stereotyping, reinforcement, and other concepts relating to the formulative aspects of the judgment process.

The aim of this program is to bring together specific sub-disciplines within psychology, within statistics, and within computer technology in a concerted programmatic investigation of the human being as an adaptive system capable of synthesizing information from its environment in systematic and predictable ways. The phenomena of interest tend most often to be those relating to medical and clinical diagnostic processes, to impression-formation, and to other forms of interpersonal judgments. However, the field of investigation also includes studies involving judgments of inanimate objects, concepts, and behavior patterns. It ranges from psychophysical judgments and attendant unresolved and theoretically interesting problems of unidimensional and multidimensional scaling, to complex decision-making in group interaction; and its methods require the refinement of both areas of theoretical

interest, and many areas of more wholly applied interest.

GS 429. THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF ITEM CHARACTERISTICS IN PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT

The goal of the assessment program is the classification of individuals into meaningful groups such that it can be said that they have been described. In pursuit of this goal, the assessment area is partitioned for both research and discussion purposes into the following logical, albeit arbitrary, classification scheme: (a) semantic coverage, (b) itemmetrics, (c) scale construction, (d) test usage, and (e) additional related areas.

Semantic coverage. A necessary prerequisite for any comprehensive assessment program is the development of a "vocabulary of personality descriptive terms which is sufficiently exhaustive, precise, and well-structured to be useful for purposes of scientific communication and assessment" (Norman, 1965). At least two major research projects have had as their goal the development of a comprehensive descriptive taxonomy. The first (Glueck, Meehl, Schofield, & Clyde, 1964) aimed at the development of a vocabulary designed primarily for clinical use; the second (Norman, 1965) aims primarily to develop a vocabulary useful for the description of normal personality. Both projects had as their initial phase an exhaustive search of unabridged dictionaries, textbooks, word lists, and theoretical languages.

Itemmetrics. Semantic coverage of the personality domain comprises a necessary but not sufficient condition for the construction and refinement of an initial item of research that has come to be known as itemmetrics. It is a field born with the advent of the high-speed digital computer. As in any new science, someone must undertake the compilation of the basic data on which future analyses may be run and on the basis of which theories may be constructed. One such compilation has begun and is well underway at ORI.

Future developments in this area will proceed beyond the descriptive approach to take up the experimental approach to itemmetrics (through the systematic manipulation of relevant item parameters). The project has as a long-range goal the development of a set of item writing guidelines which could be used by subsequent objectives; i.e., findings from this project should lead to systematic item generation procedures.

The methodology of scale construction. Perhaps the most classic problem in objective personality assessment concerns the rules by which responses to individual items are translated into meaningful scale scores. The method chosen for combining items into scales must afford a high degree of assurance that the scale scores represent relative positions of respondents on the dimension implied by the scale, and not on a dimension that is an artifact of the methodology of scale construction. ORI's program of assessment research attacks this problem.

Test usage. The scoring of a set of scales results in a page of numbers. The optimum utilization of those numbers for the purpose of classification, diagnosis, or prediction constitutes the final phase of the assessment process. The manner in which test information is used in human decision making can be rightfully considered within the domain of judgment research. At ORI, this phase of assessment activity is viewed as a question in decision making, and as such is discussed in the section on human judgment processes.

MH 08160. LEARNING CLINICAL INFERENCE

This project studies the manner in which individuals learn to make diagnoses of psychosis and neurosis from Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventories (MMPI) profiles. It employs three groups of subjects: (a) *Expert*, composed of three clinical psychologists who have had extensive MMPI

experience; (b) *Naïve*, composed of ten non-psychologists who have never heard of the MMPI and know nothing of the task they are performing; (c) *Middle*, composed of psychology graduate students who have at least a passing familiarity with the MMPI and some idea of the difference between a neurotic and a psychotic. The project utilizes 1,530 MMPI profiles with criterion diagnoses of neurosis or psychosis. The *Naïve*, *Middle*, and *Expert* judges have been intensively and systematically trained, one hour a day five days a week for 26 weeks.

The study focuses first on the accuracy which can be achieved by the various groups of judges as a result of the training and on the extent to which the training generalizes profits samples from both the same the different clinical installations. It focuses second on the construction of mathematical models to provide representations of the judgment process at any one point in time. The study then uses changes (over time) in the estimates of the parameters of these models to provide a description in the way in which individuals learn to make decisions on the basis of data that have a complex probabilistic relationship to the outcome to be predicted.

A meaningful measure of complex learning must take into account the fact that the way in which an individual makes a decision may change, even though his accuracy does not, i.e., the models which best describe an individual's decision-making behavior at different times during the training process may differ, even though the overall hit rate remains unchanged. Paramorphic models will also be used to assess the extent to which verbally reported changes in decision strategies are reflected in actual changes in decision behavior, i.e., to assess the extent to which an individual's statement that he has learned something indicates that he has, in fact, done so.

The significance of this research lies in its focus on the way in which individuals learn to make complex judgments. The clinician, be he physician or psychologist, must make many such decisions in the best possible way. Yet, little is known how people make such decisions; less about how they learn to make such decisions; still less about how to train them to do so. By providing a means of identifying changes in decision-making behavior, this project would make possible a description of the learning process as it relates to complex problem solving. Only when such measures of change (learning) are available will it be possible adequately to assess the efficacy of various training programs.

MH 12122. CONTEXTUAL DETERMINANTS OF CHOICE AND JUDGMENT

Most decision theories assume that choices and judgments among multidimensional stimuli are governed by the value of each stimulus on some underlying unidimensional choice criterion. Furthermore, the criterion value of stimulus is presumably determined only by the intrinsic properties of that stimulus. Thus the addition of new stimuli into a set of stimuli being evaluated by a judge should not alter the judgments made among the original stimuli in that set. The purpose of this research is to attempt to demonstrate that the existence of certain types of multidimensional structure among stimuli that are being evaluated will make these evaluations susceptible to contextual biases. In particular, this research aims to assess the degree to which structural conflict and in-tradimensional variability influence choices and judgments.

The basic strategy for data analysis will be to use a mathematical model to describe the manner in which a judge combines information from several sources or dimensions into a unitary judgment. Specific characteristics of the dimensional structure of a stimulus

or a set of stimuli will be systematically manipulated in order to determine the effects of structure on the judgment process. The project relies heavily upon existing computerized methods for modelling the judgment process.

MH 12122(01). ASSESSMENT OF RISK-TAKING BEHAVIOR

The objectives of this research are to develop a model to describe the process by which a person makes decisions under conditions of risk and to use the parameters of this model to determine the influence of situational and organismic factors upon risk taking.

The model focused upon here, an additive one, is radically different from previous risk-taking models, but finds support from the recent success of similar additive models in areas such as clinical judgment and impression formation, as well as from extensive pilot research.

This research aims to refine the model and its methodology and, at the same time, study such questions as: (a) What role do probabilities and amounts, the fundamental components of any risk situation, play in the decision making process? What is their relative importance to the risk-taker? (b) To what extent do individuals differ in the way in which they make risk-taking decisions? What are the causes and correlates of these differences? (c) What determines a person's perception of riskiness or danger in a situation? How do the determiners of riskiness relate to the determiners of the attractiveness of the situation? (d) What factors determine the optimality of risk-taking decisions? Can non-optimal decision makers be identified and taught to behave more rationally?

OTHER RESEARCH AT ORI

Quantification of unstructured personal data

With the cooperation and support of the Peace Corps, and with the approval of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Oregon Research Institute will embark this year on a project designed to investigate the characteristics, content, validity, and usefulness of the Civil Service Background Report, as a predictive instrument in the selection process. The study will require the application of content analysis procedures and the development of coding techniques by means of which the Background Report might be considerably improved. The outcome of the study will be of great practical significance, but of interest to ORI researchers is the possibility of applying quantitative and computerized techniques to a document which heretofore was considered useful only through the employment of human intuition.

Mental health manpower

Under a contract from the Division of Mental Health of the State of Oregon, Oregon Research Institute has carried out an intensive survey of mental health manpower in the state, and has furnished summary data to support the State's application for Federal Funds under PL 88-386. The methodology developed during the course of this study shows promise in being able to yield answers to problems that have traditionally plagued planners. In particular, the questionnaire design permitted the collection of sets of data which could then form the basis of mathematical models of vocational decision-making by the respondents. Dr. Leonard Rorer plans to extend this work in the subsequent years.

Thresholds for horizontal oscillatory motion

The perception of horizontal acceleratory motion is undoubtedly achieved through stimulation of the otolith organs, through kinesthetic sensations, through visual cues, and perhaps by means of other factors. Less is known concerning this sense modality than any other. A study recently completed at

ORI sought to determine the threshold for horizontal oscillatory motion in an adult population. Thresholds were measured with all modalities normally sensitive to acceleration being called simultaneously into play. Thresholds were determined initially with static body positions and minimal distractions. Following this, thresholds were determined under conditions which maximize sensitivity to acceleration, and finally under conditions simulating ordinary office work activities. Significant differences were found between various experimental conditions, with the factors of attention and postural orientation being of primary importance.

Computer simulation of adaptive and problem-solving behavior

This is a theoretical research program which aims at the development of abstract systems on an ultra-large computer. The aim of this work has centered about the theory of abstract adaptive systems, with particular attention to the design of simple forms with potential for structural augmentation through "experience" under the control of an input tape. Independent funding of this research area will lead to the publication of a number of important papers, some of which are already in draft stage (e.g., Chodos, R. Computer Simulation of Adaptive and Problem Solving Behavior; Trupin, R. The Evolution of Cognitive Processes).

Teleprocessing facilities

Behavioral science researchers not located near a large-scale computing facility, such as Health Sciences Computing Facility on the UCLA campus, must find some way to make efficient use of such a facility from a distance. One possible solution lies in the utilization of telephone lines for the sending and receiving of data between the research location and the computing facility. Oregon Research Institute has pioneered in the development of such teleprocessing systems for the convenient, high-speed yet economical solution to its data processing problems. During the past year and a half, under Public Health Service Grant MH-10822, ORI has utilized various equipment configurations in attempting to find an optimum system.

A common thread running through all research activities at ORI is a shared desire, among the staff, to participate in the development of an objective science of human behavior. Central to the fulfillment of this desire is continued reliance upon the traditional methods of experimental design and statistical analysis. However, such methods have been well-exploited, and the more imaginative research requires more imaginative tools. This forces a primary emphasis upon methodology, upon the development of mathematical models of behavior, of extensive analysis of large quantities of multivariate data.

The staff of ORI does not regard the computer as an auxiliary piece of equipment. Rather, we regard the computer as an absolutely essential and central element in the entire program of activities here. Not only is the computer instrumental as a tool for the conduct of our research, the computer becomes an object of study in its own right, and joins other techniques which are being constantly reexamined and improved at ORI in its general interest in methodology.

The present IBM 1978 allows moderately efficient sending and receiving. Since the configuration includes only a card-read-punch, a data line terminal, and a printer, data must be sent as it is read from cards and may be received back either as punched output, an extremely slow process, or in an on-line printing mode. With the installation of the 360 system, both data and programs can be returned to an ORI disc or tape file at maximum transmission speed. They may then be punched, or printed, or transmitted at a later date. The increased effi-

ciency of operation of the data transmission system will make available to students and faculty, as well as to the ORI staff, a computing capability that is virtually identical with that which might be achieved, were the research being conducted at the Health Science Computing Facility.

Much of the significance of the remote teleprocessing facility has already been demonstrated. This is reflected not only in the unusually large number of published research studies of ORI staff, but also in the increased involvement of other scientists and students, both in the ongoing research activities of the Institute and in the applications of computer methodology. ORI does not have an "open door" policy with respect to the availability of its facilities, but it does encourage serious research and its staff frequently collaborate with scientists in exchange visits. Funds permitting, visiting scholars and advanced students who are engaged in health-related research can, to a limited extent, be given access to our teleprocessing facilities, and with results which are of benefit in the development of the behavioral sciences.

Of more consequence, it is a policy of ORI to make available to other researchers any data or computations which others might want to use. The following list includes some of those to whom data have been made available: Dr. Robert C. Angell, Center for Research on Conflict Resolution, University of Michigan; Dr. Peter M. Bentler, University of California, Los Angeles; Dr. Jack Block, University of California, Berkeley; Dr. Donald T. Campbell, Northwestern University; Dr. Robert Ellsworth, VA Hospital, Roseburg; Dr. Edward Fitzgerald, Peace Corps Training Center, Hilo, Hawaii; Dr. Kenneth Hammond, University of Colorado; Dr. Douglas N. Jackson, University of Western Ontario; Dr. John O. Kangas, University of Oregon Medical School; Dr. G. Rolfe LaForge, University of Portland; Dr. James Lingoes, University of Michigan; Dr. Lloyd Lovell, University of Oregon; Dr. Samuel Messick, Educational Testing Service; Dr. Dean Peabody, Swarthmore College; Dr. Robert Tryon, University of California, Berkeley; Dr. Leona Tyler, University of Oregon; Dr. Jerry S. Wiggins, University of Illinois.

The programmers have, of course, benefited also from the new system. In prior years, there were instances in which the debugging of a program extended over a period of more than a year because of the two-to three-week turnaround time. Now, the programmer has his results the following day at the latest. He is thus able to work continuously on a single problem, submitting and revising it until the results are achieved.

FACILITIES AVAILABLE

Oregon Research Institute is currently housed in three adjacent buildings located midway between the University of Oregon campus and downtown Eugene, each only a five minute walk away. Within ORI's three buildings, which provide 5,878 square feet of floor space, there are available soundproof testing rooms, a multi-purpose group testing and projection room which can be used as a vision tunnel or an auditory testing chamber, a workshop, a conference room, and office space for secretaries, programmers, technicians, research assistants and staff members.

Oregon Research Institute maintains a library of both past and current books and journals in the areas of human judgment, decision theory, risk taking, small group behavior, statistics, mathematical psychology, personality assessment, scaling and test theory, and computer programming, as well as standard text and reference works in general psychology. It is the policy of ORI to purchase whatever books or journals are required for current research projects. In addition, the personal libraries of ORI staff

members, as well as the extensive facilities of the University of Oregon Library, are available.

(By D. Richard Hammersley, Oregon Research Institute, Sept. 13, 1966)

Oregon Research Institute has filled a basic research need over the last six years that grows out of a national awareness of a failure on the part of mankind to advance the behavioral sciences to a point where responses to a modern day nuclear world are appropriate and productive.

Research in the behavioral sciences is still in the "crawling stage" when compared with research in the physical sciences, indicating the need for special governmental stimulus. This has been provided by way of partial or full grant support of research projects and these grants go to three types of institutions generally: (1) educational institutions; (2) hospitals or service organizations where research is a secondary function; and (3) independent non-profit research organizations engaging in general research or promotion of a product such as the Salk vaccine.

Oregon Research Institute is in still a fourth category, or possibly a subdivision of the third, in that its energies are directed totally toward research in human behavior. O.R.I. makes no profit selling an assessment technique or patented psychological cure; it exists to aid the national interest by turning out the best research product possible in one specialized area, human behavior.

Of course, the ideal conditions exist in private research organizations when one considers our democratic, private enterprise ideologies, but a need has been felt for additional research efforts which have been sponsored and directed by the executive agencies through a grant examination and administration procedure.

The main objection of those who would devote their life's time to research and still maintain contact with a college or university is that the restraints of teaching requirements and other regulatory hindrances associated with the average university faculty have sometimes been inhibiting to the point of substantial frustration, both of the individual and his research.

It is with this in mind that Dr. Hoffman, director of O.R.I. and others became interested in the establishment* of an independent research organization free from the "other than research" demands found in service organizations and institutions of higher learning.

When the 1966 Appropriations Act was passed which for the first time required that there be cost-sharing on each grant approved, O.R.I. was shocked to imagine diverting energies otherwise utilized for basic research into such areas as solicitations of funds or negotiation of private contracts in order to be eligible for Federal research grants.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC, HEALTH SERVICE
Bethesda, Md., February 11, 1966.

To: The Heads of Institutions Conducting Research with Public Health Service Research Grants.

From: Chief, Division of Research Grants.
Subject: Cost-sharing in research grants.

In appropriating funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1966, the Congress removed the previous limitation of 20% for indirect cost and inserted in its stead a provision that "none of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost of the project." The attached Bureau of the Budget Circular A-74 establishes policies and guidelines for the Federal Government to use in connection with cost-sharing for research grants.

The provisions of Circular A-74 will be applied to Public Health Service new and renewal (competing) research grants for which the Notice of Research Grant Awarded carries a date of March 1, 1966, or later as the "date issued." At the same time, full indirect cost may be allowed on these grants provided an indirect cost rate has been satisfactorily negotiated in accordance with Bureau of the Budget Circular A-21. In the absence of a negotiated rate, only direct costs will be awarded.

