Johnson, Paul E., xxxxxxxx.
Martin, Richard K., xxxxxxxx.
Piskura, Joseph H., xxxxxxxx.
Woehr, David J., xxxxxxxx.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Albright, Barbara L., xxxx.
Ball, Elizabeth C., xxxx.
Burbank, Arlene G., xxxx.
Cascone, Joan C., xxxx.
Klainer, Joyce I., xxxx.
McCord, Patricia A., xxxx.
Slater, Suzanne, xxxx.
Tilden, Carol J., xxxx.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Anderson, James R., xxxxxxxx.
Bigelow, Charles R., xxxxxxxx.
Bilbrey, Gordon L., xxxxxxxx.
Bingham, Korth E., xxxxxxxx.
Blalock, James C., Sr., xxxxxxxx.
Bobitt, John R., xxxxxxxx.
Bogart, John N., xxxxxxxx.
Bowe, Richard G., xxxxxxxx.
Brazinsky, John H., xxxxxxxx.
Brobeck, Alan, xxxxxxxx.
Buhrow, William L., xxxxxxxx.
Cipriano, Frank J., xxxxxxxx.
Clark, Robert W., xxxxxxxx.
Coats, David A., xxxxxxxx.
Cobb, Tyson C., xxxxxxxx.
Conroy, Robert W., xxxxxxxx.
Davis, William R., xxxxxxxx.
Dawson, John T., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Demtrak, Christofer S., xxxxxxxx.
Evans, Roger W., xxxxxxxx.
Feldman, Melvin L., xxxxxxxx.
Firestone, Marvin H., xxxxxxxx.
Fossum, Dale R., xxxxxxxx.
Geschke, Dietrich W., xxxxxxxx.
Glasser, Stephen P., xxxxxxxx.
Greer, Thomas D., xxxxxxxx.
Gunther, Robert C., xxxxxxxx.
Hall, Ronald R., xxxxxxxx.
Hallee, Theodore J., xxxxxxxx.
Hecht, Manfred H., xxxxxxxx.
Hill, John C., xxxxxxxx.
Hinckley, Marshall, xxxxxxxx.
Hooper, Robert L., xxxxxxxx.
Irby, Benjamin F., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
James, Charles F., xxxxxxxx.
Kimball, James D., xxxxxxxx.
Kowalski, Leonard R., xxxxxxxx.
Lane, Charles D., xxxxxxxx.
Lefko, Andrew G., xxxxxxxx.
Light, Jimmy A., xxxxxxxx.
Lung, John A., xxxxxxxx.
MacDonald, Robert, xxxxxxxx.
Marrin, Daniel J., xxxxxxxx.
McAninch, Jack W., xxxxxxxx.
Morrisseau, Paul M., xxxxxxxx.
Neel, Donald R., xxxxxxxx.
Nevarez, Leonard J., xxxxxxxx.
Powell, George K., xxxxxxxx.
Rapp, Robert S., xxxxxxxx.
Renn, John S., III, xxxxxxxx.
Rodriguez-Garces, Francisco, xxxxxxxx.
Ruark, Sylvan R., xxxxxxxx.
Sabol, Edward D., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Shaw, Jon A., xxxxxxxx.
Smith, Alvin E., xxxxxxxx.
Smith, Carl R., xxxxxxxx.
Smith, Donald W., xxxxxxxx.
Smith, Gerald E., xxxxxxxx.
Stephens, Robert O., xxxxxxxx.
Strait, Gail B., xxxxxxxx.
Taylor, Robert R., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Thomason, William B., xxxxxxxx.
Travis, Richard T., xxxxxxxx.
Wagner, Kenneth J., xxxxxxxx.
Wearn, Joseph H., xxxxxxxx.
Welch, Melton J., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Wheeling, James R., xxxxxxxx.
Williams, Reginald, xxxxxxxx.
Williams, Troy H., xxxxxxxx.
Zindel, Barry L., xxxxxxxx.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Alexander, Bassell, xxxxxxxx.
Dean, Richard J., xxxxxxxx.
Dowdy, Thomas S., xxxxxxxx.
Spano, Donald M., xxxxxxxx.
Ward, James P., xxxxxxxx.
Zehngraff, Paul E., xxxxxxxx.

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

Fairchild, David G., xxxxxxxx.
Fruin, John T., xxxxxxxx.
Shroyer, Emerson L., xxxxxxxx.
Sims, James E., xxxxxxxx.
Taylor, James F., xxxxxxxx.
Vandercook, Richard, xxxxxxxx.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Baker, George D., xxxxxx.
Baker, Harlan H., Jr., xxxxxx.
Barnes, Perry A., xxxxxx.
Barnes, Walter, Jr., xxxxxx.
Belcher, David R., xxxxxx.
Bell, John H., xxxxxxxx.
Bennett, Winston R., xxxxxx.
Black, Baxter F., III, xxxxxx.
Braddock, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Brown, Wallace J., xxxxxx.
Burn, Joseph J., Jr., xxxxxx.
Carlson, Carl E., xxxxxx.
Carnahan, Robert P., xxxxxx.
Coleman, Jerry B., xxxxxx.
Creighton, James P., xxxxxxxx.
Danhouser, David C., xxxx.
De Los Santos, Carlos, Jr., xxxxxx.
Delane, Charles E., xxxxxx.
Derrickson, William, xxxxxx.
Dixon, Richard N., xxxxxx.
Dominguez, Roberto, xxxxxxxx.
Donehew, Gerald R., xxxxxx.
Ellingson, Mayo K., xxxxxx.
Elsarelli, Leon E., xxxx.
Evans, Harold L., xxxxxx.
Forrer, Dennis B., xxxxxx.
Frate, Joseph A., xxxxxx.
Fulton, Robert B., xxxxxx.
Goodman, Dorris C., xxxxxx.
Gorby, Richard J., xxxxxxxx.
Graydon, Donald M., xxxxxx.
Greene, Frederick L., xxxxxx.
Greenhalgh, Donald, xxxxxx.
Grider, Donald A., xxxxxx.
Hahn, Ruediger, xxxxxx.
Hale, Arnold W., xxxxxx.
Hamilton, John C., xxxxxx.
Hansen, Louis J., xxxxxx.
Harris, Cecil B., xxxxxx.
Harris, Jon N., xxxxxx.
Heggers, John P., xxxxxx.
Heitzman, Lawrence, xxxxxx.
Herber, William E., xxxxxx.
Hill, Walter B., xxxxxx.
Holcomb, Robert E., xxxxxxxx.
Houston, William E., xxxxxx.
Howell, Lawrence C., xxxxxx.
Iber, Peter K., xxxxxxxx.
Jessen, Gary C., xxxxxx.
Jones, Ronald C., xxxxxx.
Kearns, William J., xxxxxx.
Keller, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Kestner, James C., xxxxxxxx.
Lanier, Jack O., xxxxxx.
Lassiter, Charles S., xxxxxx.
Lingle, Kenneth C., xxxxxx.
Lynch, George R., xxxx.
Mallory, Lloyd M., xxxxxx.
Malone, Richard L., xxxxxxxx.
Marchand, Francis W., xxxxxx.
Marine, Wayne E., xxxxxx.
McCurley, Robert L., xxxxxx.
Meiers, Richard E., xxxxxx.
Mendell, James M., xxxxxx.
Merritt, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Miller, Roger C., xxxxxx.
Osborne, Edward J., xxxxxx.
Peacock, James L., xxxxxx.
Pedersen, Edward R., xxxxxx.
Penick, Norman D., xxxxxx.
Phillips, Harry V., xxxxxx.
Plaatsman, James P., xxxxxx.
Pollock, Archie D., xxxxxx.
Powell, Larry G., xxxxxx.
Quillin, Robert M., xxxxxx.
Rasmusson, James A., xxxxxxxx.
Reuter, Leroy H., xxxxxx.
Roach, Roy S., xxxxxx.
Sandleback, Eugene, xxxxxx.
Schlaak, James R., xxxxxx.
Schwindt, Philip C., xxxxxxxx.
Shannon, Sam Jr., xxxxxx.
Sinnot, George W., xxxxxx.
Soles, Elmer M., xxxxxx.
Solomon, Richard C., xxxxxx.
Stone, Leland M., xxxxxx.
Summary, James J., xxxxxx.
Thompson, George E., xxxxxx.
Travis, Edward E., xxxxxx.
Trumbla, Thomas E., xxxxxx.
Turner, John W., Jr., xxxxxx.
Vallandingham, James W., xxxxxx.
Webb, Byron D., Jr., xxxxxx.
Wergeland, David A., xxxxxx.
Zell, Matthew N., xxxxxxxx.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Christ, Nancy M., xxxxx.
Clifton, Mary R., xxxxx.
Condon, Kathleen T., xxxxx.
Dennis, Carmen R., xxxxx.
Garfall, Gloria M., xxxxx.
Glor, Beverly A. K., xxxxx.
Goodwin, Nancy C., xxxxx.
Heer, Edith J., xxxxx.
Hiers, Frances A., xxxxx.
Jims, Madeline P., xxxxx.
Kucha, Deloros H., xxxxx.
Mantooth, Jerry M., xxxxx.
Marsh, Carolyn J., xxxxx.
McCaffrey, Mary G., xxxxx.
McKenzie, Nancy J., xxxxx.
Nagelhout, Anna J., xxxxx.
Nolfe, Vera A., xxxxx.
Skinner, Fay J., xxxxx.
Sullivan, Barbara A., xxxxx.
Vineys, Eugenia A., xxxxx.

To be captains, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Boyd, Kattie A., xxxx.
Lucas, Mary E., xxxx.
Uemura, Norma M., xxxx.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate October 11, 1966:

The nomination sent to the Senate on September 26, 1966, of David K. Burkhart to be postmaster at Del Mar in the State of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

God has not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.—II Timothy 1: 7.

Eternal God, our Father, who art the refuge of Thy people in every age and our strength in this present hour—make Thyself real to us as we bow humbly in Thy presence. Help us to recognize our dependence upon Thee, our constant need of Thy strength, Thy guidance, and Thy love. Give us to know that Thou art always with us and that with Thee we can be made ready for every responsibility and equal to every experience.

We pray for peace in our world, for good will among our people and for a faith in Thee which makes us strong, gives us courage and helps us on our upward way.

May Thy spirit touch each one of us with healing power. Kindle our faith, make sensitive our consciences, dedicate

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

our strength, fortify us in our difficulties and send us out strong in Thee and in the power of Thy might. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 3104. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Plumas County, Calif., to C. A. Lundy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9520. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Inyo County, Calif., to the personal representative of the estate of Gwilym L. Morris, Dolores G. Morris, George D. Ishmael, and Verna H. Ishmael;

H.R. 14754. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate a certain oil and gas lease; and

H.R. 16813. An act to transfer to the Atomic Energy Commission complete administrative control of approximately 78 acres of public domain land located in the Otowi section near Los Alamos County.

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. 14644. An act to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years, and for other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for an additional year; and

H.R. 17637. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14644) entitled "An act to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years, and other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for an additional year," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MORSE, Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17637) entitled "An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. SYMINGTON (ex officio), and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 3460. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for scientific and technological research, and for other purposes.

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

S. 84. An act to provide for reimbursement to the State of Wyoming for improvements made on certain lands in Sweetwater County, Wyo., if and when such lands revert to the United States; and

S. 2358. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of such lands.

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1967, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 17637, an act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SIKES, MCFALL, PATTEN, LONG of Maryland, MAHON, CEDERBERG, JONAS, and BOW.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1966.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 5:35 P.M. on October 10, 1966, and said to contain H.R. 7546, An Act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, United States Air Force (retired), and a veto message thereon.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

VETO MESSAGE RE BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF GILMOUR C. MACDONALD, COLONEL, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED (H. DOC. NO. 520)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I regret that I must return without my approval H.R. 7546, a bill "For the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, United States Air Force (retired)," which would, in part, confer upon the Court of Claims jurisdiction to render judgment upon an "equitable" claim.

The Acting Attorney General has advised me that this bill is unconstitutional. In his opinion, in the special sphere of private claims, "equitable" connotes what the Government should do as a matter of moral, as distinguished from legal, responsibility; as a constitutional court, the Court of Claims cannot receive and exercise such a jurisdiction, and the power to determine what the Government should do in such circumstances is legislative in nature and nondelegable.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 10, 1966.*

The SPEAKER. The objection of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF THE REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION BY THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the resolution (H. Con. Res. 1007) authorizing the printing of a report on "International Education" by the House Education and Labor Committee, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 1007

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the document entitled "International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects," a report by the Task Force on International Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, be printed as a House document and that an additional five thousand copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 6, strike out the word "five" and insert "seven".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL HEARINGS AND OTHER MATERIALS BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the resolution (H. Con. Res. 1017) to authorize the printing of additional hearings and other materials by the Committee on Agriculture, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 1017

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed an additional one thousand copies of the hearings of the Committee on Agriculture entitled "World War on Hunger" parts 1, 2, and 3, together with a committee print entitled "World War on Hunger—Staff Summary of Testimony Presented by Public Witnesses at Hearings on World Food and Population Problems." All of such copies shall be for the use of said committee.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the resolution (H. Con. Res. 1022) to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function?", and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 1022

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, (a) with permission of the copyright owner of the book "Our American Government—1001 Questions on How It Works", with answers by WRIGHT PATMAN, published by Scholastic Magazines, Incorporated, there shall be printed as a House document, with emendations, the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; and that there shall be printed one million eighty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which two hundred and six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and eight hundred and seventy-eight thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House document rooms.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PUBLIC PRINTER TO PRINT FOR AND DELIVER TO THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION AN ADDITIONAL COPY OF CERTAIN PUBLICATIONS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the bill (S. 3809) to authorize the Public Printer to print for and deliver to the General Services Administration an additional copy of certain publications.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3809

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Printing Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 601), as amended by the Act of June 17, 1935 (ch. 267, 49 Stat. 386; 44 U.S.C. 215a), is hereby amended by striking that portion of the first sentence preceding the colon and by inserting the following in lieu thereof: "There shall be printed and delivered by the Public Printer to the General Services Administration for official use, including use by the Presidential Library established for the President during whose term or terms the documents were issued, three copies each of the following publications which shall be chargeable to the Congress:". The Act is further amended by striking the word "two" where it appears in the last phrase of that portion of the first sentence following the colon and inserting in lieu thereof the word "three".

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

AMENDING THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO PROVIDE INCLUSION OF PERIODS OF REEMPLOYMENT OF ANNUITANTS

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill (S. 699) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of their surviving spouses, which was unanimously reported out by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 699

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13(b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In the case of any annuitant who upon termination of employment is married to a wife or husband potentially entitled to annuity as surviving spouse by virtue of the annuitant's retirement, the benefit described in the proviso shall be reduced by 10 per centum and such wife or husband shall be paid an annuity equal to 55 per centum of such benefit commencing and terminating at the same times as the survivor annuity payable by virtue of the annuitant's retirement, unless at time of claiming the benefit under the proviso the annuitant notifies the Commission in writing that he or she does not desire the wife or husband to receive such annuity."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to reemployed annuitants whose periods of reemployment expire on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. The provisions under the heading "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85-844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 8344(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'If an annuitant on termination of employment is married to a spouse potentially entitled to annuity as surviving spouse by virtue of the retirement of the annuitant, the benefit described in the second sentence of this subsection is reduced by 10 per centum and the spouse is entitled to an annuity equal to 55 per centum of that benefit commencing and terminating at the same times as the survivor annuity payable by virtue of the retirement of the annuitant, unless the annuitant notifies the Civil Service Commission in writing, at the time of claiming that benefit, that he does not desire his spouse to receive this annuity.'."

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act applies only with respect to reemployed annuitants whose periods of reemployment expire on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of section 18(b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act as enacted by the Act of September 27, 1965 (79 Stat. 840; Public Law 89-205), and section 1101(b) of the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 868; Public Law 87-793), the annuity of each congressional employee and each Member whose annuity commences between December 31, 1966, and February 1, 1967, both dates inclusive, shall be increased from its commencing date as if the commencing date of such annuity were December 31, 1966.

"SEC. 4. Section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, does not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DANIELS

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is technical and simply to make a correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DANIELS: On page 3, line 1, strike out the word "second" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fourth".

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of their surviving spouses, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY—COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit this afternoon at 2 o'clock.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, H.R. 15963.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING REPORTING OF CONGRESSIONAL REFERENCE CASES BY COMMISSIONERS, U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H.R. 1665, 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 U.S. Court of Claims," together with the Senate amendments thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

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 the 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 subpena 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 provision 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 to 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.'"

Amend the title 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. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: In section 1 of the amendment of the Senate, strike out "S. 2509" and insert "S. 1492".

The amendment to the Senate amendment was agreed to.

The Senate amendment as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY TREATMENT OF BAGPIPES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1035) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and parts thereof shall be admitted free of duty, which was reported unanimously by the committee with amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas briefly to explain the bill.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill, which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable CHARLES S. GUBSER, of California, is to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to make duty free the importation of bagpipes and parts thereof.

The bagpipe, a reed musical instrument of great antiquity, has become increasingly popular in the United States in recent years, with numerous bagpipe bands having been organized in various parts of the country. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that there is no known commercial production of bagpipes in the United States, and all the departmental reports received by the committee on H.R. 1035 were favorable.

The committee is unanimous in recommending enactment of the bill.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, we know man does not live by bread alone. We know that through his history man has sought to interpret surroundings and to express these insights and feelings. There is a bit of the artist in all of us. The Muses appeal to us in varying degrees. Of all the arts, the one with broadest appeal down through the ages is music. One of the oldest instruments is the bagpipe. Its lineage may be traced back into the first century, B.C. There is an apparent reference to pipers in the plays of Aristophanes.

Scholarly music books tell us there is no inhabited continent where the bagpipe is not played—whether by those of

Scottish descent or by native musicians irresistibly attracted by its frankly primitive musical character.

Bagpipes may be identified in the paintings of Hogarth and the junior Brueghel. And Queen Victoria's armies marched more smartly because of the sonority of the bagpipe and the pomp of its players. A famous account of D-day, June 1944, when the allied invasion of Normandy was launched, tells of bagpipers marching ashore at the head of a Scottish regiment into the face of enemy fire. Indeed it has been referred to as an instrument of war from time to time instead of a musical instrument.

And just recently I read about the physician in England who prescribed strengthening exercises by blowing on a bagpipe for a patient with a lung ailment. So there are therapeutic as well as cultural benefits attached to the bagpipe.

Now, of course, there are always scoffers. Old Samuel Johnson scoffed at things Scottish. Modern detractors of today may scoff. There is, I am told, in a certain land just south of Scotland, a misguided definition of a gentleman—"a person who knows how to play a bagpipe but doesn't." Well, we Scottish have borne much abuse in respect to the bagpipe, Mr. Speaker, but it is a thrifty instrument and plays a bonnie tune. I do not believe, for example, that I have campaigned for the Senate without being accompanied on most days by my piper friend in Portland, Phil Gray.

It is with this introduction that I rise to support H.R. 1035 that would remove import duties on bagpipes which, I am assured, are not manufactured within the United States. Lifting of the duties would provide the widest possible circulation of the bagpipe to all our advantages. The 89th Congress is moving toward its final days, Mr. Speaker, and what better evidence of our receptiveness to creating the Great Society in all its aspects than to approve this musical measure.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I have checked with Mr. Shewmaker regarding possible importation of bagpipes from behind the Iron Curtain.

Separate statistics are not available with respect to bagpipes, as they are classified in a "basket clause" along with all other woodwinds—except for clarinets and saxophones. However, Mr. Shewmaker checked the statistics available and said that importations of any woodwinds that could include bagpipes from Communist-controlled countries has been negligible, and, of course, there is nothing to indicate that this negligible amount did actually include any bagpipes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I fully support this legislation which would remove the tariff on bagpipes. At present, the rate on imported bagpipes is 15 percent ad valorem. Inasmuch as bagpipes are not produced in the United States in commercial volume, this puts an unfair burden on bagpipe players in this country.

The bagpipe is a very ancient instrument, said to have been introduced by the Romans in England. From England the instrument was introduced in Ireland and Scotland. In both of these countries the instrument is still popular and, with the large number of Scottish and Irish immigrants in the United States, there are numerous bagpipe bands on this side of the Atlantic. The truth of the matter is that in recent years, with an increase in leisure time, more and more bagpipe bands have been organized. One of the better Scottish bagpipe bands is in Miami, Fla., under the outstanding leadership of Scotty Draper.

However, the increased interest in bagpiping has not been limited to those of Irish and Scottish ancestry; indeed, as a case in point, I should like to bring to your attention the exploits of a Jewish friend of mine, Mr. Wyn Samuels, who became interested in playing the bagpipes and performing with a band.

Not only did Wyn Samuels become interested in the bagpipes but he also learned to play the pipes under the tutelage of Pipe Major Scotty Draper. As Mike Morgan of the Miami Herald pointedly remarked in one of his articles:

Wyn did a lot of do-it-yourself instruction with a book entitled "The Highland Bagpipe Tutor."

Not easily discouraged, Mike notes:

Wyn persisted and finally passed the test laid down by the pipe major. He was able to play the five tunes, all of different tempos, which made him eligible to join the band and get his piper's badge and kilts—Royal Stuart tartan. The tunes were "Scots Sha Hae Wie," "Brown-Haired Maiden," "Barren Rocks of Aden," "Scotland the Brave," and "Bonnie Dundee." Since then he has added extensively to his repertoire. "What's the hardest thing about the pipe," I asked, "besides developing the lung capacity?" "It's the marching and playing. There you are pumping and squeezing and blowing and marching in step. Lots of pipers can play well standing still, but aren't worth a puff if they have to march."

Mr. Speaker, from personal experience I can verify that Wyn Samuels has mastered the art of bagpipe playing. The Scotty Draper Band has performed for the entertainment and enjoyment of all.

A recent performance by Scotty Draper and his kilted bagpipers was rather unique because one of the band members was a Jewish piper in a Scottish band playing "The Wearing of the Green" at a picnic for an American of Italian extraction where American hot dogs with English mustard and a Greek salad were the feature of the day's menu.

If the bagpipes are responsible for this important step in the direction of mutual understanding and brotherhood, I believe that barriers to further enjoyment of them should be removed. Furthermore bagpipes are not manufactured in the United States, so that removal of the tariff, while adding to the possibility of enjoyment of that blood-stirring music of the kind which can only come from well-played bagpipes, will not cause economic harm to any American.

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

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

H.R. 1035

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, page 359, Aug. 17, 1963) is amended by striking out item 725.24 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Wood-wind instruments:		
725.24	Bagpipes	Free	Free
725.25	Other	15% ad val.	40% ad val.

(b) Title I of such Act (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, page 360, Aug. 17, 1963) is amended by striking out item 726.70 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Parts of wood wind instruments:		
726.70	Parts of bagpipes	Free	Free
726.72	Other	15% ad val.	40% ad val.

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to articles which are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, immediately after line 2, strike out—

	Woodwind instruments:		
725.24	Bagpipes	Free	Free
725.25	Other	15% ad val.	40% ad val.

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

	Woodwind instruments:		
725.24	Bagpipes	Free	Free
725.25	Other	15% ad val.	40% ad val.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLS: On page 2, after line 2, strike out "Free" in the last column and insert: "40% ad val."

On page 2, after line 6, strike out "Free" in the last column and insert: "40% ad val."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the committee amendment restores the column 2 rate which, in drafting, was inadvertently eliminated by the original reported bill. This has been corrected by the committee and is the matter which is involved in the amendment to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN STRADDLE TRANSACTIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill H.R. 11765 to amend section 1234 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which was reported to the House unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee to explain briefly the bill.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 11765, is intended to permit the netting of gains and losses resulting from the granting of certain types of options to buy and sell corporate stock.

The transactions I have referred to in stock market parlance are known as "straddles." Briefly, a straddle is a combination of an option to buy and an option to sell the same quantity of a security at the same price during the same period of time. The option to buy is known as a "call." The option to sell is known as a "put." Typically, the combination—the straddle—is written by a person who owns the stock and does not believe that it is likely to fluctuate in value very much over the long run. The inducement to write the straddle is the receipt of a premium for it. A straddle is sold by the writer to a dealer, who then normally separates out the component options and sells the put—the option to sell to the writer—to one investor and the call—the option to purchase from the writer—to another investor. Normally, if the market in that security moves upward, the call is exercised and the put option is allowed to lapse. If the market in that security moves downward, then the put is apt to be exercised and the call allowed to lapse. Sometimes—generally about 10 to 15 percent of the time—the movement in the stock is so slight that neither option holder exercises his option. Rarely—less than 1 percent of the time—the stock fluctuates so much that both component options are exercised. This bill is intended to have its primary effect in the overwhelming majority of the cases—where one component option is exercised and the other is not.

Under the 1939 Internal Revenue Code and under the 1954 code until January 1965, it was the usual practice for the writer of a straddle to treat the entire premium as either an increase in the amount received for the stock when the call was exercised, or as a decrease in the writer's cost of the stock when the put was exercised. As a result, the premium merely increased a capital gain or decreased a capital loss.

Under a ruling issued in January in 1965, the Internal Revenue Service has been requiring the writer of a straddle to apportion his premium between the put option and the call option. That part of the premium allocated to the option that ultimately is exercised would continue, as in the past, to either increase the writer's capital gain or decrease his capital loss. The part of the premium allocated to the option that ultimately lapses is treated as ordinary income. Consequently, a single straddle transaction now might well result in the writer realizing both ordinary income and a capital loss. Since net capital losses can be used to offset ordinary income only to the extent of $1,000 a year, a writer's straddles transactions may well result in both ordinary income and capital losses which could not be netted against each other.

Straddles are viewed by those who write them as giving rise to a single transaction. This seems to be borne out by the facts in these cases, for example, the premium received by the writer of the straddle is less than the premium received by the writer of an option to buy plus a completely separate option to sell. Also, the stock exchange company that endorses the option—guarantees that it will be honored if it is exercised—will require considerably less collateral from the writer of a straddle than it will from the writer of a separate option to buy and a separate option to sell.

Because of this combination of characteristics, the Ways and Means Committee concluded that some method ought to be found to permit the gains and losses resulting from the straddle transactions to be netted against each other.

This bill permits just such netting by treating the option lapse income in these cases as short-term capital gains. Since all the gains and losses from a straddle would be capital gains and losses, they could be netted gainst each other. However, any net profits would normally result in short-term capital gains, and would be taxed generally as ordinary income.

The problem giving rise to this bill was examined by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation at the request of former Senator Harry F. Byrd and myself, in our capacities as vice chairman and chairman last year of the joint committee. The requested study was announced in a press release dated January 27, 1965. This staff has consulted with Treasury staff on this bill. This bill, reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee, is consistent with the suggestions of the joint committee staff; and the Treasury does not object to the bill.

The joint committee staff report on this bill stated:

Since Rev. Rul. 65–31 applies only to transactions entered into after January 25, 1965, and since the staff study of the problems arising out of the ruling began at about that time, it is suggested that any legislation along the lines suggested probably should apply to straddles written after January 25, 1965. This will minimize the number of changes in applicable law.

This bill specifically adopts that suggestion.

This bill is not expected to have any appreciable effect on revenues. However, this bill will bring the tax laws into greater conformity with the economic considerations that move people to write straddles and buy options. It will remedy an unfair quirk in the tax laws. It should be adopted.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11765

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1234 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to options, is amended as follows:

Subsection (c) is redesignated as subsection (d) and the following new subsection (c) is added at the end of subsection (b).

"(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR CREATORS OF STRADDLE.—

"(1) GAIN ON LAPSE.—In the case of gain on lapse of an option that was granted as part of a straddle (as defined in paragraph 2), the gain shall be deemed to be gain from the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for less than six months on the day that the option expires.

"(2) DEFINITIONS.—

"(A) For purposes of this section a 'straddle' is defined as a combination of an option to buy and an option to sell, giving the holder the right to both buy and sell a specified quantity of a security at a fixed price for a stated period of time.

"(B) For purposes of this paragraph 'security' shall not include contracts to buy or sell commodities.

"(3) EXCLUSION OF DEALERS.—This subsection shall not apply to any person who holds securities for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 2. This Act shall apply to options granted after January 25, 1965.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That section 1234 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to options) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"'(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR GRANTORS OF STRADDLES.—

"'(1) GAIN ON LAPSE.—In the case of gain on lapse of an option granted by the taxpayer as part of a straddle, the gain shall be deemed to be gain from the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for not more than 6 months on the day that the option expired.

"'(2) EXCLUSION OF DEALERS.—This subsection shall not apply to any person who holds

securities for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business.

"'(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"'(A) The term "straddle" means a simultaneously granted combination of an option to buy, and an option to sell, the same quantity of a security at the same price during the same period of time.

"'(B) The term "security" has the meaning assigned to such term by section 1236(c).'

"SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to straddle transactions entered into after January 25, 1965, in taxable years ending after such date."

Mr. MILLS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. 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. 348]

Albert	Evans, Colo.	Murphy, N.Y.
Andrews, Glenn	Feighan	Murray
Ashley	Fisher	Nix
Aspinall	Flynt	O'Brien
Bandstra	Foley	O'Konski
Brooks	Frelinghuysen	Olsen, Mont.
Broyhill, Va.	Fulton, Tenn.	Ottinger
Callaway	Fuqua	Powell
Celler	Gilligan	Purcell
Cleveland	Gross	Reinecke
Clevenger	Hagan, Ga.	Rivers, Alaska
Collier	Hansen, Iowa	Rogers, Tex.
Conte	Harvey, Ind.	Roncalio
Conyers	Hicks	St Germain
Cooley	Holifield	Schmidhauser
Corman	Huot	Scott
Craley	Jennings	Steed
Culver	Jones, Ala.	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	Keith	Stratton
Devine	Long, La.	Taylor
Dickinson	Love	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	McDowell	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	McVicker	Toll
Dorn	Martin, Ala.	Trimble
Dulski	Martin, Mass.	Tuten
Duncan, Oreg.	Matsunaga	Vigorito
Dwyer	Moorhead	Walker, Miss.
Dyal	Morris	White, Idaho
Edmondson	Morrison	Whitten
	Moss	Wolff

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 343 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3112) to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 per centum of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes, together with House amendments, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, JARMAN, O'BRIEN, ROGERS of Florida, SPRINGER, and NELSEN.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2215)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15941) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," having met, after a further full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, and 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 20, 22, 23, 28, 30, 32, and 33; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,943,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,017,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 10, 13, 24, and 27.

GEORGE MAHON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEO. W. ANDREWS,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB (except amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4),
MELVIN R. LAIRD (except amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5),
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL (except amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5),
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
LISTER HILL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate in the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

(Except as to amendments nos. 5 and 24 the following statement of action recommended on Senate amendments is identical to that set forth in H. Report 1886, dated August 24, 1966.)

TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Military personnel, Army

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $6,164,400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,429,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Military personnel, Navy

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $3,652,100,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,736,100,000 as proposed by the House.

Military personnel, Marine Corps

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $1,183,200,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,214,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Military personnel, Air Force

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $5,015,800,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,204,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Reserve personnel, Army

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. It is the intention of the managers on the part of the House to offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment. The amendment of the Senate as amended will read:

"Provided further, That—

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until June 30, 1968, the President may order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who—

"(1) is not assigned to, or participating satisfactorily in, a unit in the Selected Reserve, and

"(2) has not fulfilled his statutory reserve obligation, and

"(3) has not served on active duty or active duty for training for a total of twenty-four months.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until June 30, 1968, the President may order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who had become a member of a reserve component prior to July 1, 1966; and who

"(1) has not served on active duty or active duty for training for a period of one hundred and twenty days or more, and

"(2) has not fulfilled his statutory reserve military obligation.

"(c) A member ordered to active duty under this section may be required to serve on active duty until his total service on active duty or active duty for training equals twenty-four months. If the enlistment or period of military service of a member of the Ready Reserve ordered to active duty under subsections (a) or (b) of this section would expire before he has served the required period of active duty prescribed herein, his enlistment or period of military service may be extended until that service on active duty has been completed.

"(d) In order to achieve fair treatment as between members in the Ready Reserve who are being considered for active duty under this section, appropriate consideration shall be given to—

"(1) family responsibilities; and

"(2) employment necessary to maintain the national health, safety, or interest.

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until June 30, 1968, the President may, when he deems it necessary, order to active duty any unit of the Ready Reserve of an armed force for a period of not to exceed twenty-four months."

Reserve personnel, Navy

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $112,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $111,900,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Operation and maintenance, Army

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $5,122,427,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,132,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Operation and maintenance, Navy

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $3,980,300,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,982,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Operation and maintenance, Air Force

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $4,943,100,000 instead of $4,948,600,000 as proposed by the House and $4,937,100,000 as proposed by the Senate. It is the intent of the conferees that the $6,000,000 addition to the amount proposed by the Senate be used to keep the total current active number of B–52 aircraft in operation through June 30, 1967, as proposed by the House.

Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies

Amendment No. 10: Reported in technical disagreement. It is the intention of the managers on the part of the House to offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment to appropriate $806,500,000 instead of $808,100,000 as proposed by the House and $806,900,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agreed that only $1,600,000 shall be available for management studies.

Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard

Amendment No. 11: Not in conference. The House in earlier action agreed to the Senate amendment providing language requiring the retention of the present twenty-five airlift squadrons.

TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $3,483,300,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,484,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy

Amendment No. 13: Reported in technical disagreement. It is the intention of the managers on the part of the House to offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing that no part of the funds in this bill shall be available for the procurement of F–111B aircraft, with an amendment which will permit advance procurement of equipment, the total cost of which shall not exceed $7,800,000.

Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $1,756,700,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,909,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 15 and 16: Delete language proposed by the Senate to provide that, of the funds appropriated under this heading, $130,500,000 would be available only for the construction of a nuclear powered guided missile frigate and $20,000,000 would be available only for the procurement of long leadtime items for an additional nuclear powered guided missile frigate.

Aircraft procurement, Air Force

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $4,017,300,000 instead of $4,032,300,000 as proposed by the House and $3,992,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference in agreeing to this sum has approved the amount of $55,000,000 for the F–12 aircraft program, as proposed by the House, and have agreed to the reduction of $15,000,000 in the A–7 aircraft program as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19: Delete language proposed by the Senate that, of the funds appropriated under this heading, $30,000,000 would be available only for the F–12 aircraft program and $16,000,000 would be available only for the procurement of CX–2 (aeromedical transport) aircraft.

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Research, development, test and evaluation, Navy

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $1,758,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,753,600,000 as proposed by the House. The $10,000,000 provided above the budgeted amount is the sum of an increase of $7,500,000 for antisubmarine warfare development and an increase of $2,500,000 for the deep submergence systems project.

Amendment No. 21: Makes the total amount of $24,000,000 provided for the deep submergence systems project, including the $21,500,000 budgeted and the $2,500,000 increase, available only for the deep submergence systems project instead of $26,500,000 as proposed by the House and $21,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $3,112,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,062,600,000 as proposed by the House. The $50,000,000 increase is for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory program.

Amendment No. 23: Provides that the total sum of $200,000,000 provided for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory program, including the $150,000,000 budgeted and the $50,000,000 added, shall be available only for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory program as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. It is the intention of the managers on the part of the House to offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment which will provide a per-pupil limitation of $490 for the dependents overseas education program. The amendment will include language preserving pay rates in effect on June 30, 1966.

Amendment No. 25: Strikes language proposed by Senate relating to purchase of milk.

Amendment No. 26: Restores monthly reporting requirement as contained in House bill relating to use of section 612 authorities.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in technical disagreement. It is the intention of the managers on the part of the House to offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment which will provide quarterly reports to Congress on the use of deficiency authorities contained in section 3732 of the Revised Statutes.

Amendment No. 28: Strikes language proposed by House providing differing allowances for the shipment of household goods for differing pay grades leaving a single maximum allowance of 13,500 pounds as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Not in conference. The House in earlier action had agreed to the Senate amendment permitting appropriations to be used for the purchase of house trailers solely for the purpose of relieving unusual individual losses occasioned by the relocation of personnel from installations in France.

Amendment No. 30: Provides limitation of $11,746,000 as proposed by Senate instead of $12,647,300 as proposed by House on funds available for the hire of motor vehicles.

Amendment No. 31: Strikes language proposed by the Senate and restores House language concerning research grant costs.

Amendment No. 32: Inserts language as proposed by Senate providing that none of the funds shall be available for expenses of the special training enlistment program.

Amendment No. 33: Changes section number.

GEORGE MAHON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEO. W. ANDREWS,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB (except amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4),
MELVIN R. LAIRD (except as to 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5),
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL (except as to 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5),
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a second conference report on the Defense Department appropriation bill. The first conference report was before us August 25 last in identically the same form it is before us today and a full discussion, together with tabulations of the appropriations, appears in the RECORD of that date.

We had a rollcall vote on the conference report at that time, and it was approved by a vote of 383 to 1. Therefore, I do not believe further discussion is necessary and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5, on page 3, after line 22, insert the following: *"Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, until June 30, 1968, the President may order any member in the Ready Reserve of an armed force, who has not served on active duty other than for training, to active duty for not more than twenty-four consecutive months less the number of months such member has previously served on active duty for training: *Provided further,* That in order to achieve fair treatment as between members in the Ready Reserve who are being considered for active duty under this section consideration shall be given to—

"(a) family responsibilities; and

"(b) employment necessary to maintain the national health, safety, or interest."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert:

"Provided further, That—

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until June 30, 1968, the President may order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who—

"(1) is not assigned to, or participating satisfactorily in, a unit in the Selected Reserve, and

"(2) has not fulfilled his statutory reserve obligation, and

"(3) has not served on active duty or active duty for training for a total of twenty-four months.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until June 30, 1968, the President may order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who had become a member of a reserve component prior to July 1, 1966; and who—

"(1) has not served on active duty or active duty for training for a period of one hundred and twenty days or more, and

"(2) has not fulfilled his statutory reserve military obligation.

"(c) A member ordered to active duty under this section may be required to serve on active duty until his total service on active duty or active duty for training equals twenty-four months. If the enlistment or period of military service of a member of the Ready Reserve ordered to active duty under subsections (a) or (b) of this section would expire before he has served the required period of active duty prescribed herein, his enlistment or period of military service may be extended until that service on active duty has been completed.

"(d) In order to achieve fair treatment as between members in the Ready Reserve who are being considered for active duty under this section, appropriate consideration shall be given to—

"(1) family responsibilities; and

"(2) employment necessary to maintain the national health, safety, or interest.

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until June 30, 1968, the President may, when he deems it necessary, order to active duty any unit of the Ready Reserve of an armed force for a period of not to exceed twenty-four months."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that on August 25 the House had before it the conference report on the Defense Department appropriation bill. At that time, an amendment in technical disagreement was considered by the House, was rejected, which would have authorized the calling up of certain individual members of the Reserves. That proposal, as I said, was rejected by the House.

We have since met in a further conference with the other body, and an agreement has been worked out. We present to you now a substitute for the proposal which was rejected by the House on August 25.

The vehicle which made it possible for this agreement to be reached with the other body was the so-called Reserve bill of rights (H.R. 17195) which was passed by the House on September 21 of this year by a vote of 322 to 6.

The conferees on the Defense appropriation bill took the portions of the bill to which reference has been made and wrote them into an amendment which has been read by the Clerk. This amendment substantially gives the President the right to call up reservists under certain circumstances. If they are in units, they cannot be called up unless the whole unit is called up. Individuals who are not assigned to units can be called up if they have not performed a certain service heretofore.

This is a compromise arrangement worked out in conference. It is not perfect, but it is the best agreement we could reach. This Congress is almost ready to adjourn and the funds needed by the Department of Defense must be appropriated. I would like to think of it as an interim settlement of this problem.

The House, as will be remembered, passed the Reserve bill of rights bill on September 21. It went to the other body and it developed, in our conference with the other body, that the Members did not have the time to conduct the detailed review needed to complete action on that bill, which was handled by Mr. HÉBERT of the Committee on Armed Services, as you know, when it was on the House floor. However, we were given assurances by the other body that early next year the whole matter of Reserve legislation would be brought before the Committee on Armed Services of the other body and an effort would be made to work out substantive legislation dealing with this subject.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is substantially the agreement that was reached in conference. Its effect is to provide a permissive authority. We are not advocating that any reservists be called up, or that any reservists not be called up. We are giving the option to the executive branch to call up reservists under certain circumstances as are set forth in the amendment which has been read here. In taking this action, the Congress will not be in the position of stating that the Reserves should be called up or should not be called up. Our position is that the President should be able to call up the Reserves quickly if it becomes necessary to do so. The amendment is permissive in effect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] such time as he may require.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, this matter is perhaps one of the most important matters to come before the House. Those of us who have been personally involved with the members of the Committee on Appropriations, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] have worked very diligently and very hard on it. I do not rise to object to this amendment, but, Mr. Speaker, I only rise to ask certain questions in order to make the legislative history positive and definite in this connection. In order that there be no misunderstanding as to exactly what we direct our remarks to, I have reduced to writing four or five questions, Mr. Speaker, which I shall ask in order and then ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas to reply so that we may have a very definite and a crystal clear understanding of this matter. The first question I ask the gentleman from Texas is this:

First. Is not the substitute amendment, for practical purposes, the language originally contained in section 105 of H.R. 17195, the Reserve bill of rights, with the following changes:

Deletion of the certification requirement to the Congress, and

The addition of substantive language which would permit the President until June 30, 1968, authority to order to active duty units of the Ready Reserve for a period not to exceed 24 months.

Is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. The answer to that question is, "Yes." The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. The second question I will ask the gentleman is this:

Second. The legislative language contained in this substitute amendment is, therefore for practical purposes, the House language approved by a record vote of 322 to 6 on September 21, 1966.

And, am I correct in stating that the House conferees were persuaded to accept the Senate substitute of the language formerly in H.R. 17195, because they were told that the other body could not, because of the lateness of the session, take final action on the entire bill, that is, H.R. 17195; and, therefore, the conferees accepted an amendment which was repetitious, Mr. Speaker, but I want to be sure that we understand it.

Mr. Speaker, we were assured that the other body would give early consideration to the remaining provisions of H.R. 17195 shortly after the convening of the 90th Congress.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Louisiana is correct. We were assured by the highest authority on the Armed Forces Committee of the other body that the provisions of H.R. 17195 would be given consideration by that committee early in the next year.

Mr. HÉBERT. In other words, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the ranking member, both concurred in giving early hearings to the bill which the House of Representatives passed overwhelmingly during this session of the Congress?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. Does the term "Selected Reserve" as used in the context of this amendment bear the same meaning as was contained in H.R. 17195—that is, a paid drilling unit in the Ready Reserve?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Louisiana has asked a very pertinent question and the gentleman's interpretation is precisely correct, in the opinion of the House conferees.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, the next question of the gentleman from Texas is this:

If the President elects to use this authority to call individuals to active duty, will this in any way affect mandated personnel strengths of the Reserve components?

Mr. MAHON. The answer to that question is that it would not. The answer is "no."

The mandated personnel strengths remain in the bill and will be contained in the law.

Mr. HÉBERT. It is in the bill now?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The mandated strengths are in no way affected by the amendment which we are now considering.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the next question is as follows:

If the President orders units to active duty under this authority, will this not result in a compensating reduction in mandated personnel strengths?

Mr. MAHON. As a practical matter, the answer is "yes."

Mr. HÉBERT. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, the last question is this:

In subsection (e) of the substitute amendment, the term "unit"—and I emphasize the term "unit"—of the Ready Reserve means, as I understand it, those organizations in the Ready Reserve components structure which are established upon a table of organization under which a unit is expected to function operationally when ordered to active duty?

Is that a correct statement?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Louisiana is absolutely correct. I want to thank the gentleman for cooperating in undertaking to make the record crystal clear as to the intent involved here in the consideration of this amendment.

Mr. HÉBERT. So, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, in a capsule summation this is the situation: the conferees took the House language, abandoning the language of the amendment which the House had previously rejected from the other body, and accepted the language of the House, and offered two amendments to it, notably, the deletion requiring the President to advise or certify to the Congress, and the other amended the unit strength for a callup, and in other words, protected the function of the unit as we have always sought to do? Is this not in fact what happened?

In addition, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, gave assurances that hearings would be held on the House-passed bill of this Congress early at the convening of the 90th Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has made a correct statement. That is my understanding.

Mr. HÉBERT. In view of this, I want to say to the Members of this body, as the manager of the bill on the part of the House Committee on Armed Services which was passed, that on January 3 I will reintroduce the bill which the House has supported 322 to 6 in its identical language, as supported by the House and the Committee on Armed Services, with the assurance of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman [Mr. RIVERS], that it will be given immediate consideration. And this piece of legislation will be submitted to the House as quickly and as expeditiously as the parliamentary situation will allow us to, and we will send it to the other body. I do not think I am too far out in prognosticating, or being out too far on a limb, to say that the other body will have this piece of legislation before the year closes on the month of January.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his helpfulness. This was the best arrangement that could be worked out under the circumstances.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 10 minutes at this time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and I will yield later to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 12 minutes. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time so there can be no mistake in the House today over the colloquy conducted by the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the House conferees. The language in the first section of amendment No. 5 upon which we are about to vote regarding individual Reserve callups is almost the same language that was passed in the House Reserve bill with two minor exceptions. The new language, however, in the second section of the amendment was never approved by the House of Representatives in any legislation passed in this session of the Congress.

There have not been any hearings conducted with respect to the authority granted by Congress to the Executive in the second part of this amendment attached as a rider to this appropriation bill. Let there be no mistake about what we are voting on at this point. We are not voting on anything but the following amendment.

Part 1 reads as follows:

Provided further, That—

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until June 30, 1968, the President may order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who—

(1) is not assigned to, or participating satisfactorily in, a unit in the Selective Reserve, and

(2) has not fulfilled his statutory reserve obligation, and

(3) has not served on active duty or active duty for training for a total of twenty-four months.

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until June 30, 1968, the President may order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who had become a member of a reserve component prior to July 1, 1966; and who

(1) has not served on active duty or active duty for training for a period of one hundred and twenty days or more, and

(2) has not fulfilled his statutory reserve military obligation.

(c) A member ordered to active duty under this section may be required to serve on active duty until his total service on active duty or active duty for training equals twenty-four months. If the enlistment or period of military service of a member of the Ready Reserve ordered to active duty under subsection (a) or (b) of this section would expire before he has served the required period of active duty prescribed herein, his enlistment or period of military service may be extended until that service on active duty has been completed.

(4) In order to achieve fair treatment as between members in the Ready Reserve who are being considered for active duty under this section, appropriate consideration shall be given to—

(1) family responsibilities; and

(2) employment necessary to maintain the national health, safety, or interest.

Part 2 reads as follows:

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until June 30, 1968, the President may, when he deems it necessary, order to active duty any unit of the Ready Reserve of an armed force for a period of not to exceed twenty-four months.

That particular language in part 2 gives to the President the authority to call out any National Guard unit, any Reserve unit in the Army, any Reserve unit in the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, without coming to the Congress, and without declaring a national emergency.

At the time of the Berlin crisis President Kennedy came to the Congress of the United States and he asked for authority to call selected Reserve units of the Army, Navy and the Air Force into active duty. This properly went before the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services, where it should have been considered, and where hearings should have been held, and were held, at the time of the Berlin crisis.

But the language in this conference report goes even beyond the language in the Berlin crisis callup. It provides that these individual units can be called up, not for 12 months, as was the limitation put on the callup language by the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services with regard to President Kennedy's Berlin request, it provides that these units can be called up for 24 months.

This authority is given to the executive branch of our Government even though no request had been made by the President or the Secretary of Defense or any other official of the executive

branch of our Government, and with a statement to the effect: "give us the authority, and we will never use it," according to the Secretary of Defense. And this was brought up in conference: Why give them the authority if the Secretary of Defense says he will not use it anyway?

Well, it does not seem to me that this is the proper way to legislate by adopting this language, giving this authority to go beyond the Berlin crisis callup for our Reserve units all over the United States, whether they are the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, or any other Reserve component. We not only go beyond the language of the Berlin crisis callup, as far as the Reserve services of this country are concerned, but we give this authority to the President of the United States, rather than wait until the Hébert bill can pass the Congress and be enacted by the House and the Senate. This language could have been limited so as to cover the period when Congress will not be in session or even until the end of fiscal year 1967—next June 30—in order to give the legislative committees time to enact a bill.

But no, we grant this authority not only through this fiscal year, but go beyond it another 12 months and under this authority the executive branch has a commitment from the Congress until June 30, 1968.

I happen to be in support of the Reserve bill that passed the House of Representatives. There are many amendments in that bill that are necessary today.

Talk to some of these technicians who are working for the Reserve units around the country. They have no retirement benefits and very few, if any, other benefits at all. That particular problem was taken care of in the Reserve bill. Extending this authority through a rider to an appropriation bill takes the pressure off of the legislative committees to enact a bill in a timely fashion that will help, for example, these technicians.

Why go through item after item in that bill which is needed and necessary if you grant this authority for almost 2 years? If you want to keep the pressure on to get that kind of legislation, do not use a backdoor approach by an appropriation rider giving broader authority than has ever been given to any President of the United States in any crisis, especially when that President has never even requested such authority and when his Secretary of Defense says he will not use it.