The provisions of Circular A-74 will not be applied to continuation grants (non-competing) nor to supplements to grants awarded prior to the effective date of this policy. For the remainder of fiscal year 1966 and throughout fiscal year 1967, the PHS interim policy on cost-sharing will continue to be applied to continuation or supplemental awards for ongoing projects. The interim policy requires that the Public Health Service limit the indirect cost allowance to 90% of actual indirect cost or 20% of the total direct costs listed on the Notice of Grant Awarded, whichever is the lesser.

It should be noted that the provisions of Circular A-74 are not intended to reduce the current level of cost participation by the grantee institution except as a result of increased indirect cost allowances. The circular does provide that where there has been no requirement for cost participation in the past, the grantee institution must now share in the research costs on more than a token basis. Where the applicant proposes a "lower" contribution as described in section 4.c. of the circular, explanation and justification must be provided with the cost-sharing data.

There are four additional provisions in connection with cost-sharing which should be called to your attention at this time: (1) each grantee institution will be required to maintain records to demonstrate the total actual contribution by the grantee; (2) time or effort reports will be required for personnel whose salaries, in whole or in part, are charged to the PHS grant or claimed as the grantee contribution to the research supported by the grant; (3) the amount of grantee contribution will be subject to audit; and (4) the requirements previously governing expenditure of Public Health Service funds, including prior approval for certain uses, will now apply to the total costs of the project which will include both PHS funds and the grantee contribution.

The PHS has on hand many new and renewal applications which are being reviewed. In addition, many more will be received within the next few months before application forms and instructions can be developed to provide information on proposed cost-sharing. Institution officials responsible for administering specific grants will receive instructions from PHS awarding Institutes or Divisions concerning additional information that will be needed for each pending application before an award can be made.

The cost-sharing policy applies only in research project grants. It does not apply, for example, to general research support grants, training grants, health services grants, construction grants, conference grants, grants to Federal agencies, or foreign grants where the indirect cost is provided by the grantee institution.

EUGENE A. CONFREY, Ph. D.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, Washington, D.C., December 13, 1965.

[Circular No. A-74]

To: The heads of executive departments and establishments.

Subject: Participation in the costs of research supported by Federal grants.

1. Purpose. This circular provides guidelines for Federal agencies concerning participation by colleges and universities and

other institutions in the cost of research supported through Federal grants.

These guidelines take into account provisions in the appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1966 for the Department of Defense (P.L. 89-213), the Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare (P.L. 89-156), and the Independent Offices (P.L. 89-128), that prohibit Federal agencies from paying any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost of the project. These guidelines also take into account the removal of statutory limitations on the payment of the indirect costs of research financed by Federal grants.

This circular does not affect existing policies and practices of Federal agencies concerning cost participation in research financed through contracts.

2. Effective date. The guidelines set forth in this Circular should be applied as soon as practicable to all research grants awarded subsequent to the issuance of this Circular and not later than March 1, 1966.

3. Background of cost participation. The conduct of research is a significant function and important responsibility of institutions of higher education. In addition to contributing to the advancement of knowledge, academic research is an essential element in the advanced training of scientists and engineers. At the same time, the Federal Government relies heavily upon research conducted in non-Federal institutions, and particularly in colleges and universities, to assist in the accomplishment of the missions of Federal agencies. Thus, Federal research grants generally serve the objectives both of the institutions and of the Federal Government. Cost participation reflects this mutuality of interest.

In the past cost participation by the grantee institution has been accomplished through: (a) cost participation as a consequence of legal limitations on the proportion of indirect costs payable by the Federal agencies under research grants; (b) cost participation through continued payment by grantee institutions of part or all of the salaries of faculty members or professional personnel participating in sponsored research, and (c) payment by grantee institutions of a portion of other costs such as equipment.

4. Guidelines for Federal agencies.

a. Agencies should generally continue their present policies and practices concerning the extent of cost participation by grantee institutions:

(1) Except for increased indirect cost allowances which may be paid as a result of the removal of statutory limitations on payment of such allowances;

(2) Except that in cases where Federal agencies would otherwise pay all research costs, the applicant institution must share in such research costs on more than a token basis.

b. The costs which may be charged to a research grant include direct costs and their associated indirect costs, as determined in accordance with Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-21 (Revised), dated March 3, 1965.

c. The extent of cost participation by grantees may vary in accordance with a number of factors relating to both the granting agency and the grantee institution, e.g.:

(1) A higher degree of cost participation should ordinarily exist when the cost of the research consists primarily of the efforts of senior faculty during the academic year, or when the grantee institution's long range interests are best served by substantial cost participation;

(2) Cost participation should generally be lower when a major portion of the research cost consists of equipment, when the grant provides for a large component of services to be made available on a regional or national basis, or when in the view of a Federal agency

an area of research requires special stimulus in the national interest.

5. *Administration.*

a. Federal agencies will require that proposals for each research grant include:

(1) The amount requested for direct expenses, by category of direct expense;

(2) The amount requested for indirect expenses related to the requested direct expenses;

(3) The total grant request;

(4) The additional amount which the grantee institution proposes as its contribution from non-Federal sources to the planned research.

b. Federal agencies will require each grantee institution to maintain records to demonstrate a total actual contribution by the grantee institution of an amount which is not less, in proportion to the actual charges against the grant, than the total amount proposed in the application, or any subsequent revision thereof, approved by the agency. The amount of the granted institution's contribution will be subject to audit.

6. *Agency reports on cost participation.*

Each agency which awards research grants will report to the Bureau of the Budget by November 1 of each year on cost participation by grantee institutions in the immediately preceding fiscal year. This report should provide information on the overall amount obligated for grants in the preceding fiscal year and the overall additional amount which grantee institutions proposed to contribute to the research supported by these grants. (The report to be submitted by November 1, 1966, should cover grants awarded from the date of implementation of this Circular through June 30, 1966.)

CHARLES S. SCHULTZE, Director.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Date: August 23, 1966.

Re: Grant No. 1 PO1 Mh 12972-01.

To: Dr. Paul J. Hoffman.

From: Mrs. Sylvia Gibberman, Grants Management Specialist, Grants and Contracts Management Section.

Subject: Cost-sharing in research grants.

In keeping with the Public Health Service policy applicable to cost-sharing in research grants which was announced in a memorandum dated February 11, 1966, copy attached, it is necessary to establish in advance of each award under a new or competing renewal project, the extent of cost participation by the applicant institution.

To accomplish this purpose, please complete the enclosed form for the grant application identified above. Subject to agreement on cost-sharing, this application has been approved for a PHS grant not to exceed \$141,417 for direct costs, to which related indirect cost may be added. Please do not assume that a grant will be made until such time as your cost-sharing proposal is accepted by the Public Health Service.

The following information is offered for your guidance in completing the form:

1. The PHS support requested for direct costs may be the same as indicated above or it may be revised downward to the extent you elect for the purpose of cost-sharing.

2. PHS policies governing the expenditure of grant funds apply equally to expenditures from the grantee contribution. PHS policy on rebudgeting of funds applies to the totals in column (C), rather than to the respective amounts in columns (A) and (B).

3. When your application was submitted, it was not necessary to show the amount of indirect cost requested because in the past this was computed and added by the Public Health Service. Now it is necessary to show the amount of indirect cost requested, if any. Indirect cost related to the direct costs requested should be computed at the rate

established for your institution but the *indirect cost support requested* from the Public Health Service may be less than the resulting amounts depending on whether you elect to show your cost-sharing in this category. Indirect cost related to salaries or other items contributed by the grantee institution may not be included in the amount requested of the Public Health Service.

Please return two copies of the form and retain one copy for your record.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Hammersley has suggested that institutions such as his be exempted from the cost-sharing provisions of the statute. I note that the committee, on pages 74 and 75 of the report, discusses section 203, the research cost-sharing provisions of the bill, and that it was the feeling of the committee that none of the funds provided shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost of such project, provided that no such grant for medical and health related research shall be considered out of conformance with this limitation if the non-Federal share of such cost is 3 percent.

My inquiry of the manager of the bill is this: Would an organization such as the Oregon Research Institute, which is engaged in fundamental research in the behavioral science areas come within, in the judgment of the committee, the provisions of section 203 and that projects which are given to it would be required to raise only 3 percent of the cost of the project from outside sources?

Mr. HILL. When the Senator uses the word "behavioral," that goes to health research also, does it not?

Mr. MORSE. Psychiatric health, psychological—

Mr. HILL. Psychology is health, too, is it not?

Mr. MORSE. And mental health—

Mr. HILL. That is also health, so I would certainly think that 3 percent would apply to the Oregon Research Institute.

Mr. MORSE. I want to thank the Senator in charge of the bill very much. He knows that I seek now to make the legislative history so that the Department will know what the intent of Congress was, at the time it comes to determine the fiscal application of this particular type of institution.

I quite agree with the Senator from Alabama. I think his answer is right, but I thought we should tie it down in debate.

Mr. HILL. It applies to medical and health-related research. I judge from what the Senator has said that the research being carried on by the Oregon Research Institute is health-related research.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will read Mr. Hammersley's letter, which I just placed in the RECORD and made a part of legislative history, the Senator will find that his conclusion is the same as mine.

Mr. HILL. Therefore, the 3 percent would apply to the Oregon Research Institute.

Mr. MORSE. Because of the health research activity.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

I wish now to make a brief speech on the bill, but I want to know what the pleasure of the manager of the bill is. This is simply my statement of the bill that I wanted in the RECORD today before getting to the voting stage tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. I invite the Senator to proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the members of the Appropriations Committee that have brought H.R. 14741 to us certainly deserve commendation for the diligence with which they have worked and the excellent quality of the bill in certain particulars that they have presented.

I wish to congratulate Senator HILL, the chairman of the subcommittee, on the perseverance shown by him and his colleagues in stressing, through adequate financial aid, the exceedingly important areas of medical research.

If the Senator from Alabama will close his ears for a moment, I want to say that, in my judgment, the American people will not be able ever to express the debt of gratitude they all owe to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his many years of service as a great statesman in the Congress, both in the House and in the Senate. I know of no one who can approach Senator HILL of Alabama in the devotion he has constantly given to the subject of the health of the American people. Therefore, I want the RECORD to show that he and his committee deserve great credit for providing adequate financial aid in these very important areas of medical research.

Few, if any, in our country will have reservations about the wisdom of that course of action. I therefore wish to commend him and his colleagues on the committee for their farsighted recognition of the public interest which is shown in the financing of the programs of the Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health.

As a Senator from Oregon, I also wish to give to the committee my thanks, and those of my State for providing, under the heading, "Federal Water Pollution Control Aid," on page 61 of the report, that the laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg., may share in the \$950,000 allocated for laboratory equipment.

I further wish to commend the committee on its funding in the area of the handicapped. This is an area which is of great interest and concern to the members of my Education Subcommittee. It is my hope that when pending legislation embodying an expansion in this area becomes statute, the committee will continue to afford substantial funds for this purpose.

However, Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in reviewing the provisions made for the programs administered by the Office of Education, based upon statutes enacted in the last session, I am constrained to qualify in part the commendations I have already given.

I do applaud the work of the committee in certain respects, however, without stint. I refer here to the action of

the committee in funding Public Law 874 at \$416,200,000, an increase of \$232,800,000 over the budget estimate. The committee report language on page 13, which states, "the committee has no reason to believe that Congress will change the law in the manner contemplated in the budget estimate and believes that the full entitlement should be provided as long as the law is not amended," is, in my judgment, a sound assessment of the situation. It is certainly in full accord with the actions taken by the Education Subcommittee in recommending to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare provisions with respect to Public Law 874, which, rather than curtailing this needed program, would seek to broaden its base.

As one Senator who has received many communications from the great land-grant institution of his State, I further wish to pay tribute to the judgment of the committee in providing the full \$11,950,000 amount for the further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts.

I also wish to vigorously support the action of the committee under the heading of "Defense Educational Activities," in the addition over the House amount of \$25 million for title III National Defense Education Act purposes. As chairman of the Education Subcommittee, I would endorse the committee report statement on page 14 that the logic underlying the proposed reduction is faulty and that the restoration of this item on that basis is fully justified.

Having said this, Mr. President, there are items carried in the act which, on the basis of the testimony I have received as chairman of the Education Subcommittee, I cannot hail with great pleasure.

The Higher Education Act of 1965, which became public law last October, in my judgment was singularly ill starred so far as adequate financing to carry out its purposes is concerned. I deplore the fact that the committee saw fit to veto the further operation of title I of the Higher Education Act by refusing to finance it by so much as \$1. I fear that the committee, in refusing to fund the legislation looked at but half the picture.

This program, which was authorized at \$55 million in the first year, was given but \$10 million. The budget estimate, which I thought was grossly insufficient for the current year, was \$20 million. By providing no funds at all, unless the action is reversed either now or at a later date, the Appropriations Committee is, in effect, recommending to the Senate that the law become a dead letter. This is a great pity since continuing education in my State, which is operated as an integral part of the great public institutions of higher education in my State, enjoys high public acceptance and is so well established in public esteem that it is under the direction of a vice chancellor of the Oregon State system of higher education.

It is the program which takes from the land-grant institution at Corvallis and from the university at Eugene and from the faculty of Oregon State College in Portland, the instructors who travel to

the smaller towns in my State, which have no access to higher education immediately in their vicinity, and through the device of continuing education conducts in the local high school or other community centers courses on a one- or two-night-a-week basis. This enables our citizens to equip themselves through education at the collegiate level to function more effectively both in the economic sense and as citizens. The cut-off of funds for this program will not stop the program. It will continue to grow, but at a slower rate, and it will require, I fear, that many very important types of training will be stunted because the tuition costs to the student will be too high to permit effective participation.

The need is there, but it will not be met until much time has elapsed, and we will have wasted the potentialities of many of our citizens.

Community service programs of title I, which include the provision of training courses for public servants who manage water supplies, who are concerned with fire protection, police protection, and the many other facets of small local public administration, obviously will have to be curtailed.

In this same category of shortsighted financing, I would place the action of the committee in permitting only \$7.5 million to fund the Teachers Corps, which was a part of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This is particularly distressing to me since I recall very well the gallant fight led by Senator TED KENNEDY and Senator GAYLORD NELSON in committee which led to the acceptance of the Senate concept of the Teachers Corps. This provision was not an easy one for us to hold in our conference with the House. We battled long and hard to uphold the Senate concept which had no parallel on the House side. We were successful in that endeavor in conference.

We received from the President's sickbed in Bethesda Hospital his personal appeal to those of us in conference charge of this program that the Teachers Corps be retained in the conference with the House. I went back to the conference. I delivered to the conference the President's personal message, in which he gave wholehearted support to the retention of the Teachers Corps, and we retained it last year in the conference report.

I know that there is no change in the support of the President of the United States for the objectives of the Teachers Corps.

I think it is rather easy for us to forget that in some areas of this country with high population density, in some of the poverty regions, in some of the districts of great metropolitan areas such as portions of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland—one can go down the list of the great cities of this country, and he will find no exception to what I now say—there is a great and dire need for Teachers Corps services.

Therefore, I think it is a sad thing that the committee brings to us a recommendation of only \$7.5 million for

teachers' services that these poverty-stricken sections of this country sorely need.

I would not hesitate to offer an amendment to this bill, seeking to raise the amount if there were an indication to me of sufficient interest and support for such an amendment. I have not had a chance to talk to either Senator KENNEDY or Senator NELSON since this matter has been raised, but I think this underfunding for the Teachers Corps is a grave mistake in this bill. I say that the \$7.5 million, provided, let us be frank about it, is really only a liquidation amount. It will not permit any expansion.

We do not have boys and girls of our own in these ghetto schools. Most Members of Congress have not had the personal experiences which characterize the children who sorely need this kind of extra educational help. I think we ought to give more thought to what we are doing to those boys and girls. As I have been heard to say so many times in these educational debates, I am never going to take my eyes off those boys and girls. I speak respectfully, but sadly, when I raise the question of what will be the effect of the denial of these funds to the boys and girls in the poverty-stricken schools.

We have a great experiment going on. All the reports I have received, in my capacity as chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. President, indicate that the program augurs well for the future, as far as supplying the necessary additional educational services to these boys and girls, if we will only give it a try. But we are cutting it off at the roots, before the plant has been able to grow and to blossom. This is a mistake, Mr. President.

I do not know how lonely I am in this fight. I do not think I am very lonely. I think if Senators will pause and take a look at the purposes of the Teachers Corps, and what it is already starting to accomplish and can accomplish, we can get support for an amendment to this bill to provide at least \$15 million; and I hope some thought will be given to that between now and tomorrow, because if there is a chance of getting this matter reconsidered, and increasing the amount to \$15 million, I say in the interests of the boys and girls it ought to be done.

Here is the place to spend our money. When I think of the waste of money of which we are guilty, in the face of the human needs that exist on the domestic front; when I think how easy it would be to take \$7.5 million off of the moon project, which can certainly wait; when I think how easy it would be to take \$7.5 million off of the shocking amount we are pouring down international ratholes by way of a wasteful foreign aid program in many parts of the world, and bring that additional \$7.5 million to the benefit of the little American boys and girls. These are the children whose lives we are blighting, because we are failing to give them the opportunities that they deserve under an educational program. This is the least that we can do for them, I say respectfully but, I emphasize, with

great sadness in my heart, that the \$7.5 million in this bill is inadequate, and can only amount to the liquidation of a program. It is a program for which our educators are pleading.

Read the record of the hearings before my subcommittee. Listen to the school superintendents—from Cleveland, for example, from New York, or from Chicago—I do not care what city you want to name; you will get unanimous support from these educators for an expansion of the Teacher Corps program, not a liquidation of it.

So, Mr. President, I owe it to my own responsibilities, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education to make this plea; and I would rather make this plea first; I would rather have the Appropriations Committee, in the intervening hours between now and tomorrow, give further thought to this particular item rather than to cut this great program off at its roots.

I know, Mr. President, it is difficult for the people in these poverty-stricken school districts to exercise much political influence. But we never should consider legislation on the basis of the political influence of the recipients of its benefits. We should consider legislation on the basis of what is good for our country. And I do think that cutting off the Teacher Corps, liquidating the Teacher Corps with the \$7.5 million provided for it in this bill, is not good for the country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many teachers would the Federal Government hire, who would become members of this corps if the full amount of money which the Senator urges were made available?

Mr. MORSE. I shall ask counsel to give me the exact figure; but while he is producing it, let me say that a Teacher Corps unit usually consists of one teacher and three or four assistants, whom the experienced teacher takes with her into the local system and thus helps train them to become effective teachers of the boys and girls in the poverty-stricken schools. So wherever you have a school district that asks for one of these teams, you would have three to four personnel, but one teacher would be in charge; the others, the so-called learners, would, of course, receive much less than the teacher in charge.

But I shall get the exact figure and put it in the RECORD.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But this is a program under which the Federal Government would hire teachers, specially trained, together with assistants, and then, when some community in the Nation made application, out of Washington the Federal Government would send this corps?

Mr. MORSE. I fully understand why the Senator has that view; but that is only partly correct.

The hiring has to be done by the local school district. The school district has to pass upon teacher A; it does not have to hire teacher A and can fire teacher A. It is not a case where the Federal Government supplies teachers with Federal Government jurisdiction.

It is true that the Federal Government, under the Teacher Corps training program, through our institutions of higher education is providing the financing of the training. But the decision to accept the program is made by the local school district, and they have the authority to hire and to fire the team or a member of it. The local school district can hire a team, and next week, if they are not working out, it can fire them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the selection by the local school district is made of those persons the Federal Government sends in.

Mr. MORSE. Made by the local school district from those trained in the graduate training courses that the Federal Government finances.

But let me tell the Senator where these teachers come from. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not go out and select the teachers to be trained. The teachers are recommended to them by schools of education, by universities, or by school superintendents. The Federal Government finances the program, but the policy of the program is not determined by the Federal Government. That is a great misconception which has somehow sustained itself in this debate on the Teacher Corps, and has aroused the great fear that the Federal Government some way, somehow, is going to move in and operate some segment of the schools.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The fear is that eventually the Federal Government will have an army of these teachers, and will send them around the country in response to applications that will be made for the assignment of corps of teachers to help in the particular communities.

Mr. MORSE. With this special type of training.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say the fear is unfounded, because the Senator and I will be here, or our successors will be here.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How does the Senator know?

Mr. MORSE. Our successors will be here, and I am not at all worried that Congress will ever sit by and let the Federal Government dominate, in any way, the schools of this country.

But I do think the Federal Government has a responsibility for helping put up the money that can supply the services for these special educational needs. These are financially sad school districts we are talking about. These are districts where they have problem children, the children who have not been able to keep up to grade. One of the reasons they have not been able to keep up to grade is because of the economic conditions under which they have had to live, and the deprivations that have characterized their plight.

I know the fear. All I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio is that I would not be pleading for this program if I thought there was any danger of Federal control. I would not be pleading for this if I were not satisfied that safeguards are written into the Teacher Corps program

so that we do not have to worry about that situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there can be a genuine diversity of opinion on this subject. Many people are afraid that the Federal Government is increasing the number of agents it sends out and that these agents might not properly fall within the connotation of the term "agent."

The Government is sending an army of workers from Washington all over the country. The question is whether certain dangers are not connected with the program, and that argument cannot be cast aside as being inconsequential.

Mr. MORSE. I do not cast it aside. I would insist that the controls are written in there to guarantee complete control to the local school districts. The controls are in the Gaylord Nelson-Ted Kennedy-Lyndon Johnson program for the Teacher Corps. Those three men are as sincere as the senior Senator from Ohio or the senior Senator from Oregon in seeking to prevent any Federal control.

What bothers me about the whole attitude expressed concerning the Teacher Corps is, how are we going to reach those little boys and girls? They will not be reached without this special service. They have not been reached, and they constitute a great problem in the schools in the country.

Listen to the school superintendents. They say:

If we do not have this assistance, we must continue to sacrifice the boys and girls.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I think there is a fallacy in that argument. The assumption made by the Senator from Oregon is that the U.S. Treasury is endlessly filled with an overflow of money and that the local and State governments do not have money.

The President now emphasizes that it is important to cut Federal spending. I do not subscribe to the idea that the U.S. Treasury can everlastingly be used to do things which the local communities do not want to do.

The Senator argues that superintendents come here and demand money. It would be miraculous if, when we say that money is available and give hints that we might give that money to them, they did not come here and ask for the money.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I most respectfully make two points to my friend.

I make no such assumption that the Senator attributes to me concerning the Treasury of the United States.

I do not think we can justify wasting the money of the taxpayers. I do not think that the Treasury of the United States is a bottomless pocket.

I would not be asking for a dime for this program if I thought the program was not needed to promote and to protect human value. That is not my argument. That is the argument of the Senator from Ohio, but not the argument of the Senator from Oregon.

I think the Senator does our educators and superintendents a great injus-

tice if he thinks that they come here to ask for money they do not need.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I assume that they do need the money, but they do not ask their local taxpayers to approve it.

Mr. MORSE. Quite to the contrary. Listen to their testimony. They say that they have asked for local money, and many of them testify about having been turned down on the last bond issue and being turned down by the State agency. They cannot get the money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the point I want to make.

Mr. MORSE. There are constitutional limitations in many States.

All I am talking about is a sharing of the responsibility. I happen to think that the Senator from Ohio and I as Federal citizens, as well as State citizens, have a responsibility to come in and help these poverty-stricken districts.

The Senator knows how the laws work in various States. It is a great, complex pattern. The money will not be available. The service is not being rendered. What we are doing is costing the American taxpayers several times the amount that we are asking for by warping the lives of individuals, by creating criminals and by placing on welfare men and women that could have developed the intellectual potentiality to get out of the slums. We are sentencing those individuals to a future life in the slums. I think that is a great waste.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I recognize the sincerity of the Senator from Oregon. But I think the Senator made an admission a moment ago that he has repeatedly stated, namely, that the matter has been submitted to the voters largely on a bond issue and the voters of the community have turned it down. They say that they are here to ask us to take moneys out of the Federal Treasury because their own taxpayers would not approve such expenditures.

Mr. MORSE. That is no admission. I point out that if the Federal Government would start assuming a major share of its responsibility in this field, we would get more cooperation from the local school districts. We should use the money of the American taxpayers that Congress is already spending elsewhere in the world, and not for the benefit of our own people.

That is why the Senator has heard me say that our great need is for a domestic aid program rather than a foreign aid program in this country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We need both.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. I am for foreign aid, but not for the kind of highjacking foreign aid program that we have been passing in Congress in recent years, looting the pockets of the taxpayers. It is catching up with us.

I do not want to see boys and girls in the slums of America suffer because of a failure on our part to put in the checks that ought to be in the law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not believe that any Senator would like to see that happen.

Mr. MORSE. I would like to see them vote against it, then.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is a concept of realism involved in this matter.

Mr. MORSE. The \$7.5 million in this bill would only liquidate the program contained in the statute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think the concept of realism is manifested not only in the bill but also by the action of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Seven and one-half million dollars of the twenty million dollars has been provided. That is enough to liquidate the program as of June 30. The House was asked for \$31 million. That amount would have funded 3,750 teachers and 850 in training, after June 30.

That is a small number of teachers to deal with this cancerous condition which exists in the educational body of our country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The point I make is that there is strength in the fear expressed that the Federal Government will set up a pool of teachers—3,750 teachers for 1967, and probably 50,000 for 1975—and that the then incumbent administration will use that corps of teachers and send them throughout the country. Regardless of how hard I try, I cannot dismiss from my mind the danger that exists in that situation. I do not want the Federal Government to develop armies of propagandists to go around the country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I respectfully say to the Senator from Ohio that I think we are engaging in a fallacious argument.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We have covered that.

Mr. MORSE. But the Senator keeps repeating what I think is a fallacious argument.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator keeps repeating his statement.

Mr. MORSE. I always will, as long as the Senator engages in that kind of fallacious argument.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will continue to repeat my statement.

Mr. MORSE. We will build up a record then that the public will read.

Does the Senator take the position that the money that goes to subsidize and pay the Federal-State employees across the country endangers Federal control? Does the Senator think that the great land-grant colleges of this country, and those professors who are the beneficiaries of that kind of Federal subsidy, constitute an educational threat to the Government?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not, but there are certain classifications.

I am of the belief that the program of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been used for political propaganda and the development of political strength.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because I take judicial notice now that I have a vote coming up, because we are going to bring the poverty bill to the floor of the Senate soon, and we have some controls in it. I am glad that I will get a vote with respect to that.

I want to say that the fear that the Senator from Ohio has about—

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are back where we started from.

Mr. MORSE. Three thousand seven hundred and fifty teachers about to take over the educational processes of this country is absurd.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But that probably means 37,500 by 1975, so we are back where we started from.

Mr. MORSE. No. We are not back where we started from. The Senator never got up with me.

The issue is, what is the need? If the need is there—and this is the way to meet the need, with the checks against Federal control—we ought to meet the need.

Mr. President, I wish to continue on another phase of this report. First, I want to finish my comment on the Teacher Corps.

I feel, however, that the fruits of that legislative victory in conference with the House, are to be turned to ashes by the action of the Appropriations Committee which provides funding for the program only through June 30, ignoring completely the implied commitment to the students, universities, and teachers that are involved in the 2-year program of masters legal training for these young professionals.

The program is not a large one. Four hundred teams, nationwide, would be, to be frank, but a demonstration of a new concept in teacher training. I can assure the members of the Appropriations Committee and the Senate that we will not be able to solve the teacher shortage, if indeed there is a teacher shortage, through the nonfinancing recruitment and training efforts in this area.

I was very much distressed to see that another part of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, suffered a \$12.5 million cut. I am perhaps prejudiced because the masters fellowship program for teachers and ancillary educational professions derive from a bill which I had originally introduced, and which was based upon a concept of teacher training which gave great promise, and one which opened up new vistas for bringing into the field young people of high talent. The \$42.5 million of the administration recommendation would have provided for 4,101 fellowships, had it been fully funded. The \$30 million item recommended by the committee will provide for only 2,140 training opportunities. At a time when there is general concern about the ability of our school system to meet the demands placed upon it by an ever-growing population of school-age children, we must recognize that deferral of programs such as this, through underfunding, will come back to haunt us in the years ahead.

I note the concern of the committee in the medical area over the problems encountered in recruiting the able professionals to staff the health programs. I would point out to the committee that the surest way to solve recruitment problems at the medical school level is to encourage and improve the general educational level in our elementary schools and in our secondary schools, to the end that more of our young people will be stimulated into entering higher education, and thus become part of the pool

which will be tapped for graduate education in these crucial health areas.

There is one additional area under the Higher Education Act of 1965 authorities of title IV, where I am distressed by the committee action. I refer to the curtailment in the student scholarships from the level established in 1966. By reducing the appropriations for the new economic opportunity grants by \$7.5 million, at \$500 per student, the committee is denying to about 15,000 young men and women the opportunity to enter or stay in college. I believe the approach taken is shortsighted in the national interest on two accounts. First, I believe it is undeniable that were they to be given the opportunity to go to college, their lifetime earnings and the income tax realized therefrom would have repaid tenfold the investment in these scholarships, and second, the increase in our gross national product which we might otherwise have had, resulting from their increased earnings as a consequence of that higher level of skill obtained from advanced training, will not be available.

This is an injury to our economy, not a help to it. We are not saving anything. We are wasting the taxpayers' money by denying these scholarships.

This committee has heard me state many times the undeniable facts the evidence points out as to what the average lifetime earning of a college graduate is, as opposed to that of a high school graduate and a school dropout. During their lifetime, college graduates pour into the Treasury many, many times the cost of their education, by the increased taxes they are able to pay, which they otherwise would not be able to pay. If there ever was a penny wise, pound foolish policy, this is it.

Mr. President, one does not economize at the expense of the education of the young people of this country. If one really wishes to invest taxpayers' dollars in a program that will return many times the investment to the economic welfare of the country, he should support the senior Senator from Oregon, as he pleads against cuts in these educational programs.

Oregon is not a densely populated State; California, New York, Pennsylvania, and Alabama far surpass her in population. But as a result of this cut, about 195 young Oregon students will not be able to go to college, who would have gone had the administration estimates been upheld by the committee. Oregon's share of this program is very small, only 1.3 percent of the total. I am very pleased, of course, that the 1,519 of last year can continue, and that 1,430 will be able to start; but I must regret the loss, possibly forever, of the \$97,500 which would have opened a new educational opportunity to the 195 now denied.

In the same vein, Mr. President, I deplore the \$4,897,000 decrease under 1966 to finance teachers institutes under the National Defense Education Act titles V-B and XI. We have constantly, through our legislative efforts over the past few years, broadened and expanded these essentially inservice training op-

portunities for our teachers. Many Senators have written me in support of further expansion in this area to include categories which have not yet received legislative approval, particularly in the physical education, health, and recreation areas. To these Senators I can only say, as I have in my correspondence with them, that unless the institute programs are funded, it is exceedingly difficult to expand them to include new categories of educational professionals.

I would urge those who would see this worthwhile institute program broadened further to join me in expressing to the members of the Appropriations Committee their concern for full funding of this program.

There is one item, Mr. President, in the appropriations report which frankly baffles me. I am sure there is an excellent explanation for the action and it may be that it is the intention of the committee to seek funding for the Library Services and Construction Act in a supplemental appropriation. I note that the committee report on page 84, under the title of, "Grants for Public Libraries," indicates that no action was taken due to lack of authorization. Since Public Law 89-511, which was carried through committee by the chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, was signed into law on July 19, 1966, may I have the assurances of the leader of the bill that there is no intent on the part of the committee to refuse to supply funds for this program, but rather that it was the intent of the committee to fund it in another vehicle?

May I also at this time express the hope to the manager of the bill that he can give me some assurances that should the administration submit estimates in a supplemental appropriations bill covering the programs authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, the committee will give to the new justifications accompanying the estimates most careful consideration and that where, in the judgment of the committee, the justifications are adequate, additional funds would be provided?

I appreciate very much the candor of the manager of the bill and because I am satisfied that the committee will carefully evaluate the administration proposals in these areas should they be sent, I shall be happy to vote for this bill.

I wish to say to the manager of the bill that I owe him an apology. I received a telephone call at my office advising me that the Senate was about to go out, and would I please go to the floor of the Senate and raise the questions that I raised with the manager in regard to the Oregon Research Institute. It was my understanding that I was to make my speech. I did not know that the manager of the bill had not yet made his speech on the bill. I would not have thought of making my speech ahead of his speech.

I want the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to know that somehow, somehow, the lines of communication got crossed. I am sorry. I shall now sit and listen to the Senator from Alabama as patiently as he listened to me.

Mr. HILL. The Senator need have no concern or worry about the matter. I am delighted that the Senator made his speech while he had the opportunity to make his speech. It does not concern me in the least that he made his speech ahead of mine.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry.

Mr. HILL. I am glad that the Senator made his speech.