It seems to me we should understand thoroughly what we are doing here by using the appropriation process in the closing weeks of this session to grant this kind of authority that has never been granted before.

At the very least, this amendment should be corrected to provide that if these units are called, their term of service should be limited to 12 months as it was in the Berlin crisis. If the Defense Department or others want to go beyond 12 months, they should have to come to the Congress and ask for it to keep those units in service longer than 12 months.

At the very least there should be some consideration given—as there was in the House bill and as there was in the original amendment—to these units that were called up during the Berlin crisis. My own State of Wisconsin and my own district contributed more in terms of manpower to the Berlin crisis than any other district in the U.S. Congress.

There should be some consideration given to members of the Reserves who are in these units who have had 4 and 5 years of active duty.

These are matters that should properly have come before a congressional committee and hearings should have been conducted on these matters. Yet, no hearings were conducted by the appropriations committee in this session of Congress on this grave and serious matter.

I do not want anybody to get the impression that the language of the second proviso of this bill is anything that was adopted by the House of Representatives at an earlier date, because it was not.

The House Committee on Armed Services did not include this kind of language in their bill and under present law these units can only be called if the President of the United States notifies the Congress and declares a national emergency.

It seems to me we should be following the same procedure that was used in the case of the Berlin crisis and not use the appropriations process to tag this amendment on in the last closing weeks of this session of the Congress—an amendment that is going to affect and which could affect millions of Americans. There is every right to expect that hearings would be conducted on such an important matter as this.

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

Is it not a fact that in the Reserve bill, the President had to certify that these Reserves were needed?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, he had to so certify to the Congress. There is no such certification required here whatsoever, even on individual callups. This is the individual callup section that you are referring to, the first section of the Mahon amendment. The first section of the Mahon amendment follows closely the language of the Hébert bill. But there are several amendments—the Hall amendment which was stricken from it as well as several other provisions that were stricken. But they were not major provisions.

But the second proviso is not in the Hébert bill and was not considered by the House of Representatives. This is a provision which gives the executive branch the authority that it has never requested. Furthermore, it gives the executive branch this authority not until the committee might act—it gives the executive branch this authority until June 30, 1968.

I am for protecting the integrity of each guard and Reserve unit, but this could have been done without giving this blanket authority until June 30, 1968. One would think that legislation from the Armed Services Committees could be expected before then, especially if the President requests such authority in the interim.

In the conference we could not get any commitment about a bill being reported out. They have had the bill before the Senate committee all during this session of Congress, all during these many months. The only commitment we could get in the conference was that consideration—I repeat, consideration—would be given to it in the next session of Congress.

If consideration was going to be given to it in the next session of the Congress, this amendment should have been at least limited to June 30, 1967, and not extended until June 30, 1968.

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

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. There were several conferees, including yourself, who did not agree to amendment No. 5, I believe it is. Is that correct?

Mr. LAIRD. It is amendment No. 5. That is correct.

Mr. BRAY. I am very grateful that at least some members of the conference had respect for this House that passed almost unanimously this bill and turned down almost unanimously the rider placed on the bill by the Senate. I am certainly happy that some Members did stand up for the finding of the House and did not absolutely surrender without trying to bring about what this House almost unanimously voted for.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

I should like to add one further point, and that is that on such an important issue as this, affecting well over a million young men in America today, it seems to me that we are not so busy that we cannot afford to have at least a hearing, call the executive branch up, the Secretary of Defense, the Guard bureau, the State adjutant general's office; at least we should consider for a few moments the views of these people before we tack this kind of broad authority on an appropriation bill.

This legislative authority is a very, very serious matter, one which I do believe merits some attention in behalf of the Congress by a legislative committee, and not be considered by a few conferees in a House-Senate conference. This is not the way the House of Representatives should operate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I heard the very able statement by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin. But I am constrained to call the attention of the House to the fact that, in the action which is proposed today, Congress is simply facing the facts. We are in a war. We are seeking to insure that this Nation will be ready for whatever defense emergencies may arise.

Shortly this session of Congress will be ended. If a greater emergency should arise while we are away, legislative authority for a callup of the Reserves will be available. I think we can be certain

this grant of power will not be abused. We have to trust to someone, and I am willing to trust those in positions of leadership who are responsible for the great decisions of our Nation in time of war.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that there is nothing reprehensible about the action which is proposed. What we do is in keeping with the forward-thinking action on defense matters followed by the 89th Congress throughout its history.

This Congress has taken the lead in providing the Nation with a strong defense. This Congress has taken the lead in giving better pay, better living and working conditions, and improving the morale of those who wear the uniform.

Time and time again we have taken steps which were not requested by the Department of Defense but which we believed were necessary, from careful studies, to strengthen our forces in areas where greater strength was needed. And time has proved us right.

The Berlin crisis occurred under far different conditions, in a far different world. We were not then in a shooting war. There had been no buildup of strength in preparation for world crises, such as we have had in recent years. To meet that crisis, with its sudden expanding demand for air units, there had to be a callup of Reserves. Actually, in numbers, very few were called, but the authority to call them was essential.

We are now in a serious emergency. No one will gainsay that. We propose to take one more step in the Nation's defense by saying the Reserve components can, for a limited time, be called into service if needed.

May I remind the Members respectfully that the Reserve forces are maintained for use in national emergencies. They realize this. They expect to serve. That is why they spend months and years in training, in preparation for just such periods as this. They train so that they can be used when the Nation requires their services.

In this amendment we simply propose to make the Reserves available without the declaration of a national emergency. I believe everyone here recognizes the significance of this action. We live in an edgy world. Our State Department is seeking to maintain an atmosphere conducive to the search for peace. We are trying to maintain balance in world relations, trying to keep from frightening the daylights out of nations that are worried about what is going to happen in southeast Asia.

A declaration of national emergency under present circumstances could cause a very serious set of jitters throughout the world. It could even push Communist countries not yet fully committed into active support of the Vietcong in Vietnam. Regretfully I recognize, also, there are many nations which should be on our side but which are maintaining neutrality. The precarious negotiations progress with these powers could be upset by a declaration of national emergency.

We know we are treading a dangerous path. And we in Congress are trying not to rock the boat but to provide whatever support is needed to win in South Vietnam, and at the same time to help avoid a greater involvement.

This is not an action which has just been thought up out of thin air. The House already has acted on substantially the language which is before us. I refer to the Hébert bill, the Reserve bill of rights. On that bill there were extensive hearings. On that bill there was debate. And for that bill there was overwhelming support when it passed the House.

Now we are merely trying to face the facts. We are in a war. We want to be sure that our Nation is ready for any defense emergency that may occur until we come back here in January, when we can complete the enactment of permanent legislation to deal with Reserve problems.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me.

I enjoyed listening to the gentleman's remarks. He states we are now in a national emergency so far as our country is concerned.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman agrees, does he not?

Mr. LAIRD. I believe we are in such a position right now, and have been for the past 12 months. This is the reason why I believe the administration should come forward and declare a national emergency. It should come before the Congress and tell us exactly what it is spending in Vietnam and its future programed manpower needs. That decision is being postponed. Why?

If the situation in Vietnam has deteriorated to the point where this authority is needed between now and the convening of the 90th Congress, then this appropriations rider should be limited at most to the period ending June 30, 1967, and not June 30, 1968.

If, as the gentleman from Florida states, we are presently in a national emergency, we should not continue to follow the policy of doing business as usual. We should not continue to mislead the American people so far as the manpower needs and costs of this war are concerned. The Congress, representing an independent branch, should have the facts presented before writing blank checks. This is our responsibility to our country and our people.

By removing the requirement that the President of the United States should declare a national emergency or at the very least come to the legislative branch outlining our country's manpower needs, we do a disservice to representative government.

Mr. SIKES. My friend is not asking a question. I decline to yield further.

I have attempted to show some of the reasons that we have not had a declaration of national emergency.

I do not consider that the situation is worsening in Vietnam. I think the situation is definitely better in Vietnam. It has only been a short time since the head of our forces there said that we are now in a position where we will hold and police and secure the territory which we capture from the Vietcong. This is the first time we have had forces in sufficient number to do that. That is an extremely important thing.

There is no great mystery about the cost of the war in Vietnam. It involves a tremendous cost. It was brought out not long ago, in a public forum, that it is costing $2 billion a month. However, money already has been voted by Congress which is sufficient for the time being. There is no doubt but that within a short time the Department of Defense must ask for a supplemental. Any facts that we need to know on expenditures will be brought out at that time. All of this is well known. There is no mystery here; no attempt to hold anything back from the Congress.

Mr. LAIRD. Will the gentleman agree that the procedure we were using yesterday in the committee was borrowing from the third and fourth quarters in order to finance the emergency needs on a vital basis in Vietnam today? All we are doing is borrowing. We are not reprograming.

Mr. SIKES. There are alternative procedures, of course. I would have preferred a direct request for additional funds. It must be done within a short time anyway. But there is nothing wrong with using money in the manner the gentleman referred to in order to fulfill a present need. There will be a period of several months when the money will not be needed for the original purpose for which it was funded.

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

Mr. SIKES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is the situation before us. I am always enthralled by the eloquence at this time of the year of my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] for very obvious reasons. Now, we are talking about the Reserve components here. A lot of us have been here for a long time, and there is nobody in this body who knows more about the Reserve components than the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. Let me assure you, I cannot imagine anybody else whose heart is going to bleed for the Reserves and take the position that papa knows best. Listen to me. If the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] supports this position taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], who in the world, speaking for the Reserves, could say a nay? Nobody.

Mr. SIKES. Finally, let me say we have achieved substantive improvements in the language of this report with regard to the Reserves. It makes the Reserve readiness posture more in keeping with the needs of the hour. Great care had been taken by the committee, in the many weeks in which we labored, to provide the most effective Reserve Forces possible. We provided support for the Reserves of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. A substantive increase is provided for the Army because

its form and support have been in contention. Mandatory language was included to protect and preserve this indispensable part of our defense structure.

Now we have reached agreement on language which will make it possible for the callup of some elements of the Reserves without causing undue international unrest or interfering with the manning, training, or readiness of the Reserve units.

This amendment will make available for callup, to fill out the Active Army, thousands of Ready reservists, and will permit the President, when he deems it necessary, to call to active duty any unit of the Ready Reserves.

There are, of course, deficiencies in the law with regard to the Reserves. We need a general law to treat with all aspects of the Reserve problem. But we have received assurances that this matter will be handled promptly when the Congress reassembles in January. Under the circumstances, what is now contained in the language of the appropriations bill goes as far as we can go at this time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. I grant that it should probably come through regular legislative channels, but, as has been explained to the House already, time will not permit adequate consideration in the Senate of the Hébert bill, H.R. 17195. The language of section 105 of H.R. 17195 has been picked up and placed in this amendment with a couple of minor exceptions. If I understand the debate correctly today, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], who is the author of H.R. 17195, has clarified his position before the House. He and his committee are the most knowledgeable in this area. We are taking that language with the clarifications and putting it in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this amendment to the appropriation bill is necessary and is a responsible action for us to take at this time because of the gravity of the situation and present status of the Reserves.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the House of Representatives will accept this amendment and get on with the conference report and get this bill over to the White House. I say this because action on this measure is long overdue. It represents a reflection upon the Congress. I feel that this bill, since it is still pending before us, represents just that at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill carries appropriations with which to finance not only the war in Vietnam, but it carries all of the appropriations for our worldwide commitments on which we are hoping to complete action.

Mr. Speaker, it should have been before the House and signed by the White House by July 1, 1966. The fact is that right now, at this moment, this House should be voting upon a supplemental appropriation for additional money for fiscal year 1967 with which to finance items that are needed by the Department of Defense, funds which the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States should request at this time for the Congress to act upon.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense uses the excuse that he does not know how much we may need, and that the amounts of money involved therein will be known later and that the request will come up later, probably early next year.

Mr. Speaker, this is the budget situation and in my opinion the important matter is to get this bill to the President for his signature so that the Department of Defense can continue to operate.

But, Mr. Speaker, instead of following good fiscal procedures, the Secretary of Defense is borrowing funds, reprograming funds, and manipulating appropriations that were made to the Department of Defense.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Defense appropriation bill, the conference agreement on which you are voting today, does not carry adequate financing for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1967.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, there is not enough money in this bill for military personnel, for the pay of the actual force structure that is on board in the Department of Defense at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it does not finance the pay actions voted by this House of Representatives and the other body, and signed by the President; namely, pay increases for fiscal year 1967.

Mr. Speaker, it does not finance operations and maintenance for expanding operations in Vietnam and other worldwide commitments.

Mr. Speaker, it does not finance adequate procurement for the armed services to employ in our battle with which we are faced in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it does not finance long leadtime on weapons, ammunition, and ordnance. And through the admission of the Secretary of Defense himself, he is going to have to reprogram over $400 million as contained in this bill, money on which you are acting today, to provide combat aircraft for the Department of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense is borrowing from funds contained in this bill to finance those reprograming actions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the Secretary of Defense should ask Congress for this money. Insofar as I am concerned, his method of handling this situation represents a poor and irresponsible manner in which to handle appropriations financing a Military Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations in my view, and the Congress, in the area of defense appropriations, might as well close up shop and go home if we allow things to continue in this way.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense McNamara and his computers could make all of the decisions and just let the Congress rubberstamp them.

In my opinion, this is wrong, and I believe it is time that the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress of the United States stepped up and did something about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to take the time of the House of Representatives at this time on an amendment with reference to this Reserve matter, but I believe it is important that we look at what we are doing in this conference report and with these amendments, because some other action must be taken by those who join in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, all of the estimates were based upon the unrealistic premise that the war in Vietnam would be over by June 30, 1967.

The Secretary of Defense now has changed, and recognized that this is still an optimistic assumption. New ground rules have been established for the budget, and new estimates have been sent to the Secretary for the rest of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Congress should once again call upon the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States to send to the Congress the necessary requests for funds that they know now are needed so that we can appropriate that money before we leave in a supplemental bill. This will let the American people know, at least, what this war is costing them and what they are expected to do. They are entitled to know that.

Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment pertaining to the Reserves. As I said, I think it is a necessary and responsible move. But let us get on with this business; let us give the military the funds they really require to operate our Defense Establishment. Let us demand of the President that he submit proper figures so we can appropriate adequate funds for the support of our Military Establishment and the war in Vietnam.

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I would like to say to the gentleman that I join with him in support of his amendment, having to do with the Reserve components.

There have been some who questioned whether the President should be required to declare a national emergency before calling the Reserves, rather than to have the Congress provide the language that is in this amendment. I might say that it was not necessary for the President to declare a national emergency in order to draft the boys that are being drafted today. It seems to me that we have this Ready Reserve and the Reserve is ready after all these years of buildup and training. We have these Reserves for occasions such as this. There is no more reason that there should be a requirement for a declaration of emergency by the President in order to properly utilize the Reserves than there is to require the declaration of an emergency by the President in order to utilize the draft.

It seems to me this gives an opportunity to call up the Reserves under the same method by which we are drafting men today.

The men now in the Reserves are there voluntarily, knowing that they might be called up, knowing that their services might be required. This bill gives the President the opportunity to use them. I support the amendment and the conference report.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the adoption of amendment No. 5 as a protest against the procedure followed by the Senate in including legislation on the Department of Defense appropriation bill which would have been ruled out of order had such an amendment been offered in the House of Representatives.

This procedure, wherein the House is being asked to concur in an amendment offered as a substitute for an amendment adopted in the Senate, is an excellent example of an increasing tendency on the part of the other body to accomplish by a back-door approach that which is impossible under the rules of the House of Representatives.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that, prior to the opening of the 89th Congress, I attempted, in the caucus of the majority, to secure a change in the rules of the House which would in effect make subject to a point of order any amendment adopted by the Senate in the consideration of a bill passed by the House when such a bill is returned to the House for concurrence in Senate amendments, if such amendment adopted by the Senate would have been subject to a point of order if introduced originally in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is time that the Members in both branches of Congress are placed on an equal footing. I appreciate the fact that as a matter of expediency we are often willing to make exceptions, but in this particular instance which involves an important national policy, and not overlooking the controversial nature of the amendment, I feel that the issue should not be resolved as an incidental amendment which has no reason to be considered in this appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] for a question.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. I am actually interested in the armed services Reserve personnel portion of the bill. I understand that it is an interim measure. In fact, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations itself, says it will be June 30, 1968, although the appropriation bill only goes to the end of fiscal year 1967; therefore, an interim or stopgap measure is necessary. The purposes at the time of the so-called bill of rights for the reservists, whether they be the Guard or armed Reserve units, was to insist on training Reserves, especially those who have found a safe haven and had avoided the selective service, without being trained.

My first question is: Does this amendment, in the opinion of the gentleman from Texas, insist that those who find themselves saved from the selective service in the Reserves, have total adequate training so that they are ready?

Mr. MAHON. May I say that men who are in the Reserves, whether they are in organized units or not, and who are called up, will have received, or will have to receive, a certain level of training, as is the case with all men called into the active services.

Did I understand your question correctly?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I stated my question correctly concerning the enlistment of people who are now in the Enlisted Reserve, and the Reserve enlistment program, who have not had 120 days of requisite training, but who have completed their duty in an organized T.O. & E. group, or a composite control group.

The responsible legislation applies directly to them because there are at least 56,000 who have received no training under the circumstances, and yet who are no longer liable for the draft. Is it the purpose of the legislation here—we have all admitted we are legislating on the appropriation bill here because of the urgency of the situation—to see that they are drilled, and that they have the training spaces available for the first 120 days before they go into the 6-year Reserve program; in the opinion of the gentleman does this do that, therefore, and plug the loophole of the safe-haven from the draft?

Mr. MAHON. I do not see how this amendment would guarantee that those men in the Reserves who have had no training will be trained. If they are called up to active service, they would have to be trained before they would be assigned to a combat unit. That is required elsewhere in the law of the land.

Mr. HALL. If that is the answer, Mr. Speaker, then the amendment is deficient, admittedly, as far as the carrying out the intent of the bill of rights for the reservists, and for the strengthening of the armed services of our land.

Of course, the second great deficiency is that this fails of any notification of the Congress.

Would the gentleman not agree with me that at the present time we are exceeding our authorized troop strength of the regular active duty army—of the Army of the United States—which, of course, is set by the Congress at 2.6 million and that we now have well over 3 million on extended active duty?

Second, would the gentleman not admit with me that there are just four ways of handling this emergency situation:

The first, is the way we are doing it, simply by the draft call, which is the most expensive in personnel and in dollars, of filler replacements that you can find for any war effort, without notifying the Congress;

Second, notify Congress and do it as was originally written into the bill, and as has been stricken out by the conferees, simply saying that the President on certifying the need to Congress could do this; and

Third, a Presidential emergency; and

Fourth, a congressional declaration of emergency or war.

It seems to me that we are in a poor position and I hope the gentleman will agree with me and say that it is only because of the urgency and the need for getting some such defense appropriation measure signed, that we have relegated the responsibility of the Congress to raise armies and to support the national defense and determine policy; by saying that he can order either filler replacements—or now even units—to duty without notifying the Congress, and that he may exercise this authority which according to the Constitution rests with the Congress.

I think this is a very serious situation.

I hope the gentleman and the entire Committee on Appropriations will join with the Committee on Armed Services as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana has said, in a 1967 reserve bill of rights involving notification of the Congress, and not involving the use or the calling up of filler replacements who have not received training.

It is Mr. McNamara who stuck his neck out when he said the reserves should be disbanded and then due to embarrassment, refused to order the Reserve units or the filler replacements to active duty from the National Guard and/or the organized Reserves.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this legislation, its amendment—and so far as the legislative record we're making here is effective—could emphasize to the Secretary of Defense that he must place these calls on the selective service and training system as authorized. This should not be done at the expense of such as these who are untrained, but that these fillers be used only after they have had adequate training spaces provided with housing and all requisites.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these people should be provided with trainers and personnel to train these people in Reserve or regular armed service units, rather than resort to the draft for filler and unit replacements.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has asked a series of questions which I shall not undertake to comment on at length.

With respect to the number of men in the active services, there is presently no effective ceiling except that of the availability of funds for pay and allowances of troops.

With respect to the matter of notification, it would seem to me that the callup to duty is in itself a notification of the necessity for the callup.

What this amendment seeks to do is to show the position of the Congress in making available any necessary tool or vehicle to assist the President, if he thinks such tool or vehicle is required, to prosecute this war in which we find ourselves engaged and to prosecute it to a successful conclusion.

I hope that this compromise arrangement which has been worked out, and

which, as we have said, is an interim settlement of a very difficult technical situation, will be agreed to by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 305, nays 42, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

YEAS—305

Abbitt	Dow	Joelson
Abernethy	Dowdy	Johnson, Calif.
Adams	Downing	Johnson, Okla.
Addabbo	Dulski	Johnson, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Duncan, Tenn.	Jonas
Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Jones, N.C.
Andrews, George W.	Erlenborn	Karsten
Andrews, N. Dak.	Everett	Karth
Annunzio	Evins, Tenn.	Kee
Arends	Fallon	Kelly
Ashbrook	Farnsley	Keogh
Ashley	Farnum	King, Calif.
Ashmore	Fascell	King, N.Y.
Ayres	Feighan	King, Utah
Baring	Findley	Kirwan
Barrett	Fino	Kluczynski
Bates	Flood	Kornegay
Battin	Fogarty	Krebs
Beckworth	Ford, Gerald R.	Kunkel
Belcher	Ford, William D.	Landrum
Bell	Fountain	Langen
Bennett	Fraser	Latta
Betts	Friedel	Leggett
Bingham	Fulton, Pa.	Lennon
Blatnik	Gallagher	Lipscomb
Boggs	Garmatz	Long, La.
Boland	Gathings	Long, Md.
Bolling	Gettys	McCarthy
Bolton	Giaimo	McClory
Bow	Gibbons	McCulloch
Brademas	Gilbert	McDade
Brock	Gonzalez	McEwen
Broomfield	Goodell	McFall
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Grabowski	McGrath
Broyhill, N.C.	Gray	Machen
Burke	Green, Oreg.	Mackay
Burleson	Green, Pa.	Mackie
Cahill	Greigg	Madden
Callan	Grider	Mahon
Carey	Griffiths	Mailliard
Casey	Grover	Marsh
Cederberg	Gurney	Martin, Nebr.
Chamberlain	Hagen, Calif.	Mathias
Chelf	Haley	Matthews
Clancy	Halpern	May
Clark	Hamilton	Meeds
Clausen, Don H.	Hanley	Michel
Clawson, Del	Hanna	Miller
Cleveland	Hansen, Idaho	Mills
Cohelan	Hardy	Minish
Colmer	Harsha	Mink
Conyers	Harvey, Mich.	Minshall
Corbett	Hathaway	Mize
Cramer	Hawkins	Moeller
Cunningham	Hays	Monagan
Curtin	Hébert	Moore
Curtis	Hechler	Morgan
Daddario	Helstoski	Mosher
Dague	Henderson	Multer
Daniels	Herlong	Murphy, Ill.
Dawson	Holifield	Natcher
de la Garza	Holland	O'Hara, Ill.
Delaney	Hosmer	Olson, Minn.
Dent	Howard	O'Neal, Ga.
Denton	Hull	O'Neill, Mass.
Dole	Hungate	Ottinger
Donohue	Hutchinson	Passman
Dorn	Ichord	Patman
Dowdy	Irwin	Patten
Downing	Jacobs	Pelly
Dulski	Jarman	Pepper
Duncan, Tenn.	Jonas	Perkins
Edwards, La.	Jones, N.C.	Philbin
Erlenborn	Karsten	Pickle
Everett	Karth	Pike
Evins, Tenn.	Kee	Pirnie
Fallon	Kelly	Poage
Farnsley	Keogh	Pool
Farnum	King, Calif.	Powell
Fascell	King, N.Y.	Price
Feighan	King, Utah	Pucinski
Findley	Kirwan	Quie
Fino	Kluczynski	Quillen
Flood	Kornegay	Randall
Fogarty	Krebs	Redlin
Ford, Gerald R.	Kunkel	Rees
Ford, William D.	Landrum	Reid, Ill.
Fountain	Langen	Reid, N.Y.
Fraser	Latta	Reifel
Friedel	Leggett	Resnick
Fulton, Pa.	Lennon	Reuss
Gallagher	Lipscomb	Rhodes, Ariz.
Garmatz	Long, La.	Rhodes, Pa.
Gathings	Long, Md.	Rivers, S.C.
Gettys	McCarthy	Roberts
Giaimo	McClory	Rodino
Gibbons	McCulloch	Rogers, Colo.
Gilbert	McDade	Rogers, Fla.
Gonzalez	McEwen	Ronan
Goodell	McFall	Rooney, N.Y.
Grabowski	McGrath	Rooney, Pa.
Gray	Machen	Rosenthal
Green, Oreg.	Mackay	Rostenkowski
Green, Pa.	Mackie	Roush
Greigg	Madden	Satterfield
Grider	Mahon	St Germain
Griffiths	Mailliard	St. Onge
Grover	Marsh	Saylor
Gurney	Martin, Nebr.	Scheuer
Hagen, Calif.	Mathias	Schisler
Haley	Matthews	Schmidhauser
Halpern	May	Schneebeli
Hamilton	Meeds	Schweiker
Hanley	Michel	Secrest
Hanna	Miller	Selden
Hansen, Idaho	Mills	Senner
Hardy	Minish	Shipley
Harsha	Mink	Shriver
Harvey, Mich.	Minshall	Sickles
Hathaway	Mize	Sikes
Hawkins	Moeller	Sisk
Hays	Monagan	Skubitz
Hébert	Moore	Slack
Hechler	Morgan	Smith, Iowa
Helstoski	Mosher	Smith, N.Y.
Henderson	Multer	Smith, Va.
Herlong	Murphy, Ill.	Springer
Holifield	Natcher	Stafford
Holland	O'Hara, Ill.	Staggers
Hosmer	Olson, Minn.	Stanton
Howard	O'Neal, Ga.	Stubblefield
Hull	O'Neill, Mass.	Sullivan
Hungate	Ottinger	Sweeney
Hutchinson	Passman	Teague, Calif.
Ichord	Patman	Teague, Tex.
Irwin	Patten	Tenzer
Jacobs	Pelly	Thomas
Jarman	Pepper	Thompson, N.J.
Joelson	Perkins	Todd
Johnson, Calif.	Philbin	Tuck
Johnson, Okla.	Pickle	Tupper
Johnson, Pa.	Pike	Udall
Jonas	Pirnie	Ullman
Jones, N.C.	Poage	Van Deerlin
Karsten	Pool	Vanik
Karth	Powell	Vivian
Kee	Price	Waggonner
Kelly	Pucinski	Waldie
Keogh	Quie	Walker, N. Mex.
King, Calif.	Quillen	Watkins
King, N.Y.	Randall	Watson
King, Utah	Redlin	Watts
Kirwan	Rees	Weltner
Kluczynski	Reid, Ill.	Whalley
Kornegay	Reid, N.Y.	White, Tex.
Krebs	Reifel	Whitener
Kunkel	Resnick	Widnall
Landrum	Reuss	Williams
Langen	Rhodes, Ariz.	Willis
Latta	Rhodes, Pa.	Wilson, Bob
Leggett	Rivers, S.C.	Wilson, Charles H.
Lennon	Roberts	Wright
Lipscomb	Rodino	Wyatt
Long, La.	Rogers, Colo.	Wydler
Long, Md.	Rogers, Fla.	Yates
McCarthy	Ronan	Young
McClory	Rooney, N.Y.	Zablocki
McCulloch	Rooney, Pa.	
McDade	Rosenthal	
McEwen	Rostenkowski	
McFall	Roush	
McGrath	Tenzer	
Machen		
Mackay		
Mackie		
Madden		
Mahon		
Mailliard		
Marsh		
Martin, Nebr.		
Mathias		
Matthews		
May		
Meeds		
Michel		
Miller		
Mills		
Minish		
Mink		
Minshall		
Mize		
Moeller		
Monagan		
Moore		
Morgan		
Mosher		
Multer		
Murphy, Ill.		
Natcher		
O'Hara, Ill.		
Olson, Minn.		
O'Neal, Ga.		
O'Neill, Mass.		
Ottinger		
Passman		
Patman		
Patten		
Pelly		
Pepper		
Perkins		

NAYS—42

Adair	Edwards, Calif.	O'Hara, Mich.
Berry	Gubser	Poff
Bray	Hall	Race
Brown, Calif.	Halleck	Robison
Buchanan	Horton	Roudebush
Burton, Calif.	Jones, Mo.	Roybal
Burton, Utah	Kastenmeier	Rumsfeld
Byrnes, Wis.	Kupferman	Ryan
Cameron	Laird	Smith, Calif.
Carter	MacGregor	Stalbaum
Conable	Morse	Talcott
Davis, Wis.	Morton	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	Nedzi	Utt
Edwards, Ala.	Nelsen	Younger

NOT VOTING—85

Albert	Evans, Colo.	Morrison
Andrews, Glenn	Farbstein	Moss
Aspinall	Fisher	Murphy, N.Y.
Bandstra	Flynt	Murray
Brooks	Foley	Nix
Broyhill, Va.	Frelinghuysen	O'Brien
Byrne, Pa.	Fulton, Tenn.	O'Konski
Cabell	Fuqua	Olsen, Mont.
Callaway	Gilligan	Purcell
Celler	Gross	Reinecke
Clevenger	Hagan, Ga.	Rivers, Alaska
Collier	Hansen, Iowa	Rogers, Tex.
Conte	Hansen, Wash.	Roncalio
Cooley	Harvey, Ind.	Scott
Corman	Hicks	Steed
Craley	Huot	Stephens
Culver	Jennings	Stratton
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Taylor
Devine	Keith	Thompson, Tex.
Dickinson	Love	Toll
Diggs	McDowell	Trimble
Dingell	McMillan	Tunney
Dorn	McVicker	Tuten
Duncan, Oreg.	Macdonald	Vigorito
Dwyer	Martin, Ala.	Walker, Miss.
Dyal	Martin, Mass.	White, Idaho
Edmondson	Matsunaga	Whitten
Ellsworth	Moorhead	Wolff
	Morris	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Albert with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Hicks with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. McVicker with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Love with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Cabell with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Corman with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Farbstein.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Nix with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Roncalio.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Cooley.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Dyal with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Olsen of Montana.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Trimble.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Vigorito.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Craley with Mr. Tuten.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Huot.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Rogers of Texas.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Murray.

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10, page 11, line 25, strike out "$808,100,000" and insert "$806,900,000".

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$806,500,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13, page 17, line 1, insert "*: Provided,* That no part of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for the procurement of F–111B aircraft."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: at the end thereof, add the following: ", but this proviso shall not apply to advance procurement of equipment the total cost of which shall not exceed $7,800,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24, page 28, line 8, strike out "(a) except as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 236–244), for primary and secondary schooling for minor dependents of military and civilian

personnel of the Department of Defense residing on military or naval installations or stationed in foreign countries, as authorized for the Navy by section 7204 of title 10, United States Code, when the Secretary of the Department concerned finds that schools, if any, available in the locality, are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents;" and insert in lieu thereof: "(a) except as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 236–244), for primary and secondary schooling for minor dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense residing on military or naval installations or stationed in foreign countries, as authorized for the Navy by section 7204 of title 10, United States Code, in amounts not exceeding an average of $455 per student, when the Secretary of the Department concerned finds that schools, if any, available in the locality, are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law the Secretary of Defense shall establish rates of compensation for teachers in the Overseas Dependents Schools System in accordance with the per pupil limitation established in this section;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "490", and at the end thereof strike out the semicolon and insert the following: ", but in no event at less than the rates of compensation in effect on June 30, 1966;".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment involves education, overseas, for the dependents of the military. It is a subject which was discussed in the House when the first conference report was before us on August 25.

I take pleasure in yielding to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] at this time for a question.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We had a little ruckus back here in August when the conference report was first before us. A number of us objected to the motion on the part of the managers of the House at that time because we felt it did great violence to the overseas school system, and we felt it did great violence to a law we had passed in the House and that had been signed by the President in April this year. I am not disposed to object to the amendment the gentleman has offered, but for the record I would like to clarify two points.

The original Senate amendment would have imposed a $455 per pupil limitation. The amendment which the House managers proposed in August would have raised this from $455 to $475. As I understand it, now there will be a per pupil limitation, but it will be $490 per pupil. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's statement is entirely correct. In the opinion of the committee, the $490 figure will meet the requirements of the pay of the teachers, in line with the wishes and recommendations of the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. It came actually within $2. In the colloquy and discussion we had in August it was pointed out that it would take a $492 per pupil limitation. We now have $490.

Mr. MAHON. We rounded the figure off at $490. As the gentleman knows, this issue was raised in the other body, where an amendment was added. This is a compromise that was worked out. I believe that the gentleman from Arizona will be satisfied now with this compromise, insofar as the bill is concerned for this fiscal year.

Mr. UDALL. I have a further question, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. I understand that this limitation will be in effect only for this 1 year. This is a 1-year amendment?

Mr. MAHON. This is not permanent law. It will apply only to 1 year.

Mr. UDALL. Let me say that I believe this settlement is something we can live with. I am disposed—and I believe some others who objected in August, with whom I have talked, are also disposed—to accept this for 1 year. I know the great difficulties the gentleman from Texas faced in conference and I congratulate him on doing an exceptional job for the House position. However, I wish to make it clear that I believe this whole procedure is deficient in at least two respects.

First. We are legislating on an appropriation bill in a field in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] and his select subcommittee and my own subcommittee have made extensive studies. They have gone to Europe and to other places to study these schools. I believe it is wrong, when we have permanent legislation from two committees which have studied the matter, to proceed in this fashion.

Second. The amendment still will not correct the situation. It will provide the salaries which were in effect on June 30, 1966, but it will not put into effect the permanent law we wrote, which we thought was very sound, which every year would have given these teachers salaries comparable to those in the United States. Under our bill they would have had salaries in effect for the United States for the 1966–67 school year instead of the one previous.

I wish to go on record as saying that I strongly object to this kind of procedure and I hope it will not occur next year, because I believe that many of us will want to have something to say, should that be the case.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I wish to join the gentleman from Arizona in saying I believe you have done a magnificent job with the tools with which you had to work. I also concur in the statement that this is not the proper method.

However, since we are stuck with that kind of situation, you have done a magnificent job.

We are faced with a situation which is realistic. The figure of $490 will cover this situation because in the three branches we are controlling and managing overseas, with regard to schools—namely, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—there was a differential in the per pupil total they were expending, running from $437 to $465. So the $490 figure will cover the situation.

The special select committee studying this problem intends to further explore this matter, because it is a volcanic situation which might erupt at any time, because of the restrictions that are not a part of this proposal.

In the face of the present situation, I commend you for the job you have done.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman very much. Let me refer back to the comment of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] for a moment. I would like to point out that the $490 per pupil limitation now provided in the bill is intended to be effective from the beginning of the fiscal year and will permit an increase in overseas teachers salaries of about $216 for the 1966–67 school year. Such an increase would be in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 89–391, approved on April 14, 1966. This increase, together with the two salary increases granted during the last school year, will amount to about a $1,000 increase in teacher salaries since July 1, 1965. In my opinion, this is a sizable increase with which the overseas teachers should be very happy.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who joined with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], and the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] in the debate on this amendment on a point of disagreement between the House and Senate when last it was before us, I rise at this time to support the compromise now being put forth by the conferees on behalf of the House in the form of amendment No. 24 as it appears on page 6 of report No. 2215 now before us.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], who preceded me in the well today, and emphasize our continued concern for the ultimate removal of the unrealistic per pupil limitation contained in past bills appropriating funds for our overseas dependent schools.

I observe that, as a result of the action taken by the House when the conference report was first presented to us, we rejected the Senate's per pupil limitation of $455 per pupil and further rejected the House conferees' offered compromise of $475 per pupil.

At that time, we called the attention of the House to the fact that in the fiscal year 1967 budget prepared on the basis of an expected school enrollment of 182,869 pupils, the Department of Defense estimated their needs to be $492 per pupil to maintain the system.

The $475 per pupil compromise would have resulted in a reduction of $3.11 million in the funds which those administering this school system believe to be

absolutely essential for its continuance and would have had the following results—that is to say, the following alternatives would have been available as methods of operation for the school system to reach the lower figure.

One possible alternative would have been the elimination of all summer school, which could have saved $300,000. As we stated before, the special problems of the students in this school system convince us that this would be a disaster.

A second alternative would have been the reduction of expenditures for textbooks, library books, and teaching equipment, which could result in a saving of $1 million. It is clear to me, as a member of Congressman DENT's committee which made the investigation in 1965 of our overseas school system, that one of the greatest deficiencies in this system is the shortage and, in some instances, a total lack of adequate textbooks and teaching materials. We found, much to our disgust, that in many parts of the world American schoolchildren were being taught such important subjects as social studies from textbooks then 15 years old. We were shocked to note, for example, that at this time, when understanding by our people of the Asiatic countries and their relationship to us is so important, our elementary school students were being taught from textbooks which still told them of French Indochina, an area we now know as Vietnam.

Even these drastic cuts would have saved less than half of the funds required to be cut to meet this restrictive per pupil limitation, and the additional $1.8 million cut would, of necessity, be accomplished through either a reduction of 400 teachers from a system which already has its classrooms overloaded by every fair standard, or an unconscionable rescinding of the salary schedule authorized for fiscal year 1967 under Public Law 89-391, previously passed by this House. This latter course of action would have resulted in an average reduction of $250 for every teacher now teaching in the system for the current school year, notwithstanding the fact that they were recruited and contracted with their Government to teach on the basis of an expectation of compensation under Public Law 89-391.

I believe that the compromise we have accomplished, the $490, will enable the Department of Defense to carry on with its obligation to the dependent children of our military personnel around the world. However, together with those with whom I have joined in this fight, I want to promise the House that we recognize this to be a 1-year proposal and the best that we could accomplish at this time. We also recognize a continuing obligation on our part to press in the 90th Congress for further improvements in the financing of overseas schools and the improvement of the quality of educational opportunity afforded by them.

Even now, those of us on the conference committee for the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966 are fighting to preserve the amendments we made to title II, the textbook and teaching materials title, and title III, the supplemental educational centers title which included this year for the first time our overseas dependent children as a category of children eligible for funds under this legislation.

Each and every one of us who participated in the Dent study, previously filed with this House in March 1966 as a report from the Committee on Education and Labor, remain convinced that under the able leadership of the Honorable Lynn M. Bartlett, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Education, who, I am honored to say is a former State superintendent of public instruction from my own State of Michigan, this school system has made great progress. Nevertheless, we feel that the effort we are making in providing education for our overseas school dependents falls far short of that which we can and should make and borders on being an international disgrace. We must remember that, aside from our concern for the education of these American children, we should have some concern for the impression we create throughout the world in the eyes of the people of foreign lands who evaluate us on the basis of our apparent commitment to the education of our youth.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the comments made by the chairman of our select committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] and also the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]. I concur that the amendments which have been recommended to the House are in substantial agreement with the proposals we made in our committee.

I express also my disappointment that the per pupil limitation is to be retained.

I join the committee in commending the gentleman from Texas for the efforts he has put forth in behalf of the overseas schoolteachers and the educational system in general.

I ask the House to concur in the gentleman's motion.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27, on page 34, after line 14, insert the following:

"(e) Section 3732 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 11) is amended as follows:

"Designate the existing paragraph as '(a)' and add the following paragraph:

"'(b) The Secretary of Defense shall immediately advise the Committees on Apriations of the Congress of the exercise of the authority granted in subsection (a) of this section, and shall report quarterly on the estimated obligations incurred pursuant to the authority granted in subsection (a) of this section.'"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Delete the following words: "Committees on Appropriations of the".

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

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report in the RECORD, as well as on the amendments acted upon by the House in connection with the Defense Department appropriation bill, and that all Members be permitted to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1967

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 17787) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2216)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17787) "making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 22, 23, and 24.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 18, and 19; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$967,460,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$87,135,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$149,000.000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,473,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$192,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 16, and 20.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
BOB CASEY,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J. RHODES,
HOWARD W. ROBISON,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN STENNIS,
ALAN BIBLE,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17787) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army

Cemeterial Expenses

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Appropriate $15,098,000 as proposed by the House instead of $15,348,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have agreed to delete the increase of $250,000 proposed by the Senate for acquisition of additional land at five of the national cemeteries pending outcome of the current legislative review of the future Federal policy with respect to the continued operation of the national cemetery system. Conferees urge that this review be expedited during the next session of Congress because of the critical situation facing many of the cemeteries.

Corps of Engineers—Civil

General Investigations

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $32,450,000 instead of $31,730,000 as proposed by the House and $32,575,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $220,000 for navigation studies; $425,000 for flood control studies; $45,000 for beach erosion cooperative studies; and $30,000 for the Great Lakes deicing special study.

The increase provided over the House bill shall be allocated to the following projects:

ALASKA	
(N) Bethel	[1] 6,000
(N) Cape Nome	6,000
(BE) Dillingham	8,000
(FC) Fort Yukon	10,000
(BE) Point Hope	12,000
CALIFORNIA	
(N) Cambria and San Simeon Bay	10,000
(BE) Point Mugu-San Pedro	15,000
(FC) San Francisquito Creek	15,000
(N) Trinidad Harbor	15,000
(FC) Whitewater River	10,000
DELAWARE	
(N) Delaware Bay-Cape May to Lewes, Del	18,000
GEORGIA	
(N) Brunswick Harbor	[1] 15,000
(FC) Ogeechee River	30,000
(FC) Ogeechee-Altamaha area	20,000
(FC) Savannah River Basin	75,000
HAWAII	
(FC) Kaneohe-Kailua area	[1] 20,000
IDAHO	
(FC) Salmon River, Challis	[1] 10,000
ILLINOIS	
(FC) Bay Creek	10,000
KANSAS	
(FC) Grand Neosho River Basin	10,000
(FC) Verdigris River Basin study, Oklahoma and Kansas	20,000
(N) Verdigris River Basin study, Oklahoma and Kansas	17,000
LOUISIANA	
(BE) Holly Beach	10,000
(FC) Mississippi River, Jefferson Parish between Mississippi River and Bayou Barataria and Lake Salvador	5,000
MAINE	
(N) Camden Harbor	7,000
(N) Union R. Ellswork	6,000
MASSACHUSETTS	
(N) Boston Harbor	5,000
MICHIGAN	
(Spec) Great Lakes deicing study (lengthening navigation season)	30,000
(N) Manistee River	5,000
(FC) Marquette County	[1] 10,000
(N) Misery Bay Harbor	5,000
MINNESOTA	
(FC) Red River of North, Minn. and N. Dak	[1] 5,000
MISSOURI	
(FC) Osage River, Mo. and Kans	5,000
MONTANA	
(FC) Flathead and Clark Fork	[1] 30,000
NEBRASKA	
(FC) Neobrara River, Nebr. and S. Dak	[1] 5,000
(FC) White River, S. Dak. and Nebr.	10,000
NEW JERSEY	
(N) New Jersey coastal inlets and beaches	[1] 10,000
NORTH CAROLINA	
(FC) Eastern North Carolina above Cape Lookout	23,000
(N) Roanoke River	5,000
NORTH DAKOTA	
(FC) Cannonball River	10,000
PENNSYLVANIA	
(N) Delaware River channel dimensions	[1] 10,000
PUERTO RICO	
(N) Aguadilla Harbor	15,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	
(N) Murrels Inlet	10,000
TENNESSEE	
(FC) First Creek	2,000
(FC) Mill Creek	[1] 5,000
TEXAS	
(N) Matagorda ship channel	15,000
VIRGINIA	
(N) AIWW Virginia Beach	15,000
(FC) Potomac River, streams draining into the Alexandria area, Virginia	10,000
WASHINGTON	
(FC) Chehalis River	[1] 30,000
(N) Hoquiam and Chehalis Rivers	15,000
WEST VIRGINIA	
(FC) Middle Island Creek Basin	[1] 25,000
WISCONSIN	
(N) Brown, Kewaunee, etc., counties	10,000
(FC) Upper Mississippi River, Nav. flood control, prevention of ice jams	20,000

[1] Increase in House bill figure.