Mr. MORSE. I am going to leave with the chairman the two questions that I asked in the last part of my speech. If later in his remarks the Senator deems it appropriate to make reply to them I would be glad to have his reply made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. HILL. Let me say this. Of course, if the administration submits these estimates in a supplemental appropriation bill they will receive the most careful and sympathetic consideration by the committee. The answer is very definite there.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill, H.R. 14745, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations totals \$10,473,309,500, a reduction of \$99,963,000 from the amount of the bill as passed the House, and an increase of \$390,125,000 over the budget estimates.

We have heard protestations from many sources concerning the alleged prodigal allowances over the budget requests approved by the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress—from the President, from Members of Congress, and from the public. This bill as passed by the House was \$490,088,000 over the budget estimates.

Included in the House allowances were the following increases, among others, in excess of the budget estimates: \$232,800,000 for payments to school districts in providing education in federally impacted schools, under Public Law 874, enacted in 1950 as a successor to the Lanham Act enacted early in World War II; \$11,950,000 for instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts and related fields in the 68 land-grant colleges, the basic authorization for which was approved by President Lincoln in 1862; \$157,813,000 for student loan funds under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, to allow the full authorization of \$190 million; and \$21 million to allow the full authorization for student loans to medical and nurse students. The total increases for these items is \$423,563,000.

Had the President made adequate provision for these items, the bill before us today would be \$33 million under the budget requests. The Congress has since the inception of Public Law 874 appropriated funds annually to pay entitlements in full; the President's budget estimate for 1967, \$183,400,000, which was predicated upon extensive legislative amendments to be proposed by the President for enactment—and which by the

way have been rejected by committee action in both Houses—would have dropped hundreds of school districts from the entitlement rolls and drastically reduced entitlements to other districts. I wonder if a motion to reduce the committee allowance to the budget estimate, a cut of \$232,800,000, would receive many votes in the Senate.

And what would the Senate action be if someone offered a motion to delete, as the President recommended, the funds for the land-grant colleges?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I completely approve of the inference, from the statement of the distinguished Senator, that the omission by the budget of funds for the defense-impacted schools and funds for the land-grant colleges was most unrealistic.

Everyone who had anything to do with framing the budget must have known that those amounts would have been replaced by Congress, and that, in my judgment, Congress would have been subject to the gravest criticism if it had not replaced them.

I want the RECORD to show my support of the Senator's statement with regard to those two items, and perhaps others; but particularly with respect to those two items I wish to point out that the budget was completely unrealistic and those reductions should not have been made.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for his statement. As a member of the subcommittee and the full committee the Senator from Florida strongly supported the restoration of these funds which were cut out by the budget.

The President's budget request for the NDEA student loan funds was \$34,187,000, which the Office of Education did not expect to spend, but to use as advances to colleges in the spring and summer, and then to recover such advances when the students negotiated the guaranty loans, as authorized in the Higher Education Act of 1965. Today we know that the loan guarantee program is not progressing as anticipated—the Office of Education contemplated some 375,000 guarantee loans for a total of \$750 million. Senators have heard from constituents because of the inability of students to get the financial assistance contemplated in these two programs—the NDEA loans and the guaranty loan. Had not the House added, and the Senate committee approved, funds in the amount of \$157,813,000 to allow the full amount authorized, \$190 million, the Congress would have received thousands of messages from irate constituents concerning the inadequacy of the administration's requests.

As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] knows, we restored these funds to carry out the student loan programs under the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would like to have my earlier comments apply to that restoration.

Our country is crying for more trained men and women, and particularly for more trained men and women who are able to take important places in the defense and security of our country. To have made the great cut that was suggested in those National Defense Education Act funds was something that I believe the Congress could not have contemplated doing. I am glad that the fund was restored.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Florida, as a member of the subcommittee and the full committee, played an important part in the restoration of these funds, in not permitting these reductions. The funds were restored so that they would be available to carry out the provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

The reduced budget estimate, the House increase and the Senate committee approval, for the student loan program for medical and nursing students is similar to the National Defense Education Act student loan program—the budget request was one-half of the full authorization, and the House added funds to allow the full authorization.

Of course, we know that if the funds we put in do not meet the requirements, they will be taken care of in the supplemental bill.

Mr. MORSE. Let me state for the record that I expressed my disappointment about what I considered to be inadequate money for the Teacher Corps. Does the Senator wish to state for the record—although the bill calls for only \$7.5 million for the Teacher Corps—that further consideration will be given to it in the supplemental bill?

Mr. HILL. Undoubtedly that is absolutely true. As the Senator knows, there is legislation for the elementary and secondary schools. We had no estimate for that because the legislation had not passed at the time the estimates were sent up. Undoubtedly, funds for the program for the elementary and secondary education act will be considered in the supplemental, along with the other funds.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator made that statement because as he knows, I am in a difficult position with regard to this appropriation bill because of my views, and how important it is that we receive adequate money to finance the programs of elementary and secondary educational activities and also higher educational activities. Both bills have yet to come to the floor. They have yet to go through the full committee. I am indebted to the Senator for so many reasons that I never like to disagree with him on any matter when I know how fair he is; but I should say, the fact that we do not have an elementary and secondary bill and a higher education bill on the calendar awaiting Senate consideration is not the fault of the Senator from Alabama, and neither is it mine.

Mr. HILL. Of course not.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Alabama and I have not had much of a free

choice in the matter, in that we have had to follow administration priorities.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. We took a long time on the minimum wage bill. It took many days.

Mr. HILL. Yes, many days.

Mr. MORSE. It took days beyond what we anticipated it would take, meanwhile holding up the education bills.

Mr. HILL. We were a long time on the machinists' strike.

Mr. MORSE. We were many days considering the airlines' strike.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. We set aside all business for that, and then we just finished a long controversy on the poverty program which is still waiting for the report to be written up before it can come to the floor of the Senate.

Thus, I want the Senator to know that, in my opinion, he has done everything he could to move along the education bills.

To give the Senate some idea of the cooperation the Senator from Alabama always extends to the committee, he has placed upon me the responsibility of taking the bills through the committee when he has been tied up on the appropriation bill. We have so many cross-memberships on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that it has been impossible, sometimes, even to get a quorum.

The assurance the Senator gives me now is important for this record, because there will be many misunderstandings throughout the country on this appropriation bill, especially on the part of our educators. I know. The Senator from Alabama can have my assurance that whatever we pass tomorrow, I will be saying to the educators, as they express disappointments to me, "Well, read what Senator HILL said in the RECORD on September 26, 1966, about the supplemental appropriation bill."

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. That will be coming up in answer to a specific question which the Senator from Oregon put to him, that we will have a supplemental appropriation bill. I tried to cooperate, too. I want to say that I made some reference in that part of my speech on the Teacher Corps, that if there was some interest, I would not hesitate to offer an amendment to it. It is not my present intention to offer one tomorrow, but that does not mean that if there are those who feel we should not wait for the supplemental bill, I would not support one. But I would recommend to them as of now, in view of what the Senator from Alabama has said, that we wait for the supplemental and that we go ahead with what we have in regard to appropriations for what I think are inadequately financed educational programs, and take it up at the time of the supplemental. I think that is only fair to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say that no one could be more devoted to the cause of education, could give more of his time, his thought, his efforts, and his leadership to the cause of education

than the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; but, he has had these many difficulties, such as the legislation to which he and I have referred, which made it impossible to get action on some of these bills. But the bills will be acted upon and, undoubtedly, a supplemental appropriation bill will come up that will make it possible for the appropriation of funds to be authorized by this legislation. Certainly, no one could have been more tireless in his efforts, or more devoted to the cause of education, than the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, for the Department of Labor the committee recommends a total of \$638,220,000, a reduction of \$48 million from the House allowance, \$58,260,000 from the budget estimates, and \$66,357,500 from the 1966 appropriation.

The committee recommends reductions in the Department of Labor accounts as follows: \$10 million for "Manpower development and training activities"; \$5 million for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Manpower Administration"; \$23 million for "Advance for employment services"; and \$10 million for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen."

For the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the committee recommends a total of \$9,778,125,000, a reduction of \$51,963,000 from the House allowance, and an increase of \$448,385,000 over the budget estimates.

The committee reduced the allowance for the Food and Drug Administration, salaries and expenses, by \$3,454,000, inasmuch as there was an unobligated balance of \$3 million out of the 1966 appropriation of \$53,079,000; and the request for "Buildings and facilities" was reduced by \$950,000, sought for the planning of an additional laboratory facility at Beltsville, Md.; the Congress denied this request a year ago inasmuch as the committee felt there was no shown need for the establishment of this facility in the Metropolitan Washington area.

For the Office of Education the committee recommends an allowance of \$1,693,935,000, a reduction of \$42,645,000 from the House allowance; the committee recommendation includes the increases added by the House for payments to school districts under Public Law 874, for grants to the States for land-grant colleges, and for the National Defense Education Act student loans.

The committee added \$7.5 million for the National Teacher Corps, for which the House made no provision, to pay 90 percent of the salaries through fiscal year 1967 of corps members employed by local school districts, local administrative costs, and certain transportation expenses. The committee also added \$25 million under title III of the National Defense Education Act for grants to States for the acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling, to allow \$79.2 million for the purpose, the same amount

as was appropriated for 1966, in lieu of the budget estimate and House allowance of \$54.2 million.

Reductions in the Office of Education funds are recommended as follows: expansion and improvement of vocational education, \$17,750,000; higher educational activities, \$30 million; research and training, \$10 million; educational research, special foreign currency program, \$800,000; foreign language training and area studies, \$500,000; salaries and expenses, office of the Commissioner, \$6,095,000.

For the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration the committee recommends a total of \$312,054,000, a reduction of \$17 million from the House allowance.

For the Public Health Service the committee recommends a total of \$2,505,412,000, an increase of \$59,802,000 over the House allowance; included in this increase is \$41 million for the National Institutes of Health, and \$25 million for grants for construction of health research facilities.

Let us look at the allowance for the National Institutes of Health. The Public Health Service approved requests and submitted them to the Department for the operating accounts of the NIH totaling \$1,348,177,000; the Department reduced these requests by \$48,427,000, and submitted to the Bureau of the Budget NIH estimates totaling \$1,299,750,000; the Budget Bureau reduced these requests by \$113,010,000 to \$1,186,740,000, the 1967 budget estimate. The total reduction assessed by the Department and the Budget Bureau totaled \$161,437,000. The original budget request approved by the Budget Bureau for the National Cancer Institute was for an amount lower than the 1966 appropriation, but later it was raised to an amount \$189,000 over the 1966 appropriation.

The annual authorization for several years for grants for construction of health research facilities was \$50 million. The full authorization was appropriated by the Congress annually. Last year the Congress raised the authorization to \$280 million in the aggregate over a 3-year period. The request from the NIH, approved by the Department, was for \$100 million. The Bureau of the Budget at the outset deleted the item—allowed nothing—but later allowed \$15 million. The recommendation of the committee proposes \$75 million for health research facilities and \$6 million for grants for construction of mental retardation research centers. At the close of fiscal year 1966, 61 grants had been approved and unpaid for health research facilities, with matching on a 50-50 basis, totaling \$60,908,000.

For St. Elizabeths Hospital the committee approved the budget estimate and House allowance for "Salaries and expenses"; and for "Buildings and facilities," added \$160,000 to permit the planning of a facility to house approximately 50 youths under 18 years of age apart from the adult patients. This money had been requested but disallowed by the Department.

The committee allowed the full budget estimate for three accounts of the Social

Security Administration—for salaries and expenses, for payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged, and for payment for military service credits. For construction, to be derived from the Social Security Administration trust funds, the committee added \$16,939,000 for the construction of 42 district field offices and for the acquisition of land contiguous to its headquarters site in Baltimore. These funds are not out of the Treasury.

The committee recommends for the Welfare Administration a total of \$3,956,456,000, a reduction of \$47,400,000 from the House allowance. The principal reduction was \$46,400,000 for grants to States for public assistance; the Federal Government is obligated by law to reimburse the States on a formula basis for whatever benefits are paid and the Congress will be required to provide any supplementary funds which may be needed.

For Gallaudet College the committee added \$35,000 for "Salaries and expenses" and \$20,000 for "Construction," the latter for planning an addition to the cafeteria, and the former for additional custodial services.

For the Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses, a reduction of \$531,000 is recommended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 2, line 9, to strike out "\$400,044,000" and insert "\$390,044,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968."

On page 2, line 18, to strike out "\$35,900,000" and insert "\$30,900,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968."

On page 3, line 17, after "(68 Stat. 1130)", to strike out "\$508,950,000" and insert "\$524,000,000", and at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$12,000,000".

On page 5, after line 2, to strike out:

"ADVANCES FOR EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

"For advances to the account 'Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration' for employment services, \$23,000,000, to be in addition to amounts otherwise available in that account and to be repaid as may be hereafter provided by law."

On page 5, line 13, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$90,000,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 shall be available for benefit payments for trade adjustment activities."

On page 6, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$18,172,000 which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund" and insert "\$17,222,000 which may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, of which not to ex-

ceed \$1,475,500 shall be available for activities of the farm labor services, and".

On page 13, line 3, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$63,454,000" and insert "\$60,000,000".

On page 13, line 7, after the word "services", to strike out "\$4,080,000" and insert "\$3,130,000".

On page 13, line 21, after "(20 U.S.C. 35-35n)", to strike out "\$290,041,000" and insert "\$272,291,000"; on page 14, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "\$220,250,000", and insert "\$202,500,000", and in line 8, after the numerals "1963", to insert "of which \$192,500,000 shall be available for grants to States, and not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available for research and special project activities under said section".

On page 14, line 25, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$403,900,000" and insert "\$373,900,000".

On page 15, line 1, after the word "which", to strike out "\$10,000,000 shall be for grants for college and university extension education under title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965"; in line 6, after the word "act", to strike out "\$122,000,000" and insert "\$114,500,000"; in line 7, after the word "which", to strike out "\$119,500,000" and insert "\$112,000,000", and in line 14, after the numerals "1968", to insert "\$30,000,000 shall be for the program under part C of title V of that Act".

On page 15, after line 21, to insert:

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

"For the National Teacher Corps authorized in part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, \$7,500,000 for the purposes of section 514 of said Act: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 per centum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teacher Corps: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be spent on behalf of any National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to approval of such program by the State educational agency of the State in which the school system is located."

On page 17, line 2, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to carry out the provisions of legislation enacted after June 30, 1966."

On page 17, line 21, after "(20 U.S.C. ch. 17: Public Law 88-665)", to strike out "\$431,357,000" and insert "\$446,357,000"; on page 18, line 2, after the word "contributions", to strike out "\$63,200,000" and insert "\$82,200,000", and in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "\$54,200,000" and insert "\$79,200,000".

On page 20, line 2, after the numerals "1965", to strike out "\$80,000,000" and insert "\$70,000,000".

On page 20, line 11, after the word "law", to strike out "\$1,800,000" and insert "\$1,000,000".

On page 20, line 19, after "(75 Stat. 529)", to strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$3,000,000".

On page 21, line 2, after the word "slides", to strike out "\$39,095,000" and insert "\$33,000,000, including \$100,000 to be available only for the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf and \$100,000 to be available only for the National Conference on Education of the Deaf."

On page 21, line 11, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$259,060,000" and insert "\$244,060,000", and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "\$236,000,000" and insert "\$221,000,000".

On page 23, line 19, after the word "law", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000".

On page 26, line 23, after "grants-in-aid", to strike out "\$90,614,000" and insert "\$81,614,000".

On page 27, line 8, to strike out "\$124,190,000" and insert "\$124,280,000".

On page 28, line 7, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$20,597,000" and insert "\$21,597,000", and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "\$13,950,000" and insert "\$14,950,000".

On page 29, line 13, to strike out "\$9,193,000" and insert "\$9,693,000".

On page 32, line 5, after the word "Act", insert "including \$27,000,000 for the purposes of subsection (2) of said section".

On page 33, line 12, strike out "\$6,342,000" and insert "\$6,592,000".

On page 33, line 18, after the word "aircraft", strike out "\$20,395,000" and insert "\$20,895,000".

On page 35, line 22, after the word "sciences", strike out "\$142,613,000" and insert "\$145,113,000, of which \$1,000,000 shall be available for the training of clinical anesthesiologists".

On page 36, line 9, after the word "development", strike out "\$61,422,000" and insert "\$64,922,000".

On page 36, line 15, after the word "act", strike out "\$170,656,000" and insert "\$175,656,000".

On page 36, line 23, strike out "\$258,119,000" and insert "\$164,119,000".

On page 37, line 11, after the word "act", to strike out "\$154,770,000" and insert "\$169,770,000".

On page 37, line 22, strike out "\$133,687,000" and insert "\$135,687,000".

On page 38, line 5, after the word "diseases", strike out "\$88,670,000" and insert "\$90,670,000".

On page 38, line 12, after the word "blindness", strike out "\$111,296,000" and insert "\$116,296,000".

On page 39, line 4, after the word "Act", strike out "\$56,000,000" and insert "\$81,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, after the word "law", strike out "\$19,217,000" and insert "\$10,000,000".

On page 40, at the beginning of line 2, strike out "\$20,092,000" and insert "\$20,192,000".

On page 40, line 18, after the word "methods", strike out "\$8,069,000" and insert "\$7,648,000".

On page 42, line 19, after the word "specifications", strike out "\$2,138,000" and insert "\$2,298,000".

On page 43, line 21, after the word "construction", strike out "\$26,250,000" and insert "\$43,189,000".

On page 44, line 22, after "(42 U.S.C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX)", to strike out "\$3,746,400,000" and insert "\$3,700,000,000".

On page 48, line 2, after "(42 U.S.C. 1310)", strike out "\$3,150,000" and insert "\$3,650,000".

On page 48, line 8, after the word "law", strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$1,500,000".

On page 51, line 7, after "(Public Law 420)", strike out "\$2,485,000" and insert "\$2,520,000".

On page 51, line 19, after the word "services", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$70,000".

On page 52, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "\$7,531,000" and insert "\$7,000,000", and, in line 15, after the word "Welfare", to insert a colon and "Provided, That the position now designated as Comptroller, level V, shall hereafter be designated as Assistant Secretary, Comptroller, level V.". At the top of page 55, to strike out:

"Sec. 203. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost of such project."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"SEC. 203. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount equal to as much as the entire cost of such project: *Provided*, That no such grant for medical and health related research shall be considered out of conformance with this limitation if the non-Federal share of such cost is 3 per centum."

On page 55, after line 17, to strike out:

"Sec. 205. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used for any activity the purpose of which is to require any recipient of any project grant for research, training, or demonstration made by any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to pay to the United States any portion of any interest or other income earned on payments of such grant made before July 1, 1964; nor shall any of the funds contained in this Act be used for any activity the purpose of which is to require payment to the United States of any portion of any interest or other income earned on payments made before July 1, 1964, to the American Printing House for the Blind."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"SEC. 205. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used for any activity the purpose of which is to require any recipient, including States, municipalities, and local agencies, of any grant for research, training, demonstration, or other purpose made by any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to pay to the United States any portion of any interest or other income earned on payments of such grants made before July 1, 1964; nor shall any of the funds contained in this Act be used for any activity the purpose of which is to require payment to the United States of any portion of any interest or other income earned on payments of such grants made before July 1, 1964, to the American Printing House for the Blind; nor shall any of the funds contained in this Act be used for any activity the purpose of which is to require any recipient, including States, municipalities, and local and private agencies, of any grants for research, training, or demonstration made by any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to refund to the United States overpayments that may have resulted from the use of fixed indirect cost rates as a basis for determining grants awarded prior to July 1, 1965."

On page 57, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 207. No funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or administer any program whereby any requirement shall be imposed on any hospital or other medical facility as to an individual beneficiary which is contrary to the beneficiary's physical or mental well-being as certified by the attending physician and the chief medical officer of the facility, or the acting chief medical officer."

On page 57, after line 11, to insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 208. None of the funds contained in this title shall be available for additional permanent Federal positions in the Washington area if the proportion of additional positions in the Washington area in relation to the total new positions is allowed to exceed the proportion existing at the close of fiscal year 1966."

On page 62, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say that the Senator from Alabama has been very helpful to me. I am glad that I remained in the Chamber to listen to his remarks.

September 26, 1966

I want him to know that I shall continue to work with him in regard to his problems on the Appropriations Committee, to the end that together we can get the maximum amount for these needed educational programs which we can justify until a supplemental appropriation bill comes up.

Mr. HILL. I want to thank the Senator very much.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, during the time I served as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, great, constructive changes were made in our Nation's public welfare programs. We were especially concerned with the responsibility of the Federal Government in the administration of the various public assistance grants-in-aid to the States. A number of urgent reforms were needed. The public welfare programs were serving a necessary purpose. They were keeping people from starvation; they were providing daily maintenance of a large number of people, the very old, the very young, the sick, and the disabled. What we did was to rework these laws to emphasize prevention—and where it was too late, rehabilitation, a fresh start. Specifically, the reforms were of two kinds. First, it was necessary to provide an assurance to the American people that the caseload was a valid one. Persons receiving assistance must be eligible, and the amount of the assistance they were receiving must reflect their actual need. Fraud could not be tolerated even if it existed in only one single case. We reviewed the procedure the Department had in this area and concluded that while they were basically sound, they needed to be strengthened by the development of a specified procedure for dealing with the cases of recipient fraud. These procedures are now an integral part of the operation of the public welfare programs.

The second broad set of reforms could only partly be accomplished by administrative direction; legislation was needed. What was needed was to redirect the emphasis of the program. Eligibility determination and the payment of financial assistance were still important. But we needed to incorporate constructive social services which would move recipients off the welfare rolls to self-support where possible or to self-care where that was feasible.

The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, which were formulated during my period in office, gave the Federal Government the tools to redirect the program along these constructive lines. This is now being done. I have today introduced a bill to extend these amendments another 5 years. It was my desire that the public assistance programs be good programs, available to those who are truly in need and bringing opportunities for independence to those who can in any way be helped. That is why the bill I have introduced today also provides that effective July 1, 1969, every State and the District of Columbia must include aid to needy children whose parents are unemployed.

I read with great interest the paragraph included in the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the subject of the responsibility of the Federal Government with respect to the eligibility of assistance recipients. The report suggests that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in its guidelines to States, require that in the determination of eligibility for public assistance, thorough checks be made, including inspection of the premises with the permission of the client. This means that the State would normally be expected to make a home visit in every public assistance case at some stage.

This procedure would not require that the visits be made before the time assistance is granted, provided the visit be made within some reasonable period of time thereafter. It would permit help to be given quickly to meet emergency needs and to prevent unnecessary hardship. Since the permission of the client is required, the visit would not be made during unusual hours, such as late at night, because it would be difficult to conclude that a public assistance applicant or recipient could give valid permission under such circumstances. The language contemplates that welfare departments will continue to require appropriate verification with respect to items about which there might be reasonable doubt.

The committee is obviously concerned that assistance be given only to eligible people. Nobody will contest the need for or the validity of this point of view. From my experience, however, in the administration of these programs, it is clear that a constructive welfare program serving the needs of the Nation must combine the element of caseload validity with a sympathetic and constructive approach to the many problems of assistance recipients.

The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 expire on June 30, 1967. It is my firm belief that they must be continued and strengthened. We must take a new, hard, and constructive look at the fabric of our programs geared to aid our least fortunate citizens.

They should be coordinated and adjusted to meet new and changing needs. No waste or overlapping or inefficiency should be tolerated; neither should hunger or distress on the part of our most important resource—our Nation's children. These programs must be administered, as I said long ago, when the program was first proposed, with a hard head and compassionate heart.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

TWENTY DAYS IN JUNE—SUCCESSFUL CONTROL OF A FOREST PEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there has just come to my attention a fine article

that appeared in the March 1966 issue of American Forests entitled "Twenty Days in June."

This article describes in graphic terms an exciting episode in the continuing war being waged by the Forest Service against pests that destroy our forests—in this case, the deadly tussock moth. As the article aptly described the situation:

The Forest Service's tussock moth operation might turn out to be more than the biggest helicopter attack ever staged against a timber enemy. It may well become a case study example of how, through an intelligent balancing of flight technology, applied biology and responsive public relations, a forest enemy can be overcome.

The intensive project to combat an outbreak of tussock moth infestation in the Malheur National Forest, in the vicinity of Bend, Oreg., was planned with military precision and close timing to assure that the effects of the pest eradication program would be concentrated on the tussock moth while avoiding injury to fish and wildlife and domestic animals of the area.

This intricate operation involved a cooperative and extremely well-coordinated arrangement between the Forest Service and a very efficient Oregon helicopter operation—Evergreen Helicopters, Inc., of McMinnville, Oreg.

I wish to pay special tribute to the Evergreen Co. for the part it played in this very successful forest-spraying operation. Its fine helicopter pilots gave impressive accounts of themselves in carrying on spraying operations which concentrated, with deadly effect, on the tussock moths in the infested areas.

This very dramatic description of Pilot Alan Cole's participation in the helicopter attack against the forest pest appears in the American Forests' article:

At 5:45 a.m., Evergreen Pilot Alan Cole swung his Hiller 12-E skyward and the war was on.

Cole gunned his 2800-lb. bird from the meadow helispot, picked up a 45-mile-per-hour speed, spotted his first run, then swooped over the timber and flicked a toggle switch on the cyclic control, laying an 80-foot swath of mist onto the forest.

"Leading" and "lagging" with his switch, contouring his flight path to follow the tumbling mountains, skidding into tight six-second "spray turns," Cole banked, slipped, flared and dipped his bubble-bird 'till his spray tanks were empty, then sped to his spot for another load. The instant he touched ground, crewmen filled the tanks through three-inch plumbing in a "pit stop" of just 30 seconds racing for time in the morning calmness.

Guided and observed by a Forest Service copter that flew above and behind, Cole laid his bird close to the land—just 30 feet over the tree tops—depositing the killing mist over 660 acres of the Vance creek unit. Along the creek and in grassy grazing areas, Cole's toggle switch expertly clicked to "off" for split seconds until the trees popped up again.

Mr. President, I know that my Senate colleagues will be deeply impressed, as I was, over the account of this magnificent battle to protect our Federal forests. As senior Senator from Oregon, I take great pride in the joint enterprise between the Forest and Evergreen Helicopters, Inc., which was brought to such a successful conclusion. Therefore, I

ask unanimous consent that the text of the article entitled "Twenty Days In June" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY DAYS IN JUNE—THE CAUTIOUS WAR
(By Herbert E. McLean)

The mountain-cool silence of tiny Burns, Oregon, suddenly pulsated at one a.m. Jeeps, pick-ups and the mumblings of men were heard in front of an all-night restaurant. Forest Service men, and a handful of civilians.

They stepped inside and curiously ordered steak . . . for breakfast. Strange goings-on for around Burns, loggers at the bar privately agreed.

Fact of the matter was, a war was about to begin 90 miles up the road. The men were simply getting an early start.

An early start on the biggest, boldest, most cautious war of its kind ever waged in American forestry: an all-helicopter assault on a winged, crawly critter that was, at that moment, methodically defoliating some 66,000 acres of prime forest.

Spreading 50,000 pounds of DDT through cattle, deer and trout country is a pretty serious business, so before long the men shoved away from their tables, and the restaurant locked up for the night.

Some of the Forest Service crew, headed by Project Director Randall Perkins, headed for a vacant furniture store up the street (now a project control center), where a short-wave radio was already crackling out a weather report. Others, in four-wheel drive equipment, drove north into Malheur National Forest, winding through darkened meadows and shadowy stands of fir.

FIFTEEN ACRES OF BROWN

No one would have speculated, just two years prior to June 10, 1965, that a 60-man force of copter pilots, smoke jumpers, entomologists, weather experts, administrators—even a veterinarian—would be laying out a \$240,000 spray project in that quiet forest.

A flying ranger had, however, spotted a 15-acre brown spot in a fir stand on Antelope mountain in June, 1963. "It looked like it had been scorched," he recalled later. In a 54 million-acre forest survey, such things aren't terribly unusual. But they are worth watching.

An entomologist from the Forest Service's insect and disease control branch in Portland hiked the scene later, found caterpillars busily at work on the needles of 10 to 50-year-old douglas and white firs.

"We had it pretty well pegged. We knew we were dealing with the tussock moth, one of the deadliest tree defoliators in the world," relates Benton Howard, insect and disease control chief for the Forest Service's Pacific Northwest region.

Through that summer of '63 and late into the year, conditions favored the moth.

His caterpillars, practically unnoticed since 1947 in this area, suddenly—almost explosively—grew plump and vigorous. Virus infections which normally control the population seemed to have disappeared. Through the cycle from caterpillar, to winged moth, to wintering eggs, larvae by the billions sprang to life. They blew for miles on the brisk upland winds of the Malheur and Ochoco national forests. Hunters and cattle-men noticed egg clusters, cocoons and webs in the branches. They complained of skin irritation—from airborne caterpillar hairs.

By the following summer the Forest Service was alarmed. On August 5, Malheur's Prairie City ranger district gravely reported that the outbreak had become epidemic: a staggering 40,000 acre was now involved. An insect survey crew reported the egg mass

ratio was up from the year before. The situation could worsen.

The moth could, in fact, lay siege—could destroy—200,000 acres of timber land, obliterating \$16.5 million worth of commercial timber and virtually wiping out the lumbering economy of Burns, John Day and Hines.

A SILENT SPRING?

Lethal DDT was the only known weapon against the moth. Applying it would be no small problem.

Grazing lands of the Wine Glass and other ranches were splotched through the ravaged region, making aerial spraying difficult. Overtones of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* pervaded conferences and planning sessions as the prospects of mass public reaction to the spraying were gravely considered. The possibility of damaging some 1,100 deer and elk in the spraying area caused concern among Forest Service personnel as did Vance creek, a critical steelhead stream.

The Forest Service was, in effect, facing a combined migrainous headache in moth epidemiology, aerial spray technology, logistics and public relations.

The answer—if indeed there was one—would have to come from helicopters, it was decided.

To perform the exacting task, the Forest Service called upon Evergreen Helicopters, Inc. of McMinnville, Oregon, whose 134,000 acres of experience on two previous spray projects—probably the largest such copter job ever performed—made it first choice for the job.

In a precisely timed, rigidly plotted, skillfully executed assault, the Evergreen ships would blanket the infested area with a solution of $\frac{1}{4}$ pound of DDT in diesel fuel per acre. Not the meandering grasslands, not the streams. Just the ravaged trees.

But first there was some convincing to be done.

Late in 1964, the Forest Service took its problem to the Pacific Northwest Pest Action Council, an industry-state-federal group formed in 1948, which approved a plan of action presented by Howard. Then the Regional Forester's Advisory Council received the briefing, followed by the Federal Committee on Pest Control.

The Forest Service's Dr. Glenn Crouch, in the meantime, organized a surveillance team to watchdog effects of the spraying. Working with him: representatives of the Oregon State Game Commission, Oregon State University, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and a handful of Forest Service specialist groups.

The Oregon Cattlemen's Association, Wildlife Management Institute, lumber companies and associations—even the Audubon Society and the Izaak Walton League—were invited to participate.

Out in the field on the "working level," the Forest Service arranged briefings and fly-overs for county governing bodies. Local editors and chamber of commerce officials toured the area, and a 70-year-old county judge consented to a helicopter tour—his first time off the ground.

Press kits went out to news media, inviting on-scene coverage and photo flights.

In the first light of last June 10, following literally months of preparation and coordination, and then two weeks of strained suspense during cool weather, the tussock larvae were finally ready for the Big Dose at the stage most susceptible to the insecticides.

Up at Vance creek, the metallic green and white Evergreen craft stood in silhouette. Inside a 5000-gallon truck-mounted tank nearby, an agitator slowly churned the lethal brew as final instructions from Burns came in by radio.

In the flashlight glow of the semidarkness, Forest Service smoke jumpers—brought in as aerial observers and heliport managers—pored over maps and reference points.

The man with the final word—the project director—gave "thumbs up" after a final

check with the meteorologist at the field station.

At 5:45 a.m., Evergreen Pilot Alan Cole swung his Hiller 12-E skyward and the war was on.

Cole gunned his 2800-lb. bird from the meadow heliport, picked up a 45 mile-per-hour speed, spotted his first run, then swooped over the timber and flicked a toggle switch on the cyclic control, laying an 80-foot swath of mist onto the forest.

"Leading" and "lagging" with his switch, contouring his flight path to follow the tumbling mountains, skidding into tight six-second "spray turns," Cole banked, slipped, flared and dipped his bubble-bird 'til his spray tanks were empty, then sped to his spot for another load. The instant he touched ground, crewmen filled the tanks through three-inch plumbing in a "pit stop" of just 30 seconds, racing for time in the morning calmness.

Guided and observed by a Forest Service copter that flew above and behind, Cole laid his bird close to the land—just 30 feet over the tree tops—depositing the killing mist over 660 acres of the Vance creek units. Along the creek and in grassy grazing areas, Cole's toggle switch expertly clicked to "off" for split seconds until the trees popped up again.

By 9 a.m., the gathering thermals of a warm morning brought the wind up to five miles per hour—enough to cause dangerous drift. The spray day ended.

That same warmth stirred tussock larvae to life in other sections of the 70,000-acre battleground. Field entomologists gave the "ready" word as larvae reached 80 percent of hatching at Silver Springs, at Gold Hill, on Antelope and King mountains.