Construction, General

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $967,460,000 instead of $953,715,000 as proposed by the House and $971,358,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation:

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1967 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Alabama:				
(N)	Alabama River Channel			$800,000	
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Claiborne lock and dam	$7,500,000		7,500,000	
(N)	Holt lock and dam	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(R)	John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam (spillway)	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(MP)	Millers Ferry lock and dam	13,500,000		13,500,000	
(N)	Perdido Pass				$54,000
	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi. (See Mississippi.)				
(MP)	Walter F. George lock and dam, Seaboard Airline RR., relocation, Alabama and Georgia	700,000		700,000	
	Alaska:				
(MP)	Snettisham power project			750,000	
	Arizona:				
(FC)	Alamo Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Painted Rock Reservoir (Dateland Crossing)			100,000	
(FC)	Phoenix and vicinity		$200,000		200,000
(FC)	Pinal Creek				100,000
(FC)	Winslow				100,000
	Arkansas:				
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:				
	(a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	7,500,000		7,500,000	
	(b) Navigation locks and dams	85,000,000		85,000,000	
(MP)	Dardanalle lock and dam	400,000		400,000	
(MP)	Degray Reservoir	8,000,000		8,000,000	
(FC)	DeQueen Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Dierks Reservoir			500,000	
(FC)	Garland City	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Gillham Reservoir	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	Maniece Bayou, upstream extension	400,000		400,000	
(MP)	Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit	450,000		450,000	
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La	6,500,000		7,600,000	
(MP)	Ozark lock and dam	11,700,000		11,700,000	
(FC)	Pine Mountain Dam		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	200,000		2,000,000	
	California:				
(FC)	Alameda Creek, Del Valle Dam	2,600,000		2,600,000	
(FC)	Buchanan Reservoir		321,000		321,000
(FC)	Corte Madera Creek	850,000		850,000	
(N)	Dana Point Harbor	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC)	Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Reservoir			2,700,000	
(FC)	Eel River (reimbursement)	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Eel River (delta area) 1965 act		150,000		150,000
(N)	Half Moon Bay and Harbor	1,248,000		1,248,000	
(FC)	Hidden Reservoir		222,000		222,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	14,200,000		14,200,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,350,000		1,350,000	
(FC)	Lytle and Warm Creeks (1965 act)		100,000		100,000
	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)				
(FC)	Merced River Reservoirs (New Exchequer Dam)	4,232,000		4,232,000	
(FC)	Mojave River Reservoir			1,000,000	
(N)	Monterey Harbor		81,000		81,000
(FC)	Mormon Slough	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Napa River (1965 act)		100,000		100,000
(FC)	New Bullards Bar Reservoir			1,000,000	
(MP)	New Melones Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N)	Oakland Harbor	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir	[1] 11,400,000		7,695,000	
(N)	Port San Luis		125,000		125,000
(FC)	Redwood Creek	1,340,000		1,340,000	
(FC)	Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N)	Sacramento River deep water ship channel	200,000		200,000	
(N)	San Francisco Bay to Stockton				100,000
(N)	Santa Barbara Harbor		20,000		20,000
(FC)	Santa Paula Creek		85,000		85,000
(FC)	Tahquitz Creek				100,000
(BE)	Ventura-Pierpont area (reimbursement)	94,000		94,000	
(FC)	Walnut Creek	3,400,000		3,400,000	
	Colorado:				
(FC)	Chatfield Reservoir		481,000	6,000,000	
(FC)	Las Animas		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Trinidad Reservoir	1,300,000		200,000	
	Connecticut:				
(FC)	Ansonia-Derby	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Black Rock Reservoir	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	Colebrook River Reservoir	5,300,000		5,300,000	
(FC)	Danbury		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Derby		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Hop Brook Reservoir	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Mystic		130,000		130,000
(FC)	New London Barrier	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Stamford	2,800,000		2,800,000	
(FC)	Sucker Brook Reservoir	915,000		915,000	
	Delaware:				
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
(N)	Inland Waterway Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeak and Delaware Canal), pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	15,500,000		15,500,000	
	Florida:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Apalachicola River channel improvement	350,000		350,000	
(N)	Canaveral Harbor	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Central and southern Florida	[1] 13,700,000		13,700,000	
(N)	Cross-Florida Barge Canal	16,000,000		16,000,000	
(N)	East Pass Channel at Destin	150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Four Rivers Basins	1,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Intracoastal Waterway:				
	Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	648,000		648,000	
(N)	Jacksonville Harbor				80,000
(N)	Key West Harbor			600,000	
(BE)	Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	10,000		10,000	
(N)	Palm Beach Harbor	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(N)	Ponce de Leon Inlet		60,000		60,000
(BE)	Virginia Key and Key Biscayne	200,000		200,000	

See footnote at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1967 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Georgia:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(MP)	Carters Dam	$8,600,000		$8,600,000	
(MP)	Lazer Creek Dam		$300,000		$300,000
(N)	Savannah Harbor			400,000	
(N)	Savannah Harbor (sediment basin)		135,000		135,000
(MP)	Spewrell Bluff Dam		500,000		600,000
	Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)				
(MP)	West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga	5,200,000		5,200,000	
	Hawaii:				
(N)	Barbers Point Harbor		100,000		100,000
(BE)	Haleiwa Beach (reimbursement)	252,000		252,000	
(N)	Honokahau Harbor		33,000		33,000
(N)	Hawaihae Harbor		118,000		118,000
(N)	Maunalua Harbor				32,000
	Idaho:				
(MP)	Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir	20,000,000		20,000,000	
(FC)	Heise-Roberts extension	430,000		430,000	
(FC)	Portneuf River and Marsh Creek	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Ririe Reservoir			200,000	
	Illinois:				
(BA)	Calumet River, bridges	[1] 1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Campbell's Island				50,000
(FC)	Carlyle Reservoir	2,031,000		2,031,000	
(FC)	Columbia Drainage and Levee Districts No. 3		45,000		45,000
(FC)	District No. 21 levees between Cowden and Vandalia				100,000
(FC)	England Pond levee	400,000		200,000	
(FC)	Freeport	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Harrisonville and Ivy Landing Drainage and Levee District		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Henderson County Drainage District No. 1	750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Henderson County Drainage District No. 2	590,000		590,000	
(N)	Horse Island and Crescent Bridge (Mississippi River), Illinois and Iowa	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District	[1] 200,000		200,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag modification, part I, Illinois and Indiana	6,300,000		6,300,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway, duplicate locks, Illinois and Indiana				200,000
(FC)	Indian Grave Drainage District	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Kaskaskia River	1,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Lincoln Reservoir		150,000		220,000
(N)	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:				
	(a) Regulating works	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	(b) Chain of Rocks	250,000		250,000	
(N)	Mound City lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky		250,000		360,000
(FC)	Mount Carmel	950,000		950,000	
(FC)	New Athens	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC)	Oakley Reservoir		240,000		240,000
(FC)	Peoria		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Prairie Dupont Levee and Sanitary District			300,000	
(FC)	Rend Lake Reservoir	5,050,000		5,050,000	
(FC)	Richland Creek	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Rock Island		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Saline River and tributaries			300,000	
(FC)	Shelbyville Reservoir	6,300,000		6,300,000	
(N)	Smithland (Dog Island) lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky		225,000		300,000
(FC)	Sny Island Levee and Drainage District	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	South Quincy Drainage and Levee District	800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Tri-Pond levee	100,000		100,000	
	Indiana:				
(FC)	Big Pine Reservoir				150,000
(FC)	Brookville Reservoir	3,200,000		3,200,000	
(N)	Burns Waterway Harbor		25,000		55,000
(N)	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC)	Clifty Creek Reservoir				100,000
(FC)	Evansville	320,000		320,000	
(FC)	Greenfield Bayou levee		70,000		70,000
(FC)	Huntington Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000	
	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, part I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Lafayette Reservoir		125,000		125,000
(FC)	Levee unit 5, Wabash River	1,750,000		1,750,000	
(R)	Michigan City Harbor	450,000		450,000	
(FC)	Mississinewa Reservoir	5,160,000		5,160,000	
(N)	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	6,070,000		6,070,000	
(FC)	Patoka Reservoir		175,000		325,000
(FC)	Salamonie Reservoir	3,467,000		3,467,000	
(N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	9,500,000		9,500,000	
	Iowa:				
(FC)	Ames Reservoir				100,000
(FC)	Ames Reservoir (road relocation)	830,000		830,000	
(FC)	Des Moines	750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Dubuque		145,000	250,000	
(FC)	Guttenburg	100,000		100,000	
	Horse Island and Crescent Bridge, Mississippi River, Ill. and Iowa. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Iowa River Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Marshalltown		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(N)	Missouri River, Sioux City to mouth, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	7,100,000		8,300,000	
(FC)	Rathbun Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Red Rock Reservoir	9,500,000		9,500,000	
(FC)	Saylorville Reservoir	5,500,000		5,500,000	
(FC)	Waterloo				100,000
	Kansas:				
(FC)	Atchison	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Clinton Reservoir		205,000		205,000
(FC)	Clinton Reservoir (land acquisition, Richland)	645,000		645,000	
(FC)	Cow Creek, Hutchinson		120,000		120,000
(FC)	Dodge City		75,000		75,000
(FC)	El Dorado Reservoir				100,000
(FC)	Fort Scott Reservoir		180,000		180,000
(FC)	Grove Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Hays		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Hillsdale Reservoir (restudy)		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification)		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Lawrence	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	Marion Reservoir	4,600,000		4,600,000	
(FC)	Melvern Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Merriam	[1] 0		0	
(FC)	Milford Reservoir	3,600,000		3,600,000	

See footnote at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1967 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Kansas—Continued				
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Osawatomie	[1] $200,000		$200,000	
(FC)	Perry Reservoir	10,500,000		10,500,000	
(FC)	Topeka	1,800,000		1,800,000	
	Kentucky:				
(MP)	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn	3,484,000		3,484,000	
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Carr Fork Reservoir	4,800,000		4,800,000	
(FC)	Cave Run Reservoir	4,500,000		4,500,000	
(FC)	Fishtrap Reservoir	9,600,000		9,600,000	
(FC)	Frankfort, North Frankfort area	790,000		790,000	
(FC)	Grayson Reservoir	7,558,000		7,558,000	
(FC)	Green River Reservoir	8,700,000		8,700,000	
(MP)	Laurel River Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Martins Fork Reservoir		$100,000		$100,000
	Mound City lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky. (See Illinois.)				
	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Paintsville Reservoir		100,000		200,000
(FC)	Red River Reservoir	400,000		400,000	
	Smithland lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Sturgis	710,000		710,000	
	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Yatesville Reservoir				200,000
	Louisiana:				
(N)	Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	882,000		882,000	
(FC)	Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute and Loggy Bayous, Black and Cypress Bayous				150,000
(BA)	Berwick Bay Bridge	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Caddo Dam	100,000		100,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	East Point levee	114,000		114,000	
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	Grand Isle and vicinity				200,000
(FC)	Lake Pontchartrain		450,000	1,600,000	
(FC)	Mermentau River				85,000
(N)	Mississippi River, gulf outlet	2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Morgan City and vicinity				140,000
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection	400,000		400,000	
	Ouchita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)				
(N)	Overton-Red River Waterway				64,000
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex., (See Arkansas.)				
	Maine:				
(MP)	Dickey-Lincoln School Dam and Reservoirs		1,200,000		1,100,000
(N)	Pepperell Cove (sec. 107)			(264,000)	
	Maryland:				
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and Channels	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va		665,000		1,265,000
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), pt II. (See Delaware.)				
	Massachusetts:				
(N)	Andrews River (sec. 107)			(141,000)	
(N)	Marblehead Harbor	[1] 0		0	
(R)	Newburyport Harbor	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Plymouth Harbor	765,000		765,000	
(R)	Plymouth Harbor	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Provincetown Harbor		29,000		29,000
(N)	Weymouth Fore and Towne Rivers		90,000		190,000
	Michigan:				
(N)	Alpena Harbor				40,000
(N)	Cedar River Harbor		40,000		40,000
(R)	Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments)	170,000		170,000	
(R)	Grand Marais Harbor	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Kalamazoo River		75,000		75,000
(N)	Leland Harbor	90,000		197,000	
(N)	Mackinac Island breakwater extension (sec. 107)			(332,000)	
(N)	New Buffalo Harbor	485,000		485,000	
(N)	New Poe lock, St. Marys River	8,000,000		8,000,000	
(FC)	River Rouge	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(N)	Rouge River	395,000		373,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River (flood control)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Saginaw River (navigation)	1,545,000		1,545,000	
	Minnesota:				
(FC)	Bigstone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak		80,000		80,000
(N)	Duluth-Superior Harbor, inner harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Roseau River				50,000
(FC)	Rushford	370,000		370,000	
(FC)	St. Paul and South St. Paul	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Winona	1,100,000		1,100,000	
	Mississippi:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
	Jackson and East Jackson	2,506,000		2,506,000	
(FC)	Okatibbee Creek Reservoir	2,900,000		2,900,000	
(FC)	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi	750,000		850,000	
	Missouri:				
(FC)	Chariton and Little Chariton Rivers including Shoal Creek				100,000
(FC)	Chariton River	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(MP)	Clarence Cannon (Joanna) Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Des Moines and Mississippi Levee District	600,000		600,000	
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir	12,100,000		12,100,000	
(FC)	Meramec Park Reservoir		400,000		400,000
	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)				
	Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri. and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Pattonsburg Reservoir (highway construction)				50,000
(FC)	St. Louis	10,000,000		10,000,000	
(FC)	Smithville Reservoir (including channel at Smithville)		50,000	75,000	50,000
(MP)	Stockton Reservoir	13,500,000		13,500,000	

See footnote at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1967 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Montana:				
(FC)	Great Falls	$500,000		$500,000	
(MP)	Libby Reservoir	32,000,000		32,000,000	
	Nebraska:				
(FC)	Gering Valley	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Little Nemaha River				$25,000
(FC)	Little Papillion Creek	1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Norfolk	1,275,000		1,275,000	
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Nevada:				
(FC)	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev	400,000		400,000	
	New Jersey:				
(BE)	Atlantic City (reimbursement)	150,000		150,000	
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorages), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	4,400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Elizabeth River		$150,000		150,000
(R)	New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, Point Pleasant Canal	[1] 690,000		690,000	
	New York and New Jersey Channels, Kill Van Kull entrance, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)				
(FC)	Rahway River at South Orange				50,000
(FC)	Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Shrewsbury River Inlet				100,000
(MP)	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y.		975,000		975,000
	New Mexico:				
(FC)	Albuquerque	5,500,000		5,500,000	
(FC)	Cochiti Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Galisteo Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Rio Grande Floodway, Espanola Valley unit		50,000		50,000
	New York:				
	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(FC)	East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay				200,000
(BE)	Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet (1962 act)		225,000		225,000
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	2,850,000		3,900,000	
(N)	Irondequoit Bay Harbor		52,000		52,000
(FC)	Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet	450,000		450,000	
(FC)	Lackawanna	1,240,000		1,240,000	
(N)	Lake Montauk Harbor	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Little Neck Bay	550,000		550,000	
(N)	Moriches Inlet				100,000
(N)	New York-New Jersey Channels, Kill Van Kull entrance, New York and New Jersey	1,000,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Nichols			163,000	
(FC)	North Ellenville	150,000		150,000	
(N)	Oak Orchard Harbor				25,000
(FC)	Rosendale	1,115,000		1,115,000	
(FC)	Salamanca	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	South Ellenville		90,000		90,000
(FC)	Staten Island, Fort Wadsworth to Arthur Kill		150,000		150,000
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y. (See New Jersey.)				
	Wellsville	200,000		200,000	
	North Carolina:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Cape Fear River above Wilmington				51,000
(FC)	Falls Reservoir		200,000		360,000
(BE)	Fort Macon State Park (reimbursement)	208,000		208,000	
(FC)	New Hope Reservoir			2,600,000	
(N)	Topsail Inlet (sec. 107)			(100,000)	
(FC)	Oracoke Island		115,000		115,000
(N)	Rollins Channel	280,000		280,000	
	Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)	2,700,000		2,700,000	
	North Dakota:				
(FC)	Bowman Haley Reservoir	1,095,000		1,095,000	
(FC)	Missouri River, Garrison Dam to Oahe Reservoir	800,000		1,000,000	
	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)				
(FC)	Pipestem Dam				130,000
	Ohio:				
(FC)	Alum Creek Reservoir		225,000		225,000
(N)	Ashtabula Harbor			200,000	
(FC)	Athens		175,000		175,000
(N)	Bellville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	10,400,000		10,400,000	
(FC)	Big Darby Creek Reservoir	1,900,000		1,900,000	
(FC)	Buck Creek Reservoir	1,700,000		1,700,000	
(FC)	Caesar Creek Reservoir			450,000	
(N)	Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacement widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(N)	Conneaut Harbor	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Deer Creek Reservoir	7,300,000		7,300,000	
(FC)	East Fork Reservoir			500,000	
(FC)	Eastlake-Chagrin River				75,000
(FC)	Freemont	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	3,300,000		3,300,000	
(N)	Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, Ohio and Pa				500,000
(N)	Lorain Harbor	[1] 1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Mill Creek Reservoir, Scioto River Basin		100,000		100,000
(FC)	North Branch Reservoir (Kokosing River)			700,000	
(FC)	Paint Creek Reservoir	3,100,000		3,100,000	
(N)	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	17,700,000		17,700,000	
	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(N)	Vermillion Harbor				35,000
(N)	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Youngstown, Crab Creek	1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Oklahoma:				
	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
(MP)	Broken Bow Reservoir	9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC)	Copan Reservoir		201,000		201,000
(FC)	Crutcho Creek				50,000
(FC)	Hugo Reservoir		129,000	721,000	129,000
(FC)	Kaw Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(MP)	Keystone Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Lukfata Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Oologah Reservoir	550,000		550,000	
(FC)	Optima Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Pine Creek Reservoir	2,900,000		2,900,000	
(MP)	Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam	27,000,000		25,600,000	
(FC)	Shidler Reservoir				50,000
(FC)	Skiatook Reservoir		160,000		160,000
(FC)	Waurika Reservoir		75,000		185,000
(MP)	Webbers Falls lock and dam	19,300,000		19,300,000	

See footnote at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1967 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Oregon:				
(FC)	Applegate Reservoir		$200,000		$200,000
(FC)	Blue River Reservoir	$8,700,000		$8,700,000	
(MP)	Bonneville lock and dam (2d power unit) Oregon and Washington		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Cascadia Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(N)	Chetco River		30,000		30,000
(N)	Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington	4,400,000		4,400,000	
(N)	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Elk Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Gate Creek Reservoir		195,000		195,000
(MP)	Green Peter Reservoir	12,200,000		12,200,000	
(MP)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	42,000,000		41,294,000	
(FC)	John Day River		50,000		50,000
(MP)	Lost Creek Reservoir			500,000	
(FC)	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Port Orford			350,000	
(FC)	Reedsport (sec. 205)			(494,000)	
(R)	Rogue River (north jetty)	500,000		500,000	
(MP)	The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington (additional power units)	700,000		700,000	
(N)	Tillamook Bay (south jetty)				30,000
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor	2,200,000		2,200,000	
	Pennsylvania:				
(FC)	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	7,500,000		7,500,000	
(FC)	Aylesworth Creek Reservoir	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Beltzville Reservoir	6,700,000		6,700,000	
(FC)	Blanchard Reservoir	8,500,000		8,500,000	
(FC)	Blue Marsh Reservoir		220,000		220,000
(FC)	Chartiers Creek		310,000		310,000
(FC)	Cowanesque Reservoir		400,000		500,000
(N)	Dam 4, Monongahela River	3,818,000		3,818,000	
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
(N)	Erie Harbor (1962 modification)	211,000		211,000	
(N)	Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, Ohio and Pa. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Latrobe	1,193,000		1,193,000	
(FC)	Muddy Creek Reservoir		110,000		110,000
(BE)	Presque Isle Peninsula (reimbursement)	430,000		430,000	
(FC)	Prompton Reservoir (modification)		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Raystown Reservoir			1,500,000	
(FC)	Sandy Lick Creek, Du Bois local project				30,000
(FC)	Scranton	850,000		850,000	
(FC)	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa	2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Tioga Hammond Reservoir		645,000		645,000
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., N.J., and N.Y. (See New Jersey.)				
(FC)	Trexler Reservoir		275,000		275,000
(FC)	Turtle Creek	3,300,000		3,300,000	
(FC)	Union City Reservoir	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(FC)	Woodcock Creek Reservoir	500,000		500,000	
	Rhode Island:				
(FC)	Lower Woonsocket	824,000		824,000	
(FC)	Point Judith, hurricane barrier	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Providence River and Harbor			800,000	
	South Carolina:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(BE)	Hunting Island Beach			350,000	
	South Dakota:				
(MP)	Big Bend Dam-Lake Sharpe	1,950,000		1,950,000	
	Big Stone Lake-Whetstone River, Minn. and S. Dak. (See Minnesota.)				
(FC)	Cottonwood Springs Reservoir			400,000	
(MP)	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	6,500,000		6,500,000	
	Tennessee:				
	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)				
(MP)	Cordell Hull lock and dam	6,800,000		6,800,000	
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Reservoir	9,300,000		9,300,000	
	Texas:				
(FC)	Abilene Channel improvement		150,000		150,000
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(R)	Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)	[1] 0		0	
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	4,200,000		4,200,000	
(FC)	Cooper Reservoir and Channels (Sulphur River)	[1] 0		0	
(FC)	El Paso		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension	1,114,000		1,114,000	
(FC)	Freeport and vicinity	1,700,000		1,700,000	
(N)	Galveston Harbor and Channel, 36-foot project	[1] 250,000		[1] 250,000	
(FC)	Highland Bayou				150,000
(N)	Houston ship channel (Greens Bayou)	485,000		485,000	
(FC)	Lake Kemp Reservoir			1,000,000	
(FC)	Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement	800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Pat Mayse Reservoir	2,175,000		2,175,000	
(R)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties)	1,195,000		1,195,000	
(FC)	Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)	4,100,000		4,100,000	
	Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway, 40 feet and channel to Echo	3,300,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	San Antonio Channel	1,350,000		1,350,000	
(FC)	San Gabriel River tributary to Brazos River		418,000		418,000
(FC)	Somerville Reservoir	[1] 2,342,000		[1] 2,342,000	
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Dam	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Taylor's Bayou				100,000
(FC)	Texas City, hurricane protection	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(N)	Texas City Channel 40-foot project	[1] 725,000		[1] 725,000	
(N)	Trinity River (restudy)		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Vince and Little Vince Bayous	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(N)	Wallisville Reservoir, Trinity River	1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Vermont:				
(FC)	Bennington				50,000
	Virginia:				
(N)	Bonum Creek, Westmoreland County (Sec. 107)			(200,000)	
(FC)	Gathright Dam			1,500,000	
(N)	Hampton Roads	5,000,000		7,000,000	
(BE)	Virginia Beach (reimbursement)	85,000		85,000	

See footnote at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1967 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Washington:				
	Bonneville lock and dam (2d powerplant, Oregon and Washington). (See Oregon.)				
(FC)	Calispell Creek				$25,000
(WP)	Chief Joseph Dam (additional power units)		$400,000		400,000
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
	Columbia River and lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(FC)	Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2	$500,000		$500,000	
(R)	Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (south jetty)	2,300,000		2,300,000	
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(FC)	Kalama River south area		35,000		35,000
(MP)	Little Goose lock and dam	39,000,000		39,000,000	
	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(MP)	Lower Granite lock and dam	14,000,000		14,000,000	
(MP)	Lower Monumental lock and dam	32,000,000		32,000,000	
(FC)	Raymond (restudy)		20,000		20,000
(FC)	Skagit River, Avon bypass		100,000		100,000
(N)	Swinomish Channel-March Point (sec. 107)			(450,000)	
(N)	Tacoma Harbor	183,000		183,000	
	The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(FC)	Wahkiakum Diking District No. 4		35,000		35,000
(FC)	Wynoochee Reservoir			250,000	330,000
	West Virginia:				
(FC)	Beech Fork Reservoir			500,000	
	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)				
(FC)	Buckhannon	702,000		702,000	
(FC)	Burnsville Reservoir		290,000		290,000
(FC)	East Lynn Reservoir	4,800,000		4,800,000	
	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(N)	Opekiska lock and dam	2,550,000		2,550,000	
(FC)	R. D. Bailey (Justice) Reservoir	800,000		1,500,000	
	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Rowlesburg Reservoir		400,000		780,000
	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
	Wisconsin:				
	Duluth-Superior Harbor inner harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin. (See Minnesota.)				
(FC)	Eau Galle River, Spring Valley	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)	[1] 1,750,000		1,750,000	
(R)	Kenosha Harbor	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	La Farge Reservoir and Channel improvement, Kickapoo River		267,000		267,000
	Wyoming:				
(FC)	Sheridan	253,000		253,000	
	Miscellaneous:				
(FC)	Emergency bank protection	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation (sec. 205)	6,000,000		6,494,000	
(FC)	Snagging and clearing	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $500,000 (sec. 107)	1,500,000		2,987,000	
(BE)	Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $500,000 (sec. 103)	250,000		250,000	
	Recreation facilities, completed projects	5,000,000		5,000,000	
	Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	550,000		550,000	
	Aquatic plant control (1965 act)			300,000	
	Employees compensation	225,000		225,000	
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages and availability of carryover balances	−95,700,000		−127,700,000	
	Grand total, construction, general	944,909,000	18,327,000 (963,236,000)	943,573,000	23,887,000 (967,460,000)

[1] Original budget amount revised as shown in budget amendment submitted in H. Doc. 441.

The conferees have deleted the $1,690,000 included in the Senate Bill for initiation of dredging of the Mantua Creek Anchorage under the Delaware River, Philadelphia to the Sea project pending the outcome of current negotiations by the Corps of Engineers to obtain easements on suitable disposal areas and completion of the independent staff investigation being conducted of the problem by the House Committee on Appropriations. As soon as the necessary information is available to assure that appropriate competition will prevail on bidding on Federal dredging contracts in the area, it is agreed that the committees will consider a reprogramming within available funds to initiate the subject dredging.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment inserting language authorizing the Chief of Engineers to provide a new four-lane high level bridge as a replacement for the United States Highway No. 64 bridge immediately west of Fort Smith, Arkansas.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment inserting language authorizing, at the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, that funds appropriated for the Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam, Oklahoma, may be used to provide appropriate navigational clearances for bridges crossing the Sans Bois Creek which are to be relocated under the existing project.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment inserting language providing that the Lost Creek Project in Oregon and the Wynoochee Project in Washington shall not be operated for irrigation purposes until such time as the Secretary of the Interior makes the necessary arrangements with non-Federal interests to recover the costs, in accordance with Federal Reclamation Law, which are allocated to the irrigation purposes.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment inserting language providing that appropriations under this head shall be available to the Chief of Engineers for the purposes authorized by section 6 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 and providing that the authority shall be extended to include the Libby Dam and Reservoir project in Montana.

Operation and Maintenance, General

Amendment No. 9: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment inserting language pertaining to the financing of the United States share of the cost of pumping water from Lake Okeechobee to the Everglades National Park in connection with the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control project.

Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $87,135,000 instead of $84,950,000 as proposed by the House and $87,350,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House Bill consists of the following: study of the Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and Tributaries, Tennessee, $10,000; Mississippi River levees, $175,000; and Channel improvement, $2,000,000.

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 11: Provides a limitation of $149,000,000 on the capital of the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, instead of $147,000,000 as proposed by the House and $151,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Panama Canal

Canal Zone Government

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $33,404,000 for operating expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $33,300,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House Bill is for pay act costs.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment inserting language authorizing the apportionment of funds for operating expenses of the Canal Zone Government to the extent necessary to permit the payment of such pay increases for officers or employees as may be authorized by administrative action pursuant to law which are not in excess of statutory increases

granted for the same period in corresponding rates of compensation for other employees of the Government in comparable positions.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

General Investigations

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: Appropriate $15,075,000 instead of $14,270,000 as proposed by the House and $15,325,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House Bill includes: San Pedro-Santa Cruz project, Arizona, study, $30,000; for reconnaissance study of Cache Creek project, Oklahoma, $25,000; and for atmospheric water resources engineering and research, $750,000.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment inserting language providing for not to exceed $35,000 to be available for payment to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa and Ft. McDowell Indian tribes for economic studies in connection with the potential construction of the Orme Dam on the Salt River in Arizona.

Construction and Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $192,375,000 instead of $187,055,000 as proposed by the House and $192,475,000 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase provided over the House Bill consists of the following: For advance planning on the Southern Nevada Water Supply project, Nevada, $1,000,000; for advance planning of the Lower Teton Division, Teton Basin Project, Idaho, $300,000; deletion of the House item for the Colorado River Front and Levee system due to the availability of carryover funds, a decrease of $3,055,000; Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado, $800,000; Pecos River Basin Water Salvage project, New Mexico-Texas, $250,000; drainage and minor construction (Eden project, Wyoming), $100,000; Missouri River Basin project-Transmission division, for planning of the 345 kv transmission line from Ft. Thompson, South Dakota to Grand Island, Nebraska, $450,000. The conferees are in agreement that this approval shall not be construed in any way as a future commitment for the planning and construction of an extension of the line from Grand Island, Nebraska to Springfield, Missouri; feasibility investigation of Ft. Thompson and Grass Rope Units, South Dakota pumping division, $80,000; feasibility investigation of the Mitchell Section, James Division, Oahe unit, South Dakota, $25,000; reconnaissance study of facilities to provide municipal and industrial water to Minot, North Dakota, $15,000; reconnaissance investigation of the Moorhead Unit, Montana and Wyoming, $30,000; for continuing preconstruction planning on the Mid-State division, Nebraska, $125,000; and a reduction of $5,200,000 in the undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19: Appropriate $50,198,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $48,948,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House Bill is to be applied to the item for undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays.

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the language provision inserted by the Senate providing for full reimbursement by the Office of Emergency Planning of funds expended by the Bureau of Reclamation for disaster relief under P.L. 81-875.

Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $3,950,000 for construction instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House and $3,910,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease in the House Bill amount results from the deletion of funds for initiating construction of the Stockton Dam-Carthage line ($10,000); Norfolk Dam-West Plains line modification ($280,000); West Plains substation ($180,000); and Norfolk substation addition ($80,000) pending further study of whether the current and future transmission requirements can be met adequately through the facilities of the REA generation and transmission cooperatives in the area. A total of $40,000 has been included within the amount allowed for the purpose of making this study.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Tennessee Valley Authority

Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority Fund

Amendment No. 22: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 240 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House instead of 285 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $63,700,000 as proposed by the House instead of $63,635,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed reflects the following changes in the budget estimate: an increase of $2,000,000 for the Tims Ford Dam and Reservoir; a disallowance of $75,000 for the purchase of 45 additional passenger motor vehicles; a disallowance of $500,000 for trucks and heavy mobile equipment; and a reduction of $1,360,000 for anticipated delays and savings in the capital outlay program. None of the latter reduction shall be applied to the land acquisition program.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Departments, agencies, and corporations

Amendment No. 24: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing for the acquisition and installation of air conditioning equipment in passenger motor vehicles and station wagons in certain areas in the United States.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
BOB CASEY,
GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN J. RHODES,
HOWARD W. ROBISON,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KIRWAN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement of the managers.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the bill agreed to in conference is a good bill. The total for the bill is $4,134,511,000, including $2,257,030,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. It is $32,562,000 below the budget request and $190,981,800 below the appropriations for last fiscal year. It should be noted that the decrease in the budget estimate would have totaled $44,762,000 had it not been necessary for the committees to provide an additional $12,200,000 for the budgeted programs of the Bureau of Reclamation to cover the shortages incurred by the Bureau in meeting contractors' earnings during June 1966.

The bill makes provision for only the highest priority requests for new construction starts. The conference action adds only 10 additional new construction starts over those provided in the House bill. The emphasis in the bill has been placed on funding of projects in the study and planning stage because of the small current expenditures involved and in order that they might be ready for the initiation of construction as soon as larger capital expenditures in the economy are warranted. With the large backlog of authorized projects that are urgently needed for essential water resources development, I hope that at an early date we will be able to provide more adequate appropriations to accelerate the program.

I want to express my appreciation for the cooperation which I have received from the members of the subcommittee throughout the many months we have labored to come up with an adequate bill and yet remain under the budget estimate and below last year's appreciation. I regret that Mr. WHITTEN could not be with the rest of our subcommittee here on the floor today but he had to leave town right after the conference meeting yesterday to meet an important prior commitment in his district.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following table in further explanation of the report:

Summary table—Public works appropriation bill, 1967

	Appropriation 1966	Budget estimate 1967 (as amended)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations 1966	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate
Title I—Department of Defense, Civil	$1,378,476,500	$1,333,516,000	$1,324,343,000	$1,345,585,000	$1,341,097,000	−$37,379,500	+$7,581,000	+$16,754,000	−$4,488,000
Title II—Department of Interior	452,999,300	441,252,000	459,224,000	466,359,000	466,049,000	+13,049,700	+24,797,000	+6,825,000	−310,000
Title III—Atomic Energy Commission	2,426,720,000	2,321,200,000	2,257,030,000	2,257,030,000	2,257,030,000	−169,690,000	−64,170,000		
Title IV—Independent offices	67,297,000	71,105,000	70,335,000	70,270,000	70,335,000	+3,038,000	−770,000		+65,000
Grand total, all titles	4,325,492,800	4,167,073,000	4,110,932,000	4,139,244,000	4,134,511,000	−190,981,800	−32,562,000	+23,579,000	−4,733,000

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report and congratulate the chairman of the House conferees and all of the House conferees on what I think is a workmanlike job. This is not an austere bill, Mr. Speaker, by any stretch of the imagination, but neither is it an extravagant bill. As the gentleman from Ohio so well stated, we come back with a figure which is considerably under the budget and even more under the amount appropriated last year, which I think is certainly in line with the fiscal situation in which the country finds itself with regard to the Vietnamese war and the other expenditures which the House and the Senate have already voted.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support this bill and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a time when the Members of this Congress must exercise a great deal of restraint with respect to commitments of added spending, and I submit that this bill as it passed the House of Representatives, reflected very little restraint in that respect, and the bill as it passed the other body, even less of that restraint.

Mr. Speaker, the additional $20 million included in this conference report, but which did not appear in the House bill, may not loom large in terms of dollars in a $4 billion plus bill. But I do submit, Mr. Speaker, that these dollars do loom large in terms of the commitments of our spending over the next few years that are involved in the projects which are included in this conference report, but which were not included in the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the people of this country are entitled to a demonstration of restraint and are waiting for that demonstration of restraint with respect to spending commitments.

Mr. Speaker, today we have pending before us a conference report, which represents another group of civil works projects, "as usual."

Last week we had pending before us a multibillion-dollar education bill which represented huge commitments over these next years.

The week before that it was the antipoverty bill, another multibillion-dollar program, in terms of commitments over the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, there is not any secret that all of these extra dollars that we are appropriating or authorizing to be expended are borrowed dollars.

Everyone knows that we are operating on a deficit basis and that we do not now have available, either in terms of dollars or in terms of appropriations, the money with which to finance the war in Vietnam.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that because of this lack of restraint, this continuation of spending, that inflation is here, and that it is a real and present danger to this Nation, and to its people and to its economy.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have continued to go on our spending way.

We know that we are facing a decision within a few weeks on probably a $10 billion tax bill, and it will be enacted in the name of the "war in Vietnam" and not in the name of "big spending." It will not be enacted in the name of big spending upon new and overly expanded domestic programs.

Oh, I know it will be said that this conference report is under the total dollars that were contained in the President's budget, and that is true for one reason only—because of the cut that was made in the Atomic Energy Commission funds. This is not true with respect to any other of the titles contained in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, what we can do here today is limited. We can only deal with $28.3 million, the amount that was added by the other body to this bill.

But, at least, Mr. Speaker, we can do what we can, and that is to substantially restore the bill insofar as we practically can to the form in which it passed the House of Representatives.

I have prepared a motion to recommit this conference report, with instructions to the managers on the part of the House, to do substantially that. It goes as far in that direction, at least as the rules relating to conference reports on appropriation bills will permit.

The effect of such a motion would be to restore and insist upon the House figures for general investigations, for planning, and for construction, for the Corps of Engineers. It would restore with respect to the Mississippi River and its tributaries, the House figure, a figure that is already $7 million over the budget. It would restore the figures for the Bureau of Reclamation investigations, for the Bureau of Reclamation construction and rehabilitation to the figures at which they were included in the House bill.

In the Corps of Engineers' revolving fund it would restore that to the figure of $147 million, and it would do it on the basis that this is what the representatives of the Corps of Engineers told our subcommittee would be needed to carry us through this fiscal year.

I submit that we ought not to assume that we are going to fiddle around with appropriation bills the next year the way we fiddled around with them this year. And to give them more for this revolving fund than was included in the House bill is to assume that we are not going to have this appropriation bill through the House by the first of July next year.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of our committee.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, to clarify the gentleman's motion to recommit, may I ask him this question: If the motion to recommit were to carry, as I understand it, it would take these figures back to the House figures, as the bill passed the House. Am I correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is substantially correct. It could not even go quite that far because of some practical limitation in the parliamentary situation, but in no case would it affect anything that was in this bill at the time that it passed the House.

Mr. BOW. I wanted to make this clear. In other words, there would be nothing affected that was in the bill when it passed the House; the figures would remain the same as they were when the bill passed the House?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. With one single exception, and that is with respect to the proposal relative to amendment No. 23 only. I am glad the ranking minority member of the committee brought that to the attention of the House.

In that connection it is suggested that we accept the Senate figure, which is slightly smaller, and there the effect would be to cut back on an unbudgeted amount for the Tennessee Valley Authority that was included in the bill, because it was substantially over the budget figure. So we would be cutting back about $65,000 below the House figure, but that is the only instance anywhere in this proposed motion to recommit.

Mr. BOW. And no project that was in the bill, or anything a Member might have had in the bill when it left here would be affected by the gentleman's motion to recommit?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is true, with the single exception that I pointed out.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In this one instance where, if the motion to recommit prevails, the figure would be $65,000 less than the House figure, would the gentleman from Wisconsin tell the House how the $65,000 figure relates to the total figure for that particular project, or program?

Would the gentleman recollect?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It would be exactly at the budget figure, and $65,000 less than the amount that was carried when it passed the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Does the gentleman recollect the figure that was involved in that particular project? Was it a $10 million amount, or a $5 million amount?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The total amount was something in excess of $63 million.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, it is a $65,000 reduction related to a $63 million item?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct. It would result in some shifting of funds within that total amount.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. If I misunderstood the gentleman, I beg his pardon, but I thought I understood the gentleman to assure the House that the motion to recommit would almost entirely bring the figures back to the figures as contained in the House-passed bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I think this country needs a gesture of restraint in spending. Perhaps that is what this $20 million is. Maybe it is only a gesture. But I submit it is a gesture that this country needs. It is a gesture that this House of Representatives needs to make. Because of parliamentary limitations that prevent it, I cannot now attempt any more than this $20 million gesture on this $4.1 billion conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the majority of the Members of the House will support the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee or one of the members of the committee a question with regard to the Dickey-Lincoln School Reservoir project in Maine.

I was one of 11 Members from the State of Massachusetts who voted on this item a year ago and 10 of us opposed it.

I know that I still feel exactly the same way—that the Dickey-Lincoln project is an obsolete program. Yet, I note that the conference committee has increased the item from $800,000 to $1,100,000.

We had no serious opposition to the $800,000 at the time the bill passed the Congress because it was my belief that there was going to be an independent study made by the Committee on Appropriations and that the majority of us who had sat down on this bill had agreed that if an independent study showed that the Dickey-Lincoln Reservoir was necessary that we from New England would go along with it.

While there is nothing that spells out in the bill that there will be study, is it still the feeling of the House side of the committee that there will be a study on the Dickey-Lincoln project?

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

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. I think I may be able to answer the question that the gentleman has put.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, the conferees did increase the amount in this bill for the planning for the Dickey-Lincoln School Reservoir project from $800,000 to $1,100,000.

As the gentleman knows, the conferees function and operate in an area of compromise. The distinguished gentlemen from the State of Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY and Mr. TUPPER], asked the House conferees to go along with the Senate position. We came out with a good compromise. There is a staff study which has been set up and is in the process of now being established for the Dickey-Lincoln School Reservoir project.

Let me say further to the gentleman, that the investigative staff of the House Committee on Appropriations is made up of Federal Bureau of Investigation agents. These agents, who are now of the investigative staff of the House Committee on Appropriations, will have available for this study some of the best talent in the field of power and hydroelectric projects. In this investigation I would hope that they would pull from the various departments and agencies downtown—plus whatever extra they need from the outside—the best available team to answer some of the questions that this committee is propounding to the investigative staff.

Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the investigation will include a number of points. To be specific, the House Appropriations Committee is asking for these six points to be covered in the investigation:

First. A review and appraisal of the completeness and adequacy of the study conducted by the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior on which the report was based recommending the project for authorizations.

Second. An analysis of the soundness of the cost estimate of $218.7 million.

Third. An analysis of the soundness of the estimated allocation of the annual project benefits to power, flood control, and area redevelopment.

Fourth. An appraisal of the plans for the marketing of power including the proposed power rates to be charged and the payout schedule.

Fifth. A comparison of the estimated cost of power production under the project with costs under alternative means, including steamplants, nuclear plants, and pumped storage and nuclear combinations.

Sixth. An overall appraisal of the need and significance of the project in meeting power requirements in the light of the expansion program planned by the New England utilities.

It would seem to me that on the basis of the particular recommendations that this committee has suggested to the investigative staff, this will be a project which will be studied in depth and we hope to get an impartial, complete, and well-balanced study by the investigative staff of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I, for one, am perfectly satisfied with that and intend to abide by the decision that was made. I hope those who are advocating legislation will also abide by the decision in the same way.

Mr. BOLAND. I think the gentleman would agree with me that if the investigative staff comes up with a recommendation, or if recommendations indicate that this project ought to be built, we in New England will support it.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to compliment the committee for making this study at this time, because that was my objection to it in the first place. If the study comes up favorable to the project, I for one will not oppose it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily, I might be expected to oppose amendment No. 21, whereby the Senate has deleted funds for initiating construction of several projects by the Southwestern Power Administration affecting West Plains, Mo., one of the principal cities in the 10th Congressional District. However, Mr. Speaker, I could not be consistent in my position of insisting on nonduplication of facilities, if I opposed this amendment, particularly since the House conferees have insisted upon, and obtained, approval of an appropriation of $40,000 for the purpose of financing a study of whether the current and future transmission requirements can be met adequately through the facilities of the REA generation and transmission cooperative in the area. I have been assured that, with the approval of the $40,000 for the study, it will proceed without delay and, if the need is shown for the construction of additional lines, or the increasing of capacity on existing lines, such construction will be approved, and the necessary funds provided.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in consideration of the conference report on the public works appropriation bill, may I call the attention of the House to two items, which have been approved by the House and Senate conferees, most important to my district.

The first item pertains to funds to begin construction on the Lower Teton Dam in Fremont County, Idaho. This dam is a multipurpose development, designed to make maximum use of available water resources in this area. The first stage of construction would provide urgently needed supplemental water for 114,000 acres of land. The project would also provide substantial flood protection to a highly developed area in the Upper Snake River Basin which has suffered from severe flooding in recent years. This particular area has suffered not only from flooding, but from droughts in several years; and this project should eliminate both of these problems.

Appropriation of these funds would permit the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed immediately witn foundation exploration at the dam site, field topographic surveys, ground water exploration, land classification studies, right-of-way appraisals, and repayment contract negotiations.

I know the farmers and residents in this area appreciate the favorable action by the conferees in recommending approval of the $300,000 for this project.

I am also very pleased to note that the conferees accepted the Senate recommendation of $200,000 for the Ririe flood control project which is urgently needed to avoid serious losses in this section of the Snake River.

I urge the House to accept the conference report because of the critical need for these projects

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin moves to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 17; and in respect to amendment numbered 23, that the managers on the part of the House concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to recommit the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 91, nays 255, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

YEAS—91

Adair	Derwinski	Minshall
Adams	Dole	Moeller
Anderson, Ill.	Duncan, Tenn.	Morse
Arends	Erlenborn	Morton
Ashbrook	Findley	Mosher
Ayres	Fino	Nelsen
Bates	Ford, Gerald R.	Ottinger
Bell	Fraser	Pelly
Betts	Fulton, Pa.	Pirnie
Bingham	Goodell	Quie
Bow	Grover	Reid, Ill.
Bray	Hall	Reid, N.Y.
Brock	Halpern	Rumsfeld
Broomfield	Harsha	Saylor
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Harvey, Mich.	Schneebeli
	Hosmer	Schweiker
Broyhill, N.C.	Hutchinson	Smith, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Joelson	Smith, N.Y.
Cahill	Johnson, Pa.	Smith, Va.
Carter	Jonas	Springer
Cederberg	Kunkel	Stalbaum
Chamberlain	Laird	Talcott
Clancy	Latta	Todd
Clawson, Del	Lipscomb	Vivian
Cleveland	McClory	Watkins
Conable	McCulloch	Whalley
Corbett	McDade	Widnall
Curtin	McEwen	Wilson, Bob
Curtis	MacGregor	Wyatt
Dague	Mailliard	Wydler
Davis, Wis.	Mathias	

NAYS—255

Abbitt	Annunzio	Berry
Abernethy	Ashley	Blatnik
Addabbo	Ashmore	Boggs
Anderson, Tenn.	Baring	Boland
	Barrett	Bolling
Andrews, George W.	Battin	Bolton
	Beckworth	Brademas
Andrews, N. Dak.	Belcher	Brown, Calif.
	Bennett	Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan	Helstoski	Powell
Burke	Henderson	Price
Burleson	Herlong	Pucinski
Burton, Calif.	Holifield	Quillen
Burton, Utah	Holland	Race
Callan	Horton	Randall
Cameron	Howard	Redlin
Carey	Hull	Rees
Casey	Hungate	Reifel
Celler	Ichord	Resnick
Chelf	Irwin	Reuss
Clark	Jacobs	Rhodes, Ariz.
Clausen, Don H.	Jarman	Rhodes, Pa.
	Johnson, Calif.	Rivers, S.C.
Cohelan	Johnson, Okla.	Roberts
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Robison
Conte	Jones, N.C.	Rodino
Conyers	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Cramer	Karth	Rogers, Fla.
Cunningham	Kastenmeier	Ronan
Daddario	Kee	Rooney, N.Y.
Daniels	Kelly	Rooney, Pa.
Dawson	Keogh	Rosenthal
de la Garza	King, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Delaney	King, Utah	Roudebush
Dent	Kirwan	Roush
Denton	Kluczynski	Roybal
Donohue	Kornegay	Ryan
Dow	Krebs	Satterfield
Dowdy	Kupferman	St Germain
Downing	Landrum	St. Onge
Dulski	Langen	Scheuer
Edwards, Ala.	Leggett	Schisler
Edwards, Calif.	Lennon	Secrest
Edwards, La.	Long, La.	Selden
Ellsworth	Long, Md.	Senner
Everett	McCarthy	Shipley
Evins, Tenn.	McFall	Shriver
Fallon	McGrath	Sickles
Farbstein	McMillan	Sikes
Farnsley	Machen	Sisk
Farnum	Mackie	Skubitz
Fascell	Madden	Slack
Feighan	Mahon	Smith, Iowa
Flood	Marsh	Stafford
Fogarty	Martin, Nebr.	Staggers
Ford, William D.	Matthews	Stanton
	May	Stubblefield
Fountain	Meeds	Sullivan
Friedel	Michel	Teague, Calif.
Gallagher	Miller	Teague, Tex.
Garmatz	Mills	Tenzer
Gathings	Minish	Thomas
Gettys	Mink	Thompson, N.J.
Giaimo	Mize	Thomson, Wis.
Gibbons	Monagan	Tuck
Gilbert	Moore	Tupper
Gonzalez	Morgan	Udall
Grabowski	Multer	Ullman
Gray	Murphy, Ill.	Utt
Green, Oreg.	Natcher	Van Deerlin
Green, Pa.	Nedzi	Vanik
Greigg	O'Hara, Ill.	Waggonner
Grider	O'Hara, Mich.	Waldie
Griffiths	Olson, Minn.	Walker, N. Mex.
Gubser	O'Neal, Ga.	Watson
Gurney	O'Neill, Mass.	Watts
Hagen, Calif.	Passman	Weltner
Haley	Patman	White, Tex.
Halleck	Patten	Whitener
Hamilton	Pepper	Williams
Hanna	Perkins	Wilson, Charles H.
Hansen, Idaho	Philbin	
Hardy	Pickle	Wright
Hathaway	Pike	Yates
Hawkins	Poage	Young
Hays	Poff	Younger
Hechler	Pool	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—83

Albert	Evans, Colo.	Mackay
Andrews, Glenn	Fisher	Martin, Ala.
	Flynt	Martin, Mass.
Aspinall	Foley	Matsunaga
Bandstra	Frelinghuysen	Moorhead
Brooks	Fulton, Tenn.	Morris
Byrne, Pa.	Fuqua	Morrison
Cabell	Gilligan	Moss
Callaway	Gross	Murphy, N.Y.
Clevenger	Hagan, Ga.	Murray
Collier	Hanley	Nix
Cooley	Hansen, Iowa	O'Brien
Corman	Hansen, Wash.	O'Konski
Craley	Harvey, Ind.	Olsen, Mont.
Culver	Hébert	Purcell
Davis, Ga.	Hicks	Reinecke
Devine	Huot	Rivers, Alaska
Dickinson	Jennings	Rogers, Tex.
Diggs	Jones, Ala.	Roncalio
Dingell	Keith	Schmidhauser
Dorn	King, N.Y.	Scott
Duncan, Oreg.	Love	Steed
Dwyer	McDowell	Stephens
Dyal	McVicker	Stratton
Edmondson	Macdonald	Sweeney
Taylor	Tunney	White, Idaho
Thompson, Tex.	Tuten	Whitten
Toll	Vigorito	Willis
Trimble	Walker, Miss.	Wolff

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Albert with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Love with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Mackay with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Jennings with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Bandstra with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Macdonald.
Mr. McVicker with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Dyal with Mr. Huot.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Roncalio.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Nix.
Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Olsen of Montana.
Mr. Gilligan with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Tuten.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Craley.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Hansen of Iowa.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Vigorito.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. McDowell.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Brooks.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Morrison.

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5, page 5, line 6, insert ": *Provided further*, That the Chief of Engineers shall, in lieu of altering the existing obsolescent bridge, provide a new four-lane high-level bridge as a replacement for the United States Highway Numbered 64 bridge immediately west of Fort Smith, Arkansas".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Members of the House should be advised as to the effect of this amendment. The existing authorization would permit the replacement of the bridge in the area of Fort Smith, Ark., at a cost of approximately $2.5 million, of which $1.5 million would represent a contribution by the State or local communities. The effect of the proposed amendment would be to double the cost.

I am not prepared to argue the merit as to whether an inadequate bridge should be restored or whether a new, more adequate bridge should be constructed. But the point which I think the Members of the House should be aware of is that in the restoration of the old bridge for $2.5 million there would be a contribution by local interests of one-half million dollars, but that in the construction of the proposed new bridge costing $5.5 million there would not be a dime of local contribution to be made.

I do not think that is quite a fair way to treat the taxpayers of this country. Yet, I am sophisticated enough to know the very difficult circumstances under which this amendment was accepted by the conferees. I am not in a position to oppose the amendment as such, but I simply wish to have my colleagues know of the circumstances under which this amendment is brought to the floor.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees made every effort to include a provision in the language providing that the local interests would share in the cost of the bridge to which the gentleman refers. However, we were advised that a plan had finally been worked out between the Corps of Engineers and the local interests involving cost sharing on several bridges on the Arkansas. Although there is no local cost on this bridge, local interests are contributing funds at other locations, including the new bridge at Pine Bluff, Ark.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6, page 5, line 10, insert the following: *"Provided further,* That at the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, funds appropriated for the Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam, Oklahoma, may be used to provide appropriate navigational clearances for bridges crossing the Sans Bois Creek which are to be relocated under the existing project".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7, page 5, line 15, insert the following: *"Provided further,* That the Lost Creek Project in Oregon and the Wynoochee Project in Washington shall not be operated for irrigation purposes until such time as the Secretary of the Interior makes the necessary arrangements with non-Federal interests to recover the costs, in accordance with Federal Reclamation Law, which are allocated to the irrigation purpose".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8, page 5, line 22, insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That appropriations under this head shall be available to the Chief of Engineers for the purposes authorized by section 6 of the Flood Control Act of 1946: *Provided further,* That the authority contained therein is extended to include the Libby Dam and Reservoir project in Montana: *Provided further,*".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9, page 6, line 17, insert the following: "; financing the United States share of the cost of pumping water from Lake Okeechobee to the Everglades National Park;".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13, page 11, line 15, insert the following: "Funds appropriated for operating expenses of the Canal Zone Government may be apportioned notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases for officers or employees as may be authorized by administrative action pursuant to law which are not in excess of statutory increases granted for the same period in corresponding rates of compensation for other employees of the Government in comparable positions."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16, page 12, line 21, insert the following: ": *Provided further,* That not to exceed $35,000 of this appropriation shall be available for payment to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa and Mt. McDowell Indian Tribes for economic studies in connection with the potential construction of Orme Dam on the Salt River in Arizona: *Provided further,*".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20, page 21, line 11, insert the following: "Any appropriations made heretofore or hereafter to the Bureau of Reclamation which are expended in connection with national disaster relief under Public Law 81-875 as administered by the Office of Emergency Planning shall be reimbursed in full by that Office to the account for which the funds were originally appropriated."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. KIRWAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the

RECORD, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement of September 30, 1966, this is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

COMPENSATION FOR CANCELLATION OF GRAZING PERMITS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1375) providing a method of determining the amount of compensation to which certain individuals are entitled as reimbursement for damages sustained by them due to the cancellation of their grazing permits by the U.S. Air Force.

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

S. 1375

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and declares that Claudius C. Toone, of Morgan, Utah; W. E. and David Dearden, of Henefer, Utah; Robert Byram and Sons, of Ogden, Utah; Joseph O. Fawcett, of Henefer, Utah; and Richins Brothers, of Henefer, Utah, are equitably entitled to compensation for damages sustained by them because of the cancellation of their grazing permits by the United States Air Force as a result of a need for additional land for the Wendover bombing range.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized and directed to determine and pay the amount of compensation to which such persons are equitably entitled for damages because of the cancellation of their grazing permits. Such determination shall be made in accordance with criteria established in the usual cases where grazing permits are canceled as the result of withdrawals by a Federal department or agency.

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

FRED E. STARR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1068) for the relief of Fred E. Starr.

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

S. 1068

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to provide for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of Fred E. Starr, a former employee of the Department of the Air Force assigned to Headquarters, Pacific Air Force, Hawaii, from his last oversea duty station, Honolulu, Hawaii, to his permanent residence in Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin, and to pay, out of any funds available for the payment of transporting household goods, any unpaid storage charges which may be due on such household goods and personal effects at the time of shipment.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Fred E. Starr, the sum of $1,095.28 in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for expenses incurred by the said Fred E. Starr in storing the household goods and personal effects referred to in section 1 of this Act prior to the shipment thereof authorized by this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 10: after the word "Act.", insert the following: "No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. RAISLA STEIN AND HER TWO MINOR CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1945) for the relief of Mrs. Raisla Stein and her two minor children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. HALL objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ARLINE AND MAURICE LOADER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2016) for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader.

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

H.R. 2016

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20,000 to Arline and Maurice Loader of Half Moon Bay, California, in full settlement of their claims against the United States based upon the deaths of their sons, Maurice G. Loader and Frederic M. Loader, on October 15, 1944, as the result of the explosion of a 37 millimeter armor-piercing shell found by children on the Montara firing range.

No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

DEMETRIOS KONSTANTINOS GEORGARAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2146) for the relief of Demetrios Konstantinos Georgaras (also known as James K. Georgaras).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MELBA B. PERKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3275) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Mrs. Melba B. Perkins against the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROBERT A. HARWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6039) for the relief of Robert A. Harwell.

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

H.R. 6039

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000 to Robert A. Harwell in full settlement of his claims against the United States to compensate him for the amount equitably due for approximately sixty acres of land in Haskell County, Oklahoma, and described as that part of the east half of the northwest quarter lying north of Oklahoma State Highway Numbered 9, in section 24, township 9 north, range 18 east of the Indian base and meridian, Haskell County, State of Oklahoma. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

EDWARD G. BEAGLE, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13909) for the relief of Edward G. Beagle, Jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. HALL objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHARLES J. ARNOLD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13910) for the relief of Charles J. Arnold.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. HALL objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

USE OF THE VESSEL "JOHN F. DREWS"

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14517) to amend Private Law 86–203 to permit the use of the vessel *John F. Drews* in the coastwide trade while it is owned by a citizen of the United States.

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

H.R. 14517

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, That Private Law 86–203, approved September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. A89), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "or by any other citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. 802)".

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

IOANNIS A. VASILOPOULOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2621) for the relief of Ioannis A. Vasilopoulos.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ERNEST BUILLET

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3879) for the relief of Ernest Buillet.

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

H.R. 3879

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, Ernest Buillet 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ernest Buillet 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 his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Grisel, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act: *Provided,* That the brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MICHAEL P. BUCKLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1890) for the relief of Michael P. Buckley.

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

H.R. 1890

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Michael P. Buckley, of Pittsfield, Massachusetts, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $503.83, the amount of the balance, as of August 11, 1964, of his liability to the United States on General Accounting Office Claim Number Z–2250627. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$503.83" and insert "$389.50".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MISS SYLVIA KRONFELD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7885) for the relief of Miss Sylvia Kronfeld.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

J. M. PENDARVIS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9036) for the relief of J. M. Pendarvis, Jr.

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

H.R. 9036

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $30,000 to J. M. Pendarvis, Junior, of Edgefield, South Carolina, in full settlement of his claims against the United States based upon the injuries and disabilities he suffered as the result of an assault by members of the United States Army on August 6, 1963, at the time of the Army maneuvers designated Swift Strike Operation. This claim is not cognizable under the tort claims provisions of title 28 of the United States Code by reason of the exception provided in subsection (h) of section 2680 of that title. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$30,000" and insert "$15,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ARTHUR ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11946) for the relief of Arthur Anderson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CECIL A. RHODES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13459) for the relief of Cecil A. Rhodes.

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

H.R. 13459

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the employment of Cecil A. Rhodes of Jacksonville, Florida, in a civilian position by the Post Office Department during periods of service on active duty with the United States Navy beginning on March 27, 1960, and ending October 4, 1965, shall be deemed lawful, and he shall be entitled to all of the compensation and other benefits to which he would have been entitled had he not been serving on active duty during such period.

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

DINO J. CATERINI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 17259) for the relief of Dino J. Caterini.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DR. BIENVENIDO BENACH CARRERAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6226) for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido Benach Carreras.

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

H.R. 6226

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Bienvenido Benach Carreras may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required, in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since August 26, 1961.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Bienvenido Benach Carreras shall be held and considered to have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 26, 1961."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. HILDA WENCESLAA PEREZ DE GONZALEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6658) for the relief of Dr. Hilda Wenceslaa Perez de Gonzalez.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2587, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, 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.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 6658) was laid on the table.

DR. MYRIAM DE LA CARIDAD ARES Y FERNANDEZ DE BOSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6899) for the relief of Dr. Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch.

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

H.R. 6899

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress asesmbled, That Doctor Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required, in addition to her residence and physical presence within the United States since July 28, 1960.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 28, 1960."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as all of these bills, beginning with Calendar No. 554, which the Clerk shall commence to read next, through Private Calendar No. 558, have been carefully checked on both sides of the aisle, and which have been reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary, and which are somewhat similar or identical, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc and passed by the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there any amendments to any of these bills that the gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent be considered en bloc?

I shall request the Clerk to report these bills by title and then shall ask unanimous consent to the gentleman's unanimous consent request that Private Calendar No. 555 through Private Calendar——

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Private Calendar No. 588, and a motion is included in the unanimous-consent request to take care of such necessary modifications in order to adapt previously passed Senate bills, substitutions, and correcting the title, et cetera.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Let the Chair suggest, for the convenience of the Chair, in putting the question, that we go through and including Calendar No. 555 first, and then take the others up in a separate request.

The Clerk will report the titles of these bills under Private Calendars Nos. 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560.

DR. ALLAN BAUMAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10259) for the relief of Dr. Allan Baumal.

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

H.R. 10259

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 Allan Baumal shall be held and considered to have complied with the provisions of section 316 of that Act as they relate to residence and physical presence.

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

DR. PEDRO RAPHAEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11224) for the relief of Dr. Pedro Raphael.

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

H.R. 11224

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 Pedro Raphael shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 17, 1961.

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

DR. JACINTA LLORENS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11590) for the relief of Dr. Jacinta Llorens.

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

H.R. 11590

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 Jacinta Llorens shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of June 13, 1960.

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

DR. AUGUSTO J. FERNANDEZ-CONDE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12317) for the relief of Dr. Augusto J. Fernandez-Conde.

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

H.R. 12317

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 Augusto J. Fernandez-Conde shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 11, 1961.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the date "August 11, 1961." and insert in lieu thereof the date "August 10, 1961."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MARIO P. NAVARRO, M.D.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13101) for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, doctor of medicine.

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

H.R. 13101

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, Mario P. Navarro, doctor of medicine, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 28, 1961.

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

DR. ANTONIO RONDON DELGADO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16610) for the relief of Dr. Antonio Rondon Delgado.

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

H.R. 16610

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 Antonio Rondon Delgado shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 4, 1957, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the date "July 4, 1957" change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING 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

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1275) 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.

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

S. 1275

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4132 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (46 U.S.C. 11), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the vessel Elva L., owned by Harold Bunker, of Matinicus, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States, upon compliance with the usual requirements, with the privilege of engaging in the coastwise trade so long as such vessel is owned by a citizen of the United States.

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

GABRIEL A. NAHAS AND VERA NAHAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 405) for the relief of Gabriel A. Nahas and Vera Nahas.

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

S. 405

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the periods of time Gabriel A. Nahas and Vera Nahas have resided in the United States since their lawful admission for permanent residence on March 2, 1960, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

DR. MARSHALL KU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 769) for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku.

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

S. 769

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 Marshall Ku shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 30, 1951, 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.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Marshall Ku shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 30, 1951."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. RAFAEL PEDRO MARTINEZ TORRES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1137) for the relief of Dr. Rafael Pedro Martinez Torres.

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

S. 1137

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the periods of time Doctor Rafael Pedro Martinez Torres has resided in the United States since his lawful admission for permanent residence on March 5, 1950, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Rafael Pedro Martinez Torres shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 25, 1961."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. JOSE JOAQUIN DIAZ FRANQUIZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2106) for the relief of Dr. Jose Joaquin Diaz Franquiz.

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

S. 2106

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 Jose Joaquin Diaz Franquiz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 7, 1961.

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

JORGE AJBUSZYC VOLSKY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2457) for the relief of Jorge Ajbuszyc Volsky.

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

S. 2457

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, Jorge Ajbuszyc Volsky shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 22, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed,

and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. GUILLERMO RODRIGUEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2640) for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Rodriguez.

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

S. 2640

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 Guillermo Rodriguez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 18, 1960.

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

DR. EZZAT N. ASAAD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2738) for the relief of Dr. Ezzat N. Asaad.

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

S. 2738

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 Ezzat N. Asaad shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 11, 1958, and the periods of time he has resided in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

DR. BLANCHE L. ASAAD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2739) for the relief of Dr. Blanche L. Asaad.

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

S. 2739

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 Blanche L. Asaad shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 16, 1958, and the periods of time she has resided in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

DR. JULIO SANGUILY, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2761) for the relief of Dr. Julio Sanguily, Jr.

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

S. 2761

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 Sanguily, Junior, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 13, 1961.

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

HAZEL LOUISE SCHUMAN STRUNK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2771) for the relief of Hazel Louise Schuman Strunk.

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

S. 2771

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, Hazel Louise Schuman Strunk shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permament residence as of December 1, 1923.

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

HELENA GILBERT MADDAGIRI AND HEATHER GILBERT MADDAGIRI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2801) for the relief of Helena Gilbert Maddagiri and Heather Gilbert Maddagiri.

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

S. 2801

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, Helena Gilbert Maddagiri and Heather Gilbert Maddagiri may be classified as children within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act, upon approval of a petition filed in their behalf by Wanda Schickling Maddagiri, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Helena Gilbert Maddagiri shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Aswath Maddagiri, a lawfully resident alien and a citizen of the United States, respectively.

"SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Heather Gilbert Maddagiri 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 Mr. and Mrs. Aswath Maddagiri, a lawfully resident alien and a citizen of the United States, respectively.

"SEC. 3. The natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiaries shall not, by virtue of such relationship be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. ALBERTO L. MARTINEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3106) for the relief of Dr. Alberto L. Martinez.

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

S. 3106

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 L. Martinez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 30, 1960.

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

MISS MATSUE SATO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3238) for the relief of Miss Matsue Sato.

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

S. 3238

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, Miss Matsue Sato, the fiancée of Mr. Mark R. Edelberg, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Miss Matsue Sato is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Mr. Mark H. Edelberg and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Miss Matsue Sato, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Miss Matsue Sato, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Miss Matsue Sato as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] rise?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration en bloc of the bills on the Private Calendar, Nos. 575 through and including 588, in the interest of expediting the consideration of these bills by the House.

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

There was no objection.

DR. JORGE IGNACIO MIQUEL FRANCA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5622) for the relief of Dr. Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5622

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca shall be held and considered to have satisfied the requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to required periods of residence and physical presence within the United States and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 310(d) of that Act, he may be naturalized at any time after the date of enactment of this Act if he is otherwise eligible for naturalization under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Jorge Ignacio Miquel Franca shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 23, 1961."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. RAUL R. MORFFI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5969) for the relief of Dr. Raul R. Morffi.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5969

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 Raul R. Morffi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 29, 1961.

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

DR. ANTONIO U. CATASUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6443) for the relief of Dr. Antonio U. Catasus.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6443

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 Antonio U. Catasus shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 3, 1959.

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

DR. RICARDO R. FUSTE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7341) for the relief of Dr. Ricardo R. Fuste.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7341

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 Ricardo R. Fuste shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 12, 1961.

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

DR. LUIS CRESPO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10151) for the relief of Dr. Luis Crespo.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10151

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Luis Crespo shall be held and considered to have satisfied the requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to required periods of residence and physical presence within the United States and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 310(d) of that Act, he may be naturalized at any time after the date of enactment of this Act if he is otherwise eligible for naturalization under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Luis Crespo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 17, 1961."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. LUIS E. BENCOMO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10253) for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Bencomo.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10253

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 Luis E. Bencomo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 5, 1961, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the date "June 5, 1961" change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JUN BECKY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11617) for the relief of Jun Becky.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11617

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, Jun Becky may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Richard Allen Ginther and Mary Jeanette Ginther, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans. Section 205(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jun Becky 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 Mr. and Mrs. Richard Allen Ginther, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. JUAN ANTONIO DUMOIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11640) for the relief of Dr. Juan Antonio Dumois.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11640

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 Juan Antonio Dumois shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 19, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA KARIDAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (HR. 11952) for the relief of Maria Karidakis.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11952

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, Maria Karidakis may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of that Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. George N. Karidakis, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of that Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to petitions in behalf of a child as defined in section 101(b)(1)(F).

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

MURIEL WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11957) for the relief of Muriel Williams.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11957

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Muriel Williams shall be held and considered to have been physically present in the United States for a period of five years after attaining the age of fourteen years.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of section 201(g) of the Nationality Act of 1940, Muriel Williams shall be held and considered to have been residing in the United States for a period of five years after attaining the age of sixteen years."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. MARIO ORLANDO SANTOS-ESTEVEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12781) for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12781

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 Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 21, 1961.

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

ALEXANDER FRANCIS SAKER, M.D.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12920) for the relief of Alexander Francis Saker, M.D.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12920

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, Alexander Francis Saker, doctor of medicine, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 10, 1961.

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

ANTONIO BARQUET CHEDIACK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14173) for the relief of Antonio Barquet Chediack.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14173

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, Antonio Barquet Chediack shall be held and considered to be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 26, 1961.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the name "Antonio Barquet Chediack" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Antonio Barquet Chediak".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Antonio Barquet Chediak."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTEBAN FERNÁNDEZ NODA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14174) for the relief of Esteban Fernández Noda.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14174

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, Esteban Fernández Noda shall be held and considered to be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 13, 1960.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. ELEANOR ROBLEDO DIAZ MARTINEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14233) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Robledo Diaz Martinez.

Without objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14233

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Eleanor Robledo Diaz Martinez shall be held and considered to have been physically present in the United States for a period of five years after attaining the age of fourteen years and prior to the birth of her daughter Beatriz Diaz.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Beatriz Diaz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 17, 1951."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Beatriz Diaz."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE DEL CARMEN BERMUDEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14920) for the relief of Marie del Carmen Bermudez.

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

H.R. 14920

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, Marie del Carmen Bermudez 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 Mr. and Mr. Arsenio Bermudez, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: *"Provided,* That the natural brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JAN DROBOT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15197) for the relief of Jan Drobot.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DR. ALI HAJI-MORAD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15488) for the relief of Dr. Ali Haji-Morad.

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

H.R. 15488

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 Ali Haji-Morad shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 29, 1956.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the date "June 29, 1956," and insert the following: "June 28, 1956, and the periods of time he has resided in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

VINCENTE FERNANDEZ MARINO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16522) for the relief of Vincente Fernandez Marino.

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

H.R. 16522

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, Vincente Fernandez Marino shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 8, 1961.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the date "November 8, 1961" and insert the date "November 7, 1961".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JAMES W. ADAMS AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 231) for the relief of James W. Adams and others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NORMAN J. PITMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 690) for the relief of Norman J. Pitman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PUGET SOUND PLYWOOD, INC., OF TACOMA, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1347) for the relief of Puget Sound Plywood, Inc., of Tacoma, Wash.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MERRITT A. SEEFELDT AND AUGUST C. SEEFELDT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1572) for the relief of Merritt A. Seefeldt and August C. Seefeldt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JAMES A. TODD, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2500) for the relief of James A. Todd, Jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. WILLIFRED S. SHIRLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1333) for the relief of Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DR. GEORGE H. EDLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1404) for the relief of Dr. George H. Edler.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROSE MINUTILLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1944) for the relief of Rose Minutillo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5349) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ELMER O. ERICKSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7241) for the relief of Elmer O. Erickson.

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

H.R. 7241

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 laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to the seniority rights of employees of the Post Office Department, Elmer O. Erickson, of Minneapolis, Minnesota, an employee of the postal service assigned to the Saint Paul and Aberdeen railway post office, Minnesota, shall be entitled to receive credit for service performed by him in the postal service during the period from August 12, 1940, through January 13, 1961, in like manner as if the provisions of sections 748.1 through 748.17 of the Postal Transportation Service seniority rules, Post Office Department Publication 31, dated August 18, 1958, under which certain employees who transfer from and later reenter an occupational group subject to such rules will have service seniority based upon the seniority they had attained before transferring from such group, had been applicable with respect

to the said Elmer O. Erickson during the period from January 14, 1961, the date he transferred from the clerical group, which is the occupational group into which he and all other former employees of the Postal Transportation Service were placed when such Service was merged into the post offices, to April 29, 1961, the date he retransferred to such group, the said Elmer O. Erickson not having been advised prior to his transfer from such group that the Postal Transportation Service seniority rules had been terminated.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "postal service", insert "formerly".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JESSE W. STUTTS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10090) for the relief of Jesse W. Stutts, Jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MR. ROBERT A. OWEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10481) for the relief of Mr. Robert A. Owen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ADEL LESSERT BELLMARD, CLEMENT LESSERT, JOSEPHINE GONVIL PAPPAN, JULIE GONVIL PAPPAN, PELAGIE GONVIL FRANCEOUR DE AUBRI, VICTORE GONVIL PAPPAN, MARIE GONVIL, LAFLECHE GONVIL, LOUIS LAVENTURE, ELIZABETH CARBONAU VERTIFELLE, PIERRE CARBONAU, LOUIS JONCAS, BASIL JONCAS, JAMES JONCAS, ELIZABETH DATCHERUTE, JOSEPH BUTLER, WILLIAM RODGER, JOSEPH COTE, FOUR CHILDREN OF CICILI COMPARE, AND JOSEPH JAMES, OR THE HEIRS OF ANY WHO MAY BE DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10596) for the relief of Adel Lessert Bellmard, Clement Lessert, Josephine Gonvil Pappan, Julie Gonvil Pappan, Pelagie Gonvil Franceour de Aubri, Victore Gonvil Pappan, Marie Gonvil, Lafleche Gonvil, Louis Laventure, Elizabeth Carbonau Vertifelle, Pierre Carbonau, Louis Joncas, Basil Joncas, James Joncas, Elizabeth Datcherute, Joseph Butler, William Rodger, Joseph Cote, four children of Cicili Compare and Joseph James, or the heirs of any who may be deceased.

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

H.R. 10596

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to the following named people the sums of money set opposite their names:

Adel Lessert Bellmard	$----
Clement Lessert	-----
Josephine Gonvil Pappan	-----
Julie Gonvil Pappan	-----
Pelagie Gonvil Franceour deAubri	-----
Victoire Gonvil Pappan	-----
Marie Gonvil	-----
Lafleche Gonvil	-----
Louis Laventure	-----
Elizabeth Carbonau Vertifelle	-----
Pierre Carbonau	-----
Louis Joncas	-----
Basil Joncas	-----
James Joncas	-----
Elizabeth Datcherute	-----
Joseph Butler	-----
William Rodgers	-----
Joseph Cote	-----
Four children of Cicili Compare:	
First	-----
Second	-----
Third	-----
Fourth	-----
Joseph James	-----

Said sums is full satisfaction of all claims against the United States growing out of the loss of Indian lands allotted to them and the failure of the United States to protect the right of possession of the original allottee and their being deprived of the use of said lands; the said allotments being the half-breed Kaw allotments allotted under article 6 of the treaty of June 3, 1825, in the Territory of Kansas.

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to determine the heirs at law of the above named individuals in accordance with the laws of interstate succession of the State of Kansas. Upon the finality of such determinations under the rules and regulations which the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, the Treasurer of the United States shall pay each above named individual's funds to be divided among all persons determined to be his heirs free and clear of any obligations, debts, or claim of that individual or his successors in interest. The sums of money paid hereunder shall not be subject to State or Federal taxes of any kind: *Be it further provided,* That in the event the Secretary of the Interior shall find that as of the effective date of this Act any of the above named individuals have no living heirs at law, he shall make a formal determination of this fact. Such determinations of the nonexistence of heirs at law shall be final and conclusive at the expiration of a date two years from the date of this Act. Upon the finality of such determination of the lack of surviving heirs at law, the share or shares of the above named individuals shall be divided equally among all persons otherwise sharing under the proceeds of this Act. The Treasurer shall distribute the sums accruing to individuals having no heirs based upon the previous determinations made by the Secretary of the Interior or to their successors in interest as determined in appropriate State court probate procedure in the State of residence of any subsequently deceased heir.

The payments provided for hereunder, when accepted by the parties named or their heirs as determined herein, shall be in full and final settlement of any and all claims of the allottees or their heirs of any nature whatsoever concerning the allotments involved.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the persons determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be the heirs of the following named individuals their proportionate intestate share of the amount shown opposite their ancestor's names:

"Adel Lessert Bellmard	$3,200
Clement Lessert	3,200
Josephine Gonvil Pappan	3,200
Julie Gonvil Pappan	3,200
Pelagie Gonvil Franceour de Aubri	3,200
Victoire Gonvil Pappan	3,200
Marie Gonvil	3,200
Lafleche Gonvil	3,200
Louis Laventure	3,200
Elizabeth Carbonau Vertifelle	3,200
Pierre Carbonau	3,200
Louis Joncas	3,200
Basil Joncas	3,200
James Joncas	3,200
Elizabeth Datcherute	3,200
Joseph Butler	3,200
William Rodgers	3,200
Joseph Cote	3,200
Four children of Cicili Compare:	
First	3,200
Second	3,200
Third	3,200
Fourth	3,200
Joseph James	3,200

"The amounts paid under the authority of this Act shall be paid in full and final satisfaction of all claims of the named individuals or their heirs against the United States based upon the loss of Indian lands included in the twenty-three halfbreed Kaw allotments granted the above named individuals under article 6 of the treaty of June 3, 1825 (7 Stat. 244) in the Territory of Kansas and in full satisfaction of any claims of the original allottees or his heirs for the consequent loss of use of the land.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to determine the heirs at law of the above named individuals in accordance with the laws of intestate succession of the State of Kansas. Persons asserting rights to share in the distribution of amounts as provided in this Act as heirs of the persons named in section 1 shall file their claims with the Secretary of the Interior within one year of the effective date of this Act and in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. In the event that the Secretary determines that any of the individuals named in section 1 had no living heirs at law on the effective date of this Act, he shall make a formal determination of this fact, and his determination of the absence of heirs at law shall be final and conclusive as of the date of the expiration of the time for the filing of claims under this Act. Upon determination of heirship as provided for herein, the Secretary of the Interior shall certify the names of the persons entitled to payment to the Secretary of the Treasury together with the amounts he has found to be due in each instance and his determinations as to the amount and the person entitled to receive it shall be final and not subject to appeal.

"SEC. 3. The amounts paid under the authority of this Act are to be free and clear of

any obligations, debts or claims of the original allottees or any successors in interest and are not to be subject to State or Federal taxes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

KATHERINE M. PERAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14749) for the relief of Katherine M. Perakis.

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

H.R. 14749

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of determining the entitlement of Katherine M. Perakis to child's insurance benefits under section 202(d) of the Social Security Act on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of George Perakis (Social Security Account Number [redacted]), of Peabody, Massachusetts, the said Katherine M. Perakis shall be deemed to have been the legally adopted child of the said George Perakis, and to have been dependent upon him, at the time of his death on August 20, 1962.

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

EDWARD DE BUTTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15446) for the relief of Edward de Butts.

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

H.R. 15446

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Edward de Butts of Malibu, California, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $871.27 representing the net amount of an overpayment of compensation made to him as a result of administrative error for his services as a rural letter carrier during the period November 9, 1963, to February 2, 1966 inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward de Butts an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4: Strike "$871.27" and insert "$865.27".

Page 1, line 8: Strike "to February 2, 1966" and insert "through February 11, 1966".

Page 2, line 9: Strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

CAPT. HAROLD G. WILMARTH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9348) for the relief of Capt. Harold G. Wilmarth.

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

H.R. 9348

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Harold G. Wilmarth, captain, United States Air Force ([redacted], is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $4,233.99 the amount of an overpayment of his pay as an officer in the United States Air Force in the period beginning April 5, 1961 and ending March 30, 1964, because of an administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to said Harold G. Wilmarth, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$4,233.99" and insert "$3,610.98".

Page 1, line 7, strike "April 5, 1961" and insert "March 10, 1961".

Page 1, line 8, strike "March 30, 1964" and insert "March 10, 1964, inclusive".

Page 2, line 8, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

JAMES R. KEMP

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11570) for the relief of James R. Kemp.

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

H.R. 11570

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That James R. Kemp, of Juneau, Alaska, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $4,932.01, representing overpayments of salary which he received as a civilian employee of the Alaska communications system, Department of the Air Force, for the period from April 22, 1962, through June 26, 1965, as a result of administrative error in establishing his basic salary at the rate of GS–12, step 6, plus cost-of-living allowance, when he was released from a wage board position at Ketchikan, Alaska, in order to accept a position under the Classification Act of 1949 at Juneau, Alaska, effective April 22, 1962, the said James R. Kemp having consulted officials of the Alaska communications system prior to his change of position and been erroneously assured that his basic salary would be established at such rate, plus such cost-of-living allowance. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said James R. Kemp the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$4,932.01" and insert "$5,142.81".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

OPPOSING THE GRANTING OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE IN THE UNITED STATES TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 1030) opposing the granting of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens.

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

H. RES. 1030

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not approve the granting of permanent residence in the United States to the aliens hereinafter named in which cases the Attorney General has submitted reports to the Congress pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1052, as amended by Public Law 85–885 (8 U.S.C. 1254(a)(1)):

[redacted] Villarba-Reyes, Junior, Florencio.

[redacted], Wang, Rita Shih-Yu.
[redacted], Kim, Joo Il.
[redacted], Bandoy, Tarcila Dagampat.
[redacted], Casil, Hipolito S.
[redacted], Chen, Chao Chiung.
[redacted], Hasan, Syed Shams-Ul.
[redacted], Kassir, Nabil Daoud.
[redacted], Perez-Pacheco, Maria De Los Milagros.
[redacted], Rhee, Hi Joon.
[redacted], Rhee, Ae Suk.
[redacted], Soon, Ock Cha.
[redacted], Wu, Lai Chun.
[redacted], Lee, Shook Hin.
[redacted], Soon, Leslie Gon Fay.
[redacted], Byong, Chon Choi.
[redacted], Goto, Atsushi.
[redacted], Goto, Kyoungwoun Kim.
[redacted], Nakayama, Kenji.
[redacted], Flores-Rosal, Bienvenido.
[redacted], In, Jong Park.
[redacted], Myung, Ja Park.
[redacted], Camerini, Miryam.
[redacted], Doo, Whan Park.
[redacted], Funaki, Toshihiro.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Jose Encanto.
[redacted], Gonzalez, Florentina.
[redacted], Grashian, Anahid Nerses.
[redacted], Lee, Hong Kyu.
[redacted], Lee, Chung Soon.
[redacted], Portela, Maria Amparo Pombo.
[redacted], Shihadi, Michael Isa.
[redacted], Tou, Shu Yin.
[redacted], Young, Shick Shu.
[redacted], Wong, Bing Lin.
[redacted], Chen, Shiao-Chin Andrew.
[redacted], Ly, Yeen Ai.
[redacted], Martinez-Gonzalez, Manuel.
[redacted], Pechdimaldji, Edward.
[redacted], Sabidales, Eulogio Sadsad.
[redacted], Toschi, Carmela.
[redacted], Fernandez-Piquero, Concepcion Aurina.
[redacted], Han, Hong Chai.
[redacted], Bock, Hee Chai.
[redacted], Hyun, Ho Park.
[redacted], Orfanoudis, Fotini.
[redacted], Pedersen, Ejnar Christian.
[redacted], Sancher, Amir C.
[redacted], Yun, Jai Liong.
[redacted], Klobcar, Josip.
[redacted], Ming, Hubert Shiu Chung.
[redacted], Oneto, Yolanda.
[redacted], Chi, Anh Hua.
[redacted], Chan, Debbie Dah-Teh.
[redacted], Gallardo-Gonzalez, Jose Luis.
[redacted], Martinez-Rangel, Jose Juan.
[redacted], Woo, Jook Hong.
[redacted], Rodriguez-Candia, Manuel.
[redacted], Woo, Chew Sheck.
[redacted], Pagdilao, Manuel Pascua.
[redacted], Lee, Kay Sue.
[redacted], Louie, Seow Din.
[redacted], Tong, Goon Lo.
[redacted], Wong, Park Jum.
[redacted], Leong, Tuck Young.
[redacted], Giova, Filippo.
[redacted], Zen, Saleh.
[redacted], Zen (nee Salmiah), Saripah.
[redacted], Domingos-Martins, Albina.
[redacted], Bruschetti, Giacomo.

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

DR. FIDEL RODRIGUEZ-CUBAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 18033) for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez-Cubas.

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

H.R. 18033

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 Fidel Rodriguez-Cubas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of January 1958, and the periods of time he has resided in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the date "January 1958" and substitute in lieu thereof the date "January 15, 1958".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

TO AUTHORIZE AND DIRECT THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION TO QUITCLAIM CERTAIN PROPERTY IN JACKSON COUNTY, ALA., TO SKYLINE CHURCHES CEMETERY, A CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10876) to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

WINSTON LLOYD McKAY

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5213) for the relief of Winston Lloyd McKay, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Winston Lloyd McKay 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."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13448, MAILING PRIVILEGES OF ARMED FORCES AND OTHER GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL OVERSEAS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 13448), to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, The House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on October 7, 1966, considered and unanimously approved the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication and referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

Watershed: Vanar, Wash. Executive communication: 705, 89th Congress.

Watershed: Prides Creek, Ind. Executive communication: 2583, 89th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1024 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1024

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. 51) to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and

ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 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. After the passage of H.R. 51, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 360), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 51 as passed by the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1024 provides for consideration of H.R. 51, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate. After passage of H.R. 51 the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 360, and it shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the House-passed language.

H.R. 51 proposes the creation of a new national lakeshore on Lake Michigan. This area, when established, will be designated the "Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore."

Fifty years ago the value of the 40-mile stretch of dune-covered lakefront at the southern end of Lake Michigan was recognized and the establishment of a national park in the area was recommended. Roads and railways, factories, and homes were located upon much of the land included in that first proposal. Large areas remain in a relatively natural state to make a new national park effort worth while.

The estimated cost of land acquisition under the bill is currently estimated at $21,700,000, but this is subject to change in the event of substantial increases in land values in the vicinity during the purchase period. Actual costs might be less than this amount, however, because of the provisions which suspend the authority of the Secretary to acquire improved residential property by condemnation in certain instances.

Visitor and user fees for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore will be subject to the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The Indiana dunes area on the extreme south shore of Lake Michigan is the only fresh-water beach adjacent to century-old sand dunes and vegetation of all types left on the American Continent.

Ten or twelve years ago I made a speech on the floor of Congress in behalf of establishing a park on the south shore of Lake Michigan.

The Indiana dunes area is located contiguous to the greatest concentration of industry and manufacturing, per square mile, than any similar location in the United States. I refer to the Calumet industrial region of Indiana and the southern part of the city of Chicago.

Northwest Indiana, and especially the Calumet region, has expanded in population and industrially during the last 25 years more than any urban area in the United States. In 1943 Lake County numbered approximately 340,000 people and today the approximate population is around 600,000. In another 10 years a million people will be living in the Calumet region immediately adjacent to the dunes land area. The erection of a national park on the south shore of Lake Michigan would accommodate in the Calumet and Chicago land area, including suburbs, 7 million people. This number of people does not include millions more from northern, southern, and northeastern Indiana and southern Michigan. These people would be within a 1-hour drive of the dunes land national park.

As the Nation's population increases through the coming years, this expansion will naturally call for additional industry and development to provide jobs for future generations. The Federal Government could set aside an area for a national park which would merely take up approximately 6 percent of the 40-mile Indiana Lake Michigan shoreline. Plenty of space will remain for industrial expansion in the future to provide jobs and employment. Vacation and recreational spots will be more scarce as the years pass and it is necessary that we of our generation look into the future and preserve nature's recreational areas for future generations.

Our Federal Government has spent millions in developing parks many hundreds of miles from centers of population and to my knowledge this is one of the few areas where natural wide beaches and recreational space is available close to the center of dense urban population.

Very few of our working families can afford to drive to Alaska, Canada, Maine, and the northern lakes for vacations and recreation.

An internationally known traveler and conservationist has stated that the Indiana Dunes is one of two similar natural combination sand dunes and sand beaches located on fresh inland waters throughout the globe. He testified that the other location was in Europe along the shores of the Baltic Sea. Nature took centuries to bring about the formation of the beautiful Indiana Dunes on the south shore of Lake Michigan. Plenty of space remains along the south shores of Lake Michigan for mills, factories, and other industries, and the setting aside of this national park area would not completely hamper or curtail the expansion of industry in this region.

Legislation has passed Congress this session on air and water pollution which will bring about curtailment and eventual elimination of industrial waste pollution from the waters of southern Lake Michigan and other fresh-water lakes and rivers throughout the Nation. Modern science has already accomplished the methods to eliminate air pollution. With the Federal Government already having taken steps and appropriated money for air and water pollution, it will be but a few years until the waste from the mills and industries located in this area will not, in any way, affect the bathing beaches and open-air recreation qualities in this area.

The State of Indiana is estimated as 23 million acres of land. The present bill calls to set aside 11,000 acres for Federal park purposes—a mere postage stamp when compared with the 2½ billion acres of land throughout the Nation.

Since the Dunes State Park was authorized over 40 years ago inaction and neglect on the part of the State has left this area in about the same condition it was in, with the exception of a few buildings, 40 years ago. On weekends during the summer months in recent years, automobiles were barred from entry after 10 or 11 o'clock in the morning because of lack of parking space. Plenty of space still remains in the area which could be converted into space for automobile parking. Entertainment and recreation buildings which exist in some national parks throughout the Nation have not been built in the Dunes State Park area. Children and youngsters have no amusement such as enjoyed in many other national parks.

The president of the Isaac Walton League in testifying before the committee stated that his organization and all conservation organizations throughout the Nation have endorsed a national lakeshore park in the Indiana Dunes area.

President Johnson not only has endorsed the park in the past, but has reiterated his support in the past week for the establishment of a Dunes State Park.

The Senate, some months ago, has passed the legislation to establish an Indiana Dunes State Park by a large majority. I hope that the pending legislation, H.R. 51, will receive an overwhelming endorsement by our national House of Representatives.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1024 does provide for an open rule with 2 hours of debate for the consideration of the bill H.R. 51, known as the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

According to the information I have, the purpose of the bill is to create a national lakeshore on the southern shore of Lake Michigan.

The proposed site is less than 50 miles from the Chicago-Gary industrial complex. Nine and a half million people live within 100 miles. By 1980 this figure is expected to grow to 11.5 million.

Included within the proposed park boundaries are some 6,000 privately owned acres. A small park of about 3,200 acres is enclosed within the proposed boundaries, and may be donated to the Government.

The proposal is to acquire about 6 miles of beach in addition to about 3.5 miles of State park, and 2 miles of right-of-way.

Except for the State park, almost all lands within the proposed national lake-

shore park are privately owned. It is mostly open space. Land acquisition is estimated to cost $21.7 million, but the report indicates that this figure may be substantially higher before all land is acquired. Owners who desire to remain users of their property for 25 years may do so, and sell their property to the Government.

Park development costs are estimated at $3,292,260. Swimming, camping, and picnicking facilities are planned. Annual operation and maintenance costs are estimated at $375,000 by the fifth year of operation.

I know there is considerable support for this legislation, and I know there is some objection to it. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is strongly opposed to the measure.

One of the things that confuses me about such legislation is the statement made, and from the information that has been given to us, that for 25 years the State of Indiana has not done anything about developing this park, and I would think that they would have done so before this vast amount of money or, rather, this sizable amount of money is requested from the Federal Government.

The only other comment I have to make is that I think we have been very generous this year in our park appropriations, and in the various programs that we have set aside, and I have been pleased to cooperate in them, and to spend a lot of money. And I am wondering if we should not get out of here pretty soon, and put some of these things over until next year, and perhaps the gentleman from Indiana may have some other projects to bring up next year.

So in view of that I will not object to the rule, and I urge its adoption.

I personally propose to vote against the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will use the 10 minutes at this time. I hope to have some time under general debate at which time I will go into this matter at some length. But I have been around here long enough to know that probably when we get into debate on this measure, there will not be many people here just as right now there are not many people here.

In the hearings before the committee, we tried to demonstrate that this is not a sound proposal. I thought that the showing of the opponents of this proposition were on the preponderant side. But the committee decided otherwise. That is their responsibility and I abide by their actions.

I will say at the outset, I am not opposing this rule, making in order the consideration of the bill. We can go ahead and adopt the rule and go on then to the consideration of the bill itself.

I would like to have it understood before we vote on this bill that what is really important here—all of this proposal that really is important is in the congressional district that I have been privileged to represent for many, many years.

Sometimes it has been said that you do not put national parks in the districts of Members of Congress who do not want them. Perhaps that is not the whole truth in this case.

I want to say at this time that to call this a national lake shore dunes bill is a misnomer. I have some books up there if you care to see them.

These are photos of much of this land that is to be taken, and I can say to you that it is not a lakeshore and it is not a dunes.

Of course, there are differences of opinion, as my friend, the gentleman from California, pointed out on this bill. But at this point I want it clearly understood that in this opposition that I have expressed through the years, that the county government in the area that is affected stands with me—they are against it.

The local governments, the county and city governments stand with me—they are against it. They have all so testified.

The Indiana Farm Bureau and the District Farm Bureau appeared and testified against it.

Organized labor representatives—reputable people—they appeared and testified against it.

The chambers of commerce in the affected area are against it.

The Indiana township trustees are against it. I have a telegram from them which just reiterates their position in opposition to this.

The county commissioners of Porter County, and that is where this park is to be located, are against it. They sent their representative, the chairman of their board, down here several times to testify against it.

I might remind my colleagues that I have not gone through the whole list, but in addition to those whom I have mentioned, there are hundreds and hundreds of property owners up there who are going to be vitally affected—and they are against it.

At the outset, I want to make clear that I voted for the wilderness bill which was reported out of this committee. I voted for the land and water resources bill. If this bill is passed, I do not know how long the people involved are going to be hanging in midair waiting for the time to come when they are neither fish nor fowl, saying, "when are we going to sell our property to the Government—where do we stand?"

I do not know how long it will take. We have had a great battle for our port. We were up there as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] said, and he is one of my great friends and one of the most respected Members of this House, and I say that advisedly, but we were there yesterday when Indiana finally after a long time of frustration put up the money and assessed themselves and taxed themselves to build our port.

One of the roadblocks we have had has been this proposal for a park.

I cannot quite agree with my good friend from Indiana that the State of Indiana has been negligent about preserving dunes or providing recreational facilities.

First, 50 years ago my State acquired 3 miles, 2,200 acres of the best dunes up there. You talk about saving the dunes. Indiana does not need anyone to save those dunes.

What is the situation further about that? The gentleman says that Indiana has been remiss. Well, in the hearings—and this was not a recent thing—our Governor, Governor Branigin, who is not of my political party, but who is a great Governor and doing a good job, said:

> We have drafted a plan of action in relation to Indian Dunes State Park. They are going to acquire 180 acres at one end of the park and 320 acres at the other end of the park with supporting facilities.

Then he talks about an ultimate intensive use by 32,000 people of the beach there at Lake Michigan. Why, there is talk here about the area provided for dunes industrial development and beaches. Indiana has only 40 miles of shoreline on the Great Lakes. About 10 miles of it is public beaches. Believe it or not, right now 10 miles of it is private beaches, just like some of you people up in Illinois have private beaches on Lake Michigan. Only 20 miles are involved for industrial development. It seems to me we have done very well with that.

One final word at this juncture. We had a hearing about a landfill. The hearing was held in Valparaiso, Ind., in my district. There were a lot of people who appeared there. I was there, Governor Branigin was there. As a result of that hearing an Associated Press story printed in many papers after the hearing said:

> Indiana can preserve its Lake Michigan dunes without help from Uncle Sam, Governor Roger D. Branigin said Thursday. The Governor in Washington for a White House conference of governors on inflation control responded to remarks by the Secretary of the Interior that the Secretary is ready to throw in the sponge on a proposed $23 million National Lakeshore Park in the dunes.

Then the Secretary said:

> Maybe the thing we should do is to abandon the national park idea and simply help Indiana establish a larger State Park. I would be willing to provide assistance on this, but there is no State in the Union which has shown less zest for a National Park than Indiana, and I do not have much zest myself for people that do not have the zest in this field.

Then the Governor responded to that by saying that the State of Indiana would include $2.5 million to expand our parks in the next budget.

The Governor said:

> We can take care of our own problems. We never asked for anything in the first place. We expect little and we are rarely disappointed.

If you know our Governor, that is typical of him. So at this juncture, folks, we do not need this bill. I want you to understand it is a two-edged sword with me. There are people who want it, some of them up there; but I have told you

about the official representatives of the people involved, and they are against this proposal. I will have a little more to say in more detail later on, but I just hope that when the time comes you will vote with us against this proposal.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RESNICK was granted permission to speak out of order.)

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, everyone is familiar with the old saying that "One good turn deserves another."

It is in the spirit of that old saying that I rise today to return a favor which one of our Republican colleagues recently did for the Democratic Party.

All of this altruism centers around the business of political fundraising.

When my Republican colleagues talk about political fundraising as carried out by the Democrats it suddenly has dark undertones. There are strings attached. The inference is that any contributor to the Democratic Party, regardless of his integrity or amount of personal wealth, gives only if he is assured of getting something in return. The Republicans imply that if a man gives the Democrats a thousand dollars he is getting a fat Government contract in return.

The clever spokesmen for the GOP never really narrow down the accusations. They only allege and imply and infer. In a recent press conference, three Republican Members of the House presented their so-called facts to the press. They alleged wrongdoing all over the place. But when members of the press asked for specific facts, the accusers backed off. They had all kinds of excuses. They said they did not have the money or power to investigate and so on until it must have been obvious to members of the press that if there was any wrongdoing anywhere the GOP had failed to find it.

It was implied that the Democratic President's Club was the brainchild and pet project of Mr. Cliff Carter, former executive director at the Democratic National Committee. Fortunately, one member of the press attending the conference was kind enough to point out to our Republican colleagues that Mr. Carter was nowhere around during the first 3 years of the club's existence. Surely my Republican colleagues recall that the President's Club was started during the Kennedy administration.

I find it interesting that in all the press conferences and speeches the Republicans have been making about Democratic fundraising, not one of them has said one word about contributions to the Republican Party.

One might suppose that if the Democratic political contributions are all so tainted, the Republicans would hold themselves up as some sort of good example. But since they have remained so suspiciously quiet about how the GOP gets its "bread," to use the vernacular, I can only assume that perhaps our friends of the Republican Party do not know anything about their own business. Indeed they must not or surely they would put their own house in order before casting stones at the Democrats.

If they will give me their attention, I will gladly enlighten them about Republican political contributions. I will, by chapter and verse, give them some information they certainly should have. I will as I indicated earlier, return the favor which they most recently did for the Democratic Party by letting the world and their own colleagues know something about GOP finances.

In the first place, I think my Republican friends should know that their party has an organization that, like the Democratic Presidents' Club, has a $1,000 membership fee. The Republican organization is called the Booster Club.

May I say in all fairness that membership in the GOP Boosters Club, like the President's Club, does not guarantee an invitation to the White House. The best they can promise is a handshake with Richard Nixon. And why anyone would pay $1,000 for that is beyond me.

But there is something that arouses my curiosity even more: If my Republican colleagues feel no one can give $1,000 with honest and sincere interest in good politics to the Democrats, why do hundreds give the same amount to the Republican Party?

Now, at the press conference I mentioned earlier, the Republican spokesman alleged that contributors to the President's Club had been rewarded with a Government architectural contract.

One reporter thoughtfully pointed out that the contributions to the President's Club had been made months before the contract was awarded.

Well, as one might expect, having the facts pointed out to the Republican spokesmen did not let a simple matter of the truth get in their way. They merely explained that contributions are sometimes given with the understanding the return favor will be along somewhere down the road.

Perhaps, then, this explains why the Boosters Club received $11,000 from the Pew family of Sun Oil Co. Or why it got $19,000 from the Olin family of Olin Mathieson Corp. Or why the Republicans in a very short period of 2 years received some $50,000 from various persons associated with the Du Pont Chemical Co.

If the logic offered by the Republican spokesmen to the reporter at the press conference holds true, then could those major contributors I have just named be looking down the road until the day when a Republican administration can give them contracts?

The second piece of information I want my Republican colleagues to know is that their leadership is somewhat inconsistent in its refusal to accept contributions to the GOP.

In a press conference more recent than the one to which I have been referring, the minority leader made a major production of returning a check to a member of the John Birch Society who also had his contribution returned by the Democratic Party.

If the minority leader had been consistent, he might well have returned a good many more contributions to the Republican Party by those supporting the John Birch Society.

He might, for example, have returned $1,000 contributed to the Boosters Club by Mr. Fred Loock of Milwaukee, Wis., a member of the John Birch Society's finance committee. That, by the minority leader's criteria, was tainted money.

He might have returned $2,000 given to the boosters club by Mrs. Harry Bradley of the Allen-Bradley Corp., which buys the full-page back cover advertisement of the Birch Society magazine. That was tainted money.

He might have returned all those thousands of dollars given by Mr. Pew, who is a member of the John Birch Society's editorial advisory board. That was tainted money.

And so on down the membership list of the contributors to the Boosters Club are those clearly identified with the John Birch Society.

Finally, I come to the real favor I want to do for my Republican friends.

They have been so kind as to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the list of members to the President's Club that I feel I must reciprocate. So that every Republican will have the opportunity to see who is providing at least part of the "bread" to the GOP, I am asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the membership list of the Boosters Club.

And may I say to my Republican friends that if they are concerned about the number of John Birch Society members they may find among the Boosters Club list, do not fret. I am certain that if the money is to be returned because it is tainted it will not take anything away from their share of the campaign funds. For surely the minority leader in a great and magnanimous gesture will deduct all that tainted money from the contribution he would have received from the Boosters Club for his own campaign.

BOOSTER RECEIPTS, JANUARY 1, 1965 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 1966

ALASKA

Burgess, Lloyd A, Fairbanks, $1,000.

COLORADO

Maytag, L. B., Colorado Springs, $1,000.

GEORGIA

Barge, Alvin, Atlanta, $1,000.
Martin, B. A., Atlanta, $1,000.

IDAHO

McClory, James D., Boise, $1,000.

LOUISIANA

Williams, L. Kemper, $500.

MARYLAND

Jones, Mrs. W. Alton, Easton, $3,000.
McAllister, C. J., Waldorf, $1,000.
McAlpin, William R., Chestertown, $1,000.
Sherwood, Donald H., Towson, $1,000.

ARIZONA

Bloomhardt, Mrs. S. I., Scottsdale, $500.
England, R. T., North Scottsdale, $1,000.
Gardner, Leigh O., Phoenix, $500.
Gillett, John Alanson, Scottsdale, $1,000.

Isbell, Marion, Phoenix, $1,000.
Kieckhefer, Herbert, Scottsdale, $1,000.
Kieckhefer, John, Phoenix, $1,000.
Kieckhefer, Robert, Phoenix, $1,000.
Lewis, Donna Ruth, Phoenix, $1,000.
Lewis, Donna Ruth, Phoenix, $1,000.
Louis, Herbert J., Phoenix, $1,000.
Louis, Herbert J., Phoenix, $1,000.
Louis, Mr. and Mrs. H. J., Scottsdale, $1,000.
Moller, Joseph, Scottsdale, $1,500.
Moller, Mrs. Joseph, Scottsdale, $1,500.
Moller, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A., Scottsdale, $1,000.
Murdough, Charles P., Tucson, $1,000.
Pritzlaff, Mary Olin, Phoenix, $1,000.
Speiden, J. G. F., Tucson, $1,000.
Staggs, Ralph, Phoenix, $1,000.
Sturgis, Henry S., Scottsdale, $500.
Sturgis, Henry S., Scottsdale, $500.
Trailor, Dell, Phoenix, $1,000.

ARKANSAS

Bynum, W. H., Dermott, $500.
Eisele, Garnett M., Hot Springs, $1,000.
Hinshaw, Jerry E., Springdale, $500.
Rockefeller, Winthrop, Little Rock, $1,000.
Rockefeller, Winthrop, Little Rock, $1,000.
Smith, Mrs. Geo., Little Rock, $1,000.