Six spray copters from Evergreen took to battle now, backed by two observation helos from Reeder Flying Service in Twin Falls and the Forest Service machine.

Big tank trucks lumbered into the mountains from Burns and Summit Prairie, carrying the DDT/oil mixture to smaller "nursing rigs" that could negotiate the wet ground to the remote heliports.

Bunking in Burns and hitting the deck at 1 a.m., combat elements of a 32-man Forest Service task group, plus some 25 contractor personnel (copter pilots and mechanics, loaders, truck drivers) battled snow banks, mud-laden roads and downed trees as they threaded deeper into the engagement.

By June 19 the "bugs" hit with their fullest force. Workers swung into back-breaking schedules.

"If you lose three days on one end of this operation, you could be down the drain," remarked one forester.

Into the Burns control center now flowed reports from the U.S. Weather Bureau's field station on the scene. Forest Service fire look-outs radioed in wind and temperature data; ground entomologists flashed word of new tussock break-outs. In the air through the dawn-tinged draws and canyons, rotor blades battled the morning stillness over spray plots ranging from 200 to 750 acres.

Faced with the exacting, ground-hugging requirements of agricultural flying on one hand, and higher altitude hazards of mountain flying on the other, Evergreen pilots fought the combined tensions of possible flight mishap and inadvertent range contamination. Their perception was taxed to the limit as they skidded over the shadowy monotony of the early morning forest.

With no flagmen on the ground, there was the further problem of lining up spray swaths—an intuitive, educated sort of flying in which a tailing observer often acted as a second intelligence. "Skips" in the spray application could cause serious reinfestations; they were just as taboo as "dosed up" meadows.

Still another curious breed of moth battlers roamed the ground below: members

of Mr. Crouch's surveillance team waded Vance creek and Rattlesnake creek for fish and water samples. They dipped water from Malheur lake, gathered bags of litterfall from around trees. They collected grazing land grass and shrubbery from deer areas.

In a massive before-and-after effort involving seven government agencies, 15 personnel and some 400 samples, Mr. Crouch and his group set out to determine the effects of the selective spraying.

In a bawling, stomping melee, a veterinarian attacked the rumps of 11 confused cattle, trading a shot of local anesthetic for a thumb-sized chunk of flesh for analysis. (The same cattle will be tested again later for comparative purposes.)

Forest Service PR man Jim Hughes, seeing cattle "very big" in his telephoto lens, was suddenly overrun by a small stampede.

And then on July 1, the war ended. The helicopters lifted their tails high and darted out of the Malheur and the Ochoco.

Back in Portland, Forest Service officials of the Pacific Northwest region counted casualties and logged results. Moth casualties: Entomologists checked plots throughout the battle area, found that average moth kill exceeded 98 percent . . . a "highly successful" score in anybody's book.

The tussock fighters, in the meantime, returned home virtually unscathed. Despite some 230 hours of time-pressure flying with heavy loads in tricky, close-down flying in thin mountain air, the copter pilots logged a perfect safety record. Similarly, ground crews avoided the hazards of whirling rotor blades, rattlesnakes, distraught cattle and miles of dangerous roads. They broke out just one band-aid during the whole operation when somebody cut his finger on a can of beans.

Forest Service pilot L. H. Johnson, driving east from Burns, even had time to save a boy from drowning.

Surveillance officials won't be able to give the final word on spray after-effects until comparative water, vegetation and wildlife samples are gathered and analyzed months hence. But Dr. Crouch says he is "extremely optimistic."

"We've found virtually no evidence that harm is coming to anything other than the tussock moth larvae," he affirms.

The public press, in the meantime, has given strong support to the whole effort, with not a word of adverse criticism recorded to date.

The Forest Service's tussock moth operation might turn out to be more than the biggest helicopter attack ever staged against a timber enemy. It may well become a case study example of how, through an intelligent balancing of flight technology, applied biology and responsive public relations, a forest enemy can be overcome.

The project's \$240,000 price tag for the copter operation was somewhat more than the price of a similar fixed-wing project. But unlike the airplanes, the copters were able to avoid the critical waterways and grasslands of fish and cattle.

That extra money spent on "public good" may be some of the best the Forest Service has ever spent.

THE CONFLICT IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, turning to another matter, I wish to make a few remarks in regard to the position that the United States took last week in the United Nations in connection with the Vietnam war. To say that I was disappointed in Ambassador Goldberg's speech would be, for me, the understatement of the year.

The great difficulty and shortcoming in Ambassador Goldberg's comments to

the U.N. General Assembly lies in an underlying false assumption that so many Americans, especially in high office, have made about Vietnam. It is that the causes and initial policies of 1954, 1955, 1956 have nothing to do with the present situation in Vietnam; that we all inherited this situation and we have to deal with it as it exists.

Thus, we base our so-called peace plans on the current American buildup. We constantly increase the American military power in Vietnam so that we will have more to bargain with in any peace move. The more military power we bring to bear, the more we think we have to bargain with.

The reason it does not work is that we prefer to ignore the way the war got started. We are as much responsible for the conflict in South Vietnam as any nation. We backed out at the last minute from signing the Geneva agreement, which ended the French colonial war and supposedly established an independent Vietnam.

The United States Government made no bones about disapproving that arrangement. We wanted the two military zones into which Vietnam was temporarily divided to be two sovereign countries, so that we could try to assure that South Vietnam, at least, would be pro-Western.

That is the first inexcusable course of action the United States followed in southeast Asia, for the Geneva accords did not provide for a political demarcation line at the 17th parallel. The Geneva accords made perfectly clear that the 17th parallel was a line of military demarcation, not of political demarcation.

It was not contemplated by the Geneva Conference that there should be two Vietnams. The United States has decreed two Vietnams, when, in fact, it was contemplated that there should be but one nation. Decades and decades hence, when there is one nation, people will read with great interest the historic debate in which the U.S. Senate has engaged for the last 3 years, for history will prove how right those of us who spoke up against the wrong policy our country started in 1954. History will put the responsibility on the United States, where it belongs. That is why we are more and more being isolated around the world, and we find, at this hour, in the United Nations, great resentment toward us because we are leading the world so close to a third world war.

Mr. President, if the American people were to read the Geneva Treaty and its accompanying declaration, they would ask embarrassing questions of the administration. They would begin to understand why those of us who have carried on this debate for the last 3 years have stood on the floor against our country's policies in Vietnam. I shall continue to speak out against those policies, unless my country declares war and gets back within the frame of the Constitution, instead of conducting an unconstitutional war in southeast Asia. But that treaty, in reference to the 17th parallel, provided that the French troops—and there were tens of thousands of them—should go to the south of the line, and the Viet-

minh, who had carried on the war against France, should stay to the north of it.

That was not what Dulles wanted, and therefore a course of action was started that has brought us now the holocaust which jeopardizes the fate of mankind.

Mr. President, have no doubt, no one can be sure in which direction it will go after the elections. As I said in a speech over the weekend, it is my suspicion that, as soon as the election is over, this administration is going to lead us into a highly escalated war in Asia that may very well end up in a war with China. China will not win. Russia will not win. The United States will not win. And we will leave the globe in smoldering ashes.

The type of speech given by Ambassador Goldberg in the United Nations contains no answers, but, in my judgment, it represents sophistry and a concealment of the true motives of the U.S. Government. The American people are entitled to the truth, not sophistry, from their Ambassador to the United Nations.

Instead of recognizing the 17th parallel for what it was in the Geneva Treaty, we decided on two Vietnams. We made, as I said, no bones about disapproving that arrangement of the treaty. We wanted the two military zones to outline the separation between the two governments, and not one government for Vietnam, which it should have.

We handpicked its Premier. We picked the man who was in exile from South Vietnam, who had never opposed the French. What made us think that that type of stooge was going to create unity in Vietnam is beyond my comprehension. We financed his government for 9 years, until he was assassinated.

We aided South Vietnam in attempting its own infiltration of North Vietnam; we helped them drop agents in the north, as General Ky has discussed in public, until he found it better policy not to talk about it. For some years, it was the known and published policy of the Government of South Vietnam that one day it would "liberate" the north. Not much is heard of that now. The men now holding high administration positions in this country deny they know anything about those plans of the South Vietnamese Government, but the point is that our current officeholders were not around in 1954, 1955, and 1956. They claim knowledge of only what has transpired since 1961. But unfortunately, the conflict in Vietnam was well on its way to warfare by that time, and what happened before 1961 is the reason we are in a major war in Asia today.

The Diem government refused to abide by the provision in the Geneva agreement for elections that would reunite North and South Vietnam in 1956. The Diem government refused to meet with officials from the north to work out the terms and arrangements for those elections. Diem knew he would lose. So did the United States. So there were no elections.

The United States—a country that boasts about believing in the self-determination of peoples—helped prevent the elections. We walked out on that great

American ideal in 1956 when we, the United States, blocked the elections. They were called for by the treaty. They were to be supervised by the International Control Commission set up in the treaty, consisting of representatives of India, Canada, and Poland.

Ambassador Goldberg told the United Nations last week that all we seek for South Vietnam is self-determination—"to decide its own political destiny, free of force." But from 1954 to 1956 we blocked self-determination for South Vietnam. We were afraid of it. Policy-makers of today quickly say "Oh, that was before my time. My concern is with how things stood when I took office." So far as they are concerned, life began in Vietnam only after 1961.

And things in 1961 stood with Diem and his corrupt clique losing support and control all over South Vietnam. That is why the American intervention with fighting forces began in a big way.

American money and military power has supported South Vietnam ever since. The cost to us goes up every year. South Vietnam flouted the Geneva agreement with our backing and approval 10, 11, and 12 years ago, and now we are paying the price.

Let me say that the estimate that has appeared in the newspapers over the weekend in regard to the cost of this war, that it is going to go up to \$15 billion, is low. If this administration is permitted by the American people, following the election, to escalate this war into an even greater, massive war, \$15 billion a year will be but a drop in a bucket. That is why I have been heard to ask the question so many times: Where are we going to get the money and the manpower to fight a massive land war in Asia?

It is not enough to talk piously as our officials do of the massive air raids we would be willing to stop if North Vietnam stops infiltrating its 5,000 men a month; of the hundreds of thousands of troops we could withdraw if North Vietnam will withdraw her tiny fraction of that number. That is the horse trade—a horse against a miniature pony that Goldberg offered in the United Nations last week. We have made this an American war. Yet North Vietnam still provides only a relatively small part of the manpower and even the leadership of the Vietcong.

The truth is that the United States does not dare put to the test any equivalent withdrawal of the kind Goldberg discussed at the U.N. If American forces were withdrawn, and North Vietnamese forces were withdrawn, the Vietcong would overrun the country within a matter of months, and we would have one of history's most shocking bloodbaths.

The senior Senator from Oregon stood in 1963 and 1964 for withdrawal of American forces in Vietnam. I fought going in. I opposed, on the Foreign Relations Committee, every step that took us into Vietnam. I thought we should leave while we still could, before the stakes were built too high. Today they have been built too high for that. We cannot get up and pull out overnight, now. For if we did, the result would be just as I

have pointed out in this speech—it would only be a matter of time before the Vietcong would take over. A bloodbath would take place.

I have urged, instead, that we hold certain lines that cannot be penetrated by the enemy, that we thereby prevent the escalating of the war, and then that we make clear to the other nations of the world their obligation to enforce a peace in southeast Asia, under the treaties they have signed.

Unless that course of action is followed, I see no way of avoiding a massive land war in Asia for years and years to come, until the American people finally get the facts.

American forces went there in the first place to prevent the Vietcong from taking over. We had to make it an American fight in order to keep the Vietcong from deposing Diem and his successors. Despite all the billions we have poured into South Vietnam, we still cannot leave, and see Ky remain long in power even if North Vietnam withdrew at the same time.

So it is that whenever there is an American peace offer, it is accompanied by announcements of new war plans to come. While Ambassador Goldberg spoke of supervised withdrawal by both the United States and North Vietnam, Secretary McNamara was announcing new orders for some 280 new attack aircraft, beyond the existing orders. Plans for doubling the American force of 300,000 are widely leaked in Washington.

The United States still thinks it can win a peace in Vietnam on its own terms. The administration still thinks that sufficient destruction will simply render North Vietnam and the Vietcong incapable of continuing the fighting, and they either will abandon the effort or negotiate from a position of weakness and defeat.

It is difficult to see how this country can withdraw on equal terms with North Vietnam when we went to the support of the South Vietnamese Government against the Vietcong before they received anything but token help from the north.

It raises the question of why we ever went in the first place, if now we are prepared to withdraw and leave South Vietnam to settle its own affairs. If that is the American position, why did we help South Vietnam upset the Geneva agreement? Why did we install Diem as Premier in 1954? Why did we promptly recognize his government as sovereign when the agreement specifically rejected treating North or South Vietnam as political entities? Why did we contribute hundreds of millions of American dollars every year to its support? Why did we ourselves violate the Geneva agreement with military assistance to Diem?

Do we mean to go back to the Geneva agreement or do we not? Goldberg seems to believe that the United States is ready to go back to the Geneva Conference. Are we? Are we prepared to accept its prohibition upon outside military forces, upon military assistance, and upon foreign bases?

Do we really think we can treat the military results of our escalation policy

while ignoring the political reasons why we escalated? Or is the offer one that was made while preparations to undermine it are made at the same time?

I want to tell the Senate and the American people what I think our Government means when it talks about going back to the Geneva Conference. Yes, we will go back if we are allowed to rewrite the Geneva Treaty.

Mr. President, that is not going back to the Geneva Conference. Of course if the United States were to accept the Geneva Treaty which Dulles walked out on, we would have to change completely our operations in South Vietnam. We would have to withdraw our forces, because the Geneva Treaty prohibits foreign military forces in Vietnam. "Prohibits" is the word.

Mr. President, what we are dealing with here is administration semantics to lull the American people into believing that we are willing to negotiate a peace.

Let me say to the American people that there has been no reason to believe that this administration intends to negotiate a peace in South Vietnam except upon the terms of this administration.

I wish we could negotiate a peace. I hold no brief, as I have been heard to say so many times, for anything that communism stands for.

I happen to be one of the three authors of a Communist Control Act that is now the law of the land. The other two authors were the then Senator from Massachusetts, our late beloved President John F. Kennedy, and the then Senator from Minnesota, now Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

If one criticizes the foreign policy of this country, the smear artists seek to castigate him by creating the impression that he supports communism.

I want to see the country stop making Communists around the world by the hundreds of thousands, for that is what they are doing.

The shocking war that we are conducting in Asia is playing into the hands of the Communists not only all over Asia but also all over Africa. May I also say, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, that this is also true in Latin America.

Listen to the criticisms of us in Europe.

The trouble is that the American people, speaking generically, do not like now to look into a mirror and see the image that we represent to millions of people in the world. We talk one way and then we proceed to slaughter people in a war that we should not have involved ourselves in.

This administration and our Ambassador to the United Nations will have to face up to it. The kind of semantic speech that our Ambassador made to the United Nations is not going to produce peace or cooperation in the United Nations. It only calls more attention to the duplicitous conduct of the United States with its hypocritical foreign program in Asia.

The United States will not reach a bona fide position in Vietnam until we are willing to seek a United Nations

cease-fire and a United Nations force to police it. Why did Goldberg not ask for that? Why is my President not up at the meeting of the United Nations asking to make a speech to the world calling for a United Nations cease-fire and pledging that we will comply with it and then putting the question squarely to the members of the United Nations: "Take another look at your signature on this Charter, for that signature represents your Government's pledge to enforce the peace when the peace is threatened."

That is the course of action that my country should be following, and not the semantic course of evasion of our national and international responsibility which characterized the Goldberg speech of last week.

Mr. President, multilateral, international action offers the only way that military escalation in Vietnam can be stopped. It is the only way that the visitation of death and destruction upon Vietnam can be stopped.

We also must make up our minds what kind of political government we are interested in Vietnam. So far, we have done as much as any nation to destroy the Geneva agreements. We could not abide by them because we felt they breached American security interests in southeast Asia.

What is our political interest in South Vietnam today? If it still calls for a pro-Western government and an American "presence" in South Vietnam, a state of warfare is going to continue in that part of the world for decades to come, unless we get into world war III before that time.

I again close another speech in which I set forth my opposition to this war by warning that, if we get into this third world war, then we are not going to leave a legacy to future generations of America. We are going to leave them only a horror-ridden planet, due in no small measure to our own doing.

CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN FISH AND WILDLIFE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9424) to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction; to consolidate the authorities relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the national wildlife refuge system; and for other purposes and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BARTLETT. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. Bass, and Mr. DOMINICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 27, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 26, 1966:

THE JUDICIARY

Warren J. Ferguson, of California, to be U.S. district Judge for the central district of California to fill a new position to become effective September 18, 1966, by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Manuel L. Real, of California, to be U.S. district Judge for the central district of California to fill a new position to become effective September 18, 1966, by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mary Gardiner Jones, of New York, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1966. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Irvin L. Cox, Bonnerdale, Ark., in place of C. M. Ketchum, deceased.