CALIFORNIA

Aerojet Good Citizenship Committee, Azusa, $1,000.
Allen, Bewley, Balboa Island, $1,000.
Awes, Gerald, San Leandro, $1,000.
Awes, Gerald A., San Leandro, $1,000.
Baumhefner, C. H., San Francisco, $1,000.
Baumhefner, C. H., San Francisco, $1,000.
Beaver, R. F., Fullerton, $1,000.
Bechtel, S. D., San Francisco, $1,000.
Bechtel, Stephen D., San Francisco, $1,000.
Beckman, A. O., Corona Del Mar, $1,000.
Beckman, Arnold O., Corona Del Mar, $1,000.
Blomquist, Agnes, Newport Beach, $1,000.
Booth, Frank, Laguna Beach, $1,000.
Bramstedt, W. F., San Francisco, $1,000.
Brawner, A. H., San Francisco, $1,000.
Brawner, W. P. F., San Francisco, $1,000.
Brock, Margaret Martin, Los Angeles, $1,000.
Brokaw, C. S., Corona Del Mar, $500.
Burns, Robert S., Los Angeles, $1,000.
Cameron, Mrs. Helen Dey, Burlingame, $500.
Carter, Joseph J., San Francisco, $1,000.
Carter, Jos., Orinda, $1,000.
Checkering, Sherman, San Francisco, $1,000.
Checkering, Sherman, San Francisco, $1,000.
Clark, Mrs. Alfred B., Santa Barbara, $3,000.
Cochran, Dwight M., San Francisco, $1,000.
Coldwell, Colbert, San Francisco, $1,000.
Copley, James S., La Jolla, $1,000.
Copley, James S., La Jolla, $1,000.
Cortese, Ross W., Seal Beach, $1,000.
Crocker, Roy P., Los Angeles, $1,000.
Daley, Don, San Diego, $1,000.
Davies, Paul L., San Jose, $1,000.
De y Cameron, Helen, Burlingame, $1,000.
DiGrorgio, Robert, San Francisco, $1,000.
Disney, Walter E., Burbank, $3,000.
Duffield, Marshall, Newport Beach, $500.
Early, Harry J., Los Angeles, $500.
Fluor, J. S., Los Angeles, $500.
Fluor, J. S., Los Angeles, $1,000.
Folger, J. A., San Francisco, $1,000.
Frelinghuysen, George G., Beverly Hills, $1,000.
Friden, Stanley M., San Francisco, $1,000.
Friden, Stanley M., San Francisco, $1,000.
Giorgio, Robert D., San Francisco, $1,000.
Goldwater for President Committee, San Francisco, $2,096.24.
Guggenheim, Robert, Jr., Dover Shores, $1,000.
Haag, George, II, Newport Beach, $1,000.
Haas, Walter, San Francisco, $1,000.
Harris, Stanley A., Woodside, $1,000.
Havard, Mr. and Mrs. Edward, Atherton, $2,000.
Hellman, Marco F., San Francisco, $1,000.
Hewlett, William R., Palo Alto, $500.
Hewlett, William R., Palo Alto, $500.
Hills, Leslie, San Francisco, $1,000.
Hoag, George II, Newport Beach, $1,000.
Holstein, George M., III, Costa Mesa, $1,000.
Hope, Frank L., San Diego, $1,000.
Hotchkis, Preston, Los Angeles, $500.
Hotchkis, Mrs. Preston, San Marino, $500.
Howard, Dr. and Mrs. Edward, Atherton, $500.
Hume, Jaquelin H., San Francisco, $1,000.
Hume, Jaquelin H., San Francisco, $1,000.
Jameson, Frank G., La Jolla, $1,000.
Jameson, Frank Gard, La Jolla, $1,000.
Johnson, Leland H., Atherton, $1,000.
Kaiser, Leland, San Francisco, $2,000.
Kaiser, Leland M., San Francisco, $1,000.
Keith, Willard W., Los Angeles, $1,000.
Keith, Willard W., Beverly Hills, $1,000.
Kelly, Mrs. Paul B., Santa Rosa, $1,000.
Knott, Walter, Buena Park, $1,000.
Knott, Walter, Buena Park, $1,000.
Knudsen, Mrs. Valley, Los Angeles, $500.
Knudson, Thomas R., Los Angeles, $1,000.
Knudson, Thomas R., Los Angeles, $2,000.
Launder, E. J., Whittier, $1,000.
LeMasters, Earle H., San Francisco, $500.
LeMasters, Earle H., San Francisco, $1,000.
McBean, Antholl, San Francisco, $1,000.
McBean, Antholl, San Francisco, $500.
McIntosh, John, Santa Ana, $1,000.
McKee, R. L., San Francisco, $3,000.
McPherson, Stewart S., Santa Ana, $1,000.
MacLeod, John, Newport Beach, $1,000.
Norris, K. T., Los Angeles, $1,000.
Madison, Mr. and Mrs. Marshall P., San Francisco, $1,000.
Medd, Henry J., Los Angeles, $1,000.
Moore, Joseph, Jr., San Francisco, $1,000.
Mosher, Samuel B., Los Angeles, $1,000.
Nohl, Louis E., Olive, $1,000.
Norris, K. T., Los Angeles, $1,000.
Odell, Robert S., San Francisco, $1,000.
Oliphant, Ken, La Habra, $1,000.
Packard, David, Los Altos Hills, $500.
Palmer, P. A., Newport Beach, $1,000.
Peters, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert, Beverly Hills, $500.
Peterson, T. S., San Francisco, $500.
Richard, O. W., Newport Beach, $500.
Roth, Mrs. S. William P., San Francisco, $1,000.
Roth, Mrs. William P., San Francisco, $1,000.
Russell, Henry P. (Mrs.), San Francisco, $1,000.
Schmid, W. R., Garden Grove, $500.
Schmid, Walter R., Garden Grove, $500.
Sesnon, Porter, San Francisco, $1,000.
Smith, William French, Los Angeles, $1,000.
Smith, C. Arnholt, San Diego, $1,000.
Toupin, Arthur V., San Francisco, $1,000.
Voit, Willard D., Balboa, $1,000.
Wheeler, Charles S., Corona Del Mar, $1,000.
Whitman, Frederick C., San Francisco, $1,000.
Winnett, P. G., Los Angeles, $1,000.
Wood, Adrian G., Santa Barbara, $1,000.
Wood, Mrs. Paul W., San Francisco, $750.

CONNECTICUT

Barney, Austin D., Farmington, $1,000.
Barney, Austin D., Farmington, $500.
Cole, A. L., Greenwich, $1,000.
Deeds, Chas. W., Farmington, $1,000.
Deeds, Chas. W., Hartford, $1,000.
Deeds, Mrs. Chas. W., Hartford, $1,000.
Fitzgerald, Clifford, Greenwich, $1,000.
Fuller, Alfred C., Hartford, $1,000.
Fuller, Alfred C., Hartford, $2,000.
Harris, Mr. and Mrs. David, Salisbury, $1,000.
Harris, David, Salisbury, $1,000.
Harris, Wm. R., Salisbury, $1,000.
Holden, Reuben A., New Haven, $500.
Hufty, Page, Bethesda, $1,000.
Linen, Jas. A., III, Greenwich, $1,000.
Meek, Samuel W., Greenwich, $1,000.
Merck, Mrs. Geo. W., Greenwich, $1,000.
Newington, Barbara, Greenwich, $1,000.
Newington, John C., Greenwich, $1,000.
Patterson, Robert L., Greenwich, $1,000.
Simmons, Grant G., Greenwich, $1,000.
Stubbs, Merrill, Essex, $3,000.
Teagle, Mrs. Walter C., Byram, $1,000.
Teagle, Mrs. Walter C., Byram, $1,000.

DELAWARE

Beadle, Walter J., Wilmington, $500.
Beadle, Walter J., Wilmington, $500.
Brayman, Harold, Wilmington, $600.
Bredin, J. Bruce, Greenville, $1,000.
Buck, Mary S., Wilmington, $976.35.
Carpenter, E. N. II, Wilmington, $1,000.
Carpenter, W. S., Jr., Wilmington, $500.
Carpenter, W. S., Jr., Wilmington, $1,000.
Copeland, Lammont duPont, Wilmington, $3,000.
Copeland, Mrs. Lammont duPont, Wilmington, $1,000.
Copeland, Lammont duPont, Greenville, $3,000.
Downs, Robert N., Wilmington, $1,000.
Downs, Robert N. Wilmington, $500.
Downs, Robert, Wilmington, $1,000.
Downs, Mrs. Robert N., III, Wilmington, $1,000.
Du Pont, Reynolds, Wilmington, $1,000.
Du Pont, Reynolds, Wilmington, $1,000.
Du Pont, Reynolds, Wilmington, $1,000.
Flint, Mrs. Robert B., Wilmington, $500.
Flint, Mrs. Robert B., Wilmington, $500.
Grasselli, C. A., II, Wilmington, $1,000.
Grasselli, C. A., II, Wilmington, $1,000.
Greenewalt, Crawford H., Wilmington, $1,000.
Greenewalt, Crawford, Granville, $1,000.
Harrington, Charles J., Wilmington, $3,000.
McCoy, C. B., Wilmington, $1,000.
May, Mrs. Ernest N. Wilmington, $1,000.
Raskob, William F., Wilmington, $1,000.
Raskob, William, Wilmington, $1,000.
Riegel, Mrs. Richard, Montchanin, $1,000.
Ross, Donald P., Wilmington, $1,000.
Sharp, Bayard, Wilmington, $1,000.
Sharp, Bayard, Wilmington, $1,000.
Sharp, Hugh R., Jr., Wilmington, $1,000.
Worth, William A., Wilmington, $1,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Bayne, Mrs. J. Breckinridge, $1,000.
Bayne, Mrs. J. Breckenridge, $1,000.
Brock, William E., III, $1,000.
Brock, William E., $1,000.
Cox, Mrs. Raymond E., $1,000.
Cox, Mrs. Raymond, $1,000.
D.C. Republican Dinner Committee 1965, $20,693.
DuPont, Marcella Millu, $1,000.
Gardner, A., $1,000.
Gardner, Arthur, $1,000.
Gardner, Mrs. Arthur, $1,000.
Gardner, the Honorable and Mrs. Arthur, $2,000.
Gardner, Suzanne A., $1,000.
Garrett, George A., $500.
Garrett, Mrs. George, $1,000.
Hanway, John, II, $1,000.
Kunkel, John C., $1,000.
Know, Katherine McCook, $1,000.
Lankford, Thomas J., $1,000.
McBalir, William, $500.
Marriott, J. Willard, $1,000.
Marsh, John D., $1,000.
Munson, Mrs. Curtis, $1,000.
Nevius, John A., $1,000.
Patterson, Jefferson, $1,000.
Patterson, Jefferson, $1,000.
Patterson, Jefferson, $1,000.
Warner, Mr. and Mrs. John W., $1,000.
Watts, Philip H., $500.
Wilson, Orme, $500.
Wilson, Orme, $500.

Wrather, Alice D., $1,000.
Wrather, Mrs. W. E., $1,000.

FLORIDA

Aubinoe, Mrs. Alvin L., Delray Beach, $500.
Brown, Robert Andrew, Palm Beach, $1,000.
Carpenter, William K., Fort Lauderdale, $1,000.
Carpenter, William K., Fort Lauderdale, $1,000.
Davies, Mrs. Charles S., Palm Beach, $1,000.
Duberg, Mr. and Mrs. H. P. T., Hobe Sound, $1,000.
Du Manoir, Mr. and Mrs. George, Hobe Sound, $1,000.
Kelley, Russell P., Palm Beach, $1,000.
Kelley, Mrs. Solon C., Jr., Hobe Sound, $1,000.
Kelley, Mrs. Solon C., Jr., Hobe Sound, $1,000.
Lattner, Forrest C., Delray Beach, $1,000.
McConnell, Robert E., Hobe Sound, $500.
Markey, Mrs. Gene, Miami Beach, $3,000.
Marsten, Hunter S., Hobe Sound, $500.
Marsten, Hunter, Hobe Sound, $1,000.
Merck, Mrs. George W., Hobe Sound, $1,000.
Meyeringh, Petrus W., Hobe Sound, $1,000.
Noyes, Mrs. N. H., Hobe Sound, $1,000.
Ordway, Ellen G., Palm Beach, $1,000.
Ordway, Ellen G., Palm Beach, $1,000.
Pelton, C. S., Palm Beach, $500.
Pelton, Clyde S., Palm Beach, $500.
Richards, Bartlett, Jupiter, $1,000.
Runnello, Mrs. Clive, Hobe Sound, $1,000.
Seyburn, Mrs. Wisson, Palm Beach, $1,000.
Sullivan, Bolton, Hobe Sound, $1,000.
Swenson, Edward F., Jr., Miami, $1,000.
Trout, Thaddeus R., Palm Beach, $1,000.
Woddell, C. Emmett, Palm Beach, $500.

ILLINOIS

Archambault, Bennett, Chicago, $500.
Armor, Mrs. Laurance, Lake Forest, $1,000.
Armour, Lester, Chicago, $1,000.
Armour, Lester, Chicago, $1,000.
Bard, Ralph A., Chicago, $500.
Bard, Ralph A. Sr., Chicago, $1,000.
Bent, John P., Lake Forest, $1,000.
Bent, Mrs. John P., Lake Forest, $1,000.
Buchanan, D. W., Chicago, $1,000.
Carney, William Roy, Lake Forest, $500.
Carney, Mrs. William Roy, Lake Forest, $500.
Clarke, Philip R., Chicago, $1,000.
Coleman, Mrs. John Sr., Lake Forest, $500.
Cowles, Mrs. Alfred, Lake Forest, $1,000.
Cowles, Mrs. Alfred, Lake Forest, $1,000.
Cummings, Dexter, Chicago, $1,000.
Cummings, Dexter, Chicago, $500.
Dick, Edison, Chicago, $1,000.
Dick, Edison, Chicago, $500.
Dick, Edison, Chicago, $500.
Dixon, Arthur, Chicago, $500.
Dixon, Arthur, Chicago, $500.
Donnelley, Elliott, Chicago, $500.
Donnelley, Gaylord, Libertyville, $1,000.
Douglas, Jas. H. Jr., Chicago, $500.
Douglas, Jas. H., Chicago, $500.
Farr, Newton C., Chicago, $1,000.
Farr, Newton C., Chicago, $1,000.
Felzer, Wade Jr., Chicago, $500.
Felzer, Wade Jr., Chicago, $500.
Fentreso, Mrs. Calvin, Lake Forest, $500.
Field, Joseph N., Lake Forest, $1,000.
Gardna, Addison Jr., Evanston, $1,000.
Gaylord, Clayton R., Rockford, $500.
Gwinn, Robert P., Chicago, $500.
Hales, Mrs. Marion J., Winnetka, $1,000.
Harris, Stanley G., Winnetka, $3,000.
Hoffner, Mrs. Charles C., Jr., Lake Forest, $500.
Hubachek, Chicago, $1,000.
Hutckins, John C., Chicago, $500.
Kelley, Mr. and Mrs. Russell P., Lake Forest, $1,000.
Keith, Mrs. Stanley, Lake Forest, $1,000.
Kiddoo, Gay D., Winnetka, $500.
Langhorne, Mrs. George Tayloe, Chicago, $1,000.
Leslie, John W., Chicago, $1,000.
Leslie, John W., Chicago, $3,000.
Leslie, John Woodworth, Chicago, $1,000.
Leslie, Mrs. John W., Evanston, $1,000.
Louis, John J. Jr., Chicago, $1,000.
Louis, John J. Jr., Chicago, $1,000.
Louis, Mrs. John J., Evanston, $1,000.
Louis, Mrs. John J., Evanston, $2,000.
Louis, Mrs. John J., Evanston, $3,000.
Louis, Michael W., Evanston, $1,000.
Louis, Michael W., Evanston, $1,000.
Lourie, Donald B., Chicago, $1,000.
Lunding, Franklin J., Chicago, $500.
Lunding, Mrs. Virginia, Wilmette, $500.
McCone, Fairfax, Chicago, $1,000.
McCormick, Fowler, Chicago, $1,000.
McDermott, E. H., Chicago, $500.
McGaw, Foster G., Evanston, $1,000.
McGaw, Foster G., Evanston, $1,000.
McNally, Andrew, III, Chicago, $1,000.
Mathews, Harry B., Jr., Alton, $3,000.
Mathews, Harry B., Jr., Alton, $2,500.
Mathews, Mrs. Harry B., Jr., Alton, $3,000.
Mathews, Harry B., Jr., Alton, $2,500.
Milligan, Robert L., Evanston, $1,000.
Mitchell, William, Chicago, $1,000.
Mitchell, William, Chicago, $1,000.
Morrison, Paul L., Evanston, $500.
Nielsen, Arthur C., Sr., Chicago, $500.
Nielsen, Arthur C., Sr., Chicago, $1,000.
Olin, John M., East Alton, $2,500.
Olin, John M., East Alton, $1,000.
Olin, John M., East Alton, $2,000.
Olin, Spencer T., East Alton, $3,000.
Patterson, William A., Chicago, $1,000.
Pirie, Mrs. Gordon L., Chicago, $1,000.
Pirie, Nancy Palmer, Chicago, $1,000.
Peterkin, Daniel, Jr., Chicago, $1,000.
Rayniak, Joseph L., Waukegan, $500.
Reid, Robert H., Chicago, $1,000.
Roberts, J. M. Sr., Franklin Park, $1,000.
Rockefeller, J., Prentice, $1,000.
Runnells, John, Lake Forest, $500.
Runnells, John, Lake Forest, $1,000.
Runnells, John, Lake Forest, $1,000.
Runnells, Mrs. Clive, Lake Forest, $1,000.
Ryerson, Edward, Chicago, $1,000.
Ryerson, Edward, Chicago, $1,000.
Ryerson, Mrs. Edward, Chicago, $1,000.
Ryerson, Mrs. Edward, Chicago, $1,000.
Searle, William, Chicago, $1,000.
Searle, John G., Chicago, $1,000.
Searle, John, Chicago, $1,000.
Searle, John, Chicago, $1,000.
Searle, William L., Lake Forest, $1,000.
Searle, John, Chicago, $1,000.
Slater, Mrs. Dennan J., Evanston, $1,000.
Smith, Edward Byron, Chicago, $500.
Smith, Solomon Byron, Chicago, $500.
Solinsky, Robert S., Chicago, $3,000.
Solinsky, Robert S., Chicago, $3,000.
Spencer, Gertrude, Chicago, $1,000.
Spencer, Gertrude White, Chicago, $1,000.
Stone, W. Clement, Chicago, $3,000.
Stone, W. Clement, Chicago, $3,000.
Stuart, R. Douglas, Chicago, $1,500.
Stuart, R. Douglas, Chicago, $1,500.
Stuart, Mrs. R. Douglas, Chicago, $1,500.
Stuart, Mrs. R. Douglas, Chicago, $1,500.
Stuart, John, Chicago, $1,000.
Stuart, John, Chicago, $1,000.
United Republican Fund of Illinois, Chicago, $1,000.
Vail, Derrick T., Chicago, $500.
Watt, Herbert J., Barrington, $1,000.
Waud, Morrison, Chicago, $500.
Waud, Morrison, Chicago, $500.
Waud, Morrison, Chicago, $1,000.
Wetmore, H. O., Chicago, $1,000.
Wetmore, H. O. Chicago, $1,000.
Wells, Edward K., Chicago, $1,000.
White, William P., Chicago, $500.
Willes, Donald P., Lake Forest, $500.
Willes, Donald P., Lake Forest, $1,000.
Willes, Donald P., Lake Forest, $1,000.
Wilson, John P. Jr., Chicago, $500.
Wilson, John P., Chicago, $1,000.
Wiman, Mrs. Chas. Diere, Moline, $1,000.
Wood, Robert E., Chicago, $2,573.80.
Wrigley, Philip K., Chicago, $1,000.

INDIANA

Beardsley, Walter, Elkhart, $1,000.
Carmichael, Oliver C., South Bend., $1,000.
Honeywell, Mrs. Mark, Wabash, $1,000.
Morris, Ella L., South Bend, $1,000.
Noyes, Mrs. Marguerite L., Indianapolis, $1,000.
Noyes, Marguerite L., Indianapolis, $1,000.
Noyes, N. H., Indianapolis, $1,000.
Noyes, Nicholas, H., Indianapolis, $1,000.
Noyes, Nicholas H., Indianapolis, $1,000.
Pantzer, Kurt F., Indianapolis, $1,000.
Ransburg, Harold, Indianapolis, $1,000.
Reagan, Silas B., Indianapolis, $500.
Teetor, Ralph, Hagerstown, $1,000.

IOWA

Camp, Jas. M., Des Moines, $1,000.
Farver, Paul V., Pella, $500.
Hoerner, R. N., Keokuk, $1,000.
Ruan, John, Des Moines, $1,000.
Weissenburger, G. L., Keokuk, $1,000.
Whitfield, Allen, Des Moines, $1,000.

KANSAS

Cray, Cloud L., Atchison, $1,000.
Garvey, Mrs. Olive W., Wichita, $1,122.30.
Nichols, J. C. Jr., Prairie Village, $1,000.
Patterson, Robert M., Shawnee Mission, $1,000.
Wallingford, Sam P., Wichita, $1,000.
Williams, Robert L., Wichita, $1,000.

MAINE

Boyer, Mrs. Francis, Northeast Harbor, $1,000.
Ford, Mrs. Edsel, Seal Harbor, $3,000.
Gates, Thomas S., Northeast Harbor, $1,000.
Guckes, Mrs. P. Exton, Camden, $1,000.
Hutchins, Curtis M., Bangor, $1,000.
Langhorne, Mrs. George Tayloe, Northeast Harbor, $1,000.
McCabe, Thomas B., Northeast Harbor, $1,000.
McCabe, Mrs. Thomas B., Northeast Harbor, $1,000.
McWilliams, Mrs. Charles D., Seal Harbor, $1,000.
Norris, Jas. K., Northeast Harbor, $1,000.
Thacher, Mrs. Thomas D., Northeast Harbor, $500.
Webber, Oscar, Seal Harbor, $1,000.

MASSACHUSETTS

Adams, Chas. F., Dover, $1,000.
Ames, David, North Easton, $1,000.
Ames, Mrs. David, North Easton, $500.
Ames, John S., Jr., Boston, $1,000.
Anderson, O. Kelley, Boston, $1,000.
Anderson, O. Kelley, Boston, $1,000.
Brace, Lloyd D., Boston, $1,000.
Brewster, Wm. S., Boston, $1,000.
Bright, Horace O., Boston, $1,000.
Clapp, Eugene, Boston, $1,000.
Coolidge, Wm. A., Cambridge, $3,000.
Crane, Bruce, Dalton, $500.
Crane, Bruce, Dalton, $500.
Crane, Bruce, Dalton, $500.
Curtis, Laurence, Boston, $1,000.
Curtis, Lawrence, Boston, $1,000.
Gardner, G. Peabody, Boston, $1,000.
Gilbert, Carl Joyce, Dover, $1,000.
Gilbert, Carl Joyce, Dover, $1,000.
Greer, Don S., Winchester, $1,000.
Harte, Mr. and Mrs. Richard, Brookline, $2,000.
Hodges, Chas. E., Wakefield, $1,000.
Lewis, Thos. M. II, Raynham Center, $1,000.
Lewis, Thos. M. II, Raynham Center, $1,000.
Lodge, Henry Cabot, Beverly, $500.
McConnell, Wm. C., Jr., Medford, $500.
McConnell, Wm. C., Winchester, $500.
Peabody, Amelia, Boston, $1,000.
Peabody, Amelia, Boston, $1,000.
Robinson, Dwight, Jr., Boston, $500.
Robinson, Dwight P., Jr., Boston, $1,000.
Roland, Benjamin Allen, Lawrence, $1,000.
Saltonstall, Leverett, Boston, $1,000.
Saltonstall, Richard, Boston, $1,000.
Sprague, Robert C., North Adams, $1,000.
Sprague, Robert, North Adams, $1,000.
Vance, Henry T., Boston, $1,000.
Volpe, John A., Boston, $1,000.
Volpe, John A., Boston, $1,000.
Waring, Lloyd B., Boston, $1,000.
Webster, Mrs. Edwin S., Chestnut Hill, $1,000.

Webster, Mrs. Edwin S., Chestnut Hill, $1,000.
Weeks, Sinclair, Boston, $500.
Witherby, Mrs. Frederick, Boston, $500.
Witherby, Mrs. Frederick, Boston, $800.
Whitney, Geo. K., Concord, $1,000.
Wood, C. A., Andover, $1,000.

MICHIGAN

Bentley, Alvin M., Owosso, $1,000.
Beresford, Mr. and Mrs. Jas. A., Bloomfield Hills, $1,000.
Clark, Wm. Rieve, Detroit, $3,000.
Earhart, Richard, Ann Arbor, $1,000.
Fisher, Max M., Detroit, $1,000.
Ford, Mrs. Edsel B., Grosse Point, $3,000.
Gillmore, Mrs. Donald, Kalamazoo, $1,000.
Hill, Merritt, Union Lake, $500.
Holton, Addison, Grosse Point, $1,000.
Jones, Gordon M., Holland, $1,000.
Kanzler, Ernest, Detroit, $1,000.
McClure, Harold M., Jr., Alma, $1,000.
Raphael, Mrs. Theophile, Ann Arbor, $1,000.
Repub. State Finance Cmte., Lansing, $7,000.
Romney, Geo. W., East Lansing, $1,000.
Skinner, Sherrod E., Bloomfield Hills, $1,000.
Webber, Oscar, Grosse Point Farms, $1,000.

MINNESOTA

Bennett, Russell H., Minneapolis, $2,000.
Bennett, Russell H., Minneapolis, $1,000.
Brothers, Raymond J., Minneapolis, $1,000.
Budd, John M., St. Paul, $1,000.
Congdon, Dorothy Moore, Duluth, $1,000.
Congdon, Robert, Duluth, $1,000.
Gainey, Daniel James, Owatonna, $1,000.
Heffelfinger, F. Peavey, Minneapolis, $500.
Heffelfinger, F. Peavey, Minneapolis, $1,000.
McNeely, Donald G., St. Paul, $500.
Musser, John M., St. Paul, $500.
Myers, John H., St. Paul, $1,000.
Paper, William D., St. Paul, $1,000.
Polk, Louis Frederick, Jr., Minneapolis, $1,000.
Sieger, Walter G., St. Paul, $500.
Sieger, Walter G., St. Paul, $1,000.
Slade, G. Norman, White Bear Lake, $1,000.
Walker, A. D., Minneapolis, $1,000.
Walker, Archie D., Minneapolis, $1,000.
Weyerhaeuser, F. K., St. Paul, $1,000.
Weyerhaeuser, Frederick K., St. Paul. $1,000.
Whitney, Wheelock, Minneapolis, $500.

MISSOURI

Douthat, E. M., Kansas City, $1,000.
Gates, Robert H., Webster Groves, $1,000.
Gates, Robert H., Webster Groves, $1,000.
Higdon, J. C., Kansas City, $1,000.
Jones, Cliff C., Kansas City, $1,000.
Jones, Laurence R., Jr., Kansas City, $1,000.
Lyddon, Jack R., Kansas City, $3,000.
Olin, Spencer T., St. Louis, $2,000.
Olin, Spencer T., St. Louis, $2,000.
Orthwein, William R., Jr., St. Louis, $500.
Orthwein, W. R., Jr., St. Louis, $500.
Orthwein, W. R., Jr., St. Louis, $500.
Queeny, Edgar M., St. Louis, $500.
Queeny, Edgar M., St. Louis, $2,000.
Sunnen, Joseph, St. Louis, $1,000.
Sunnen, Joseph, St. Louis, $500.
Sverdrup, L. J., St. Louis, $500.
Williams, Eugene F., Jr., St. Louis, $500.
Young, Richard A., St. Louis, $1,000.

NEBRASKA

Batchelder, Mr. and Mrs. Clifton B., Omaha, $3,000.
Bekins, Marvin, Omaha, $1,000.
Curtis, Fred P., Omaha, $1,000.
Day, John, Omaha $1,000.
Gilmore P. L., Omaha, $1,000.
Hillmer, Duane H., Omaha, $1,000.
Hosford, W. D., Jr., Omaha, $1,000.
Jacobs, Maury Omaha, $1000.
Johnson, Richard W., Omaha, $1,000.
Mattson, Lloyd H., Omaha, $1,000.
Melia, F. J., Omaha $1,000.
Owen, E. F., Omaha, $1,000.
Paxton, Charles L. Jr., Omaha, $500.
Pettis, Donald L., Omaha, $500.
Schenken, John R., Omaha, $1,000.
Swanson, Gilbert C., Omaha, $1000.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Weeks, Sinclair, Lancaster, $500.

NEW JERSEY

Bobst, Elmer Holmes, Morris Plains, $500.
Bobst, Elmer H., Morris Plains, $500.
Dorrance, John T., Jr., Camden, $1,000.
Dorrance, John T., Camden $1,000.
Marrion Louis E., Brielle, $1,000.
Pasons, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Lester, Jr., Short Hills, $1,000.
Reisweber, G. B., Montclair, $1,000.
Reisweber, Mrs. G. B., Montclair, $1,000.
Rooke, Robert L., Newark, $1,000.
Sellars, Richard B., New Brunswick $1,000.
Shanley, Maureen S., Newark, $1,000.
Stuyvesant, Mrs. R. Pierrepont, Princeton, $1,000.

NEW MEXICO

McCune, Marshall, Tesuque, $1,000.
McCune, Marshall, Tesuque, $3,000.

NEW YORK

A Million Women for Goldwater Committee, New York City, $5,000.
Addinsell, H. M., New York City, $3,000.
Aldrich, Winthrop W., New York City, $3,000.
Aldrich, Mrs. Winthrop W., New York City, $3,000.
Aldrich, Mrs. Winthrop W., New York City, $1,000.
Alford, W. J., New York City, $1,000.
Ashei, John R., Buffalo, $1,000.
Astor, Mrs. W. Vincent, New York City, $3,000.
Bache, Harold L., New York City, $1,000.
Baker, George F., Jr., New York City, $1,000.
Bewley, George W., Lockport, $1,000.
Bewley, George W., Lockport, $1,000.
Beinecke, William S., New York City, $1,000.
Boscowitz, Mrs. H. Hubert, New York City, $1,000.
Bostwick, Mrs. Albert C., Westbury, $500.
Bourne, Mary Elizabeth, New York City, $1,000.
Bruce, Alisa M., New York City, $500.
Bruce, Alisa M., New York City, $1,000.
Burns, John L., New York City, $1,000.
Bush, James Smith, Fishers Island, $1,000.
Calder, Mrs. Louis, Jr., Armonk, $1,000.
Campbell, H. Donald, New York City, $500.
Chadwick, Mrs. E. Gerry, New York City, $1,000.
Champion, George, New York City, $1,000.
Champion, George, New York City, $1,000.
Cheatham, Owen R., New York City, $1,500.
Chenery, Christopher T., New York City, $1,000.
Clay, Lucius D., New York City, $1,000.
Clark, Mr. and Mrs. Van Alan, New York City, $1,000.
Clark, Mr. and Mrs. Van Alan, New York City, $3,000.
Davies, Gordon, White Plains, $500.
Dickinson, Hunt T., New York City, $1,000.
Dickinson, Hunt T., New York City, $500.
Dillon, Robert E., Buffalo, $1,000.
Dwision, F. Trube, Locust Valley, L.I., $1,000.
Dyson, Charles H., Scarsdale, $1,000.
Ellis, John, New York City, $1,000.
Fitzhugh, Gilbert W., New York City, $1,000.
Flanigan, Mrs. Horace C., Purchase, $1,000.
Garbusch, Col. Edgar W., New York City, $1,000.
Gates, Thomas S., New York City, $1,000.
Gelb, Richard L., New York City, $1,000.
Gerry, Edward H., Westbury, L.I., $500.
Gerry, Henry A., New York City, $1,000.
Gerry, Henry A., New York City, $1,000.
Gerry, Martha F., Westbury, L.I., $500.
Gerry, Mrs. Robert L., Jr., Long Island, $1,000.
Graustein, G. Archibald R., New York City, $1,000.
Haider, Michael L., New York City, $1,000.
Halsey, Van R., New York City, $1,000.
Halsey, Van R., New York City, $1,000.
Hanes, John W., New York City, $3,000.
Hanes, John W., New York City, $500.
Hannon, Kenneth H., New York City, $500.
Hannon, Kenneth H., New York City, $1,000.
Harriman, E. Roland, New York City, $3,000.
Harriman, Mrs. E. Roland, New York City, $1,000.
Harriman, E. Roland, New York City, $2,500.
Hickox, Mrs. Charles V., Long Island, $1,000.
Hickox, Charles V., Long Island, $1,000.
Hilson, Mrs. Edwin, New York City, $500.
Hinman, Edward, Jr., New York City, $500.
Hitesman, Walter W., Jr., Bedford, $1,000.
Holbrook, John, New York City, $1,000.
Holbrook, John, New York City, $1,000.
Holmes, Carl, New York City, $500.
Ireland, R. L., III, New York City, $500.
Jackson, H. Arnold, Fishers Island, $1,000.
Kappel, Frederick R., New York City, $500.
Kennedy, David O'D., Oyster Bay, Long Island, $3,000.
Kernan, Francis, New York City, $500.
Knox, Seymour H., Buffalo, $3,000.
Larmon, Sigrud S., New York City, $1,000.
Larmon, Sigrud S., New York City, $1,000.
Laughlin, Mrs. W. K., Southampton, $1,000.
Legendre, Gertrude S., Fishers Island, $1,000.
Levering, Walter B., New York City, $1,000.
Lewis, Hobart, Katonha, $1,000.
Lewis, Madison H., New York City, $1,000.
Lindsley, Thayer, New York City, $500.
Livingston, Goodhue, New York City, $1,000.
Loomis, Alfred Lee, Jr., New York City, $1,000.
Loomis, Alfred J., Jr., New York City, $1,000.
Loomis, Ellen F., New York City, $3,000.
Loomis, Mrs. Farnsworth, New York City, $3,000.
Lynch, Mrs. Esmund C., New York City, $1,000.
McConce, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas, Fishers Island, $1,000.
McCrary, Mrs. Douglas A., Long Island, $1,000.
McDonald, Mrs. Ian, New York City, $1,000.
McIntosh, Allan, New York City, $2,000.
McIntosh, Allan J., New York City, $1,000.
Mallory, Philip Rogers, Fishers Island, $1,000.
Mason, Randolph, New York City, $1,000.
Middendorf, J. William II, New York City, $1,000.
Meek, Samuel W., New York City, $500.
Milbank, Mrs. Jeremiah, New York City, $1,000.
Milbank, Jeremiah, New York City, $1,000.
Milbank, Jeremiah, New York City, $1,000.
Milbank, Jeremiah, Jr., New York City, $1,000.
Milbank, Mrs. Jeremiah, Sr., $1,000.
Moog, William C., East Aurora, $1,000.
Moore, William H. New York City, $1,000.
Morris, Arthur, White Plains, $1,000.
Morris, Edna, B., New York City, $1,000.
Morris, Mrs. John A., New York City. $1,000.
Morrison, Lydia M., New York City, $3,000.
Morrison, Thomas J., New York City, $3,000.
Morrison, Mrs. Thomas J., New York City, $1,000.
Morrison, Thomas J., New York City, $1,000.
Motley, Arthur H., New York City, $1,000.
Natelson, Morris, New York City, $500.
Norris, Mr. and Mrs. James K., New York City, $500.
Noyes, Jansen, New York City, $1,000.
Paterson, Mrs. Charles C., New York City, $1,000.
Peabody, Mrs. Paul E., Millbrook, $1,000.
Peabody, Mrs. Paul E., Millbrook, $1,000.
Peachy, J. R., Buffalo, $500.
Pennoyer, Mr. and Mrs. Paul G., New York City, $1,000.

Phipp, Lillian Bostwick, New York City, $1,000.
Phipps, Ogden, New York City, $1,000.
Phipps, Ogden, New York City, $1,000.
Power, Donald, New York City, $1,000.
Purcell, Robert W., New York City, $1,000.
Reed, Gordon W., New York City, $1,000.
Rentschler, Rita M., New York City, $1,000.
Rockefeller, David, New York City, $1,000.
Rockefeller, J. D., III, New York City, $1,000.
Rockefeller, Laurence S., New York City, $1,000.
Rockefeller, Mary Clark, New York City, $1,000.
Rockefeller, Mary C., New York City, $1,000.
Rockefeller, Nelson A., $1,000.
Rockefeller, Nelson A., New York City, $1,000.
Russell, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas W., Fishers Island, $500.
Scanlon, John J., New York City, $1,000.
Schiff, John, New York City, $1,000.
Schiff, John M., New York City, $1,000.
Schuster, Anne Storrs, New York City, $1,000.
Senior, Mrs. John J., New York City, $1,000.
Senior, Mrs. John J., New York City, $1,000.
Simmons, Grant G., Fishers Island, $1,000.
Simpson, Mrs. William, Glen Head, Long Island, $1,000.
Slater, Martha Lyon, New York City, $1,000.
Snyder, H. N., Buffalo, $500.
Stevens, Robert T., New York City, $1,000.
Stone, Mrs. Franz T., Buffalo, $1,000.
Swift, Harlan J., Buffalo, $1,000.
Thomas, Joseph, A., New York City, $500.
Thompson, Fred D., New York City, $1,000.
Thompson, Paul W., Chappaque, $1,000.
Tower, Mrs. Roderick, Locust Valley, $1,000.
Tucker, Mrs. Carll, New York City, $1,000.
Tucker, Mrs. Carll, Mt. Kisco, $3,000.
Voorhies, E. M., New York City, $1,000.
Voorhies, E. M., New York City, $1,000.
Wallace, DeWitt, Mt. Kisco, $2,000.
Wallace, DeWitt, Pleasantville, $1,000.
Wallace, DeWitt, Mt. Kisco, $2,000.
Wallace, Mrs. DeWitt, Mt. Kisco, $2,000.
Wallace, Edward R., Northport, $1,000.
Wallace, Lila Bell Acheson, Mt. Kisco, $3,000.
Washburn, Watson, New York City, $1,000.
Wertheim & Co., Partners of, New York City, $4,000.
Wilmerding, Henry A., Westbury, Long Island, $1,000.
Wilmerding, Henry A., Westburg, Long Island, $1,000.
Winthrop, Mrs. Robert, Old Westbury, Long Island, $1,000.
Wishnick, William, New York City, $1,000.
Wishnick, William, New York City, $1,000.
Wishnick, Robert I., New York City, $1,000.
Wyckoff, C. R., Jr., Fishers Island, $500.
Wyckoff, Mr. and Mrs. Clinton R., Jr., Fishers Island, $1,000.

NORTH CAROLINA

Broyhill, J. E., Lenoir, $500.
Cheatham, Lula S., Statesville, $1,000.
Greer, Walter E., Jr., Greensboro, $1,000.
Jackson, H. Arnold, Pinehurst, $1,000.
Morris, E. A., Greensboro, $1,000.

OKLAHOMA

Albert, E. R., Jr., Tulsa, $500.
Bartlett, David A., Tulsa, $1,000.
Blair, B. B. Tulsa, $1,000.
Blair, B. B., Tulsa, $1,000.
Calvert, F. Allen, Jr., Tulsa, $1,000.
Glass, Mrs. J. Wood, Nowata, $1,000.
Henry, James W., Tulsa, $1,000.
Hull, Robert C., Jr., Tulsa, $1,000.
Johnson, John C., Boise City, $1,000.
Johnson, John C., Boise City, $1,000.
Kaiser, Herman George, Tulsa, $1,000.
Kravis, Raymond F., Tulsa, $1,000.
McClintock, F. G., Tulsa, $1,000.
McCollough, E. H., Tulsa, $500.
McCone, John R., Oklahoma City, $500.
Martin, Floyd L., Tulsa, $500.
Vinson, Bailie W., Tulsa, $500.
Walker, Fay P., Tulsa, $3,000.
Wolfe, W. W., Tulsa, $500.
Wright, C. H., Tulsa, $1,000.
Young, Mrs. R. M., Tulsa, $1,000.

OHIO

Bardes, Oliver L., Cincinnati, $1,000.
Berry, Loren M., Dayton, $500.
Burton, Courtney, Cleveland, $1,000.
Burton, Courtney, Cleveland, $1,000.
Ford, Daniel B., Cleveland, $500.
Homan, Rudof, Cincinnati, $1,000.
Humphrey, G. M., Cleveland, $500.
Jones, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick E., Columbus, $1,000.
Lazarus, Charles Y., Columbus, $1,000.
Lewis, Mr. and Mrs. J. Preston, $1,000.
McElroy, Neil Hoster, Cincinnati, $1,000.
Patterson, Gordon, Shaker Heights, $500.
Reavis, John W., Cleveland, $1,000.
Scott, G. H., Lakewood, $500.
T. R. W. Good Government Fund, Cleveland, $3,000.
White, Charles M., Cleveland, $500.

PENNSYLVANIA

Alexander, Mr. and Mrs. J. Deaver, Coatesville, $2,500.
Alexander, John Deaver, Coatesville, $2,000.
Alexander, Mrs. John D., Coatesville, $1,000.
Baker, Milton G., Philadelphia, $1,000.
Boyer, Francis, Ardmore, $1,000.
Boyer, Francis, Philadelphia, $1,000.
Brown, Richard P. Jr., Philadelphia, $1,000.
Butcher, Howard, III, Philadelphia, $1,000.
Butcher, Howard, III, Philadelphia, $500.
Cherksey, Leon, Wyncote, $500.
Corson, Mrs. Philip L., $1,000.
Day, William L., Philadelphia, $500.
Delp, George C., Lancaster, $1,000.
Derry Township Republican Club, Hershey, $1,000.
Dickey, Charles O., Philadelphia, $1,000.
Foy, Fred C., Pittsburgh, $1,000.
Foy, Fred C., Pittsburgh, $1,000.
Frick, Helen Clay, Pittsburgh, $3,000.
Frick, Helen Clay, Pittsburgh, $3,000.
Hass, John C. and F. Otto, Philadelphia, $500.
Higgens, Mrs. Dunham, $1,000.
Johnson, Robert L., Wynnewood, $1,000.
Junge, Bethel P., Jenkintown, $700.
Junge, Vera, Jenkintown, $500.
Keady, G. Joseph, Philadelphia, $1,000.
Kline, C. Mahlon, Philadelphia, $3,000.
Lavino, Edwin M., Philadelphia, $1,000.
Lavino, Edwin M., Philadelphia, $1,000.
McCabe, Thomas B., Philadelphia, $1,000.
McCabe, Thomas B., Philadelphia, $1,000.
McCabe, Thomas B., Philadelphia, $2,000.
Mellon, Richard K., Pittsburgh, $3,000.
Myrin, Mable Pew, Philadelphia, $3,000.
Nesbitt, Albert J., Philadelphia, $1,000.
Pew, George T., Haverford, $1,000.
Pew, J. Howard, Philadelphia, $3,000.
Pew, J. Newton, Chester, $1,000.
Pew, Mr. and Mrs. James G., Bryn Mawr, $1,000
Pew, John G., Philadelphia, $1,000.
Pew, Mary Ethel, Philadelphia, $3,000.
Pitcairn, Michael, Jenkintown, $600.
Pope, Jack M., Rosemont, $1,000.
Purnell, Marguerite Hillman, Bryn Mawr, $1,000.
Rorer, Gerald F., Philadelphia, $1,000.
Scranton, William W., Dalton, $1,000.
Sharples, Philip T., Philadelphia, $1,000.
Sharples, Mrs. Philip T., Haverford, $1,000.
Sharples, Philip T., Philadelphia, $1,000.
Smith, Bradford, Philadelphia, $1,000.
Spahr, Boyd Lee, Philadelphia, $500.
Steinman, John F., Lancaster, $1,000.
Thacher, Mrs. Thomas D., Chestnut Hill, $500.
Toland, Alexander Dolan, Wynnewood, $500.
Toland, Mrs. Alexander Dolan, Wynnewood, $750.
Toland, Mrs. Owen Jones, Wynnewood, $500.
Van Alen, Elizabeth K., Philadelphia, $500.
Van Alen, William L., Philadelphia, $500.
Van Pelt, David, Philadelphia, $500.
Warden, Clarence A., Jr., Wynnewood, $500.
Widener, George D., Philadelphia, $1,000.
Widener, George D., Philadelphia, $1,000.

RHODE ISLAND

Cary, Mrs. Guy Fairfax, Newport, $1000.
Cary, Mrs. Guy Fairfax, Newport, $1,000.
Davie, Eugene Mary, Newport, $1000.
Ewing, Bayard, Providence, $500.
Foote, Mrs. Archibald, Newport $500.
Foote, Mrs. Archibald, Newport, $500.
Goddard, Mrs. R. H. I., Providence, $1,000.
Hudson, Mrs. Cecil Blaffer, Newport, $1,000.
Hudson, Mrs. Cecil Blaffer, Newport, $1,000.
Merriman, Mrs. E. Bruce, Providence, $1,000.
Merriman, Mrs. E. Bruce, Providence, $1,000.
Paterson, Mrs. Charles, Newport, $1,000.
Warren, Mr. and Mrs. George Henry, Newport, $1,000.

TENNESSEE

Ashe, Mrs. Robert L., Knoxville, $1,000.
Ashe, Mrs. Robert L., Knoxville, $1,000.
Cargile, Neil H., Nashville, $500.
Clarborne, Sam, La Follette, $1,000.
Dudley, Guilford, Jr., Nashville, $1,000.
Hannon, C. W., Nashville, $1,000.
Hoehn, T. W., Jr., Memphis, $1,000.
Ingram, E. Bronson, Nashville, $1,000.
Mountcastle, Paul Nashville, $1,000.
Potter, Mrs. Justin, Nashville, $1,000.
Wilson, Mrs. David K., Nashville, $1,000.
Wilson, Mrs. David K., Nashville, $1,000.

TEXAS

Agnich, Fred T., Dallas, $1,000.
Arnold, Isaac, Houston, $500.
Bond, Roland S., Dallas, $1,000.
Fay, Albert Bel, Houston, $1,000.
Forbes, D. W., Dallas, $1,000.
Garvey, Mr. and Mrs. James S., Fort Worth, $5,387.12.
Georges, Mrs. Basil, Dallas, $1,000.
Jonsson, Mrs. J. E., Dallas, $3,000.
Jonsson, Mrs. J. E., Dallas, $3,000.
Kidd, Mr. and Mrs. Barron, Dallas, $1,000.
Negley, Carolyn B., San Antonio, $1,000.

UTAH

Browning, Val, Ogden, $500.
Browning, Val, Ogden, $1,000.
Browning, Val A., Morgan, $500.

VIRGINIA

Doeller, William E., Warrenton, $1,000.
Hanes, Mr. and Mrs. John W., Jr., Great Falls, $500.
Mars, Forrest E., The Plains, $1,000.
Olsson, S. G., West Point, $1,000.

WASHINGTON

Clapp, Norton, Tacoma, $1,000.
Clapp, Norton, Tacoma, $1,000.

WISCONSIN

Benstead, Horace M., Racine, $1,000.
Bradley, Mrs. Harry L., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Bradley, Mrs. Harry L., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Buchanan, William E., Appleton, $1,000.
Buchanan, William E., Appleton, $1,000.
Carlan, Fisk W., Palmyra, $1,000.
Carpenter, Katherine Kearney, Milwaukee, $1,000.
Carpenter, O. W., Jr., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Carpenter, O. W., Jr., Milwaukee, $2,000.
Casey, Samuel A., Port Edwards, $1,000.
Coughlin, Charles L., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Groh, H. B., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Harbison, David S., Tomahawk, $1,000.
Harnischfeger, Henry, Milwaukee, $1,000.
Harnischfeger, Walter, Milwaukee, $500.
Harnischfeger, Walter, Milwaukee, $1,000.
Hill, Merritt D., Racine, $500.
Hill, Merritt D., Racine, $500.
Johnson, H. F., Racine, $1,000.
Johnson, Herbert F., Racine, $1,000.
Johnson, H. F., Racine, $1,000.