A. G. Harvey, Chilchester, Ark., in place of H. R. Nabors, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Alyce J. Clay, Butte City, Calif., in place of E. E. Case, deceased.

David K. Burkhardt, Del Mar, Calif., in place of L. D. King, transferred.

Olive P. Patterson, Nestor, Calif., in place of J. A. Sibley, resigned.

Lois E. Bevans, Potter Valley, Calif., in place of Geneva Christofferson, retired.

CONNECTICUT

John J. Di Bella, Brookfield, Conn., in place of J. A. Rajcula, transferred.

Theodore I. Blanchette, Moosup, Conn., in place of F. L. Bibeault, retired.

James C. Murphy, Pomfret, Conn., in place of Christina Rowan, retired.

GEORGIA

Dennis R. Pittman, Lula, Ga., in place of J. E. Jones, retired.

ILLINOIS

Albert L. Dussliere, East Moline, Ill., in place of F. T. Huggins, retired.

Harold R. Bonar, El Paso, Ill., in place of P. J. Roth, retired.

Lynn O. Ogg, Gibson City, Ill., in place of H. L. Ernst, retired.

Francis M. Pope, Ramsey, Ill., in place of L. A. Hayes, transferred.

IOWA

William P. Haroff, Hastings, Iowa, in place of A. F. Lookabill, retired.

LOUISIANA

Nell E. B. Dominique, Belle Rose, La., in place of L. L. Dugas, retired.

Preston E. Richard, Jonesville, La., in place of A. I. Carter, retired.

MARYLAND

Carolyn G. Cochran, Whiteford, Md., in place of A. M. Davis, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

John M. Horan, Stow, Mass., in place of D. E. Strong, retired.

Robert T. O'Neill, Williamsburg, Mass., in place of W. S. Smith, retired.

MICHIGAN

Jerry F. Horky, Blissfield, Mich., in place of L. L. Corbett, retired.

Daniel R. Tomak, Higgins Lake, Mich., in place of H. K. Peters, retired.

MINNESOTA

George O. Tveit, Kiester, Minn., in place of O. A. Matson, retired.

Luverne J. Anderson, Sergeant, Minn., in place of F. W. Lange, retired.

NEBRASKA

Stanley D. Thompson, Amelia, Nebr., in place of Agnes Peterson, retired.

Kenneth D. Carlow, Bloomfield, Nebr., in place of W. L. McCourt, retired.

Clair E. Stubbs, Boelus, Nebr., in place of R. L. Ferris, retired.

Lloyd E. Cork, Page, Nebr., in place of B. H. Stevens, deceased.

Rose Rasmussen, Rockville, Nebr., in place of Frolin Rasmussen, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Franklin C. Barrett, Walpole, N.H., in place of G. R. Wallace, retired.

NEW YORK

Sherman D. Dowie, Mexico, N.Y., in place of G. H. Smith, retired.

Theodore A. Barkley, Salem, N.Y., in place of J. J. Beattie, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Charles C. Brown, Sr., Kitterell, N.C., in place of L. B. Ellis, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

S. Earl Feick, Neche, N. Dak., in place of L. C. D'Heilly, retired.

OHIO

Oscar W. Fisher, Hannibal, Ohio, in place of Elizabeth Dunlap, retired.

Enoch S. Allen, Ironton, Ohio, in place of J. B. Davis, retired.

Charles E. Franz, Sr., Stony Ridge, Ohio, in place of L. H. Hurrelbrink, retired.

OREGON

William F. C. Borgelt, Tillamook, Oreg., in place of F. G. Ryan, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

William F. Yohe, Fairless Hills, Pa., in place of C. B. Wright, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Efrain Lamberty, Coto Laurel, P.R., in place of M. G. Renta, retired.

Alma A. G. Head, Penuelas, P.R., in place of Ramon Zaragoza, retired.

TENNESSEE

Ernest M. Cardwell, Elizabethton, Tenn., in place of G. G. Shell, retired.

George B. Moore, Oakdale, Tenn., in place of A. E. Davis, retired.

TEXAS

Lowell C. Shuler, Bonham, Tex., in place of E. M. Spence, retired.

Theo B. Boydston, Killeen, Tex., in place of E. D. Massey, retired.

UTAH

Ned B. Mitchell, Altamont, Utah, in place of L. J. Orr, retired.

WASHINGTON

Gordon J. Donovan, Ferndale, Wash., in place of R. M. Mohrman, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Robert E. Dyer, Ferryville, Wis., in place of F. M. Dagnon, retired.

Alan L. Christensen, Montello, Wis., in place of C. F. John, transferred.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 26, 1966:

DIRECTOR OF THE MINT

Eva B. Adams, of Nevada, to be Director of the Mint for a term of 5 years.

A Promising Addition to the Nation's No. 1
Business—Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

BY HON. JAMES A. BURKE
 OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1966

MR. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include remarks made by our distinguished Speaker on the occasion of the dedication of a new building by Suffolk University in Boston, Mass., on September 12, 1966:

President Fenton, Cardinal Cushing, Governor Volpe, Mayor Collins, members of the board of trustees, and of the university administration and faculty, General McCormack, and honored guests and friends, I am very pleased to have been included in this significant event in the history of Suffolk University today in my home city and to bring you greetings from Washington and from President Johnson.

I can only commend all of these people—from President Fenton and trustees to the many devoted alumni of Suffolk University—who have made possible the construction of this striking six-story multipurpose structure. Our late beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy said that "education is both the foundation and the unifying force of our democratic way of life—it is the mainspring of our economic and social progress—it is the highest expression of achievement in our society, ennobling and enriching human life."

How true that statement is, as the scientific revolution of our era forces us to adapt and grow in entirely new ways, as citizens, as parents, in our work, and in our leisure. We realize that a strong educational foundation is imperative if we are to understand the place of our Nation in history or the meaning of the considerable domestic and international problems which we face.

We realize also that education is the unifying threat connecting our individual lives, creating cohesiveness amidst great diversity, enabling us freely to discover together what steps must be taken to meet the challenges of our times. We realize that America's great economic strength—her farm surpluses, her space successes, her high standard of living—has been built only because we have maintained a strong educational base. And we realize that the social equality which we have achieved—imperfect as it is—has been achieved, and is increasing with each passing year—only because widespread education, fashioned after democratic ideals, has helped us place greater value on tolerance and justice than on bigotry and prejudice.

Though education traditionally has played a central role in Americans' lives, the requirements of our times demand that it now be placed in the forefront of our concerns. President Johnson has declared that "the first work of these times and the first work of our society is education." And why?

The wonders of our technological achievements have raised the level of skill demands so high that both basic and continuing education are and will become even more vital to each person's economic success. Our businesses and industries will be able to operate efficiently only if we continue to introduce more and more efficient methods. We who are meant to benefit by our own

discoveries will benefit only if we are cognizant of the possibilities open to us—for medical aid, for crossing cultural bridges, for running our households more smoothly, for understanding ourselves more completely.

The hours of time which technological change has freed for our use will be used most advantageously only as we discover our talents and learn of ways to develop them. Yes, education is "the No. 1 business of the American people" today.

And this new building here at Suffolk University is both symbolically and physically a part of this No. 1 business. It is part of a larger effort throughout the Nation to increase our higher educational facilities so that the doors to postsecondary education can be opened to all who are capable of attending college. In this decade college enrollments in the United States will nearly double, and without building programs these students will never be accommodated. And the need for modern facilities can surely be supported by any of us who have seen our work suffer because we have had to work or study in a poor physical environment.

This new structure at Suffolk reflects also the way in which America's No. 1 business involves everyone. Such cooperative efforts between private and public resources will, more and more, be essential to the development of all levels of education.

This building is physically imposing enough to speak for itself as representative of the Nation's No. 1 business.

It stands symbolically and physically as representative of private and public concerns to enhance opportunities for higher education in an age when education must be our first work.

May it come alive with dynamic and fruitful activity by faculty, students, and administrators alike.

Let me offer my congratulations and good wishes to everyone who has made this dream a reality and to everyone who will benefit from its addition to the Suffolk University campus.

Letter of Praise From the Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1966

MR. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the opportunity to place on record for the interest of my constituents, your letter to me of August 11, 1966, relating to my voting attendance on legislation:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
 U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, D.C., August 11, 1966.
 Hon. JOHN C. MACKIE,
 House Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: During the 89th Congress, I have relied upon your support for passage of vital legislation. Your dedication to and conscientious performance of your duties as a Congressman are evidence that you are a valuable Member of the House of Representatives.

I am pleased to note that your voting record during the first session of this Congress stands at 93.55%, which places you among the exemplary group of Representatives

whose voting attendance records have excelled. Further, from the votes taken thus far in the second session, it is apparent that you will surpass your previous established record.

I certainly appreciate colleagues such as you. I value greatly the friendship that exists between us. The dedicated character of your public service reflects credit not only upon yourself, but your constituency, whom you have represented with great distinction and fidelity.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. McCORMACK,
 Speaker, House of Representatives.

**The 19th Anniversary of the
 U.S. Air Force**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1966

MR. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the U.S. Air Force has recently celebrated its 19th anniversary as an independent branch of our Nation's Armed Forces. I should like to call to the attention of the House that in celebrating this event we should reflect for a moment on the history of airpower and the role it has played in the defense of our Nation.

It was the ingenuity and perseverance of two Americans, Orville and Wilbur Wright, that brought airpower into existence at the turn of the century. Shortly thereafter the United States was involved in World War I, and it was then that daring men and their flying machines, such as the members of the famed "Hat in a Ring," demonstrated the importance of airpower both as a weapon of defense and as a means of carrying the war to the enemy. This importance was realized, and it, in turn, was clearly demonstrated by the Army Air Corps throughout World War II. For it was airpower which virtually brought the war to an end.

But the heroic role of the Air Force does not end in time of peace. We may recall the Berlin blockade, when in a combined effort with Great Britain, the U.S. Air Force airlifted 2,343,315 tons of food and coal to the people of West Berlin, thus keeping alive an island of freedom in a sea of communism.

Today we see the Air Force carrying out several roles. It is defending the freedom of South Vietnam by both supporting their troops and carrying destruction to the forces of the Communist National Liberation Front. It is carrying food, medical supplies to the people of South Vietnam. It is guarding our borders here at home from enemy attack from any direction, whether by man or by missile. And, as man has begun to reach out to the frontiers of outer space, it

is the Air Force that has taken the commanding role in the conquest of military aerospace.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as the Air Force enters its 19th year as an independent branch of the Armed Forces, dedicated to defending freedom throughout the world, I ask the Members, and all Americans, to reflect upon the great debt we owe to the men of the U.S. Air Force.

Tribute to the Late John Fitzgerald Kennedy on the Occasion of the Dedication of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Federal Building, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1966

MR. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include a tribute to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, paid by our distinguished Speaker on the occasion of the dedication of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Federal Building in Boston, Mass., on September 9, 1966.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY FEDERAL BUILDING, BOSTON, MASS.

It is with profound pleasure and gratitude that I join with you today in the dedication of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Federal Building.

As we have continued to mourn the loss of our late President, at the same time you have been building. This is what he would want you to do—this man of faith, who took a lively pride in his native Massachusetts.

Today this Federal building is not just another structure in our fair city of Boston, but it is a beautiful memorial to the man who served his State and country so freely and so faithfully. If he were here among us today, I am certain he would summon us to further service in the cause of democracy and inspire us to higher service in the cause of freedom.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy had a dream—a wonderous magnificent dream—to bring America a little closer to the realization of the ideals set by the Founding Fathers of this country. His dedication to the cause of peace and the elevation of human dignity will always be remembered by this Nation and the world.

He walked among the people trying to get them to do the right thing. He looked after all citizens. He looked after the freedom of men, women, and children whether they were black or white, Catholic or Protestant, Jew or gentile, privileged or of low birth.

But above all else, in everything he did, John F. Kennedy gave proof of his supreme dedication to the cause of peace and freedom. To him these were the transcendent needs of our time—at home as well as in the entire world.

Born in this city on May 29, 1917, he was reared by strong and farsighted parents to be energetic, brave, industrious, knowledgeable, and wise, and these were the traits which characterized every crowded hour of his full, rich, and warm personal and public life.

On January 9, 1961, as President-elect of the United States he appeared before the State legislature of his home State of Massachusetts. In discussing the challenge before public servants, he summarized his own credo in these few lines as he approached the office which would lead, ultimately, to his death:

"Of those to whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment on each one of us—recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the state—our success or failure, in whatever office we may hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions: were we truly men of courage—were we truly men of judgment—were we truly men of integrity—were we truly men of dedication."

He also stated in this address that courage, judgment, integrity, dedication were the qualities which, with God's help, he hoped would characterize our Government's conduct in the four stormy years that lay ahead. And he humbly asked God's help in his undertakings.

John F. Kennedy brought to America a new compassion for the lot of his fellow man, a new respect for the rights of all men and a new hope for the brotherhood and dignity of man.

In President Kennedy's death we lost a friend, a good man, and a great leader. But let us pray on this occasion that with the years we shall not lose the will which he awakened within us—the will to follow the course which he had set for us.

This Federal building will be a constant reminder of the fact that he told us on a cold day in January in 1961 "...ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

The Right Reverend Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, 1909-66

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1966

MR. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my own to the many voices of tribute which have been heard this month following the death of the Right Reverend Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, secretary general of the U.S. National Catholic Educational Association and former director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference's Education Department.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I had the opportunity on many occasions to be present when Monsignor Hochwalt testified on education legislation.

He was a vigorous exponent of his own view but was always respectful of the views of others and willing to understand the perspective of persons of differing attitudes.

I think it is fair to say that Monsignor Hochwalt's leadership, his sense of fair-mindedness and his devotion to improving American education contributed significantly to the enactment of the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Not only his church but the entire Nation has lost a leader for education in the death of Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.

Nikola Petkov

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1966

MR. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Bulgaria was one of the victims of postwar communism in the Balkans. But even after it was engulfed in a Communist sea, its political leaders still struggled for democracy and the working of free institutions. This was not easy, for the powerful steamroller policy of the Communists, supported by Moscow, sought to crush all opposition elements and groups. The Communists were successful in silencing and smothering all opposition, except the sturdy agrarian group, which, led by its stout-hearted chief Nikola Petkov, held out. Petkov and his followers carried on their struggle for more than 2 years, but theirs seemed a hopeless cause. And with the arrest of Petkov in June 1947 and his execution the following September 23, all opposition to communism in Bulgaria came to an end.

The treacherous act of executing Petkov put a definitive end to freedom and democracy in Bulgaria, and the lights went out in the homeland of the brave Bulgarian people. The catastrophic events that led to Soviet ascendancy and then complete Communist domination over Bulgaria form a sad chapter in the wartime and postwar diplomacy of the West. Bulgarian democratic leaders such as George Dimitrov—not to be confused with Communist George Dimitrov—and Nikola Petkov were well aware, even before the end of the war, that communism was their deadly foe, and they were prepared to fight it relentlessly and at any cost.

An armistice with the Allies was signed on October 28, 1944, and an Allied Control Commission in Bulgaria was established. From that time to the execution of Petkov, the democratic leaders fought Communists with all the means at their disposal. But all their attempts to salvage freedom and democracy in Bulgaria were frustrated, for Soviet leaders seemed determined to rob Bulgarians of their freedom. Nikola Petkov, with the solid support of his people, still hoped to keep Bulgaria free. But by 1947 his was a lost cause, and in the face of Communist threats, blackmail, arrests, imprisonments, and terrorism, he was doomed.

It was on June 5, 1947, Mr. Speaker, that the Communists proclaimed their unchallenged supremacy in Bulgaria. They arrested and subsequently tried and hanged the bravest champion of democracy in the whole Balkan Peninsula. But Nikola Petkov of Bulgaria,

that stanch and violent fighter for democracy and freedom, lives on in the hearts of free men everywhere, and it is a privilege to honor his memory today.

Congressman Bow's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I sense a deep unrest throughout the United States, as we enter the autumn months of 1966. Americans are troubled by the war in Vietnam. They are deeply disturbed by riots and demonstrations and the breakdown of law and order in many of our cities and towns. They are worried about the increase in the cost of living and about the heavy burden of taxation that takes too large a share of every man's earnings. They are concerned about criticism of America, both at home and abroad. Many seem uncertain about what measures should be taken to correct the difficulties that plague our Nation; others shrug their shoulders and turn to more pleasant thoughts or activities. I sense that many Americans are losing faith in government. The political apathy we encounter can only be explained by a loss of faith in the ballot and in the free elections by which our people have always decided the future course of the Nation.