Johnson, Samuel C., Racine, $1,000.
Johnson, Samuel C., Racine, $1,000.
Keland, Willard H., Racine, $1,000.
Kieckhefer, Mrs. William H., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Kieckhefer, Mrs. William H., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Kimberly, John R., Neenah, $1,000.
Kohler, Walter J., Sheboygan, $1,000.
Kohler, Walter J., Sheboygan, $1,000.
Ladish, Herman W., Cudahy, $1,000.
Ladish, Herman W., Cudahy, $1,000.
Lindsay, Mrs. Thomas C., Hartland, $1,000.
Lindsay, Walter S., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Loock, Fred F., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Miller, Emily M., Wisconsin Rapids, $1,000.
Miller, Mrs. John N., Wisconsin Rapids, $1,000.
Moore, Harry, Beloit, $1,000.
Packard, Howard M., Racine, $1,000.
Philipps, Cyrus L., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Philipps, Cyrus L., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Pickard, Samuel N., Neenah, $1,000.
Pritzlaff, Mrs. Elinor G., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Puelicher, J. A., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Reiss, William A., Sheboygan, $1,000.
Schroeder, Mr. and Mrs. John E. Milwaukee, $1,000.
Schroeder, Walter, Milwaukee, $1,000.
Sherry, Avery, Thiensville, $1,000.
Sherry, Mrs. Avery, Thiensville, $1,000.
Sherry, Avery, Milwaukee, $1,000.
Siebert, R. L., Milwaukee, $500.
Slocum, Mrs. A. Lester, $900.
Slocum, Gertrude Smith, Milwaukee, $900.
Smith, L. B., Milwaukee, $500.
Smith, Lloyd B., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Steiger, Carl E., Oshkosh, $1,000.
Stielman, Julen R., Milwaukee, $500.
Stratton, Mrs. H. M., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Stratton, Mrs. H. M., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Stratton, John F., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Trane, Helen Hood, La Crosse, $2,000.
Trane, Helen Hood, La Crosse, $1,000.
Trecker, Francis J., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Vogel, Mrs. Charles P., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Vogel, Mrs. Charles P. Milwaukee, $1,000.
Vogel, Eileen K., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Vogel, William D., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Vogel, William D., Milwaukee, $1,000.
Wadewitz, W. R., Racine, $1,000.
Walker, Gordon R., Racine, $1,000.
Walker, Gordon R., Racine, $1,000.
Weyenberg, F. L., Mequon, $1,000.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. RESNICK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. Will the gentleman from New York tell me where the Republicans are going to get the $3 million they are going to spend to elect the Republican candidates for Congress? I read an article where they are spending $10 for every dollar that the Democrats are spending. Do you know anything about that?

Mr. RESNICK. I would imagine they are not looking over the checks that are coming in very carefully. At this point I understand there is $1.2 million already collected. I think maybe they might also be getting it from the sale of Boosters Club stationery. It seems if you join the Boosters Club, you get special stationery on which to write to your Congressman if you have a problem. So they might be getting it from the sale of that stationery.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODEL SECONDARY SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF ACT

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill, H.R. 17190, to authorize the establishment and operation by Gallaudet College of a model secondary school for the deaf to serve the National Capital region, and ask for its consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this plan, as to what is involved, what funds are concerned, and the projected expenditures for the future?

On the face of it, it certainly seems to be a worthwhile and a high priority project.

I believe, probably, the committee is to be commended for bringing this piece of legislation to the floor of the House for consideration. But, I certainly believe it well to have, even in these waning days of the 89th Congress, a little explanation as to what is involved therein, if we are to be asked to approve by unanimous consent or without objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to comply with the request of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H.R. 17190), which was reported unanimously by the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped and the full Committee on Education and Labor will establish a model secondary school for the deaf to be operated by Gallaudet College. The school will serve the deaf children of the Nation's Capital and nearby States, and also provide an exemplary program as a stimulus to the development of similar schools in other areas of the Nation.

At the present time, there are no first-quality high school programs for the deaf. As a result only 8 percent of any age group of deaf children go on to college as opposed to 40 percent in the normal hearing population.

The United States has in Gallaudet College the only college for the deaf in the world. Earlier in this Congress, I introduced a bill, now Public Law 89–36, to establish a National Technical Institute for the Deaf to join Gallaudet as a source of postsecondary education for the deaf. I am happy to report that the advisory committee to choose a university as a site for the institute has completed its survey and is now preparing its report to Secretary Gardner.

While we are making progress in this direction, we find a glaring omission in the secondary area itself. Mrs. Homer Thornberry, a member of the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf, testified before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped that not many more than 1 percent of deaf children are able to communicate well enough to attend regular high schools for hearing children.

Dr. Lloyd Ambrosen, superintendent of the Maryland School for the Deaf, reported that the average deaf child achieves only a seventh- or eighth-grade education.

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Philip H. DesMarais, in presenting the Department's unqualified support for this bill affirmed these statements and also pointed out the need for a model program. He reported that educators of the deaf from the United States frequently traveled to Europe to see model elementary and secondary education programs.

In this connection, the bill has caught the attention of the President. When speaking to a group of foreign exchange teachers on August 25, 1966, concerning the interchange of ideas between nations, President Johnson remarked:

> The first thing I did this morning was to talk to a lady about building a model high school to serve as an experiment and a model for this nation, and for all the nations of the world, in how to help deaf people get a high school education.

Earlier, on June 13, speaking at Gallaudet College's 102d commencement, the President said:

> My greatest wish and prayer is that in the days ahead we will reach the day when every deaf person in our country and the world will have an equal opportunity and be able to get all the education he can possibly use.

Mr. Speaker, the high school proposed by H.R. 17190 is a legitimate concern of the Federal Government. It will provide a bona fide high school education for deaf children. Because there are relatively few deaf youngsters in any given area, and because a first-quality high school must have at least 300 to 500 students, the day and residential school I proposed, which can bring together students from several States, is essential. In addition, the successful operation of the school will provide a national and indeed international example of excellence in education of the deaf.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, do I understand from the gentleman of New York [Mr. CAREY], that at the present time we do not have a secondary school of education which would serve as a model along this line anywhere in the country, a model school from which could be forwarded students into Gallaudet College?

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri will yield further, this is the apparent thinking. There is not a first-rate or for that matter any real secondary school program anywhere in the country for the deaf. As a result thereof, when they are admitted to Gallaudet College, actually they have to go through a full year of prestudy in order to prepare themselves for college work. So, they are really only doing one-fourth of the job over there at the present time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York if the

gentleman is familiar with the secondary school in elementary education for the deaf which is located in Fulton, Mo.?

Mr. CAREY. I am familiar with the Central Institute for the Deaf in St. Louis.

Mr. HALL. This is not correct. I refer to a high school for the deaf in Fulton, Mo. They certainly have a fine and sportsmanlike football team, for I played against them, and that is both unique and exciting.

Mr. CAREY. I would say to the gentleman from Missouri that this is one of the finest schools of its kind in the country. I am well familiar with its outstanding administrator. This, of course, is an oral school for those students who can accept oral instruction and who are able to partake of the full 4 years of instruction.

However, there are many who cannot partake or who cannot receive oral instruction and, as a matter of fact, they fall behind and cannot take or receive college instruction. That is why we are asking for the enactment of this bill.

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

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I rise in support of this bill and especially in view of the fact that, for example, only 8 percent of the deaf students are admitted to college; whereas 40 percent of the regular students are admitted to college.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a necessary bill, and I believe it will prove to be a very successful program.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill wholeheartedly.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I presume there have been hearings, that there is a committee report, and that copies of the bill are available to the Members?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we held considerable hearings, and all of the minority Members were in support of this on the subcommittee, and on the full committee.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield?

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add in further answer to the question propounded by our distinguished colleague from Missouri, that on the Gallaudet College campus here in Washington there is a model elementary school. The college itself is a model institution of higher learning, but there is a gap in the secondary education years. This model school would fill that gap and would provide a model high school on these grounds in Washington, D.C., for elementary, secondary, and collegiate education. We would then have a working model complex of educational facilities for the deaf from primary through secondary and college levels in one place, for the Nation and the world to observe and study.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of our subcommittee, our colleague Mr. HUGH CAREY, of New York, for his vision, leadership, hard work, and thoroughgoing knowledge of developments in the education of the disadvantaged child. His efforts have brought a new spirit of innovation and forward momentum to an area of compassionate need to which for too long we have given far less than our best.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Model Secondary School for the Deaf Act".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of providing day and residential facilities for secondary education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for college and other advanced study, and to provide an exemplary secondary school program to stimulate the development of similarly excellent programs throughout the Nation, there are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for the establishment and operation, including construction and equipment, of a model secondary school for the deaf to serve primarily residents of the District of Columbia and of nearby States, including sums necessary for the construction of buildings and other facilities for the school.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

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

(b) The term "construction" includes construction and initial equipment of new buildings, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings and equipment thereof, including architect's services, but excluding off-site improvements.

(c) The term "secondary school" means a school which provides education in grades nine through twelve, inclusive.

AGREEMENT WITH GALLAUDET COLLEGE TO ESTABLISH MODEL SECONDARY SCHOOL

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary, after consultation with the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf (created by Public Law 89-258, 42 U.S.C. 2495) is authorized to enter into an agreement with Gallaudet College for the establishment and operation, including construction and equipment of a model secondary school for the deaf to serve primarily residents of the District of Columbia and of nearby States.

(b) The agreement shall—

(1) provide that Federal funds appropriated for the benefit of the model secondary school will be used only for the purposes for which paid and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Act and the agreement made pursuant thereto;

(2) provide for utilization of the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf to advise the college in formulating and carrying out the basic policies governing the establishment and operation of the model secondary school;

(3) provide that the college will make an annual report to the Secretary;

(4) provide that in the design and construction of any facilities, maximum attention will be given to excellence of architecture and design, works of art, and innovative auditory and visual devices and installations appropriate for the educational functions of such facilities;

(5) include such other conditions as the Secretary, after consultation with the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf, deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act; and

(6) provide that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on any construction aided by Federal funds appropriated for the benefit of the model secondary school will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5); and the Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) The Secretary shall submit the annual report of the college (required by clause (3) of subsection (b)) to the Congress with such comments and recommendations as he may deem appropriate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, after line 18, insert the following new paragraph:

"(4) provide that in the design and construction of any facilities, maximum attention will be given to excellence of architecture and design, works of art, and innovative auditory and visual devices and installations appropriate for the educational functions of such facilities;".

Page 3, line 18, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

Page 3, line 24, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(6)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1310) entitled "An act relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution."

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

S. CON. RES. 112

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1310) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make section 1 read: "That this Act may be cited as the 'National Museum Act of 1966'."

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill S. 3158.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on the bills H.R. 10304, H.R. 9985, and H.R. 3314.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 112) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 112

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1310) relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make section 1 read: "That this Act may be cited as the 'National Museum Act of 1966'."

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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. McFALL. 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. 351]

Abbitt	Culver	Fuqua
Albert	Davis, Ga.	Giaimo
Andrews, Glenn	Dent	Gibbons
Ashley	Devine	Gilligan
Aspinall	Dickinson	Goodell
Bandstra	Diggs	Green, Oreg.
Baring	Dingell	Gross
Barrett	Dorn	Grover
Bolling	Duncan, Oreg.	Hagan, Ga.
Brooks	Dwyer	Hanley
Cabell	Dyal	Hansen, Iowa
Callaway	Edmondson	Hansen, Wash.
Carey	Evans, Colo.	Harvey, Ind.
Celler	Everett	Hébert
Clark	Evins, Tenn.	Herlong
Clevenger	Farnsley	Hicks
Collier	Feighan	Holland
Conte	Fisher	Howard
Cooley	Flynt	Huot
Corman	Foley	Jennings
Craley	Fraser	Jones, Ala.
	Fulton, Tenn.	Keith
King, N.Y.	O'Hara, Mich.	Stephens
Kirwan	O'Konski	Stratton
Kunkel	Olsen, Mont.	Sweeney
Long, Md.	Ottinger	Taylor
Love	Patman	Thompson, N.J.
McDowell	Pool	Thompson, Tex.
McVicker	Powell	Toll
Macdonald	Purcell	Trimble
Mackay	Quie	Tunney
Martin, Ala.	Reid, N.Y.	Tupper
Martin, Mass.	Reinecke	Tuten
Matsunaga	Rhodes, Ariz.	Vigorito
Mills	Rivers, Alaska	Walker, Miss.
Moorhead	Rogers, Colo.	White, Idaho
Morris	Rogers, Tex.	Whitten
Morrison	Roncalio	Williams
Moss	Schmidhauser	Willis
Murphy, N.Y.	Schneebeli	Wilson, Charles H.
Murray	Scott	
Nix	Smith, Calif.	Wolff
O'Brien	Steed	Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 301 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. UDALL. 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. 51) to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

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. 51, with Mr. McFALL 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 Arizona [Mr. UDALL], will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that we have only begun at this late hour the debate on this bill, which was scheduled as the main order of business today.

The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate, followed by the 5-minute open rule.

On our side we will endeavor, because of the lateness of the hour, to expedite the debate this evening.

This bill will give the Members of the House a chance to stand up and be ccunted for conservation. It is a bill which is surrounded by some controversy, unlike many of the other fine conservation bills that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has brought before the House. But the Indiana dunes is one of the great beauty and scientific areas of this country. We have delayed too long in having a day of reckoning on what should happen to the Indiana dunes. Today, at long last we will have it.

Twenty-five years ago it was proposed that a much larger area than is now included in the bill, be made a great national park. It would have been one of the great national parks of this country. But a great deal of the area has been chipped away by industry and the growth of towns, and residences, unavoidable consequences of the growth in that area, have cut down the size of the area that we now propose to be taken into a new unit of the national park system.

This unit will be known as the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. It is about 50 miles east of Chicago, and about 25 miles east of Gary, Ind.

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

Mr. UDALL. I will be glad to yield to my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the gentleman's opening remark when he said this was a chance to stand up and be counted for conservation.

I consider myself as a conservationist, a practicing conservationist, but a great deal of the conservation mail that I have received this summer and last spring had to do with a proposal of the gentleman from Arizona to flood the Grand Canyon. I am just wondering where such as he who is in the well now, talking about conservation, here in September, were last May when we found our mail filled with mail from conservationists asking me to vote against a bill that the gentleman and my good friend had proposed and which threatened the Grand Canyon.

Mr. UDALL. I will tell my friend that perhaps my consistency index, as he may view it, will not be the highest in this Congress. But I think that the bill I proposed was one of the soundest conservation measures ever presented to this House, and in the best tradition of conservation. It is the misleading propaganda which has flooded this country and not the Grand Canyon by my bill.

I will tell my friend where I was when he had the St. Gaudens National Historic Site, a conservation measure. I was on his side, and I was on the side of most of the other of my friends, too, when they had sound proposals.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I appreciate that. I am glad to know that the St. Gaudens bill, which in my mind I thought was for artistic and humanity purposes, was also a conservation measure. I will be glad to add it to my list.

Mr. UDALL. I know my friend will also be glad to know that I stand here today as the spokesman for a number of organizations, including the Sierra Club.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding, but I just wanted to make it clear that if some of us may vote against the bill, I hope he and his associates will not invoke legislation by labeling us and just crossing us all off as being anticonservationist. That is the only point I am trying to make. Legislation by label is a pet peeve of mine.

Mr. UDALL. I appreciate that the gentleman has a serious point, and I

have a serious point too. Let me make it right now.

The gentleman from Indiana is opposed to this bill and there are others who are opposed to the bill. I recognize the sincerity of the gentleman from Indiana and have a great respect for him. But conservation has never been a partisan thing in this House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], who supports this bill, and the chairman of our committee, the great gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], in the greatest production of conservation legislation in a whole generation that has occurred in these past years, never raised the partisan flag and they never have taken their personal situations or friendships or desires of individual Members of this House into consideration. They have acted and we have acted on our side of the aisle on what is good for the country—what is good for conservation and what we should do to build up this wonderful American innovation, the national park system.

All I say to my friends in this House is if they honestly and sincerely feel that the Indiana dunes does not have the stature to be a part of the national park system, then vote against it and I will respect you. But let us not hesitate—let us not hesitate in the consideration of this legislation to take into account the Nation's interest. Because the Nation has an interest in whether or not we preserve the Indiana dunes.

I did not resent my friend, or any of my other friends here, and over here on this side, who gave me a lot of advice during the past 2 years about what we should and should not do in the Grand Canyon. The Nation is interested in the Grand Canyon and you have the right to speak out and Members should vote their conscience on that issue. Both the Grand Canyon and Indiana dunes belong to the Nation, and not just to the county or State where located.

But let us decide this question on conservation grounds and not make a decision on the ground of whether we like some particular Member or do not like him. Let us see who will stand up for conservation on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank my colleague for yielding. I am the gentleman's friend as I know he is my friend. But in my opinion, the conservation features of this bill have been abandoned. It is now a recreation bill. You have made arrangements here to provide for bathing beaches. Of course, I am for bathing beaches and I will have a little more to say about that a little later on. But the dunes that are left out there are still protected and they are going to be protected.

Mr. UDALL. It is the judgment of this Member of the House, and I went to Valparaiso in your district, in the great area that you represent, and I say it is the judgment of this Member of the House who sat through the hearings and the great debates that we had in committee that the Indiana dunes are one of the really precious scenic and scientific resources of this country. If we do not pass this bill, they are going to be destroyed.

The Indiana Dunes State Park that you refer to is one of the most overloaded parks in the country. Last summer the cars were backed up for 5 miles on a Sunday afternoon trying to get into the park.

The dunes are a very fragile thing. If you get these people chasing over these few dunes which are left, you are not going to have anything left. We need these bathing areas. We need the enlargement of this area, this national lakeshore area, to make sure that the fragile and delicate dunes are preserved.

If the House of Representatives wants to turn over this great shore of Lake Michigan to hotdog stands and steel mills and pizza joints and so on, this is a decision that the House can make. But I think it is time at long last that the Nation faced up to this problem to decide the future of the Indiana dunes. In my judgment, this is a very choice and a very unique area and ought to be preserved.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Since the matter of conservation groups has been brought up, I might state that the following conservation groups have endorsed the Dunes National Lakeshore. They appeared before the committee and gave testimony. Some of these conservation groups are as follows:

The Izaak Walton League, the Audubon Society, the Prairie Friends of the American Landscape, the Indiana Federation of Women's Clubs, Garden Clubs of Indiana and Illinois, the Conservation Clubs of Chicago, the Wild Flower Society, and the Wildlife Preservation Society.

As I say, all these groups testified or sent in their testimony in favor of preserving the Indiana dunes by means of a national lakeshore park.

Mr. UDALL. In response to my friend's contribution, for which I thank him, I can say that I know of no major conservation or scientific organization that has studied this proposal and is not in favor of it.

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

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

Mr. YATES. The gentleman spoke about the needs of the growing population. He spoke of the fact that because there are so many people who are using the existing dunes, they may very well be destroyed unless this area is established as a national park. We are told that within the next few years, within another 10 or 15 years, there will be at least another 2 million people in the immediate area who will be in need of this as a recreational area. Is that correct?

Mr. UDALL. That is correct, and the testimony before our committee shows that it is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. It is open season, I guess. I will yield to anyone who wants to speak. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Would my friend agree that merely because groups like the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, and some of these other ultraconservationist groups are in favor of the bill does not necessarily make it right or wrong? I would like your comment on what weight they had in consideration of the legislation.

Mr. UDALL. No, I would not simply say that because these groups have endorsed the bill that it is ipso facto good or bad. But I think this is a very important thing to take into account, and I think we ought not lightly to cast aside the combined judgment of scientists, outdoor-lovers, conservation groups and similar organizations. Having heard the testimony of witnesses on both sides, particularly having heard the testimony of the constituents of my friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] against the bill, I conclude the passage of it is important to the country, and that in this case these groups are right.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Is it not true that the dunes referred to are located in Indiana State Park, and the Indiana State Park would still remain under the control and supervision of the State of Indiana?

Mr. UDALL. It is a little more complex than that. Some of the best dunes are in the Indiana State Park, but in order to save those dunes—and these are the dunes that scientists want to save; these are the dunes that we want our children and grandchildren to see someday—we have to take the pressure off. If you have tens of thousands of people backed up there to see those dunes, in a few years we will not have any. If we can enlarge the park and take the pressure off the park, we will save them.

Mr. SKUBITZ. What you are saying is that the area we would save would not be the dunes area but areas that would be used for beach purposes?

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman did not ask me that. The gentleman asked me if some of the best dunes in the State are involved. They are some of the best dunes in the State. The other dunes we are going to save are right there.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Are not the dunes in that area protected by local ordinances?

Mr. UDALL. In some instances they are.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Can you name one where they are not?

Mr. UDALL. In some instances they are, but the way many people in Indiana feel about it, I would not be surprised if there are steel mills there before too many months or years go by. We need to preserve this stretch of Indiana dunes for the people of this country. This is a good bill and it ought to be passed.

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

Mr. UDALL. I did not know that we were going to have a second go-around, but I will yield, and then I would like to get to some of the facts.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I was interested in your remarks about the fact that the dunes that are now owned by the State of Indiana are apparently in a State park. The implication of your remarks was that because the State of Indiana is letting the people come in and see the dunes and walk on them, they are being threatened. Is that correct?

Mr. UDALL. No; the gentleman badly oversimplifies.

Mr. CLEVELAND. You kept talking about the thousands of people backed up and flooding in and they are going to tromp these dunes down. At least, that was the impression that you gave to me.

Mr. UDALL. There is a great danger of that. That is part of the story.

Mr. CLEVELAND. If it were a Federal holding, could or would the Federal Government keep the people out?

Mr. UDALL. There are 10 million people living in that area. We have in the State park about 3 miles of shoreline and the dunes back behind them. If we get this Federal park, we will have a total of about 11 miles of dunes, 11 miles of that Lake Michigan shore in a national recreation area, run by the National Park Service. A part of that area will be preserved, because they will have necessary kinds of restrictions. If anyone has the know-how and expertise to save this area it is the National Park Service. I have no faith that Indiana or the local governments will do so.

I will conclude in just a moment and let others get in on this debate.

Let me tell my colleagues first that we will take in about 11 miles of beach and 8,250 acres of land if this bill is passed. We will have a fine addition, in the judgment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the National Park Service.

The cost of this bill, under our present estimates, will be about $21.7 million at current prices.

I should like to add that the residents in this area will be protected. The bill provides that if there is local zoning which, in the opinion of the National Park Service and of the Secretary of the Interior, is adequate to protect the area the owners may stay there and the right of condemnation may be withheld. Those owners who wish to sell may receive at their option an estate for 25 years or life if they choose to do so. So we have taken into account the needs and problems of the residents.

Again I urge that this is a real test case. This is one of the tough ones. A lot of conservation bills we have had here have been pretty easy. Everybody is for a wilderness area. Everybody is for one of these new national parks in Utah, where the interests of very few people are involved. But the tough one comes in the East. We in the West have all the good locations. We do not have the people, but we have the scenery. The Nation has been generous to us in establishing national parks.

One of the key directions we have turned in the past few years, with the help of my friend from Pennsylvania, has been to try to do things in the East—Tocks Island, the Fire Island in New York, Cape Cod, and the new national seashore in Carolina. We have tried to put some of the national park money where the people are.

This is where the people are. We need this one badly, and we need support in passing it.

The bill, H.R. 51, is probably the most controversial of the national park bills to come out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 89th Congress. I am glad, therefore, to have this opportunity to discuss the bill at some additional length so that the House may know what its merits are and what our committee has done and has not done with it.

This bill proposes to establish on Lake Michigan in the State of Indiana a new unit of the national park system. Its location is about 50 miles east of Chicago and about 25 miles east of Gary. A population of 9½ million live within 100 miles of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. This is an important consideration, since one of the things on which our committee and the Congress has been laying emphasis for the last 5 or 6 years is that of providing national recreation areas as close to centers of population as possible. We all know that this is costly but all of us, particularly those who are from the East, are also fully aware of the perennial complaint that our national parks are where the people are not and that the people are where the parks are not. I think we were right in authorizing the Cape Cod National Seashore near Boston, the Fire Island National Seashore near New York City, and the Point Reyes National Seashore just north of San Francisco. Indiana Dunes fits into this same pattern and, costly though it will be, it is worth the price.

Now let me go on to the nature of the new national lakeshore as our committee proposes it. First, let me say that at least 50 years ago this area was so highly regarded by naturalists that it was proposed that a great national park be established here. It was then looked on by scientists and others as a unique outdoor laboratory which should be saved for all time to come. As Stephen Mather, the first Director of the National Park Service, then thought of it, the park would have included twice as much shoreline as the present proposal does and a much larger area. It is too late to carry out his recommendations in full—the growth of industry and cities and towns has made that impossible—but it is not too late to save some of the little that remains. This is what our committee is recommending.

As amended, the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes Lakeshore will include about 11 miles of beach and 8,250 acres of land. These figures include the 2,180 acres and the 3¼ miles of beach that are now in the Indiana Dunes State Park, an area which was established in 1926 and has not, I understand, been enlarged since then. The acreage which the committee recommends—8,250—I may add, contrasts with the approximately 11,300 acres which were included under the bill introduced. The committee has, in other words, stripped the proposal down to a minimum. All of us were sorry that the area had to be so drastically cut, but a number of considerations led to this action. One of the reasons was the desire of members of the committee to keep the lakeshore as compact as possible and to avoid including in it a number of detached areas. Another was their desire to avoid appearing to inflate the acreage by including in it a lot of high-priced property that could probably not be developed for recreation purposes in any event. A good example of this is the 660 acres in the town of Beverly Shores that have been omitted from the national lakeshore.

A question has been raised, I am told, worthy of national status. I think the answer to this is "Yes." We will still have an area which can accommodate thousands of the visitors from Indiana, Illinois, and elsewhere who will frequent it in the hot summer months. We will still have an area in which the ecologists and students of natural phenomena can do their work. We will still have an area which we can be proud of preserving for all time. It will be important, of course, for the National Park Service to see to it that recreational use of the area does not swamp its natural values, for this is the greatest of the dangers which the proponents of a larger national lakeshore foresee. I am confident that the Park Service will be able to do this. In any event—perhaps because I am too much of a half-a-loafer—I would still rather see this much of the southern shore of Lake Michigan preserved than to see it all pass into the dismal sort of industrial scenery that blocks it in to the west. Keeping this area in open space is just as important for the people who live and work there as it is for the rest of the Nation. If, however, the committee was wrong and it is the judgment of Members of the House that the area should be enlarged, they will be free to offer amendments at an appropriate time in these proceedings. I shall offer such an amendment.

The estimated cost of acquiring the land that is within the area recommended by the committee is $21,700,000 at current prices. This does not include acquisition of the Indiana Dunes State Park which will remain under jurisdiction of the State until it is donated to the United States, as the bill provides. We do not expect, however, that all of the land will be acquired since there are provisions in the bill to the effect that improved residential property which conforms to approved local zoning ordinances is not subject to condemnation. Likewise the bill provides that any owner of residential property who sells to the Government may retain a right of use and occupancy for 25 years or life if he chooses to do so. In this event the purchase price will be reduced somewhat. Both of these features of the bill are designed to give protection to individual property owners and are similar to provisions which we have written into law in the case of other national recreation areas.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add two more thoughts and then I will be through. The first is that the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore will be subject to the entrance and user fee provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. These fees will help to offset at least part of the cost of the facility, particularly the cost of operating it which is estimated at about $375,000 a year after it is fully established. The second is that the establishment of this Federal area will not interfere with the Burns Ditch project which was before the Congress in the last omnibus rivers and harbors bill 2 years ago. It will not stifle economic and industrial development in the vicinity, as has been charged. In fact, I am willing to assert that, a few years from now, everyone will be saying that enactment of this bill was a good thing and necessary to preserve some sort of balance between the heavy industrialization that characterizes the Chicago-Gary area and the need of the area's people for recreation as well as work. This metropolitan area now has much less acreage devoted to public recreation per thousand population than any comparable area in the United States—New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Boston, San Francisco, or Los Angeles. This imbalance badly needs changing. H.R. 51 will help to do so in a modest way. I urge the House to pass the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the legislation which is before you authorizes the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Indiana.

The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore legislation is one of two remaining park-type bills which the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is recommending in this session of Congress—the other is the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan.

At the outset of this session of Congress, the authorizing committee outlined the park program which it considered to be reasonable, in light of other Government programs and activities at home and abroad, and realistic, in terms of the Nation's needs for more outdoor recreation opportunities. Our objective was to round out the national park system by providing needed outdoor areas nearer the great population centers of the Nation—it is, in fact, to put more parks where the people are. With the exception of the two I have just mentioned—the present bill and Sleeping Bear—the House has acted on all of those that were in the program: Cape Lookout, Bighorn Canyon, Guadalupe, Oregon Dunes, and Pictured Rocks. I want to thank all of my colleagues in the House and on the committee for their great help in carrying through this program.

H.R. 51, if enacted, will be another important step in meeting the objective of putting more parks where the people are. This proposed recreation area is located in Indiana at the southern end of Lake Michigan. It is less than 50 miles from the Chicago-Gary industrial complex and is readily accessible to 9½ million people. By 1980, more than 11½ million people will probably be living in this region.

At the present time, there are no major national outdoor recreation facilities near this heavily populated region and only severely limited State and local recreation areas. All too often—at the peak of the season; in the heat of the summer—too many people are turned away from the overcrowded facilities which do exist. Testimony before the committee by a representative of the Governor of Indiana revealed that the Indiana Dunes State Park is now probably the most popular unit of the entire State park system. Materials submitted to the committee for its consideration tell of jammed parking lots and mile-long lines of traffic waiting to enter this attractive recreation area.

Indiana Dunes provoked the usual reaction to proposals of this sort. The greatest and most vocal opposition and the least support always comes from the locality immediately affected; there is less opposition and greater support when the population of the entire congressional district in which it lies is taken into account; on a statewide basis the support is still greater and the opposition quite small; and, if the proposal is one that has attracted attention beyond the State, the voices pro will almost completely drown out the voices con. In short, the closer you are to home, the more acutely sensitive people are to the impact that they think a new Federal park or recreation area may have on the resources that they are used to relying on or that they hope to develop themselves sometime in the future.

In spite of the opposition, the committee feels that the need for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore is apparent. Determining how to meet this need, however, has been no easy matter. Exhaustive hearings were held by the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee—both in the field and in Washington. Every conceivable argument for and against the proposal was heard. After considering these views, the subcommittee worked out the details of H.R. 51 and the full committee reviewed those recommendations and made some significant changes before ordering the bill reported. I can honestly say, no other park proposal has been given more intense consideration in this session of Congress than has been given H.R. 51.

The recommendations of the committee call for the creation of a lakeshore totaling 6,061 acres in size. This is the minimum which we regarded as absolutely necessary to meet the massive need in this heavily populated area. In recognition of the controversy between those, living in the area, who desire industrial development and those desiring to protect this area for its natural and recreational values, the committee attempted to find a middle ground. Trying to resolve the dispute, the committee concluded that most of the controversial detached or noncontiguous areas should be deleted, thus reducing the size of the proposed lakeshore area by slightly more than 2,000 acres. This has the effect of deleting the so-called Inland Steel property—which incidentally, due to a clerical error in the report, involves only 852 acres rather than 3,398 acres. The committee is also recommending the deletion of 75 acres, which all seem to agree is needed for other purposes, and 660 acres of intensively developed land in the Beverly Shores area at the eastern end of the proposed lakeshore.

Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the usual policy of our committee providing that State lands shall not be taken without a consent, we are recommending that H.R. 51—like other recent park bills—be amended to require that State lands can only be acquired by donation. Our committee feels, Mr. Chairman, that these national park system facilities are a great asset to the States. Not only do they bring in many tourist dollars, but the national facility relieves the States of the burden of providing and maintaining comparable facilities. As a consequence of these facts, we sincerely feel that the States should, at least, be willing to reduce the burden on the Federal Treasury by donating State-owned lands to the project. If they do not want to—as may be the case in this instance—then Uncle Sam is not authorized to purchase them and they remain in State control and ownership.

Among the other recommended amendments are two more which should be mentioned. One involves the condemnation authority of the Secretary of the Interior. We recommend suspension of the Secretary's authority to condemn improved property—construction of which began before January 4, 1965—so long as an appropriate zoning ordinance, approved by the Secretary in accordance with regulations to be established, is in effect. The only improved property to which this provision would not be applicable would be those properties adjoining the beach or waters which are deemed necessary for public access and use.

The other amendment simply limits the amount authorized to be appropriated in accordance with the proposed alterations of the lakeshore boundary. In arriving at the $21,700,000 amount, the committee used the latest available estimates for land acquisition costs.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that not everyone is satisfied with H.R. 51 as it has been reported. Some argued that the area encompassed in the proposal as it was introduced represented a nearly unreasonable compromise to begin with; others argued that the development of the full potential of the existing State park could adequately meet the future recreation needs in the area; few felt that there could be some happy middle ground. The committee was compelled to work out the details of a compromise.

The situation can be summarized by adapting the famous Lincoln quotation:

You can please some of the people all of the time; and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot please all of the people all of the time.

In H.R. 51, as recommended, we have a sizable area suitable for a variety of outdoor recreation activities and we have an area with natural characteristics worthy of protection. We feel that the need for this kind of an area in this location is highly desirable and greatly needed now and that the need will become even more pressing in the years ahead. We fully recognize and appreciate the ambitions of those who see this area as another massive industrial complex on the Great Lakes, but we also know that there must be some place of adequate size and attraction where the teeming millions can relax and enjoy outdoor activities and the wonders of nature.

We have this in H.R. 51 as reported. There is room for some industrial development, but there is also protection for some of the best beach and natural area left in this region. If it is to be spared, then action is necessary—and necessary now. I therefore recommend favorable action by the House on H.R. 51, as amended.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 51, the bill introduced by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. ROUSH] to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

I had the pleasure of visiting this area just a year ago when my Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation held field hearings at Valparaiso. We not only listened to many, many witnesses, but we also inspected the area. Three things impressed me on that trip: the deep feelings of the witnesses, both pro and con; the great potential which the dunes area has both for scientific study and for outdoor recreation; and the great need for a Federal recreation area in this vicinity.

Those of us who come from parts of the country where land is plentiful and the outdoors is only a stone's throw from a man's front door cannot fail to appreciate the problems of a densely populated and highly industrialized region like the Gary-Chicago complex when we first see it. Land along Lake Michigan is extremely scarce and valuable, we all know, but we also know that life without some opportunity to get outdoors can be pretty intolerable.

If we had been foresighted enough to create an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore 40 or 50 years ago, there is no doubt we would have done a better job than we can today. Much of the land and many of the dunes which should be included in this recreation area have been lost in the meantime. But there is still an opportunity—perhaps a last opportunity—to save what is left. The new park may not be all it should, but it will be all it can be at this late date.

All the figures that I have seen indicate that the Chicago metropolitan area has less acreage set aside for recreation per thousand population than any other large metropolitan area in the United States. In this region it is 11.6 acres per thousand, and none of this is Federal land. In the San Francisco area, on the other hand, it is 19.6 acres per thousand, in Detroit 18.4, in Boston 17.6, in New York and Philadelphia 17.2, and in Los Angeles an astounding 167.8, most of which is Federal. Surely figures like these must make clear to us the pressing need for H.R. 51.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly recommend favorable action on H.R. 51.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this proposition a little earlier under the rule. At that time I bemoaned the fact that sometimes these things of great and vital interest to great sections of the country and of local interest to States and municipalities and counties come up here when it is very difficult to get much of a hearing.

I realize that when we say "conservation" all at once everybody jumps. I have jumped a lot of times myself, because I am for conservation, and I have supported conservation measures.

But this is no longer a conservation bill. This is a recreation bill, for beaches.

Indiana has already devoted to public use 10 miles of beaches, out of Indiana's 40 miles of shoreline. That is all we have. We have 10 miles of private beaches, where people have riparian rights. Some of those riparian rights are going to be taken away under the provisions of this bill.

I have been with this thing for a long time. I am kind of tired of it.

I should like to go back just a little bit. I am not going to elongate this. I am not going to dwell on it. But I have been fighting for a public harbor in the State of Indiana for 30 years.

I may say to my friend from Indianapolis [Mr. JACOBS], I started with Governor McNutt almost before you were born. I have worked with every Governor of Indiana.

I sat next to our current Governor at the dedication of a port, for which Indiana has finally had to appropriate money, and to tax the people and raise the money, yesterday afternoon. There is an authorization for it now. When it went through the other body there was a proviso that we had to have a Dunes Lakeshore before we could get the money for the port.

That was an unprecedented action, completely unjustified. It came on before the Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member. That committee in its wisdom struck out that proviso and wrote in that the passage of the authorization bill should not prejudice the park bill. Who could have asked for anything more than that? Nobody. But there were people over on the other side who did. I will say this, with all respect to my friends outside of the confines of the State of Indiana: We have a lot of people, apparently, out of our State more interested in this park than the people of Indiana. In any event, we wind up with a proviso, which, as I say, is unprecedented, that we must have a vote on a park bill before we can get our money. Indiana has been building parks and ports all over the United States and helping to build them all over the country.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Is it not true that the moment we vote on this bill in the House, at long last, that this authorization of $25 million for the Burns Ditch port which my friend has worked so hard for all these years is activated?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. But I want to make it very clear at this point that if you vote it down, we will still get the money.

Mr. UDALL. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. And that is what I am asking you to do, because it is right.

Mr. UDALL. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. I will yield.

Mr. UDALL. Now that you have the port and we have had all the argument all these years as to whether you will have a port or a park, why not have both? We can have both, can we not?

Mr. HALLECK. I will tell you what. The Governor of my State appeared at a hearing at Valparaiso. We were all out there. Bethlehem Steel is going to build the outer breakwater. What happened? The people in support of this park said that you are putting a port for Indiana right in the middle of a park. They have never quit, and I do not think they will ever quit roadblocking Indiana's opportunity and potential for an industrial development, and that is something that the people of my State resent. I say to my friend, Mr. UDALL, I do not say you. But some of the people out there. Let me say this: I sat next to Governor Henry Shricker, of Indiana, a Democrat but a great person and a great American, yesterday afternoon. He was twice Governor of Indiana and is the only man in Indiana history who ever did that. He was standing with us for that port a long time ago. It is true we are finally getting it, but we got the authorization with a noose around our necks that I would have thought the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would have resented.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. And then I want to go on.

Mr. UDALL. I do not want to interfere with the gentleman giving his statement, but the suggestion that this is a noose around the port is one that I hope my friend does not really mean, because the fact of the matter is if you put down

a stake in the entrance to that port in the middle of the water and drew a 15-mile radius around it, 96 percent of the land in that 15-mile radius would be outside of this proposed national lakeshore, and if you cannot have an industrial development in 96 percent of that 15 miles, then I do not know where you can have it.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say this to my friend. I respect the Secretary of the Interior because he has always been a good friend although on the other side from me, but while we have had that hearing about this land fill which is an integral part of Indiana's port, he testified it was a matter of putting the industrial development right in the middle of a park. It is 2,000 feet from the first place where you get into this park, if it ever becomes the law, and I hope it does not.

Now I want to say one other thing while I am talking about the Secretary of the Interior. He said that he stretched all of the rules to provide that this be a national park. I say you have stretched them. You have stretched them real good, and there is no justification for this being a national park.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me just hurry on here. With reference to our parks, in the congressional district, which it is my honor to represent, Porter County, Ind., this is one of the most rapidly growing counties in the country.

Mr. Chairman, some people say, "You do not put parks in the districts of people who do not want them."

Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not want this one but you are going to put it in here anyway, I guess.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the entire membership were here to hear this. Let me tell the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that I stand with the opposition to this project, the representatives of the commissioners of Porter County, the town governing bodies of Portage and Beverly Shores, the Indiana Municipal League of Northwest Indiana, the Township Trustees Association of Indiana, to mention a few. These people, Mr. Chairman, represent the grassroots organizations of our government.

Mr. Chairman, further, I stand with the chambers of commerce, organized labor people, and hundreds of others. I could go on. That is not all of the list. It involves hundreds and hundreds of property owners who own some of the beautiful homes out there.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union really want to see some of the country out there I have with me some actual photographs. I am telling you right now that most of it is "puckerbrush" and you would not be caught dead on it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear, again, that I am not against conservation. I have mentioned the fact that I have been fighting for that port and we are finally moving along.

And, Mr. Chairman, I may say to my friend who is so hot for this park, I am really glad that this day has finally come and that, we are going to have a vote further on.

You know, Mr. Chairman, we had a lot of people out there who made up their minds to have this park saddled upon Indiana, because of the $25 million we were supposed to get back.

Mr. Chairman, we would never have that reimbursement, which I got written into the bill, if we had been given our just desserts, as we have had them.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have the proponents of this park who have been astraddle of our necks for 10 years before we started our efforts in behalf of the port and the park was not heard of.

So, Mr. Chairman, I wish to move along, and I do not want to filibuster this bill. I understand it is late. But I want the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to understand why we are against this bill, and many, many people are against it.

I understand there are a lot of other people who are for it. But, up there, when one starts on the west side of this property we have, for instance, the Inland Steel Company. The committee took that out. You are going to put Inland's properties back in.

Well, if you want beaches, I suppose that is important. But that land has been sand-mined long ago. I guess 17 acres out of the 800 have some dunes on it. But you say you want that beach, and we shall hear about that later on.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we have the Ogden Dunes, some of the most beautiful dunes located up there. They are not included in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, please do not misunderstand me. I do not want them covered in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, you have different language in here for Beverly Shores than you have for Dunes Acres.

In the Dunes Acres you take access along the beach.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the Interior Department—explaining what that means. They will have access in there. People are going up and down there. They will take the beach from the waterline, 100 feet back.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you more. One of the most important questions involved here are the riparian rights. What are their values? When you start into this thing, one would think that it is about $21 million. That will not represent a drop in the bucket. We will take, for instance, the Inland Steel property. You could not buy it for $10 million. Land up there right now is selling for $100 a front foot.

Mr. Chairman, there has been testimony just last week to the fact that the land under water out there right now, is worth $10,000 an acre.

Now, folks, we have got the Indiana Dunes State Park, and do not let anyone tell you that the people of Indiana are not interested in those dunes, because they are.

When we had the hearings before the House committee, I do not know how much my good friend who speaks so eloquently for this now, realizes what it will take in and what will be a part thereof.

He was there part of the time, I was there all of the time, because this thing is of vital interest to me, and I listened to him.

But there the Governor of my State, Governor Branigin one of the—well, he is a Democrat, I should not brag on him too much, it might hurt him.

My State has mapped an aggressive plan of action, and a proposed major expansion of the Indiana Dunes State Park in a 10-year plan for acquisition. We have proposed early acquisition of 180 acres at the west edge of the existing park.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Talking about the Democratic Governor, does not the Governor support this bill? You do not mean to leave the impression that he is against the bill, do you,

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will wait just a minute, I will get to that.

Specifically, Indiana has proposed the acquisition of 180 acres on the west, and 130 acres on the east. They are going to improve that for beach use—let me say to you folks, we have our park there, yes, our State park is there, but little of it is used for a beach. You must have lifeguards. There is an undertow in that water. You cannot turn people loose.

I am telling you right now: you pass this bill and you will not have many dunes left when people go tramping up and down them. When they know it is a national park they are going to go there.

The gentleman who has been talking here really knows that the worst enemy in the world of a sand dune is feet, human feet climbing over them.

So you will have to have lifeguards. You will have to have all sorts of parking facilities, sanitary facilities, dressing facilities. You cannot just go in there and throw the lakeshore open.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALLECK was permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman asked me what the Governor said. Well, we had that hearing out there about the land fill. I want to say with all respect to my friends from Illinois who are going to be speaking here, I suppose, in a little while, that you know we are getting our port out there at Indiana, and we are going to have to go at it alone if we have to, and we should not have to. But that sand has kind of been carried away, it went up to build an additional campus for Northwestern University. I did not hear anybody complaining about that. Most of that sand, or a lot of it, probably went to build the beaches in Chicago. I am all for it. I am glad it went there.

Now, Indiana—and this is an AP story, after the hearing out in Valparaiso, this last one, about the land fill, and Midwest Steel had a big land fill case that it won

through the courts up there—but this thing for Bethlehem, no, that would not do, even though the greatest experts in the world testified—I was there—that it would not mean pollution, it would not mean anything 2,000 feet from where this park would be, and Governor Branigin said "Indiana can preserve its Lake Michigan dunes without help from Uncle Sam."

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

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman was in Indiana yesterday at the ground-breaking ceremony.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. ROUSH. I have a UPI report quoting Governor Branigin of Indiana in a statement which he made on that very occasion, in which he said:

> We believe the port and the park are compatible, and that one day we will have a great recreational facility in this area.

Mr. HALLECK. I will tell you, my friend, I was there and you were not. The wind was blowing. Maybe it was the aftermath of the Inez hurricane. Some of it got up north from down south and they were afraid that it was going to blow the tent down. The winds got up to 50 miles an hour. You know we can have tornados and cyclones in Indiana. So, in the interest of safety, we moved outside.

I was there and I heard the Governor's speech. I did not hear him say anything like that. If that is in his prepared release, then all I can assume is that he was talking about Indiana's plans.

Let me go on with this.

Let me quote Secretary Udall who was a little upset apparently when a lot of us appeared out there on that land fill:

> Maybe the thing we should do is to abandon the national park idea and simply establish a larger State park there.

The Secretary said:

> I would be willing to provide assistance on this, but there is no State in the Union which has shown less zest for having a national park; and I haven't got much zest for people who lack zest.

Then the Governor said that his next budget would include $2½ million to expand our State park.

We are working at it, folks. Two-thirds or three-fourths of the cars that come to our park are from Illinois—and that is all right—we are glad to have them.

Here is what the Governor said:

> We can take care of our own problems. We never ask him [Udall] for anything in the first place. We expect little and we rarely are disappointed.

If you know my Governor Branigin—our Governor Branigin—that is typical of him. But he kind of laid it on the line—we do not need this.

Now look—Indiana has been preserving these dunes up there for 50 years. So you say you do not trust us. We say we will develop our State park and we will enlarge it and we will provide recreation. Do you believe that? Do you believe in a State having its own opportunity?

The Governor testified that Indiana would never give up its State park.

You wrote an amendment in there—and that is all right—which amendment said, if you get Indiana's park, why, it has to be donated.

Indiana is not going to donate that park. Why should we?

You might do worse with it with Federal control than we have done with State control. We have done very well. About 10 percent of it is used. We are saving these dunes for the scientists. We want them to have this. We have a bathing beach—and that is wonderful. We are going to have more.

Actually, the dunes we are talking about—and if anyone of you can dispute this, I wish you would stand up and say so—are Ogden Dunes, Dune Acres, and Beverly Shores and the State park.

Does anybody dispute that? I see my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] on his feet—does he want to dispute that?

Mr. UDALL. I will dispute that and say the dunes in those areas that you are talking about are going to stay permanently, so we will have some.

Mr. HALLECK. Wait a minute, that is not what I asked you. I said, "Where are the dunes we are talking about?" They are where I said they were.

There are about 17 acres in Inland Steel—that is all out of eight hundred and some acres.

Again I want to say, you are trusting in the people of Ogden Dunes to protect their dunes, are you not? They are not in this bill.

You are taking out the center of Dune Acres in your proposal. So you are trusting them, are you not?

Then you have Beverly Shores, clear over on the east. So you take the center out of Beverly Shores.

So what you have, folks, is a national park with the Indiana Dunes State Park in the middle of it. I will tell you about Beverly Shores, and that is a great growing community up there. You do not need to worry about steel mills. We have to have places for people to live. You have to have places to build houses. There are a great number of places left. But you are going to take them into this park and take them away from the town of Beverly Shores. What you have done is to put in the park the municipal building, the fire station, the schoolhouse—the whole ball of wax.

I want to tell you again that the governing body of Beverly Shores is against the proposal. The governing board of Portage is against it. The commissioners of the country are against it. All of the dunes that are left are either protected by the State of Indiana or they are protected by local zoning ordinances that are protected by the State of Indiana, and to assume that they are going to be destroyed, in my opinion, is just not fair.

There has been a lot of talk about economy, and I had not planned to say much about that. But we are supposed to hold down expenditures. In the committee someone said that it would be 10 years before property owners knew what the Government was going to do about their property. What would they do in the meantime? Is it fair to them?

What is being done about Assateague now? You are 10 years behind in those funds. Are we going to appropriate the money? I am telling you right now that if you start appropriating the necessary money for this project, it will cost you a great deal more than $21 million.

This is one of the great areas of the country.

Indiana is conserving its dunes and it is providing recreation. The State of Indiana is not asking for help. I stand with my Governor. I stand with my Governor that we can take care of the situation. We are going to extend our State park. Maybe in a moment of petulance the Secretary of Interior, who really never gets petulant, may have said, "Let's let Indiana do it." Perhaps he was a little exasperated.

Maybe we are going to have that landfill, but for that landfill you could not build Indiana's harbor and right now my friend from the Fifth District of Indiana and my friend from the First District, who have been up there, know that the cranes are going. We are building it to give Indiana its fair share of an opportunity on the Great Lakes.

So I ask your pardon for holding you so long. I feel deeply about this. I trust that the measure will be defeated.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Our distinguished friend from Indiana who just spoke has adverted here today on two or three occasions to the support of the local board of supervisors, county commissioners, chamber of commerce, and so on. I have no doubt that what he said is true. I heard his people come and testify.

It has been my observation from the extension of the remarks of Chairman ASPINALL, who has been through many of these fights, that you always have this is in a great national park battle. You have it every time—the local board of supervisors and the local people are against it. We would not have the Grand Canyon National Park which seems to be a favored spot tonight of some of my friends, if the Board of Supervisors of Coconino County had the say. We would not have Yellowstone National Park or any of the other great national parks if the local people had the final say.

I appreciate the gentleman's position. I am sure that if I represented his district I would have taken the same position he has. But I want to say about my friend who stands in the well now that he has stood up on this bill and has taken a lot of heat and a lot of pressure from people because he strongly believes that the national interest involves getting these national sea and lakeshore bills passed. I want to commend him for it.

I know what he has been through, because I have seen members of our committee go through the same thing.

I see some of them on the floor here tonight.

If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to ask him one question. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has couched this whole controversy in terms of destroying this great port, which I support. I want to see them get the port. I am glad they have the port. But the gentleman seems to say that if we have a national lakeshore we will destroy the port.