I think it is time to say once again, and as often as possible, that we still have the greatest nation on earth. We still provide more of the good things of life to a greater number of people than any other system of government or of economics that has ever been developed. Each of us enjoys more personal liberty and more opportunities than we could find in any other society in this world. We have a right to be troubled about the problems I have mentioned, but we have the will and the strength to solve them if all Americans will take time to think and study, devote their energies to participation in their own Government, give as much of themselves to the future of America as they give to the less important activities that occupy our time and attention.

One of my primary objectives in Congress has been to stimulate interest in government and to keep my constituents informed about the work of Congress and my own work as their Representative in Washington. I have done so with weekly newsletters, legislative reports, questionnaires, and a report at the close of each Congress since I have been a Member. Although this Congress appears likely to drag on for several more weeks or months, the time has come for my report, in this case an interim report, on the work we have done since January 4, 1965. "Congressman Bow's Report" is well known to the people of Stark Coun-

ty, who have received it at the close of seven successive Congresses. I hope it will be equally well received in southern Mahoning County and in Carroll County, the new areas of the 16th District of Ohio.

VIETNAM

This Congress met soon after an election, in which the future course of our efforts in South Vietnam had been an issue. It was apparent that many Americans had cast their ballot for the man they believed would oppose escalation of the war. Almost 2 years later we have more than 300,000 troops in the conflict and we seem to be at least as far from settlement as we were then.

Some of us in leadership positions in Congress have been called upon for counsel and advice at White House briefings on the war. I have supported the President's determination to fulfill our pledge to the people of South Vietnam to prevent the success of Communist aggression there. In Congress I have supported all of the appropriations necessary to supply our troops with food, clothing, and other necessities and with the arms they need. Like many Americans, however, I am impatient with restrictions placed on our Armed Forces and with our failure to use our tremendous military power more effectively to bring the war to an end. It must be brought to a satisfactory conclusion at the earliest possible date. To the extent that Congress can influence the course of the war, my efforts will continue to be directed to that goal.

SPENDING AND INFLATION

Democrat promises that increased tax revenue would be used to reduce the Federal debt were forgotten as quickly as they were made. Although Federal revenue increased \$15 billion in the past 2 fiscal years, Federal spending has increased even more. Instead of the promised balanced budget and debt reduction, we have an inflation-stimulating \$5.5 billion addition to the Federal debt.

Seniority has brought me the position of ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee. If Republicans gain a majority in Congress I will become chairman, one of the most powerful positions in Government. However, leadership of the economy forces in Congress this year has been a disheartening experience. The 2-to-1 Democrat majority in the House includes some 50 freshmen Democrat Members who owe their elections to President Johnson and who support his spending programs almost without question 100 percent of the time. Thus, four Bow amendments to cut spending by 5 percent were defeated overwhelmingly, even though every Member present would acknowledge that so slight a cut in so gigantic a budget would hurt no essential activity.

However, my amendment to cut the foreign aid appropriations \$45 million was accepted, even though the margin was only 5 votes. And in my own subcommittee, we recommended substantial cuts in the budgets for the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments.

Inflation is the same as a 5-percent Federal sales tax on everything we buy. The cost of living shows every sign that it will continue to rise. In speech after speech in Congress I have predicted that this would happen and must happen if the administration insists on spending extra billions for every kind of fancy new program at home, while the war in Vietnam continues to grow more costly. We can have guns and butter, but Mr. Johnson asks for guns and butter and strawberry shortcake.

The President has belatedly acknowledged that Federal spending does create inflation. He now says he will cut Federal spending. It is very late in the day. His vigorous support for our economy efforts when appropriations were being debated could have avoided much of the damage that has been done.

The retired person on pension and the family with youngsters to raise have been hit hard by these cost increases. A nickel increase in the cost of a school lunch may sound insignificant to some people, but it is a tremendous item to the working man with four or five children who need lunch money 185 days of the year. This is the kind of thing the Washington spenders seem not to understand. It is the billions the Government spends that create inflation, not the nickels and dimes and dollars that we spend for food and clothing and shelter. The proposed income tax increase would only increase the hardship on our people. The cure is in Washington, and the Federal Government should set its own house in order before it begins cracking down on the housewife, the farmer, and the small businessmen.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, WELFARE, AND POVERTY

The Johnson administration embarked upon the most extensive and expensive, and thus far the least successful, welfare and poverty programs in history. The budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, not including the poverty program, has increased from \$2 billion in 1956 to about \$12 billion this year.

I voted for the new programs to promote higher education and health education, for funds to continue the successful National Defense Education Act and the Manpower Training and Development Act, for continued support of Smith-Hughes, vocational education, the agricultural experiment stations and land-grant colleges, and for school lunch and milk programs. I voted against the general Federal aid program for elementary and secondary schools, because it means Federal control of education. Educators who belittled Federal control are now finding how serious and restrictive it really is. More of them are now favoring the Bow bill to give 1 percent of Federal income tax collections to the States for education, with no strings attached. The Republican Coordinating Committee has recommended that this tax-sharing plan, which I first offered 8 years ago, be extended to a variety of Federal-State activities.

With a billion dollars to spend, the poverty program is bogged down in a

tangle of poor planning, politics and failure. As I predicted when I voted against it, it has failed to reach the poor in any effective way.

Often I find that individuals have little knowledge about the extent of Federal programs in health care and research. In fiscal 1966 we spent \$6,581,372,121 for Federal health programs and the figure will rise this year.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The violence and bitterness that have characterized the civil rights issue increasingly during the past two years have been a major concern to all of us. I have introduced two bills relating to this problem. The first would make it a Federal criminal offense to travel into another State to incite or foment riots or violence, or to use the telephone or mail service to do so. The second would make it a Federal criminal offense to interfere with any person, because of his race, color or religion, in his efforts to go to school, to participate in any legal activity or enjoy any public service. Whether it is a gang of white men attacking peaceful Negro youngsters in Grenada or a gang of Negroes destroying property and endangering lives in Watts, the issue is the same. We must have law and order in this country and these two bills would do a great deal to assure it.

Congress considered two major civil rights bills. I voted for the voting rights bill of 1965. I voted against the "fair housing" provisions of the civil rights bill of 1966, but for the bill itself, including the Cramer antiriot amendment. The failure of the Senate to act on this bill makes it very important for the Congress to act separately on an antiriot bill, such as the Bow bill described above.

BOW LEGISLATION

In this Congress I have sponsored a variety of other bills that I believe are constructive solutions to some of our problems.

With reference to the cost-of-living problem mentioned above, I have introduced a bill to provide a cost-of-living increase in social security benefits. This would mean an increase equal to the rise in the cost-of-living index whenever that index goes up 3 percent or more. The bill also removes the limitation on earnings of social security retirees.

Another Bow bill would meet the cost-of-living problem for veterans on pension by increasing all income brackets 20 percent. The House has passed a 4.4-percent pension increase which I consider inadequate.

The Bow medicare bill was incorporated in part in the new social security medical care program, but without the tax credit principle. As yet we have too little experience to determine whether the medical care program will work well. Amendments are under consideration to restrict title XIX, financing of State medicare programs for those under 65.

I introduced a bill that would provide for private financing of the proposed supersonic transport airplane, thus saving billions for the Federal taxpayers

and giving individuals an opportunity to invest in and share in any future development.

Several bills I proposed to improve the Federal budget process were supported in reports of the Special Committee on Reorganization of the Congress.

One long-term success of which I was originally a sponsor, the Public Law 480 program for donation or barter of surplus foods, has been modified to encourage self-sufficiency in underdeveloped nations. Final action on this so-called food for freedom bill is pending.

As a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution, I have sponsored several bills to enlarge its services to science and art and to the American people. The Smithsonian is an important part of our national heritage and I am honored to be one of the six Congressional Regents who participate in its management.

MISCELLANEOUS LEGISLATION

I supported the revision of the immigration laws to strengthen enforcement and hasten the entry of skilled persons and relatives of American citizens. Scores of Ohio families have welcomed relatives who might otherwise have waited many, many years before they could come here.

I opposed the rent subsidy program that will require all taxpayers to finance the rent of a few thousand people whom some bureaucrats decide are entitled to a better apartment than they can really afford.

I voted for the Drug Abuse Control Act, the Mental Health Centers Act, the bill to control interstate traffic in stolen pets for laboratory uses and many other measures.

I opposed the foreign aid program, as I have always done, because it is too extravagant. My amendment to cut this bill was adopted 187 to 182 on September 20, saving the taxpayers \$45 million.

Republicans in the House have offered amendments repeatedly to cut off foreign aid to any nation trading with North Vietnam or Cuba. These amendments met strong opposition from the Johnson administration, but we have been successful in putting this restriction into the foreign aid appropriation measure and I trust the Senate will accept it.

I opposed construction of a mansion for the Vice President.

I supported the GI bill for post-Korean war veterans.

There were 383 rollcalls and quorum calls in the first session and there have been 300 already this year. Thus, it would be impossible to list with this report a complete voting record. My record for attendance at rollcall votes in the past 16 years has been well over 90 percent, considerably above the average for all Members of the House. I will be glad to answer any questions concerning a particular vote.

DISTRICT PROGRESS

The 16th District has made remarkable progress in the past 16 years, some of it with the help of Federal contracts

for our industries and Federal projects for our cities that I was able to guide through the pitfalls of bureaucracy. Only a few days ago I broke the ice on a public housing project for the elderly that had been frozen in a bureaucratic jam for months.

Federal aid projects for our district in recent years have included several new buildings, both classrooms and dormitories, at the College of Wooster, Mount Union College, and Malone. Several of our hospitals have benefited from Hill-Burton Federal grants, a program I have always supported.

On October 1 and 2 we celebrate the 20th anniversary of progress at Akron-Canton Airport, whose fine terminal building is a project I originated in my Appropriations Subcommittee. Akron-Canton has received over \$1,700,000 in Federal assistance.

The Federal-aid highway program has helped to improve roads and provide employment for thousands in our district. Interstate 77 is another project that I initiated, having it added to the interstate system after it had been overlooked in original planning. The Federal Government has spent \$219 million on it to date, and \$13,980,000 on the freeway in Canton.

Architects' drawings are now in final preparation for the new post office building and remodeling of the old Federal building in Canton. Local arguments about the site and interagency disagreement between the GSA and the Post Office Department have delayed construction of this project for more than 4 years after I secured in advance full appropriations for the work. We have 20 other new post offices in the 16th and plans for Massillon and Wooster are well advanced.

Several of our towns now have new sewage treatment projects and applications for aid for Alliance, Beloit, Uhrichsville-Dennison and others are under consideration. Canton has received an initial grant for its air pollution study and Stark County has received a grant for a geriatrics center. We have received many thousands of dollars for our various "poverty" programs, of which Headstart seems to be the most notable success. Also advancing is the project for a Stark County vocational education center. Stark County was eligible for depressed area aid for only a short period of time, but we received Federal aid for projects in Massillon, Minerva, and at Atwood Lake during that period. A number of nursing homes have had Federal assistance.

There seems to be a growing tendency to measure the performance of a Congressman as though he were a bagman, responsible for getting special favors and unusual treatment for his area in preference to the 434 other congressional districts. One freshman Congressman was credited with bringing to his district Federal spending exceeding 1 percent of all the money the Federal Government spends, a ridiculous claim. Actually, all Federal aid programs are based upon

formulas that determine how much each State may receive. Applications must originate with local agencies, usually under the control of a State office that established the priorities. Likewise, Federal contracts must go to the lowest responsible bidder and anyone who claims he can get a contract for his District because of influence is claiming that he violates the law.

A Member of Congress can advise and suggest consideration for his firms and his communities. He can make certain they get fair treatment. He can smooth out the rough spots and expedite action. To do these things well, he must know his way around Washington and that takes time and experience.

Every Ohio taxpayer should know that Federal aid costs Ohio more than Ohio can receive. In terms of Federal aid received as against Federal taxes paid, the nonindustrial States get a larger cut of the pie. Many Ohio people oppose Federal aid on principle. Others oppose it because of this economic disadvantage. But regardless of these objections, when the Federal aid program is in effect and when there are worthwhile purposes for which it can be used, our State, our counties and communities should take advantage of it and I am happy to help them do so.

PERSONAL

Our big Government touches our daily lives in hundreds of ways and as a result many of us have difficult problems with Federal agencies. Each year thousands of people write and call me for information and assistance on veterans, social security, immigration, tax, education, and other matters. This is assistance that I am glad to be able to give.

It is a great privilege and honor to serve in the House of Representatives. Whatever the cynics may say, the fact is that the overwhelming majority of men and women who are Members of Congress are sincere, honest, and dedicated Americans who are doing their best, as each of them views the issues, to preserve and protect this system of government and this way of life. I am greatly indebted to the voters of Stark, Tuscarawas, and Wayne Counties who have chosen me as their Representative since 1951. I have used the great advantages of seniority and experience to serve them well and I look forward to the privilege of continuing that service in behalf of the citizens of Stark, Carroll, and southern Mahoning Counties.

H.R. 13266

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Bar Association of the City of New York has ad-

vised me that it will conduct a broad panel discussion of my bill H.R. 13266, a measure to privately finance the supersonic transport—SST.

The chairman of the bar's aeronautics committee, Mr. Robert E. Young, of the law office of Gilbert, Segall and Young, has tentatively set down the date of November 16, 1966, for the discussion. Other committees of the bar association may participate in the forum.

While the proposed meeting will center around the various aspects of the SST, Mr. Young wrote me that he plans "to make my proposal the focal point of discussion." Representatives from the Federal Aviation Agency, Chase Manhattan Bank, and Ives, Whitehead & Co., Inc., also have been invited to participate in the panel meeting.

The New York Bar Association is providing a great public service in arranging this meeting to openly discuss the provisions of my bill. I welcome any constructive criticism that its members may wish to offer that may improve H.R. 13266.

I have long been an advocate of using private funds to finance projects such as the SST, rather than funds appropriated by the Congress. My bill provides for a Government guarantee of the bonds to be issued to develop the transport. It also provides for wide participation of the public in the sale of securities to produce commercially the SST.

The costs in connection with the development and production of the SST are currently estimated at from \$4 to \$4.5 billion. Commercial sales and contractual obligations to produce the SST over a 15- to 25-year period, have been estimated by industry to total at least \$30 billion.

General Pulaski Memorial Committee To Hold 30th Annual Polish Day Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the General Pulaski Memorial Committee, Inc., whose headquarters are in my district at 381 Park Avenue South, will hold the 13th Annual Pulaski Day Parade on Fifth Avenue on Sunday, October 2, 1966, at 1 p.m.

The official reviewing stand will be located in front of the public library on Fifth Avenue and 41st Street.

As Francis J. Wazeter, president of this fine organization states:

This parade is held annually pursuant to the proclamations of the President of the United States, the Governors of the States of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, the Mayor of the City of New York and the chief executives of other municipalities, calling upon all citizens to observe the memory of Brig. General Casimir Pulaski. This year's

event will mark the 187th anniversary of the death, on October 11, 1779, of this Polish hero the War for American Independence, who died of wounds suffered at the Battle of Savannah. It will also mark the 1000th anniversary of the adoption of Christianity by the Polish people.

I trust all of my colleagues will take part in their communities, as I shall, in observance of the 187th anniversary of the death of this Polish hero of our War for Independence.

Redwood National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 26, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us who are interested in seeing the magnificent and stately redwoods of northern California preserved in a national park rejoiced last September 8, when the lumber companies agreed to shift their operations to other locations.

Four companies, including the Miller-Rellim Co., have suspended cutting on approximately 18,000 acres covered by the administration's proposed park and have limited operations in the areas preferred by Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN and myself, 33 other Members of Congress, and 19 Senators.

This is an important breakthrough. The forests have been disappearing at an appalling rate. Of 2 million acres which stood less than a century ago, over 90 percent have been destroyed by logging, highway construction, and erosion. If logging had continued at its recent level, in 2 or 3 years there would be no worthy site, no major block of virgin forest left to preserve and establish as a recreational park for all Americans.

But this announcement will soon be a shallow, meaningless one unless the Congress of the United States meets with its responsibilities. I call again on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the House of Representatives to act now, before this session of Congress ends, to pass the 90,000-acre Redwood National Park at Redwood Creek.

This superior site includes 33,000 acres of virgin forest and the world's tallest trees. The site's potential for a park of diversified recreation is tremendous because of the forests, the valleys, the spectacular and varied coastline, and the few streams of the redwood region which have not been cluttered with debris and siltation from logging.

We are presented with an opportunity for action and it would be a disgrace to let it slip by. We must insure the creation of a park in which the inspirational beauty of these trees is truly present. Let us take steps now to make this park a reality.