As the bill now stands, will the gentleman tell this House how far from the center of that port would be the nearest piece of this national lakeshore? How far would it be from the nearest point of the port to the nearest part of the national lakeshore?

Mr. ROUSH. My colleague catches me off guard.

Mr. UDALL. If I may refresh the gentleman's memory, would it not be about 2 miles?

Mr. ROUSH. It could not be more than 2 or 3 miles.

Mr. UDALL. Two or three miles?

Mr. ROUSH. That is correct.

Mr. UDALL. I thank my friend for yielding.

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

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to my colleague [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to clear up a kind of impression my good friend from the adjoining congressional district gave in regard to the State being so anxious to do something to develop this park for the north end of Indiana. For the benefit of my colleagues here who are not familiar with Indiana, for the past many years I know of the northern part of Indiana, whether the administration was Democratic or Republican, has generally been looked upon as a stepchild or an orphan child. They do not seem to be interested in the development, from the State angle, up in the northern part of Indiana.

When my good friend the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HALLECK] states that the State is anxious to go right ahead with this Indiana Dunes Park, 40 years ago, in 1924, the Indiana Dunes Park was inaugurated, and up to this hour about the only money that has been spent there is for an old broken-down place to put on bathing suits. Governor McNutt came up there some 35 years ago and built a home for the Governor. The Governor went up there and spent a few weekends, and I do not believe a Governor since has paid much attention to that home up there, for the past 40 years.

To prove that the State of Indiana has completely ignored the Indiana Dunes State Park, just 10 days ago the Department of Public Parks of the State of Indiana announced that they are going to spend $2.45 million on the Dunes State Park. Up to now I do not believe they have spent $2,500 on the Dunes State Park in 40 years. So if that is not a case of deathbed religion, I would like to hear one.

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

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HALLECK. Far be it from me to come to the defense of succeeding Democratic administrations in my State of Indiana, but I feel I must.

The fact of the business is that the people on the committee who listened to the testimony—and few were there—heard the report from the representative of Governor Branigin at that time, a long time ago, that the Vollmer report had been made. That was on the business of developing State parks. They then advanced this whole program which is only now being implemented. That is true.

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

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree with the gentleman, but the parks the gentleman speaks of are down in central and southern Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. No. He specifically said the Indiana Dunes State Park was one of them. That is in the hearings. If I took a little time I could find it.

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

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. It has been suggested several times this evening that the people and the officials of Indiana are against this. Will the gentleman tell the House how many Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Indiana oppose the bill and how many favor it?

Mr. ROUSH. There are six Members who definitely favor the bill, and another Member on the Republican side submitted testimony on behalf of the bill. One Member is against the bill, and the other three I have not heard commit themselves. I believe that is out of deference to our good friend CHARLEY HALLECK.

Mr. UDALL. Tell us about the two U.S. Senators. What is their position on the bill?

Mr. ROUSH. The two U.S. Senators, Senator BIRCH BAYH and Senator VANCE HARTKE, sponsored S. 360, a similar bill, which passed the Senate last year. They still stand behind this proposal for an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

Mr. UDALL. Finally, let me, because the gentleman from Indiana, my good friend who spoke here earlier, is not widely known as the spokesman for Governor Branigin, ask the gentleman what is his understanding of Governor Branigin's position as being for or against this bill.

Mr. ROUSH. The Governor, either himself or through his representatives, has testified before the Senate committee on behalf of this legislation. He sent his representative to Valparaiso at the full hearings, and the representative testified on behalf of the legislation, and he testified before the committee this last spring on behalf of the legislation. The Governor's position is that he favors both a port and a park, and if I ever get my own time, I would like to discuss it.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me one more time, and then I will leave him alone?

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. It is a rule of the House that when your name is mentioned the other party has to yield. I do not think that applies to your relatives, but the suggestion was made here several times that an individual who currently heads the Interior Department was against the bill as it now stands. Will you enlighten the House on that?

Mr. ROUSH. I would like to say to the membership when I read the article that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] referred to, of course, I was upset. I was the sponsor of H.R. 51, which is before the House today. I did not like what I heard, and I went back into the cloakroom within 10 minutes of that time and got the Secretary on the phone and asked him what his position was. He said:

We are still behind this proposal for an Indiana Dunes Lakeshore.

I wrote him a letter the next day asking him to clarify his position, and I have his response here and I will read it to the House.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1966.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: I do appreciate the opportunity your letter of September 29 presents to make clear the Administration's position regarding pending legislation dealing with the preservation and development of the Indiana shore of Lake Michigan. This position is outlined below:

1. The Administration would prefer the enactment of legislation as nearly like the Senate-passed bill as possible. I believe the Senate bill, S. 360, adequately reconciles the proposed industrial development with the preservation of the best portions of the Indiana Dunes as a National Lakeshore.

2. We regard the establishment of appropriate portions of the Indiana Dunes as a National Lakeshore as desirable in and of itself. While it is vital to avoid unnecessary industrial encroachment upon the Dunes area, it would be a tragedy not to preserve key portions of the Dunes for use by all citizens and by future generations.

In summary, the Administration favors the enactment of legislation establishing an Indiana Dunes Lakeshore, and along the lines of S. 360.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL.

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

Mr. ROUSH. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. You know, I was not dismayed but I was quite happy when I read the report in the papers and in the press all over the country about the statements made by the Secretary, because I thought, after all, he had come to recognize that Indiana could do its job itself.

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Now, in order to get at the real truth of what was said there, I called up down at the Interior Depart-

ment, or had someone from my office call up, and requested a transcript of the press conference. Apparently there was something the matter down there, and I have not been able to get a copy of that transcript. All I can do under that circumstance is take at face value what the Secretary said. I happen to believe that the Secretary was saying what he really believed when he made these statements after the hearing out at Valparaiso.

Mr. ROUSH. I think what has happened here is that the Secretary and the Governor of Indiana got into a little tiff and words went back and forth which probably neither one of them meant. I am convinced of that. I know my Governor, and you know him, too, CHARLEY.

Mr. HALLECK. I know him real good.

Mr. ROUSH. Real good. I know you do. And you know a lot of give and take can take place when you are in the presence of the Governor. That little tiff took place and it got into the newspapers. But, I think we have clarified both the position of the Governor and the position of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to this proposal.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said here about the bill and the opposition to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. The gentleman has been an eloquent spokesman for the people of Porter County.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana asked the question, "Why should someone interfere in my district in this situation?"

Mr. Chairman, if I could, I would like to tell the members of the committee the story or the history of this legislation, hoping that it might provide an answer.

Legislation has been in the minds of the people of Indiana to the effect that they should have a port on Lake Michigan for many, many years. It has been in the minds of those people who are great conservationists, that the Indiana shoreline of Lake Michigan should be preserved and that it should not have the industrial encroachment that a port would bring.

And these two great groups were at odds and neither could get anywhere.

Well, a few years ago, during the first year of the Kennedy administration, many of us worked toward bringing about a compromise and that compromise was wrought.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], never agreed to that compromise, and I shall not attribute that to him; no, he did not.

But many people who believed strongly in one position or the other came to the conference table and agreed that there was room in northern Indiana for both a port and a park.

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

Mr. ROUSH. If I could just finish my statement, then I shall yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. Chairman, the product of that compromise has come about, and upon yesterday, ground was broken for an Indiana port, and after the vote is taken upon this bill, funds will be freed for the reimbursement of the State of Indiana for its contribution to that port.

And, now we are about—I hope—to fulfill the other part of that compromise; that is to say, to see to it that a few thousand acres of this area—just a small portion of northern Indiana—a few thousand acres of precious Indiana dunes will be set aside and preserved, not just for my generation, but for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, there is plenty of room in that area for industrial development.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] pointed out the fact that if a circle with a 15-mile radius were to be drawn using the Indiana port as the center of that circle the park would only take about 4 percent of the area included in that circle, and that only if the Inland Steel property is included therein.

Most of this area is zoned, not for industry or for commerce, but for residential use or park use, and we want to keep it that way.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I trust the people of the great State of Indiana. But the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] does not speak for all of the people of Indiana—by no means, does he speak for all the people of Indiana. You say you stand with your county officials and your township officials and your mayors.

Well, I stand with a few people too. I stand with one conservation group after the other in Indiana, and I do not know of a single conservation group which opposes this legislation.

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I stand with at least five of my colleagues in this House of Representatives and with my two Senators.

I stand with Governor Welsh who was in the Governor's chair when this compromise was brought about.

I stand with my Governor who now sits in the Governor's chair today.

Mr. Chairman, I stand with a lot of other people too.

I stand with the editors of various newspapers all over the country who have agreed that this is a necessary compromise and that Indiana deserves both a port and a park.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking of the Kokomo Tribune, the Hammond Times, the Fort Wayne News Sentinel, and, yes, even that great Republican paper the Indianapolis Star. Not only that, you spoke a moment ago of labor organizations which are opposing this bill. I grant you that there are some sincere organizations such as the Carpenters' Union, or the Carmen's Union who are located in your area who are opposed to this bill. But on the other hand the steelworkers in that area favor this bill. The AFL–CIO of the State of Indiana and, yes, of the United States of America, favor this bill. The UAW favors this bill. They have memberships which total thousands.

You have told this Membership that the people of Indiana are against this bill. Our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, JOHN BRADEMAS, whose district lies adjacent to yours, recently conducted a survey of the people of his district, and he asked the question "Do you favor legislation which will provide for an Indiana port and an Indiana Dunes Park on Lake Michigan?"

He has tabulated those replies, and 73.9 percent of the people said "yes." Seven-point-something percentage did not answer, and the rest said "no".

These are Hoosiers. These are people of Indiana who see the value of saving a few thousand acres of dunes which, if we do not save them now—and someone suggested putting this bill off until next year—they will be lost forever. Next year will be too late, as far as the Indiana Dunes are concerned. I stand with those people who want to preserve them.

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

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has spoken of the Third District, and I have nothing against the Third District, but the mayor of Michigan City testified for the mayors' association of all of northwest Indiana against the proposal of a compromise. And the gentleman very rightly said, and I appreciate it, that I was not a party to that compromise, but it just happens to be in my district, that my position about this has been known for a long time, but someone wanted to make a compromise.

All you did by your compromise was bring the 4,000 acres up to 12,000 acres. You talked about a compromise being made, and let us have a port if we are given the park. The people for this port have never given up. They came to the hearing at Valparaiso and had their say to try to stop the development and the building of the land fill, and the use of a breakwater that is integral to the port of Indiana.

So that the compromise is all one sided, in my opinion.

Mr. ROUSH. Would my colleague have been agreeable to a 4,000-acre national park?

Mr. HALLECK. When you started with a 4,000-acre national park you wanted to take the very land—well, you did not start it, somebody in the other body started it, and I shall observe parliamentary rules, and I will not name him. But somebody over there said he wanted to take the land our port is being built on right now. He wanted to take the land that Bethlehem Steel has spent $500 million on on a modern steel mill.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

The gentleman would not have been in favor, and he is not in favor of a 6,000-acre park, and he would not be in favor of a 4,000-acre park. I doubt if he would be in favor of a 1,000-acre park. They asked why it is, and this has bothered my conscience, that someone would go into someone else's district and propose a park.

Well, what do you do when you have a man in a district—and we are friends—I hope we are—I have been here 8 years, and I have never had any personal difficulties with the gentleman from Indiana

[Mr. HALLECK]—who ignores an area that is crying out to be saved for conservation and recreation purposes, I felt that someone had to act. This compromise came along, and I joined in it, and I worked for it, and I will continue to work on behalf of this Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which in my mind will serve not just the people of Indiana, but all the people of this country.

I would like in closing to just turn to the Bible for a minute. I do think that it is time that we saved these precious acres, and in the Book of Isaiah you find this:

> Woe unto them that join house to house that lay field to field til there be no place that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth.

Is this not what is happening? Luxury homes have been placed house to house in much of the area, denying the beach to the masses of people. Commercial interests are gradually, but surely, eating away at the privacy that the area affords and, most tragic of all, industry is gradually, but surely, destroying the Indiana dunes.

I yield to my colleague.

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

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORTON. I certainly appreciate the feelings the gentleman has about this proposition. I listened to the hearings at Valparaiso and I listened to all the testimony before the committee on this issue.

The question I would like to ask is this. Are we saving the dunes? That is the question. Most of the dunes are either in the Indiana State Park or they are in areas that now are completely controlled by zoning laws. If we turn this into a mass recreation area, and attract thousands of visitors to camp, swim, and to picnic and to climb over the dunes, are we really in effect conserving this area in the interest of science and for conservation? Or are we simply saying that we are putting the dunes into a new kind of ownership, but that there is no guarantee that under this ownership they will be saved? That is the point I think some of us would like really to have answered. I do not think the testimony on this bill answers that question. Are we saving the dunes? You say we have to save them now or never. Well, does this proposition save them and, if so, how?

Mr. ROUSH. Well, I will say to my colleague that I think this proposition does save the dunes.

I think it is going to take some very good and clever administration on the part of the people who plan and operate this park if we are going to save these dunes. I have confidence it can be done. I have been in the dunes area. I have seen the dunes areas. I have seen the dunes that exist outside of the Indiana dune park and in the area we contemplate for this lakeshore. They are there.

Indiana has approximately 45 miles of shoreline along Lake Michigan. In this area we propose to set aside just over 6,000 acres—approximately 8 miles of shoreline as a national lakeshore. Few spots on the Great Lakes have factors more favorably alined for combined recreational use of water, the lakeshore and the hinterland than the area of the proposed national lakeshore. Because of low latitude and shallow depth, the waters along the Indiana shoreline are the warmest in Lake Michigan. Wide, gently sloping beaches of clean, light-colored and fine-grained sand are free of debris. Inner marshes and ponds furnish an outdoor laboratory for either casual observation of plant and bird life or scientific study in geology, botany, and ornithology. Hiking, camping, picnicking, horseback riding, photography, fishing, boating, skiing, and tobogganing can be enjoyed here.

The proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has been found to satisfy the criteria for national recreation areas set forth in Policy Circular No. 1, adopted by the Recreation Advisory Council established by the President. The civilian Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments has endorsed this proposal on many occasions.

The Indiana dunes region is an unusual complex of exceptional sand dunes, numerous marshes, swamps and bogs, white sand beaches, and widely diversified flora and fauna—a natural, scientific, and scenic asset so diverse that it is difficult to equal anywhere in the country. Rising to heights of 200 feet in a series of ridges and valleys that simulate miniature mountain ranges, the Indiana dunes are intimately tied in with the geological and natural history of northwestern Indiana.

But like so many areas of the country, civilization is creeping in and pressing against these natural areas. The area is located adjacent to Gary and only 35 miles from Chicago and again only a short distance from South Bend, Ind. The proposed lakeshore presents a rare opportunity to improve the environment of millions of crowded city dwellers and to insure the enjoyment of this unusual lakeshore for future generations.

Today, 6½ million people live within a 50-mile radius of the Indiana Dunes; 9½ million within a 100-mile radius. It is predicted that the population living within a 100-mile radius will reach 11½ million within 15 years. It is estimated that 1.2 million people will visit the proposed lakeshore annually upon completion. By 1980, the annual visitation is expected to reach 2 million.

Over the past 40 years adverse interests have been eating away at the dunes. At every turn of the road we find civilization creeping over this beautiful area.

Because we are attempting something here today which, if successful, will prevent the further encroachment of these interests on a relatively small portion of the area, these interests and their spokesmen indignantly denounce this attempt.

To me, Mr. Chairman, these cries and the arguments used only serve to emphasize the need to preserve for future generations a small portion of that which this generation enjoys as the Indiana Dunes. Because this is a heavily populated area of the country, these acres should be preserved for the benefit of the millions who live in the area. Because the area is growing and promises to grow as rapidly as any area in America, it cries out for this lakeshore. Because northern Indiana is about to become one of the great industrial centers of this country, thousands upon thousands of workers will have the need for areas in which they might recreate themselves, enjoy the beauties of nature, and have a place in which their families might live and grow spiritually as well as physically.

Indiana does have a dunes park in the area. It is only 2,000 acres. I visited that park in June. At 9 a.m. on Saturday morning, not a single campsite was left. By the middle of the afternoon, the park was filled and the policemen were turning people away. What we propose today will complement the effort Indiana is making to provide at least a measure of recreation and conservation for the people of this country.

There are those who would say that we are hampering industrial expansion. This is the great hue and cry of those in Indiana who oppose this park. Now this is not true. I do not know of a single person who is a proponent of this bill who is opposed to industrial development. What we do say it this: Why take nature's most beautiful areas for this purpose? If you were to draw a circle with a 15-mile radius with the proposed Indiana Port as the center point, only 4 percent of the land we propose for a lakeshore would be within that circle. There is room for industrial development and for the development of this lakeshore. If we are wise, we will see to it that there is an orderly development of both. This is the position of the administration. The Bureau of the Budget regards both the Burns Harbor proposal and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore proposal as integral elements for a balanced development of the area. Just yesterday, at a ceremony breaking ground for the Indiana Port, the Governor of Indiana said—and I quote from a UPI report—"We believe the port and the park are compatible and that one day we will have a great recreational facility in this area."

For those of you who may feel that this is just a local issue let me assure you that this is not so. This proposal was conceived and designed with the thought that it will serve the national interest—just as do Yosemite, Grand Canyon, Cape Cod, and many other national parks. It has the support of national conservation groups as well as the support of other nationally oriented groups.

In conclusion, I would hope that the House might pass this bill today. The Indiana Dunes are a unique and beautiful work of nature located within one of the Nation's great population centers. Time is running out on us. This is not one of those instances when we can say let us do it tomorrow or next year. Unless we act now this area will be irrevocably lost. I would hope that each Member might ask this question of himself, "If the conservation effort of this coun-

try depends on what I do here today, what will be the result?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ].

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman stripped of all its fancy language, what this bill attempts to do is to provide additional beach facilities at the expense of the State of Indiana—for the benefit of the people who reside in Chicago, Ill.

Like so many other bills presented to this body, it, too, flies under a false banner.

The slogan under which it rides—"Save the Dunes"—is a misnomer if I ever heard one.

The facts are that the dunes that are worth saving are already protected by the State of Indiana.

I have no objections to the enlargement of beach facilities which are contiguous to the State park which is really the heart of this project.

But we have been advised that the State of Indiana intends to do just that.

Furthermore, it seems to me that when land in one State is to be taken for the benefit of another, then it is incumbent upon the part of the Federal Government to respect the wishes of the State in which the land is located. And the proponents of this bill are not about ready to do this.

The State of Indiana made its position abundantly clear—it would support an enlargement of beaches, providing:

First, that it did not hamper the industrial development of this area.

Second, it opposed the addition of any area which was not contiguous to the present State park.

Third, that the State maintain control over the State park and be permitted to charge fees.

As a member of the subcommittee, I attended all the hearings here in Washington and in Valparaiso, Ind.

There were times that the proceeding reminded one of the hearings recently held by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

If you think the people in the area want this legislation, you are wrong.

If you think that the State government and local governments that are primarily affected want it—you are wrong.

I must admit that the people who reside in Ogden Dunes and Dune Acres want it.

But interestingly enough, the original bill excludes these areas—the most beautiful part of the area—Dune Acres. I understand that amendments will be offered to include Dune Acres and the Ogden Dunes area; if these amendments prevail, then no one in the area will support the bill.

The subcommittee in its deliberation, decided that, since Dune Acres adjoined the Indiana State Park, we should purchase in fee the beach area located in Dune Acres. This would treat the people of this area just as we were treating the citizens of Beverly Shores.

But at the last moment the full committee—with little or no discussion, and only a few moments before the committee adjourned—accepted an amendment to strike the purchase of the Dune Acres area and take an easement on the land which would permit beach users the right to walk across the area—but not go near the water.

The park authorities tell me that the difference between purchasing the land in fee and the easement right to walk across the land would be less than $200,000.

I understand that, now, those who supported the amendment to provide walking privileges on Dune Acres proper will now offer an amendment to purchase in fee; when they do, there goes the support of the people of Dune Acres for this proposal.

The full committee also adopted an amendment to strike from the bill the west beach area—Beverly Bay—an area that is located approximately 4½ miles away from the remainder of the lakeshore—and rightly so.

I understand that amendments will be offered to include it, and it should be defeated.

You have received a letter from some of my colleagues on the committee which included a pamphlet entitled, "West Beach and Burns Bogs—Keys to the Indiana Dunes Lakeshore."

During the discussion before the committee it was referred to as the "heart of the project."

Well, it is the first time I know of that the heart of anything could be located 4 miles away from the rest of the body. I guess that is the reason they now call it the key to the proposal.

I was quite interested in the pictures that were placed in this pamphlet—they are beautiful—but, frankly, I do not know how far the photographer had to travel to get them.

This area was de-duned 40 years ago. Basically it is nothing but small sand dunes, cattail swamps and weed patches.

Let me read you what the chairman of our full committee said about this particular area:

> All of our pictures, Mr. Hartzog, show that this has been de-duned—if that is the word—as there is comparatively no acres at all back of that—that is dunes area at the present time.
>
> A little bit has gone back, I understand. But over a period of almost a quarter of a century or longer than that these dunes have not come back—and they will not come back as long as you have a railroad track there. That country has grass and no dunes at all—that is what it is.

I am surprised that one of the signers of this letter, my colleague from Arizona, in the name of conservation, is willing to deny the State of Indiana its right to expand and grow and provide jobs for its people—and yet he is willing to flood the Grand Canyon so that his State of Arizona can grow and prosper.

Mr. Chairman, I have been on the committee 4 years. As a rule, the committee really does its homework.

But this bill is the most botched up piece of legislation we have ever reported.

It should be defeated or recommitted to the committee with instructions to do its homework.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express wholehearted and vigorous support for the enactment of H.R. 51 which would authorize the establishment of an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore on the south shore of Lake Michigan in northern Indiana.

Congressman J. EDWARD ROUSH, who introduced this measure, and Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, who has for many years been a tireless advocate of the move to preserve the Indiana dunes, are to be commended for their efforts to save one of the last great natural assets of our Nation.

I want to congratulate the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, the chairman of the House Interior Affairs Committee, the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, and the other distinguished members of the committee, whose forthright action has brought to the floor a progressive and urgently needed measure.

America's need for the preservation of shorelines for public enjoyment has long been recognized. Action by Federal, State, and local governments to reserve or acquire additional water, beach, and shoreline areas, particularly near the centers of population, is one of the most pressing community needs of our times. It is a particularly urgent matter with respect to our Great Lakes shoreline where recreational resources are in heaviest demand because of the high density of population.

The Indiana dunes would provide a place for swimming, sunbathing, hiking, picnicking, camping, fishing, and other recreational activities. The dunes are easily accessible to about 10 million people living within a 100-mile radius. Many thousands of these people are from my own congressional district, located in the heart of Chicago. They are working people and cannot afford long and expensive trips to distant recreational areas. The Indiana dunes are only 25 miles from the outskirts of Chicago and are within easy reach of both the pocketbooks and the automobiles of these working people.

John A. Carver, Jr., Under Secretary of the Interior, has reported that inadequate facilities exist to meet even the present day outdoor recreational needs of the people in the area. The population explosion is serving to intensify and multiply these very real needs and wants of the people.

Botanists and biologists feel that the dunes would be ideal for scientific research and study. They are urging immediate conservation of the area because the dunes are rich in both northern and southern species of plants, a rare occurrence in most parts of our Nation.

The uniqueness of the Indiana dunes was best expressed by Merrill D. Ames,

vice president of the Save-the-Dunes Council, when he said:

It is the only place east of New Mexico in which cactus grows—the only place south of the Arctic Circle where certain types of pines are to be found—and one of the three places in the world where singing sand is located.

As early as 1916 the National Park Service recommended the Indiana dunes area for a national park. Our involvement in World War I, however, delayed our Government's action in acquiring the property. In the intervening years, a good portion of the dunes, originally comprising a strip of marshes and beaches about 25 miles long, has been irretrievably lost to industrial and residential development. Today, the dunes left that are suitable for acquisition are only a little over 10 miles long. What is left must be saved now, or there will be nothing left to be saved.

Legislation to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has the support of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Defense, organized labor, newspapers, scientists, and local residents.

Such an overwhelming mandate should and must be heeded by the legislators of this Nation who have the best interests of the people in heart and in mind. Unless the natural beauties and resources of our country are preserved now, in our generation, it will be too late. Only a barren land will be left to our children and to posterity.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that no conservation legislation is more worthy of the support of the 89th Congress than H.R. 51 which would create an Indiana Dunes National Seashore for the enjoyment of all our people and would preserve for future generations the beauties and wonders of nature.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill. I believe with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH], that this area should have a port as well as a park in accordance with the understanding reached years ago. We now have a park. It was dedicated only yesterday. It would be unfair, grossly unfair, if the port were not now established.

But apart from the question of that agreement, solely upon the question of the need for protecting this beautiful area in its positive beauty for generations to come—the growth of the cities threaten it. The glass, the concrete, the steel, the asphalt of the cities are reaching out to overrun this natural wilderness. Only if we act now to preserve this area will there be a retreat from the pressures and noise of everyday living.

We who live in the Midwest have been waiting a long time for this day.

For if we fail today to pass H.R. 51, authorizing the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, we will find that not only are the sands of time running out on us. We will find that the very sands of the lakeshore are running out on us. Already the proposed park has dribbled down to a mere 8,243 acres.

Surely this is little enough to settle for. Surely the people of the dunes area have already waited far too long to assume their natural birthright.

When Stephen T. Mather first set eyes on the dunes, the entire population of Illinois and Indiana was 9½ million. Today, there are more people than that living within a radius of 100 miles of the Indiana dunes—and by 1980 it is estimated that there will be at least 2 million more.

Existing facilities for rest and recreation are already terribly inadequate for this thriving urban-industrial complex. Imagine what the situation will be by 1980—1990—the year 2000.

Do you gentlemen who oppose H.R. 51 think that Americans will have less need for national parks in the years to come? Every sociological study I have read proves exactly the opposite—proves that people will have infinitely more leisure, infinitely greater need to fill that leisure with health-giving recreation out of doors. Then where, pray, are those desperately needed parks to come from?

Obviously, it is now or never—unless we propose to build our parks on orbiting space platforms.

I cannot believe that we as a nation have learned the lesson of conservation so poorly that we will let our present opportunity slip through our fingers, as the sands of the Indiana dunes slipped so lazily through my own fingers as a boy.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I know the worth and wonder of the Indiana dunes from personal experience. My birthplace was Chicago, my home has always been Chicago, and man and boy I have spent some of the happiest days of my life on those dunes.

Are future generations of boys and girls, men and women, to be denied the peace and pleasure, the rest, and recreation afforded by the dunes?

And for what? Just what reason would those who persist in voting against the lakeshore give those future generations? That the steel companies needed still more lake frontage?

No, I hardly think they would be able to say that.

Yesterday, October 10, 1966, back there on the Indiana dunes, the Burns Waterway Harbor—an industrial port authorized by Congress a year ago at a cost of $25 million—was dedicated.

Now, let us think of the people. Let it be the public's turn. Let us protect this natural retreat as a heritage for the generations to come. Let the House follow the lead of the Senate, which has already twice voted for the establishment of a lakeshore of far more generous acreage. Mr. Chairman, I call for passage of H.R. 51 in the name of conscience as well as conservation.

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

Mr. YATES. I am glad to yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Did the gentleman read in the papers that Mayor Daley has just brought about an appropriation of $15 million to extend McCormack Place out into the lake and take some of the beach?

Mr. YATES. I believe the gentleman may have read in the papers that there is under consideration at the present time the question as to whether or not McCormack Place will be expanded. That has not been approved. That is under study at the present time, I say to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

It is my privilege to be one of the cosponsors of a bill dealing with this legislation, H.R. 4412. I grew up on the sand dunes of Indiana. As a matter of fact, the first job I ever had in my life was down at the sand dunes at a hot dog stand many years ago. I know the area well, and I can fully appreciate the fact that this is a great recreation area and conservation area for all of the people of the Midwest. Our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], talks about this project as if the area only belonged to the people of Porter County. The fact of the matter is that for many, many years and for decades people have been moving out to the Indiana dunes for the summer, the fall, and the winter from Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I will in just a second.

I think it is wise to keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that this area, the metropolitan Chicago-Gary area, stretching from Waukegan clear around to St. Joseph, Mich., is rapidly becoming the largest complex of diversified industry in the world. I think by the early 1970's it will be the largest complex of diversified industry in the world, housing a population well in excess of 10 million people. As the gentleman who just preceded me, who is the sponsor of this bill in the House, and the senior Senator from Illinois, the sponsor of the bill in the Senate, stated, one of the great problems of our times is going to be that of providing adequate areas for the people of these highly congested communities to go and mingle with Nature. So I think it would be very cruel for us now to close our eyes to this great natural wonderland. The assurance has been given here—and I take at face value the statements made by industry, by the Department of the Interior, by the sponsor of this bill, and by witnesses who testified before the committee—that there is no conflict between the port that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] wants to develop and this national park. As a matter of fact, they complement each other. So I am not surprised that the labor movement, the steelworkers, and all of the other people in that area and the whole Midwest are solidly behind this proposal. We know well that by 1970 to 1980 the people of that time and that generation are going to thank the good Lord that there were Members in the Congress of the United States who

had the foresight to preserve this great conservation area.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this is a young country. When we look at the history of all the major powers of the world with their histories dating back 1,000, 2 000, 3,000, and even 4,000 years in the case of the Greeks and when we look at America, which is an infant in comparison to all of the other countries, we see that America is yet the most glorious country in the world. That is simply because Members of the Congresses before us have had the foresight to preserve this great wonderland of our Nation. I say that we cannot think of this program in terms of what it will do today or tomorrow. I think we should recognize what it is going to do for generations to come. This area is a vitally needed area for the development of the Midwest. I say to you for us to turn this legislation aside would, indeed, be to deny generations to come a magnificent wonderland; an area that the good Lord has blessed and which we are going to need. We need it now. We have used it for many years.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the real issue at stake here—and we ought not to conceal it—but one of the great oppositions to this national park is generated because of the fact it is believed it would have a deterrent effect upon the question of the pollution of Lake Michigan and other areas.

Mr. Chairman, the great President of this country stated not too long ago that we must marshal all the resources of America and to also preserve the Great Lakes.

Well, I say to you that this national park will certainly play a vital role in not only helping the industrial development of the area, but at the same time would prevent some of the pollution problems with which we are faced.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that this legislation will be approved. I feel it is vital and important legislation, and it is presented to the House in good faith.

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I feel very much at home and amongst home folks. I was born at St. Joe, Mich., which is not very far from Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that this bill is going to have much trouble. I am a little surprised when my good friend from Kansas speaks against it. I have always had a great affection for Kansas. It is a great State.

I do not know why anyone could come from Kansas and say that the people of Chicago—the boys and the girls, along with their parents—could not go down into Indiana to a national park or seashore. I do not know why the voice of Kansas should be raised in that direction.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, after the last speaker castigated the "voice of Kansas," it humbles me a little bit to interject the "voice of Maryland." Mr. Chairman, I have been to the Great Lakes, and have spent 2 or 3 days at Valparaiso. Also, having heard all the testimony before our committee on this issue, I feel that some of the things that were brought out in that testimony have not been said on the floor of the House today which cast some light upon this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the first question, the question of saving the dunes is at stake. I am not convinced, and I do not believe that any member of the committee is convinced, that the passage of this legislation in any way guarantees the preservation of the dunes, and the other biological and geological phenomena located there which has some scientific value.

Mr. Chairman, we have stricken out of the bill two or three external areas of great biological importance.

Mr. Chairman, this is a recreation area, and perhaps it is justified on this basis.

The point is that the inholding communities of Ogden Dunes, Dune Acres, and Beverly Shores, and the Indiana State Park actually will have the trusteeship of the dunes. The land that is being acquired here by the Federal Government is not a dune area, it is land that will be used for campsites, the beaches, and the like. And that is also true of the Inland Steel property, if it is added.

So let us not feel that this is any type of conservation bill.

When I flew from northern Indiana up to Michigan to visit the Sleeping Bear area, there was a great, red cloud—talk about pollution—coming from the steel mills of Gary, and floating along the water's edge and depositing silt, or ash, on this area.

Now, if you want to save it you had better clean the air up. You had better put the devices in those steel mills that will guarantee clean air, because constantly there is an overburden of ash being deposited not only on the dunes, but in the lungs of all those who live along that area.

Talk about pollution, where is the force and what is being done besides talk about pollution?

During my lifetime one of the Great Lakes has become a dead sea. We are fighting at the very edge of the Chesapeake Bay and other estuaries. Let us really do something about pollution, if we are going to do it, and let us really do something about conservation if we are going to do it.

This is not a conservation bill. It is a reclamation area bill. The reason why I am opposed to it is this: since the Assateague National Seashore was established the Federal Government has purchased 1 acre of land. Some 3,500 property owners are wondering what is taking place, when do we get our money? Who do we deal with? We cannot simply authorize these areas and then turn our backs. And until we can create a revolving trust fund that can be used to purchase this land within a reasonable time after its authorization, we are simply going to create havoc and confusion.

Let us regroup on this whole area, and get a total plan for this northern Indiana section that will include the port of Indiana, including the industrial development area, and will include the necessary open spaces and beach areas, and not simply inject under the guise of conservation a recreation bill which is confusing, which is not wholeheartedly supported, either by the local governments and the State. I know the problem that Chicago has because I know the problems that Baltimore has are similar.

This may be the area to do this job in. But these people must have an integrated plan, and there must also be efforts to clean up the air. There is no point in going to the beach and breathing in the red silt that is coming from the steel mills in Gary.

As I flew north from this area, there is a stretch of nearly 120 miles of absolutely undeveloped beach land. Perhaps we should look at some of that. Already the State of Michigan owns a great deal of that area. Perhaps we should look at that.

But I think that at this particular instant, at this particular time we should respect the views of CHARLIE HALLECK, who has lived with this problem and lived with the people who have fought and have the one desire to control the destiny of our own neighborhoods. I just hope this bill is defeated, because it is not complete. It is not a conservation bill, and it is incomplete as a recreation bill.

Therefore I think it has political overtones that are also unnecessary. I think we should look again at this area—either recommit it, or defeat it.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. I agree with the statement just made by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland. The gentleman sat for days and days on this particular matter. This is the area that originally the gentleman from Arizona started off as a conservation measure. But here is a recreation area and I think the gentleman has hit the nail on the head. We should make a thorough study of all of this shoreline.

I just wonder if the gentleman from Maryland will tell me this. You have little enclaves here on this map that is on display here, where you have little cities where the people have built homes. They have streets and they have water systems and so on. They have bonded their communities for these improvements. What is going to happen? This is just a start toward acquiring a large section of land here and taking away homesteads and destroying little communities.

When you say you need this for conservation and for recreation, I agree with the gentleman that we should look at the whole picture and I suggest to every Member of this Congress that I will never and I hope you will never vote to

wish onto a sitting Member of this Congress something that he does not want in his own district.

Think about that a little bit. The gentleman who represents the district involved happens to be of the other party, but I shall never vote for a bill that will wish on to you as a sitting Member of the Congress something that you say you do not need and that you do not want. Think it over a little bit because you may be faced with it sometime yourself.

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

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I can appreciate the solicitude of my friends over the line in Illinois with respect to this area. But I cannot help but remind you of this fact. This bill, if it becomes law, takes away the riparian rights of the homeowners in Dune Acres and in Beverly Shores. Some of those homes are worth $100,000 or $150,000. I do not know what the riparian rights would be worth.

But may I in all humility suggest this to my colleagues. If I went up to Illinois from my State of Indiana and I said, let us take the riparian rights away from the private beaches of Winnetka, Evanston, Glencoe and I do not exactly remember the exact sequence of the different communities there, but I dare say that these gentlemen, and they are estimable and fine gentlemen, of course, but I doubt that they would be very much enthused about that kind of proposition.

That is just what is involved here. I want to point out again, we have beaches galore. We have 10 miles of beaches right now devoted to public use out of 40 miles of shore line. That ought to be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation to establish the Indiana Dunes National Seashore and for other purposes.

Let me straighten something out in the beginning. We are not attempting to establish a national park. We are not attempting to establish a national monument. We are not attempting to establish a recreation area.

But we are attempting to establish a seashore or lakeshore area.

These are the classifications of areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has established and which we have used as criteria in all parts of the country.

Now what you Members must understand is that this is the culmination of a debate which began over 65 years ago.

Before that time Stephen Mather, who was the first Director of the National Park Service, and before that time a great conservationist and a man active in the conservation movement, suggested that this entire area—not merely the area included in this bill and not just the area included in the Indiana State Park—but the entire area within the confines of the State of Indiana be set aside and preserved for future generations.

The people of the United States turned a deaf ear on Stephen Mather. From time to time in the intervening years other people have tried to establish a national park in this area. But because of the influx of industry into the area, because of the inroads that have been made on the dunes by developers and others, this area no longer qualified as a national park, no longer qualified as a national monument.

What we are now trying to do is to establish a national seashore.

I undertake this endorsement with the full knowledge of a vociferous and determined opposition to this proposal. However, I wish to point out to my colleagues that opposition to this proposal results, I believe, from the failure to approach the controversy of a national seashore or a port in an intelligent and farsighted manner. I would ask my colleagues to look at this legislation in such an intelligent and farsighted manner.

Simply stated, the controversy which surrounds this legislation involves two separate pieces of legislation proposed for the State of Indiana—a deepwater public port and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Advocates of each project have for many years embarked on a collision course without obtaining authorization for either project.

In 1963 the administration sought to resolve this conflict and officially endorse both projects for the State of Indiana. In the spring of 1965 the Indiana General Assembly passed legislation authorizing $25 million to start construction of the public port.

In October of 1965 this Congress enacted Public Law 89-298, the 1965 omnibus rivers and harbors bill, which contained a $5 million reimbursement for that part of the port which the Federal Government would usually construct. However, the conference committee in reporting the 1965 omnibus rivers and harbors bill inserted a proviso, as follows:

> No appropriation is authorized to be made for the construction of this project until the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has been voted upon by both Houses of Congress during the same Congress.

This has been some of the legislative history and controversy surrounding this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this bill establishing the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has arrived at that point in the legislative process where there can be compliance with the conference committee's proviso and establishment of a much-needed recreational area providing a balanced development in the lands in northern Indiana.

This bill proposes the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore on the shores of Lake Michigan. The establishment of the lakeshore will preserve for the public use and enjoyment the selected remaining portions of the Indiana dunes and related areas of scenic, scientific, historic, and recreational value.

This proposed national lakeshore will be located primarily in Porter County and partially in La Porte County, Ind., at the southern end of Lake Michigan. Within a 100-mile radius of the Dunes National Lakeshore at the present time live 9½ million people.

And by the time this area is fully developed for use by the National Park Service, between 11½ and 12 millions of people will live in this area.

The land area to be included within the boundaries of the proposed national lakeshore involved initially approximately 11,000 acres. Unfortunately—and I say this advisedly—the committee saw fit, by an amendment, to delete from this proposal 5,276 acres of land, mostly in detached units, comprising lands ideally suited for their ecological, scenic, and recreational values.

The proposed lakeshore bill, as amended, now contains some 6,000 acres of land, including 11 miles of beach, to be kept available for public use and enjoyment. It is true that most of these lands are in private ownership. An additional 2,182 acres of land may be added to the proposed lakeshore by the donation of the Indiana Dunes State Park by the State of Indiana.

The estimated cost of the acquisition of these lands is $21 million plus, and the development costs are currently estimated at $3,292,000.

Mr. Chairman, the need for a national recreation area in this part of our Nation is without question. As always, the questions surrounding such projects are: How big? And, what lands should be included?

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has labored and wrestled with these problems. It is my hope that some of these detached areas deleted by the committee will be restored by this committee.

In 1962 the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended the acquisition of beaches and shoreline areas, particularly near the centers of population, to meet the recreational preferences of our citizens. The passage of this bill will be a significant step forward toward meeting the recreational needs and preferences of our citizens in that area.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out to my colleagues that I, for one, have long acknowledged the fact that man must have a place to work and a place to play. There are those who will argue that this legislation will stifle the economic and industrial development of northern Indiana. That argument has no merit so far as I am concerned with regard to this legislation.

This bill recognizes the economic and industrial growth of northern Indiana and seeks to preserve for those who are engaged in such economic and industrial pursuits an area in which to enjoy the pleasure of recreation close at hand during their leisure time.

I firmly believe that the establishment of this Indiana Dunes Lakeshore will provide a balanced development for northern Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this piece of legislation.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY].

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Chairman, as some of you know, I think most of the things the U.S. Government has done internally have been mistakes, but this is one I very deeply believe in.

My father taught me, when I was a boy, that the land, all the waterfronts of all the oceans and rivers and streams and lakes, should belong to all of the people, and that when industry needed space it should rent it.

This is just a little bit of waterfront. I surely hope we save it for the people of the United States.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of conferring with the ranking minority member of the committee.

I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to yield back all the time on this side, if the gentleman is agreeable.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. UDALL. That will be with the suggestion that the Clerk read the first line or two of the bill, and after that I would propose that the Committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 51

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the educational, inspirational, and recreational use of the public certain portions of the Indiana dunes and other areas of scenic, scientific, and historic interest and recreational value in the State of Indiana, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and administer the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore (hereinafter referred to as the "lakeshore") in accordance with provisions of this Act. The lakeshore shall comprise the area within the boundaries delineated on a map identified as "A Proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore," dated July 1964, and bearing the number "LNPNE 1003 ID", which map is on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. (a) Within the boundaries of the lakeshore the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire lands, waters, and other property, or any interest therein, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise. In order to enhance the recreational benefits of this Act, the Secretary also is authorized to acquire such easements or other interests as he deems necessary to assure public access to the beach and waters of Lake Michigan continuously from the western boundary of the lakeshore in section 21 township 37 north, Indiana base, range 6 west, second principal Indiana meridian, to the easternmost point of intersection of the lakeshore boundary with the shoreline.

The Indiana Dunes State Park may be acquired only with the consent of the State of Indiana, and the Secretary is hereby directed to negotiate with the State for the acquisition of said park. In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange for the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area described in section 1 of this Act and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, as determined by the Secretary who may, in his discretion, base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him: *Provided,* That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to seek such cooperative arrangements with the State of Indiana, political subdivisions thereof, and property owners as are required to provide public access to segments of the Little Calumet River and the adjacent river banks between the lakeshore boundary and the east line of section 31, and the Secretary may acquire, other than by condemnation, such easements and other interests in lands or waters as he deems necessary to further the purpose of this subsection.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after the effective date of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area described in section 1 of this Act which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment and subject to the limitations and conditions prescribed in section 1 hereof, the Secretary may continue to acquire lands and interests in lands for the lakeshore.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore for one year following the effective date of this Act. Thereafter such authority shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore during all times when an appropriate zoning agency shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

(b) The term "improved property", whenever used in this Act, shall mean a detached one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before October 21, 1963, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be not more than three acres in area, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided,* That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such beach or waters, as he may deem necessary for public access thereto.

SEC. 5. (a) As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning ordinances for the purposes of sections 4 and 6 of this Act. The Secretary may issue amended regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning ordinances whenever he shall consider such amended regulations to be desirable due to changed or unforeseen conditions. The Secretary shall approve any zoning ordinance and any amendment to any approved zoning ordinace submitted to him which conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of adoption of such ordinance or amendment by the zoning agency. Such approval shall not be withdrawn or revoked, by issuance of any amended regulations after the date of such approval, for so long as such ordinance or amendment remains in effect as approved.

(b) The standards specified in such regulations and amended regulations for approval of any zoning ordinance or zoning ordinance amendment shall contribute to the effect of (1) prohibiting the commercial and industrial use, other than any commercial or industrial use which is permitted by the Secretary, of all property covered by the ordinance within the boundaries of the lakeshore; and (2) promoting the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area covered by the ordinance within the lakeshore by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements and other provisions which may be required by such regulations to be included in a zoning ordinance consistent with the laws of the State of Indiana.

(c) No zoning ordinance or amendment thereof shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provision which he may consider adverse to the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the lakeshore; or (2) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and any exception made to the application of such ordinance or amendment.

(d) If any improved property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended according to the provisions of this Act, is made the subject of a variance under or exception to such zoning ordinance, or is subjected to any use, which variance, exception, or use fails to conform to or is inconsistent with any applicable standard contained in regulations issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of passage of such ordinance, the Secretary may, in his discretion, terminate the suspension of his authority to acquire such improved property by condemnation.

(e) The Secretary shall furnish to any party in interest requesting the same a certificate indicating, with respect to any property located within the lakeshore as to which the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority has been so suspended and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 6. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term of twenty-five years, or for such lesser time as the said owner or owners may elect at the time of acquisition by the Secretary. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(b) The Secretary shall have authority to terminate any right of use and occupancy retained as provided in subsection (a) of this section at any time after the date upon which any use occurs with respect to such property which fails to conform or is in any manner

opposed to or inconsistent with the applicable standards contained in regulations issued pursuant to section 5 of this Act and which is in effect on said date: *Provided*, That no use which is in conformity with the provisions of a zoning ordinance approved in accordance with said section 5 and applicable to such property shall be held to fail to conform or be opposed to or inconsistent with any such standard. In the event the Secretary terminates a right of use and occupancy under this subsection, he shall pay to the owner of the right so terminated an amount equal to the fair market value of the portion of said right which remained unexpired on the date of termination.

SEC. 7. (a) In the administration of the lakeshore the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas of the national park system and such statutory authority otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. Appropriate user fees may be collected notwithstanding any limitation on such authority by any provision of law.

(b) In order that the lakeshore shall be permanently preserved in its present state, no development or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken therein which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as the Secretary may designate: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique natural, historic, and scientific features within the lakeshore by establishing such trails, observation points, and exhibits and providing such services as he may deem desirable for such public enjoyment and understanding: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may develop for appropriate public uses such portions of the lakeshore as he deems especially adaptable for such uses.

SEC. 8 (a) There is hereby established an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission. Said Commission shall terminate ten years after the date of establishment of the national lakeshore pursuant to this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows: (1) one member who is a year-round resident of Porter County to be appointed from recommendations made by the commissioners of such county; (2) one member who is a year-round resident of the town of Beverly Shores to be appointed from the recommendations made by the board of trustees of such town; (3) one member who is a year-round resident of the towns of Porter, Dune Acres, Portage, Pines, Chesterton, Ogden Dunes, or the village of Tremont, such member to be appointed from recommendations made by the boards of trustees or the trustee of the affected town or township; (4) one member who is a year-round resident of the city of Michigan City to be appointed from recommendations made by such city; (5) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Indiana; and (6) one member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expense reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and with respect to the provisions of sections 4, 5, and 6 of this Act.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil and criminal jurisdiction over the lands within this lakeshore, or of its right to tax persons, corporations, franchises, or other non-Federal property on the lands included in such lakeshore.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $23,000,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and the bill in its entirety be printed at this point in the RECORD and be considered as open for amendment at any point.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I will not object, I do this for the purpose of making inquiry of my colleague from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]. It is my understanding that when this bill is completed tomorrow, because of a commitment heretofore made by the Members, there will be no votes tomorrow and that if there is a record vote, it is to go over and be the first order of business on Friday, the 14th.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. I am advised that this is the case by the leadership on this side. However, to make it very clear, it is my further understanding in the proceeding under the 5-minute rule any teller votes or votes on division on particular amendments would occur tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. UDALL. Then we understand each other perfectly, and that is agreeable.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCFALL, 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. 51) to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MAKING IN ORDER VOTES ON H.R. 51 ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 14

Mr. MCFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any votes on the bill H.R. 51 be the first order of business on Friday, the 14th of October.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems uncommonly strange to me that in view of the unanimous-consent request that was granted not to have rollcall votes tomorrow and in view of no action beyond 1:30 p.m. yesterday and in view of the so-called rush to adjourn, that first, we are rising at this time tonight instead of completing this bill; and second, we are putting off votes until Friday, which is a time when some of us made commitments months ago and therefore cannot be present. I shall not object to this unanimous-consent request, but this is another in the long list of examples of deterrent procedures and delaying tactics on the part of the leadership that has made this a long Congress. Personally I resent it.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is not going to object, but in fairness to the Speaker, I should say to the gentleman I was unaware of the arrangement about tomorrow until just this evening. The matter of bringing the vote up on Friday was an accommodation to me.

Mr. HALL. Again I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, to accommodate the gentleman from Indiana. As I said to the Speaker, I will not object, but my point well stands. I think if anyone had been truly interested in adjourning this Congress sine die, they would not have given the consent, even in honor of Columbus, the discoverer of America, not to have a substantive vote on tomorrow, October 12.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 51 just considered by the House.

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

There was no objection.

IS U.S. AID FINANCING THAILAND'S ECONOMY?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been disturbed by recent allegations implying that the United States is singlehandedly attempting to solve the economic problems of Thailand. I think it important, therefore, to set the record

straight. The Thai economy is a going concern on its own. U.S. assistance is of only marginal importance. Finally, countries other than the United States, and international institutions are providing more economic aid to Thailand than the United States.

Thailand is a country with a population of about 31 million, living in an area about the same size as France. It is not overpopulated, being well endowed with natural resources. Boasting a literacy rate of over 60 percent, one of the highest in all Asia, and benefiting from Government programs which have reduced malaria, and other tropical diseases, the general health of the population is good and is being steadily improved. Despite a 3.3-percent yearly increase in population, Thailand's per capita gross national product in real terms has been growing at about 3 percent annually. Real per capita income has increased by 25 percent in the past 8 years. Since 1960, the annual growth rate of Thailand's gross national product in constant prices averaged 7 percent, the highest rate in all southeast Asia.

Based on a primarily agricultural economy, Thailand is the world's third largest producer of rubber and since 1965 has been the world's leading exporter of rice. Compared with agriculture, manufacturing holds a minor place, being centered chiefly in industries which process agricultural products for domestic use and export. However, the industrial sector since 1961 has been growing at better than 11 percent a year. Thailand has made notable strides in diversification of its economy. Within the past decade, corn, tapioca, and kenaf have become important export earners, supplementing the traditional products of rice, rubber, and tin.

Foreign trade, a vital part of Thailand's economy, has grown from 1960–64, both in imports and exports, at about 9 percent per year. The Thai currency in recent years has been characterized by great stability and free convertibility. Although during the past decade Thai Government budgets, a high proportion of which have gone for economic services, education, health and public services, have risen steadily, prices have remained relatively stable.

Thailand thus is in an excellent state of economic health. How important has U.S. assistance been and is it largely responsible for Thailand's economic progress? We can get some reliable indication by examining our grant economic aid. Our grant economic aid for the last 3 years totaled $12 million in fiscal year 1964, $19 million in 1965, and $43 million in fiscal year 1966. Thailand's gross national product in 1964 amounted to $3.4 billion, in 1965 to $3.8 billion, and in 1966 an estimated $4.1 billion. Our grant economic aid thus represents approximately one-half of 1 percent of the 1964 gross national product, one-half of 1 percent in 1965 and about 1 percent in 1966. It should be clear that Thailand's economic progress was achieved because of Thailand's economic and industrial development policies and programs and because of its sound monetary and fiscal policies.

The interest and confidence displayed by other countries in Thailand's economic prospects is another indication that the Thai performance is not a function of U.S. aid. Prior to 1960 the United States was the principal source for Thai economic and social development efforts. Since 1960 the situation has changed dramatically to the point where loans and grants from international agencies and third countries are greater than U.S. developmental loans and grants. In the period from 1959 to 1965, U.S. development grants and loans amounted to $196 million, while loans and grants from third countries and international agencies to Thailand totaled $222 million. There are at present 18 countries, in addition to the United States, which are providing aid to Thailand.

IMPORTANCE OF OCEANS TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the oceans to our national interest has required Congress to give increasing attention to the science of oceanography since 1959. In June of this year, congressional interest in this subject culminated in the enactment of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966. That act, for the first time, establishes national policy for development, encouragement, and maintenance of a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national program in the marine sciences for the benefit of mankind, to assist in protection of health and property; enhancement of commerce, transportation, and national security; rehabilitation of our fisheries; and increased utilization of all the resources of the sea.

The National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, which was created by the act, has already, under the capable chairmanship of the Vice President, begun work to translate this mandate of Congress into action. This is a temporary council, which will cease to exist after it has laid the foundation for the Nation's future oceanographic activities. Its work over the next year and a half will therefore be of the utmost importance to the future of oceanography in the United States.

One of the problems which must be faced up to at the present time is the need to develop more scientists capable of carrying on the oceanographic research and development work that is contemplated. The Congress has faced up to this problem already, and both Houses have recently passed legislation to establish and operate sea grant colleges and programs by initiating and supporting programs of education, training, and research in the marine sciences. I am pleased that this legislation has been enacted, so that steps can be taken to implement the necessary programs.

We are indeed fortunate to have, at the University of Miami, an Institute of Marine Science that epitomizes the type of institution that I believe is needed if we are to have the type of practical program that will advance the Nation's interest. The Miami Institute is under the direction of Dr. F. G. Walton Smith, an internationally known oceanographer and a practical man of science.

Dr. Smith recently presented a paper in New Orleans on the "Role of the Universities in Ocean Science and Technology," in which he discusses some of the problems facing our universities today in meeting their obligations for marine education and research. All of our aspirations with regard to the sea depend upon our universities. We need them to develop scientists and engineers adequate in quality and quantity to meet our national needs in the field of oceanography.

Dr. Smith is eminently qualified to discuss this subject, by virtue of his long and distinguished career which has carried him to all parts of the world in pursuit of his scientific interests.

Mr. Speaker, because his proposals for possible solution to oceanographic problems are so convincing, under unanimous consent I insert Dr. Smith's comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITIES IN OCEAN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

(By F. G. Walton Smith, director, Institute of Marine Science, University of Miami)

DEVELOPMENT OF OCEANOGRAPHY

The present status of oceanographic research and teaching in the Universities to a considerable extent reflects the history of the development of scientific interest in the ocean. Before the existence of marine science institutes, the earlier explorers such as Frobisher, Hudson, Bering, Cook, Franklin and Amundsen were primarily motivated by geographic, navigational or commercial objectives. Information regarding the biological and physical phenomena of the seas was relatively incidental. Even later explorers, such as Nansen or Shackleton, who undertook scientific observations, were still concerned with territorial aims and navigational objectives.

Independently of these expeditions, a second source of interest in the oceans began to develop in the nineteenth century as naturalists extended their observations more and more from the museum and laboratory into the field. Ehrenberg, Hooker, Örstedt, Darwin and Müller were some of the foremost amongst these. Physicists and mathematicians, including Kepler, Vossius, Fournier, Varenius and Laplace helped to provide the background for modern theories of ocean waves, currents and tides. For the most part, however, scientific interest in the ocean itself was still secondary and incidental to the desire to broaden basic scientific disciplines. It was only after the middle of the nineteenth century that a few scientists began to be interested in the ocean as a scientific objective per se. Forbes, Maury, Wyville Thompson, Murrary, Hjort were among the early ones, followed by Sars, Shun, Otto Petterson and Gustav Ekman. These helped to found the interdisciplinary attitude to oceanography which in recent years has taken as its objectives the elucidation of the large and small scale processes of energy exchange,

and of material transformations and movements within and across the boundaries of the oceans, thus encompassing a broad integrated range of biological, chemical and physical phenomena.

The early marine laboratories were either interested in the practical problems of the fisheries or were essentially biological stations, acting as extensions of university biological departments. The latter are exemplified by the Naples Zoological Station and the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, among others. Visitors to such stations, rather than a permanent staff, have contributed enormously to the development of biology not only in systematics and descriptive research but also in the biomedical fields of embryology, physiology and biochemistry. It is only comparatively recently that laboratories directed to the ocean itself, rather than to the principles of a basic science, have developed. Among the earliest of these were the Scripps Institution of Oceanography and the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

PRESENT DAY SITUATION

Research

Research in the marine sciences today reflects these diverse origins and scientific interests. There are still summer marine biological stations at which investigations are carried out upon marine organisms in an effort to solve biomedical problems. Since the greater part of biological evolution has taken place in the sea and since many marine organisms offer relatively simple and unspecialized material for experimental study, these stations are at least as important now as they were in the past to the development of the basic (non-oceanographic) sciences. Many of these facilities are part of, or associated with, universities.

During the past thirty years, there has also been a marked increase in the number of oceanographic institutes with a permanent staff, drawn from a wide range of basic scientific disciplines and concerned with the exploration of the ocean and the elucidation of the processes taking place within and across its borders. Most of these are associated with universities.

In addition to the traditional marine biological stations and the oceanographic institutes, fishery laboratories have continued to develop for the most part as federal or state organizations, although a small number exist in universities and private research institutions. This type of research activity, ostensibly directed to and justified by practical missions, now exists in a number of government agencies, charged with various objectives such as development or control of marine resources, naval purposes, weather prediction and control, coastal engineering, recreation and so forth. Some research of this nature is carried out in a few universities also.

Finally the sudden explosion of interest on the part of industry in the oceans as a source of profit has led to a considerable growth of engineering research and development directed towards naval and navigational applications, submarine vehicles, instrumentation, environmental control, and the exploitation of marine resources. Undoubtedly, a strong factor in this phenomenon is recognition of the possibility of an eventual cut-back or limitation to the costly and unrewarding space program and the probability that organized exploration of the oceans will be used as a partial economic buffer.

Education

These four main activities, basic science, oceanography, mission-oriented research and oceanographic engineering, all necessitate the training of specialized personnel. This in turn requires that the students shall acquire instruction and experience in the kinds of research activity which correspond to their future careers. Thus, the universities have an obligation to provide not only graduate training but also research opportunities for students interested in each one of these four main activities. This is accomplished today in two ways, one of which is essentially traditional, the other comparatively modern.

In the traditional training of an oceanographer or oceanographic engineer, he enters graduate school in a branch of engineering or basic science. He may or may not acquire a limited experience in the problems and techniques of oceanography during this period by taking summer courses at a marine station. In many cases, however, with no special training or experience in the field, he enters an oceanographic institution or engineering industry as an assistant and proceeds to gain his experience by "on-the-job" training, by internship, as it were.

Until comparatively recent years the only method of recruitment for oceanographers was by internship, but a growing number of institutes are now offering special graduate curricula, leading to degrees in oceanography, usually with concentration in a field related to one of the basic scientific disciplines or in a field such as "fisheries" which is usually the applied biology of fishes. The student is generally expected to have a strong undergraduate preparation in at least one of the basic sciences. This system of graduate specialization in oceanographic science has its counterpart in engineering, in which one or two schools have already introduced graduate "ocean engineering" specialization.

Still further in the direction of oceanographic specialization is the situation where curricula and even bachelors' degrees in oceanography, fisheries, or ocean engineering are offered to undergraduate students. The extreme example of this trend is to be found in at least two high schools which, to my personal knowledge, are planning to introduce oceanography as a major part of the science curriculum and to make biology and physics subordinate to it! This extreme attitude is plainly ridiculous and does not warrant further discussion.

Problems

One of the problems facing universities today is the pressure to train oceanographers and oceanic engineers. There is a danger of overtraining as well as of underproduction. Training in the traditional manner requires no special oceanographic facilities, since the student earns a Ph. D. in the basic sciences and only later enters an oceanographic institute as an intern or research assistant. On the other hand, specialized graduate training in oceanography does demand the elaborate facilities of an institution with oceanside laboratories and sea-going ships, or at least properly equipped coastwise craft. There are proponents of both methods of recruitment.

In The Effective Use of the Sea, the report of the President's Science Advisory Committee Panel on Oceanography (PSACPOO), the traditional, nonoceanographic approach is favored. Paradoxically the same report suggests that a hopeful development would be the establishment of educational programs in the broad area of environmental sciences. It states that traditional training ensures that a sound education in the basic sciences will not be neglected in favor of specialized training in the oceanic environment. On the other hand, the second suggestion favors the other extreme in which both basic science and the oceanic environment are neglected in favor of a training spread thinly out over many environments. The only advantage in both recommendations is that the student, by not specializing in oceanography, is fitted for a wider range of occupation and therefore the danger of training more specialists than the demand requires is avoided.

To many of us who were, perforce, recruited by the traditional or internship path, a specialized oceanographic training is the preferred approach. The danger of weakening basic scientific training does exist, but is not necessarily a serious one. After all, the principles of ecology are at least as well demonstrated in teaching the ecology of the seas as in teaching the ecology of forests or lakes. Graduate work in oceanography, if properly taught, following a sound undergraduate training in the basic sciences, involves a continued development of their concepts and principles, using the ocean rather than other environments as a principal source of demonstration material.

From a positive point of view, the study of the ocean, even more than other areas of scientific research, involves special techniques and methods, an understanding of a complex environment and an ability to appreciate the limitations of work at sea. To withhold these practical aspects of training until after completion of the Ph. D. hardly seems practical.

Experience has indicated that the traditionally trained scientist who only later enters oceanography is more apt to be concerned with narrow and theoretical aspects of the ocean than with the interactions of biology, chemistry and physics in the broad and complex patterns of material and energy transformations of the marine environment. At the same time it has always seemed that the atmosphere most productive of ideas is one in which the oceanographic specialist is in close communication with the non-oceanographic scientist, and that the two points of view complement rather than hinder each other. Thus, the best of both approaches is found, for instance, at the Marine Biological Laboratory at Plymouth and is strongly encouraged in my own institute, through close relations with the basic science departments of the University, and through visiting investigators who are not always oceanographic specialists.

There is a third tendency in education that appears to retain the virtues of neither the traditional nor the specialist approach, and that is the effort to offer oceanographic curricula leading to higher degrees in inland universities. Even with access to oceanographic institutes for field experience in the summer, students recruited in this fashion can have neither the peculiar practical knowledge of environment and methodology of the oceanographic specialist nor the concentrated expertise of the traditional graduate in the basic discipline.

What has been said for the specialized training approach to ocean science applies equally well to the training of engineers for careers in "oceanics." It seems desirable that such parameters as corrosion, wave stress, biological deterioration, and the techniques of operation at sea should be inculcated as part of graduate training program, specially designed for this purpose.

The one conclusion against which there can be little argument is that the development of graduate training in oceanography and oceanographic engineering should not preclude but rather encourage the closest possible relationship between the institutes of oceanography and the basic science and engineering departments of a university.

A need that has only been partially filled is that of training personnel for the mission-oriented agencies. Only in fishery management has a real effort been made to meet this. Even among fishery biologists, however, there has been a tendency to be preoccupied with isolated biological problems and to be basic science oriented, rather than to strive towards the objectives of development and maintenance of an industry. In spite of the efforts of one or two outstanding schools, there is, in many cases, insufficient opportunity for the student to become acquainted with the legal, engineering, food technology, economic and marketing prob-

lems of the fisheries, which more often than not outweigh the purely biological ones.

What has been true of the fisheries may be even more true of other government objectives which require scientific personnel who are primarily oriented to practical applications rather than to pure science. Great improvements have taken place already as the agencies have grown, but the primary difference between the philosophy of pure science and that of serving a practical mission should certainly be carefully considered by the universities in the development of their graduate programs. As a corollary to this it is equally desirable that mission-oriented agencies continue to scrutinize the gray area of their operations that lies between research that is pertinent to the mission and that which is pure science. Obviously the remedy for the foregoing is for a much closer cooperation between university schools of oceanography and related sciences and the government agencies. The requirements of engineering industry likewise necessitate some input of a knowledge of the ocean environment into engineering schools. Surprisingly, industry has not shown any great interest in supporting the few programs that meet these requirements.

With the expansion of government support for research in oceanography some of the government granting agencies, especially those concerned with biological and biomedical sciences, have become involved in the support of oceanographic projects, but have not in all cases become fully cognizant of the techniques and logistical problems involved in such projects. The situation has improved, but it is clearly desirable that personnel with an understanding of the oceanographic environment and its associated problems should continue to be available to such agencies for a proper evaluation of the projects they support.

The financial problems of oceanographic institutions in the universities have not been lessened with the increase in the total funds available for research. Rather, with new institutes appearing at a great rate and with biomedical marine stations being drawn away from their original functions by the lure of oceanography and with inland universities seeking to join the popular trend, the competition for funds has become even more severe. In addition, the actual funds available to universities are much less than generally supposed. Between 1963 and 1967 the total expenditures for the National Oceanographic Program increased from $155 to $312 million, according to The Effective Use of the Sea. The amount spent on basic research in academic institutions and government laboratories increased from $23.9 to only $27.5 million. The ratio of basic research expenditures to the total thus dropped from 13% to 9% during this period. (These do not include ship operating costs.) It is believed that the ratio of basic research support in academic institutions to that in government institutions and agencies has also dropped. The Universities have not found, so far, an authoritative body adequately to represent their role and interests in the National Oceanographic Program.

The problem that is probably most frequently discussed among the directors of academic oceanographic institutes is that of financing ship operations. Until recently much of the financial support for operating research vessels consisted of partial amounts contained in individual research grants. It was an exercise in accounting to make sure that the actual days of ship operating time were properly apportioned among the various projects, especially as the course of research and ship operation usually necessitated changes in scheduled operating days and prorated cost per day. Two ships were later funded en bloc, for the purpose of general usage in biological research and training, without the requirement that specific research projects be justified and approved in advance. This has worked reasonably well, although there have not always been sufficient applicants and projects for continuous full time operation. It is to be hoped that a similar system can in future be extended to institutions with a long record of useful operation, with projects already justified and approved, on similar block-funding terms to those of the ships of general usage. Above all, it is desirable that, in the future, when the building of research vessels is approved and funded, ample provision be made for operation as well, lest the ships become subject to involuntary lay-up. The agencies concerned have made notable progress in this direction, but there are still problems.

A source of irritation to some scientists is the growth in number of organizations, meetings, symposia, and publications which has been prompted by the rapid development of oceanography. Both meetings and publications are generating an increasing amount of redundancy, more particularly in engineering fields, but also to lesser extent among the scientific disciplines of oceanography. Possibly the addition of a few more will reduce the situation to a degree of absurdity sufficient to eliminate some of the excess.

The future

Since many of the problems faced by the academic oceanographic institutions are a result of rapid growth, it may be assumed that a more orderly atmosphere will develop as time goes on and the curve flattens out. There will undoubtedly be an increase in educational efforts and it is to be expected that some of this may take place in universities which are removed from adequate ocean laboratory and ship facilities, as well as in existing oceanographic institutions. There will also continue to be increasing numbers of graduates trained in the traditional basic sciences. The latter will ensure an adequate pool from which oceanographers can be recruited as interns to supplement those receiving specialized oceanographic training, so that there will be no great need for extending existing academic oceanographic institutes or founding new ones. As the same time it is to be expected that more of the existing oceanside institutes will expand their facilities to admit graduate students from other universities on a cooperative basis. The building of new institutes will probably be kept within reasonable bounds on account of the cost and the shortage of trained and long experienced senior personnel to man them, although pressure may be expected to develop in this particular direction.

The development of oceanographic curricula in universities remote from ocean facilities may be expected to lead to demands for the provision of such facilities. This is the most probable manner in which overproduction of graduates may occur. The more aggressive universities may, either singly or in groups, yield to the natural temptation to build and own their own institutes at the nearest convenient oceanside locality, rather than to make use of existing laboratories, or existing laboratories may become inadequate for their needs. As previously pointed out, reliance upon a pool of students, trained in the basic sciences, provides a buffer against overproduction, whereas a general increase in the number of universities offering oceanographic curricula provides no such control. Probably the most useful growth in facilities will be in order to provide for joint use by oceanographers and visiting, non-oceanographic scientists.

Research experience in mission-oriented projects must be provided in universities in order to train personnel to man the agencies and industry. Training in mission-oriented fields such as engineering and fisheries will therefore improve as cooperation is developed between industry, government agencies, and the universities. Visiting committees are one possible way of accomplishing this. This type of cooperation and coordination may also serve to minimize in-house training and research which could be done better within universities. In these and in the other problems referred to, there is likely to be improved liaison and understanding if and when a suitable machinery is set up which can advise Congress and the government and which has the benefit of information input from the universities, industry, government agencies, Congress and the granting agencies. It is particularly desirable that the universities be adequately represented.

An existing trend which will undoubtedly continue is the organization of groups of universities into cooperative groups or corporations for the purpose of strengthening requests for funds, and for efficiency in the operation of large and expensive facilities. Those that have a strong underlying and specific purpose, such as a large drilling operation (JOIDES), will probably be most effective. Those that organize for promotional purposes will probably find increasing competition as other institutions seek to do likewise or as they become large and unwieldy.

A JOINT JET AIRPORT TO SERVE SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the regional concept of planning is a particularly sound one when it applies to a large airport. To build an airport in West Virginia is an expensive proposition, involving as it does the leveling of ridges and valleys in most cases. To accommodate the jets of the future, longer runways are necessary. And airports will play a vital role in helping to insure that every State in the Appalachian area has the opportunity to escape economic and commercial isolation.

The two largest cities in West Virginia, Charleston and Huntington, are located 50 miles apart in the southwestern section of West Virginia, close to the Kentucky and Ohio borders. Although both cities now have airports with runways between 5,000 and 6,000 feet in length, and the cities are being joined by an interstate highway, there are some individuals in both Huntington and Charleston who feel that separate airports can be maintained in the future. Mr. Speaker, this is not only impossible to finance, but it does not make sense from the standpoint of airline scheduling, service, and the proximity of the cities.

THE GREATEST GOOD FOR THE GREATEST NUMBER

Accordingly, there are many farsighted citizens who look hopefully for the day when the two communities can pool their efforts and join to build a midway airport to serve the greatest good of the greatest number.

It is quite natural that the people of the State's capital city, Charleston,

should wish to have an airport of their own, as close in as possible. For this reason, they have advocated and the Kanawha County Court has applied for funds from the Federal Aviation Agency to construct an airport at Guthrie, north of Charleston. The midway airport site, pinpointed on a ridge near Hurricane in the Cow Creek area, is actually closer to Charleston than to Huntington, and will be only 25 minutes driving time from downtown Charleston upon completion of the interstate highway into Charleston.

It is an accident of geography and administration that it is simply easier to submit an application to the Federal Aviation Agency on behalf of the Guthrie site, since it is entirely within Kanawha County. Because the ruling interests of Kanawha County adamantly refuse to discuss or even accept an invitation to hear the presentation on behalf of the economic and engineering advantages of the midway site, it is difficult to reach an agreement between Charleston and Huntington. Furthermore, the midway site is in Putnam County, and Huntington is located in Cabell County. It takes two to tango, but Charleston refuses to accept the invitation to dance and accuses Huntington of, first, failure to have an application on file; second, inability to raise the money in matching funds; and third, having the bad grace to want an airport which is not located 100 percent within the administrative boundaries of one county, as Charleston wants.

ENTER OHIO AND KENTUCKY

Now come along southeastern Ohio and eastern Kentucky to express their interest in a midway airport. All four U.S. Senators from Ohio and Kentucky, and Representatives CARL PERKINS, of Kentucky, and WALTER MOELLER, of Ohio, enthusiastically endorse the midway airport. In response to criticisms of Tri-State—Huntington—Airport officials that Ohio and Kentucky residents would prefer Tri-State Airport over driving to the midway airport, the Ohio and Kentucky officials state quite emphatically that they would prefer driving the extra distance to a midway site. At this point, the Charleston newspapers charge that such support constitutes meddling by out-of-Staters in a West Virginia problem. Tensions rise. Tempers flare.

How can this difficult situation be resolved in the best interests of the greatest number of people? Only through intelligent leadership which can raise the thinking above the narrow provincialism which has all too often characterized the arguments of the past. We cannot afford to accept what one community demands, or another community demands. It is an abdication of responsibility to hope that everything will work itself out at the grassroots. West Virginia waits and hopes that the magic formula of broad vision and constructive statesmanship will in some manner help supply the answers.

PULASKI DAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, October 11, is Pulaski Day.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is wise that we pause in our very busy schedule to pay tribute to this great warrior who came to America and fought in the American Revolution.

Mr. Speaker, 187 years ago on this day, October 11, 1776, Pulaski fell in battle at the Battle of Savannah in defense of freedom for our country.

I feel that it is also perhaps significant to point out on this day that there are those who have tried to leave an impression that, perhaps, some of those who have followed Pulaski have been less understanding of many of the problems that confront our country. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that, in this millennium year when the Poles are observing their 1,000th anniversary, Pulaski is but one glorious history in that long and glorious and heroic struggle for human decency; and, for those who would like to try and leave a different impression, let them just look at the record of Poland and they shall see a long series of heroic battles and great sacrifices on the altar of human dignity.

RIGHTWING CONSERVATIVES IN THE GOP

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STALBAUM. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, one of the most disturbing items this year in this election campaign is to note the resurgence of the conservative element.

Mr. Speaker, there was much speculation and belief in 1964 that there would be a change in their operations and in their activities. Yet as we analyze the internal workings of the Republican Party and the candidates whom they are putting forward this year, we find that the Goldwater element, that element which we believed had been so resoundingly defeated in 1964, is still dominant in the Republican Party and is continuing to control the party.

Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out in various newspaper articles and through other media that in 1968 it can be expected at the convention that this conservative Goldwater group will again control most of the delegates.

I am more interested, of course, Mr. Speaker, in 1966, and I wish to point out the fact that this conservative group is still the dominant group in our loyal opposition to the Democrats here in the Congress and who will be campaigning during the fall, that they are still closely allied with various far-rightist extreme groups where they have been operating in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly impressed by a story which appeared in the Congressional Quarterly on July 6, and which article appeared in a number of papers, headed "Conservatives Bouncing Back in Primary Polls."

Mr. Speaker, that article points out the various districts where there is well-known Goldwater support for ex-Members of Congress who were defeated in the 1964 great victory, but who are again running, where they have been challenged by well-known moderate candidates, but are opposed by the Goldwater conservative, reactionary candidates and where they have usually been the victors.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to incorporate this article, "Conservatives Bouncing Back in Primary Polls" in my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

The article referred to follows:

CONSERVATIVES BOUNCING BACK IN PRIMARY POLLS

(By Congressional Quarterly)

WASHINGTON.—Rock-ribbed conservatives identified with the political ideology of former Senator Barry Goldwater, many of whom went down to defeat in the 1964 elections when Goldwater headed their ticket, are showing remarkable powers of recovery in Republican congressional primaries around the country.

The victories for the conservatives, who have emerged triumphant in virtually every contest where moderate or liberal Republicans opposed them, testify to the superior resources and energies of the conservative wing of the GOP in the crucial area of party organization.

Backing up the conservatives with issues and staff assistance, and sometimes cold cash, has been a grouping of forces that includes conservatives in Republican staff positions on Capitol Hill, the right-wing Young Americans for Freedom and Citizens for Goldwater-Miller. Citizens for Goldwater-Miller saved over $300,000 to be used in 1966 election races for conservative candidates. Goldwater forces refused the request of GOP National Chairman Ray C. Bliss to turn over the funds, left over from the 1964 campaign, to the Republican National Committee for regular party use.

Moderate and liberal GOP contenders, on the other hand, generally have been required to satisfy themselves with press release endorsements by groups like Republicans for Progress and the Council of Republican Organizations. Both groups are allied with the anti-Goldwater wing of the party, but they have had virtually no financial resources to pump into the crucial primary contests.

The most recent conservative victories came in the June 28 New York congressional primaries. Former Rep. Steven B. Derounian, one of the few New York Republicans to back Goldwater for the 1964 presidential nomination, defeated moderate GOP contender William J. Casey by a lopsided vote of 22,542 to 15,956 on Long Island. In addition to help from conservative GOP forces from numerous areas, Derounian was aided by a promise by House Republican Conference Chairman Melvin R. Laird of Wisconsin that Derounian would get back his old seat on the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee if reelected to Congress.

Among other leaders who lined up on Derounian's side were Goldwater himself, House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, and William F. Buckley Jr., the 1965 Con-

servative party candidate for mayor in New York City.

Casey, a wealthy law partner of former Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall, received last-minute endorsements from a number of moderate leaders including New York Sen. JACOB K. JAVITS. The moderates, however, were reported not to have backed up their endorsements with positive staff assistance or contact with opinion leaders within the district.

In the fall, Derounian will face Democratic Rep. LESTER L. WOLFF, the man who edged him by 2,620 votes in the 1964 election. The district encompasses the northern section of Nassau County on Long Island and is normally Republican.

In another New York congressional primary, former Rep. John R. Pillion, a stanch conservative and also a Goldwater backer in 1964, upset the officially endorsed Republican candidate, banker Kenneth J. McIlraith. Pillion had claimed that McIlraith's selection by party leaders was "dictated in New York City by the Rockefeller machine and big banking and money interests."

The vote in the Pillion-McIlraith race was 13,656–11,939 in favor of the former incumbent. Freshman Democratic Rep. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY beat Pillion by 11,301 votes in 1964 in the suburban Buffalo district.

Previous 1966 primary victories for GOP conservatives have included:

Kentucky 4th District (Louisville suburbs)—Former Rep. M. Gene Snyder, another strong Goldwater supporter in 1964, defeated James Thompson, choice of the moderate Republican leadership in Louisville, by a vote of 9,332 to 5,534 in the May 24 primary. Speaking for Snyder during the primary campaign was Frank J. Kovac, finance chairman of the right-wing Americans for Constitutional Action, who told area Republicans that Snyder had the endorsement of a number of conservative GOP congressmen including Reps. JAMES B. UTT of California, and ALBERT W. WATSON of South Carolina. Kovac also claimed FORD had endorsed Synder, but FORD subsequently professed neutrality in the contest.

Pennsylvania 19th District (South Central-York)—Former Rep. George A. Goodling, another congressman who endorsed Goldwater for the 1964 nomination and then went down to defeat with him, overcame the opposition of Republican leaders in his district to win the 1966 GOP House nomination over five challengers. Goodling, who is 70, had refused the request of local GOP chieftains to step aside in favor of a younger man. In November he will face popular freshman Democratic Rep. N. NEIMAN CRALEY, 38, who beat Goodling by 2,689 votes in 1964.

Maine 1st District (South-Portland-Augusta)—Former Rep. Peter A. Garland, an outspoken conservative, who served in Congress in 1961–62 but who had been upset by Rep. STANLEY R. TUPPER, a GOP liberal, in the 1962 Republican primary, staged a comeback in the June 20 primary by defeating six opponents. The strength of the conservatives in the district was demonstrated by the ability of Garland and another conservative in the race to win 49 per cent of the vote between them, while the strongest running liberal polled only 21 per cent. The way was opened for Garland's comeback by TUPPER'S retirement from Congress.

Ohio 24th District (Southwest-Middletown)—Though he had never before served in Congress, right-wing Young Republicans leader Donald E. (Buzz) Lukens was able to score a stunning primary victory over the choice of the regular Ohio GOP organization, state Rep. Charles H. Jones, in the May 3 primary. Intensive campaigning, effective precinct organization and a gift of $5,000 from Citizens for Goldwater-Miller helped Lukens score his upset in the newly created safely Republican district.

Comeback tries by five additional conservative Republicans all of whom lost out in the 1964 Johnson landslide, are scheduled for later this summer. They are former Reps. Henry C. Schadeberg in the Wisconsin 1st District, J. Edgar Chenoweth in the Colorado 3rd District, General P. Meader in the Michigan 2nd District, Louis C. Wyman in the New Hampshire 1st District, and William Henry Harrison in Wyoming. Schadeberg is unopposed while Chenoweth, Meader and Harrison all face significant opposition.

A lesser number of moderate Republicans were defeated in 1964, but two of them—former Reps. Abner W. Sibal of the Connecticut 4th District and Fred Schwengel of the Iowa 1st District—are making comeback tries. Sibal already has won renomination, and Schwengel is not expected to encounter significant opposition in the Sept. 6 primary.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I have another article which delves into the same area and which appeared at about the same time, an article which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel, our leading Milwaukee morning paper, headed, "Resilience in GOP."

Mr. Speaker, the article begins by referring to "Ronald Reagan's solid victory in the California Republican Governor's primary has captured the lion's share of the attention, but it is by no means the only sign of a GOP conservative comeback."

The article goes on to state that "Conservatives identified with the political ideology of Barry Goldwater, including some who were buried in the 1964 landslide, are showing remarkable powers of recovery in congressional primaries around the country."

It concludes by saying that "many voters who were spooked by the smear campaign against Goldwaterism and stampeded into voting Democratic may now be returning to the fold."

While I do not accept their findings, I do recognize the fact that the evidence shows that Republican voters and the far-right organizations are able to manifest a great deal of power in the Republican primaries throughout the country.

I would like to ask unanimous consent to incorporate this article, "Resilience in GOP," taken from the Milwaukee Sentinel of July 6 in my comments on this particular point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESILIENCE IN GOP

Ronald Reagan's solid victory in the California Republican governor primary has captured the lion's share of the attention, but it is by no means the only sign of a GOP conservative comeback.

Conservatives identified with the political ideology of Barry Goldwater, including some who were buried in the 1964 landslide, are showing remarkable powers of recovery in congressional primaries around the country.

GOLDWATER BACKERS WIN

In New York, former Rep. Steven B. Derounian, one of the few New York Republicans to back Goldwater for the 1964 presidential nomination, defeated moderate GOP contender William J. Casey, 22,542 to 15,956. In another New York congressional primary, former Rep. John R. Pillion, also a Goldwater backer in 1964, upset the officially endorsed Republican candidate, banker Kenneth J. McIlraith, 13,656 to 11,939.

Previous 1966 primary victories for GOP conservatives have included:

In Kentucky, former Rep. M. Gene Snyder, another strong Goldwater supporter in 1964, defeated James Thompson, choice of the self-styled moderate Republican leadership in Louisville, 9,332 to 5,534.

In Pennsylvania, former Rep. George A. Goodling, another congressman who endorsed Goldwater for the 1964 nomination and then went down to defeat with him, overcame the opposition of Republican leaders in his district to win over five challengers.

In Maine, former Rep. Peter A. Garland, a conservative who had been upset by a liberal Republican in the 1962 primary, staged a comeback in the June 20 primary by defeating six opponents.

In Ohio, Young Republicans leader Donald E. (Buzz) Lukens, although he had never before served in congress, scored a stunning primary victory over the choice of the regular Ohio GOP organization, state Rep. Charles H. Jones, in the May 3 primary.

Comeback bids by five additional conservative Republicans who lost out in the 1964 Johnson landslide are scheduled for later this year. The group includes Rep. Henry C. Schadeberg in Wisconsin's 1st district.

Noting the resurgence of conservatism, Congressional Quarterly editorial services says the victories of conservative candidates in virtually every contest where moderate or liberal Republicans opposed them "testifies to the superior resources and energies of the conservative wing of the GOP in the crucial area of party organization."

Doubtless this is part of the explanation. The liberal wing of the Republican party simply can't seem to coalesce its forces or begin to match the conservative wing for enthusiasm and dedication.

But superior resources and energies are not the only factors working for the recovery of conservatism. For one thing, conservatives are managing to shake off the cockleburs of extremism; the extremist burs are sticking to the liberals now. For another thing, thinking people, as they become disillusioned with failing liberal solutions, are beginning to turn to conservatism for better answers. Finally, many voters who were spooked by the smear campaign against Goldwaterism and stampeded into voting Democrat may now be returning to the fold.

Mr. STALBAUM. Of course, what we are attempting to point out at this stage is the fact that they are still closely alined with various extremist groups throughout the country. Other colleagues of mine have noted this in their particular campaigns, and I am sure have something to offer in this particular respect.

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

Mr. STALBAUM. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to put in the RECORD several items about the gentleman, first of all, who: accused Eisenhower administration of appeasement over Antarctic Treaty; warned of spread of communism at the South Pole; traveled there for on-the-spot search for Communists.

Who hailed such extremist groups as the Minutemen, opposed by most Republicans. The Young Americans for Freedom, banned from a university in New York, the Niagara University, for views "not only contrary to the American way

of life, but also to sound Catholic principles," and named their local chapter after this gentleman.

Who went counter to Republican policy by urging Atomic Energy Commission to increase its production "not of clean bombs, but of maximum radioactive bombs with low ceilings."

Who charged that "Communists exist in our churches, our schools and colleges, in the movies, on the radio, on television, in the newspaper field and in our Government."

Who charged that President John F. Kennedy's "pro-Communist State Department" was "in the process of selling out West Berlin," introduced a bill to abolish the State Department.

Who voted against President Kennedy's bill to establish the Peace Corps.

Who declared that the United States is "fanatically and foolishly obsessed with disarmament and peace" and that the fear of nuclear war has been "highly inflated and grossly exaggerated."

Who said that the steady decline of U.S. views and prestige and the increase in Soviet Communist power is leading us to the "grim and desperate alternative of either: surrender, or a preventive thermonuclear war."

Who rejected as a "puny gesture" and "a whistle in the darkness of our own cemetery" President Kennedy's call for authority to activate 150,000 reservists to deal with crisis in Berlin.

Who urged the United States to develop the neutron bomb and manned earth-orbiting space ship with nuclear launching capability.

Who went counter to Republicans like President Eisenhower and Senator DIRKSEN in 1963 by his opposition to limited nuclear test ban treaty.

And who, before the Warren Commission's report on the assassination of President Kennedy was issued, predicted that it would be a "whitewash," and would reflect the State Department's policies of appeasement of communism.

The Commission members included such distinguished Republicans as Chief Justice Warren and U.S. Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

Mr. Speaker, I know that responsible Republicans of the caliber of President Eisenhower and Senator DIRKSEN do not share views like these. One might expect that statements such as these, such as suggesting that we can either surrender to the Communists or start a preventive thermonuclear war; or to urge that we put atomic planes or atomic satellites in orbit around the earth or that the State Department is selling us out in West Berlin—as I say, one might expect suggestions such as these to be made by a man who would go to the South Pole for an on-the-spot search for Communists. You might wonder where you would find such a person. Well for 12 years you found him right here in this Chamber. Now he is making an effort to return here.

I think the resurgence of this kind of wild, extremist philosophy is and should be a matter of serious concern for all Americans.

I would think that those of us who do not wish to have irresponsible statements of this type to be made had better wake up and find out what is happening in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York, for giving us such a vivid description of the type of candidates, a matter which is of concern to us, in this particular campaign year.

What my colleague from New York has said emphasizes and makes stronger the point that I indicated we are making here, which is that the conservative forces in the Republican Party are still strong and able to put their candidates on their ticket.

I am truly pleased that my good colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York, was able to make this illustration for us and place it before us at this time.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STALBAUM. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, current national surveys show that although the Democrats have lost some of the bloom of their 1964 popularity, due to the inevitable irritations that are associated with incumbency, the remarkable fact is that that bloom has not been transferred to the Republicans, but rather to the independents. In other words, although the Democrats have suffered the temporary and partial loss of popularity which is the lot of the party in power, the Republican popularity has not gained correspondingly, if at all.

Current Gallup polls show that only about 25 percent of the people in this country are willing to stand up and count themselves as Republicans, whereas almost twice that number are willing to identify themselves as Democrats. The remainder of the people, who equal or exceed the entire number of Republicans, remain politically unaffiliated. They have sampled Republicanism, and have found it bitter to their taste. They have preferred remaining outside the mainstream of American politics to joining the "minority party."

If American history affords a parallel phenomenon, at least within recent times, I do not recall it.

Political philosophers may debate this matter ad infinitum, but the real reason for present day Republican ineffectiveness is not difficult to find. It may be thus simply stated: the Democrats have a program, and the Republicans do not.

Nature and politics abhor a vacuum. Problems can pile up just so high, and then their solution becomes literally a matter of life or death. It is like sweeping dirt under a rug. For a while you can get away with it, and then, finally, you cannot.

People understand this. They would rather put their faith in a party that candidly recognizes the problem, and produces a program to deal with it, even though that program may be interlaced with mistakes, than in a party that refuses to acknowledge the existence of the problem, or that merely shuts its eyes until the problem goes away.

The case of the gentleman who is now running against me for my seat in Congress is typical. For weeks he has been harpooning me for my constructive votes: calling me a "rubber stamp," a "yes man," a "Socialist," and a "spendthrift." Yet I scan his record in vain to find a constructive suggestion to help solve the massive problems which the pressures of modern technology and population have created.

It is true that the conservative Republicans will continue to enjoy a certain amount of hard core, militant support, and it will come from those who have an unpleasant experience with the Federal Government or from those for whom the payment of taxes is particularly distasteful, or whose native conservatism and resistance to change constitute an inevitable anti-Federal rallying point.

I must confess there are things which the Federal Government has done which have almost driven me to distraction, and I would be the last person to ascribe to it the virtue of infallibility.

But what I am saying is that no political party worthy of survival can be built up solely on discontent, the frustrations, and the ill will of those who suffer from a sense of injured innocence, and as long as the Republican Party caters especially to this group, they will continue to remain the minority party and will deserve to so remain.

In my opinion, Republicans are not performing their function as the loyal opposition when they offer nothing but criticism rather than constructive alternatives.

Recently, the Republican Coordinating Committee presented to the Nation some recommendations that had all the earmarks of a constructive alternative. These recommendations included such things as automatic cost-of-living increases in social security benefits, more Federal aid to build hospitals and nursing homes, more Federal aid to cities channeled through the States, et cetera.

This would have been impressive but for the sobering fact that all the evidence indicates that the Republicans themselves do not take these suggestions seriously. One of the members of the committee stated that it was necessary to use a facade to get the factions of the Republican Party back together again.

As I understand it, the facade is the front or facing of the structure placed there more for decorative purposes than for support.

Mr. Goldwater himself has made snarling and contemptuous references to the so-called leftwing of the Republican splinter groups who are attempting to undermine all that he has stood for. He has stated categorically that the 1968 Republican Convention will be controlled from 75 to 80 percent by the same group who controlled it in 1964, and that any presidential aspirant who does not think so should take a long second look. He has certainly made indications that his own first choice would be Ronald Reagan, if he should win his test for the governorship of California, and that almost his last choice would be Gov. George Romney.

Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that the Council of Republican Organizations which, as I understand it, is a group of Republicans who are moderate in their political thinking and are forward-looking and who are attempting to put the Republicans back on a more constructive course—that this organization has now apparently accepted the inevitable.

I have read several statements coming from their office to the effect that they have finally agreed that Mr. Goldwater is probably correct in his estimate that the 1968 Republican Convention will be controlled 75 to 80 percent by those who controlled it in 1964.

Perhaps I could read two or three sentences from Mr. Goldwater that appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on September 9:

Our Republican Party's left-wing fringe is at it again. They are still moaning and groaning over the fact that even though they are a tiny minority in the party, everybody in the party is out of step except them. They are still trying to use the Republican Party as a base from which to launch political programs that are little more than carbon copies of Democratic Party programs.

Currently, the case in point is a report put out by a group calling itself the Council of Republican Organizations. This group, of indeterminate membership, describes itself as representing ten "progressive" Republican groups. What they mean, of course, is ten little welfare-state splinter groups, all dedicated in one way or another to using the Federal Government as an instrument to regiment, rule and reconstitute every individual.

It is an obvious fact that the Republican Party basically is opposed to collectivist programs, stands for the individual against state coercion and can be termed conservative in today's mixed-up political labeling.

From this fact, I drew another perfectly obvious conclusion: that at least three-fourths of the delegates to the Republican Party's next presidential nominating convention also would be conservative, just as they have been year after year (and just as Democrat delegates have tended to be liberal, despite the existence in their party of conservative splinter groups).

Lo and behold, the Council of Republican Organizations has looked around the country and found that what I said was all true. Their report, which commanded attention far beyond that warranted by the group's actual stature, makes particularly painful noises about the fact that conservatives have "consolidated" power in the House of Representatives under Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, the Republican Conference chairman.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to read from a recent article by Edward P. Morgan which I believe summarizes very adequately the point I am trying to bring out at the present time. This article appeared in the AFL–CIO News bearing date of August 13, 1966.

The Republican Party, like its opposite number, the Democratic Party, has no viable future outside the middle ground of the national political spectrum.

The extremes, whether racist, radical right or far left, are expensive but unavoidable luxuries of the two-party system in an open society but they are the refuge of nuts and nuisances, not the foundation of a triumphant new political order. The great bulk of American voters are moderate, some a little right, some a little left of center.

The pros of both parties know this but the Democratic pros are more successful in putting this axiom to work and one of the big reasons for this is that the Republican Party has failed to modernize its human structure. Not long ago Barry Goldwater said, in effect, that any GOP presidential aspirant who thought the Republican convention of 1968 would be controlled by different kinds of people than the delegates who nominated him in 1964, that aspirant was in for a shocking surprise.

As of now ex-Senator Goldwater is right. The grassroots party organization across the land is still largely in the hands of decent, respectable, hard-working businessmen, lawyers, real estate operators and others with astigmatism in their political vision. They know little or nothing about the art of government and politics, partly because they have always regarded government as the enemy.

The party needs not a man on horseback but a modern moderate who knows the difference between planning and socialism, recognizes that the computer has done more than to revolutionize cost-accounting and has a face that doesn't scare babies on television. The Republicans can count some highly intelligent political talent on their side. The trouble is that when these forward-looking figures start generating a little momentum, as if they were really going somewhere, the party's organizational rank and file slips a banana peel in their path.

In conclusion, the evidence is overwhelming that the trend of the Republican Party at the present time is to continue the course which it charted in 1964. It is essentially a course of criticism, of negativism, and is barren of constructive suggestions. Because of this I believe the American people, in going to the polls on November 8, should be very careful and cautious as to whom they select.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that on November 8 the American people will decide as they have decided so many times before that the safety of this Nation will lie in the hands of those who present a constructive program.

Mr. STALBAUM. I thank my esteemed colleague from Utah for his very valuable contribution to this point which we are attempting to make in the record this evening.

There is no question, as we analyze these statements, that throughout the country—I have had colleagues join me from the East and the West, and, of course, I represent the central part of the Nation—we are seeing conservative candidates following the Goldwater philosophy rising again. I shall have more to say on that in a few moments.

Perhaps the best illustration of this is in the State of California, where we find a candidate running for Governor, an actor by the name of Ronald Reagan, who I feel is putting on the best act right now he has ever put on in attempting to become Governor of that State. He has a long background of supporting right-wing groups. The evidence and file on this is big. I wish to take only a few items, to place in my remarks, to cover this.

Emmet John Hughes on June 27 in Newsweek in an article entitled "The Squandering Republicans" went on to state: "And if the prospect tells much about the State of California, it tells still more about the state of the Republican Party."

It goes into great detail to point out that the Republican Party has not learned from the campaign of 1964 by coming forward with candidates of this type.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place this article at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE SQUANDERING REPUBLICANS

(By Emmet John Hughes)

The idea of an actor named Ronald Reagan becoming the next governor of America's largest state evokes a political vision approximately as radiant as a nomination of Rock Hudson to be the next Secretary of State. And if the prospect tells much about the State of California, it tells still more about the state of the Republican Party.

Perhaps only the capricious California electorate of 8 million could stage such a political jest. Mercurial in judgment, the state's voters practice a notorious disdain for serious issues. In 1964's Presidential primary, Nelson Rockefeller narrowly lost to Barry Goldwater, by the view of most GOP analysts, essentially because the birth of the governor's child on election eve provoked enough Californians to vote their censure of his second marriage. Now in 1966's gubernatorial primary, the contest won by Reagan was clumsily fought by the rule of the GOP state chairman: "Thou shalt speak no evil of other Republicans." This injunction was issued as "the Eleventh Commandment," and it seems possible that only a GOP public-relations office could conceive a slogan so witless and so tasteless.

A veteran with decades of service in B movies and TV commercials, the victorious Reagan attests a special freedom from discrimination in Republican politics: no man should be barred from a rich prize of power merely on grounds of his desperate poverty of thought. Ruddy of cheek and white of tooth and blue of eye, he projects a Technicolor study in patriotic imagery. For 30 years, he has dabbled in politics with a delight unspoiled by contemplation or consistence. Long a New Deal Democrat, he joined the GOP only in 1962, and he livened the 1964 Presidential campaign by preaching Goldwaterism with all the zest earlier reserved for Borax. He has now shown himself a quick master of the empty gospel of the radical right. Evangelically, he divides the nation into the black legion of "politicians" and the sublime host of "the people themselves." Suddenly, he hears himself hailed as a potential leader of all the nation's Republicans.

And the wonder rises: how can such nonsense be?

IN THE RED

The event simply dramatizes the virtual bankruptcy, politically and intellectually, of a national party. This has taken many years and follies to achieve. And they have wrought a memorable irony: a Republicanism tirelessly decrying all Federal waste of economic resources has largely passed the last fifteen years in reckless squandering of its own political resources.

For these have been years rich in opportunity for a rational Republicanism. There are historically two obvious ways to win the Presidency: with a man or with an issue. And the striking fact is that the GOP—through all its time of political drought—has never been in want of either men or issues.

Of the men, it suffices to note but two: Dwight Eisenhower and Nelson Rockefeller. Their failures were complementary: the first man had the power to revitalize his party but lacked the will; and the second had the

will, but his party denied him the power. The Eisenhower Presidency became a partisan tragedy because the general left his party exactly where he found it. As for Rockefeller, it can be charged that he contributed mightily to his own failure. But the political truth remains as John Kennedy stated it after winning the 1960 election: "Nelson would have clobbered me."

Of the issues, it suffices to note but two: civil rights and Vietnam. The two most explosive issues of the 1960s, *both* could have been seized by a spirited and conscientious Republicanism. After 1960, the Kennedy Administration advanced on civil rights with a sluggishness that had Negro leaders fuming against both the President and the Attorney General. What could have been more politically logical than the party of Lincoln proclaiming this cause its own? The GOP met the chance with the same want of courage now repeated with respect to Vietnam. What would have been more politically rational than a Republican opposition sharply questioning from the outset a military commitment so carelessly calculated? In both critical cases, the GOP chose to greet its chance simply by taking no chance.

ON THE RUN

Alike by the measure of men or issues, then, the modern history of Republicanism reads as a prolonged act of abdication. And the legacy now governs the politics of the land. On the West Coast, the vacuum is filled by the windy rhetoric of a Ronald Reagan. On the East Coast, it is filled by a ROBERT KENNEDY whom all politicians of both parties view as the only living threat to the futures of Lyndon Johnson and HUBERT HUMPHREY. For the Democratic senator—only a few years ago regarded with such distaste by most civil libertarians—has shrewdly etched his own independent identity in terms of the very issues so foolishly blurred by the GOP—civil rights and Vietnam.

The political point could not be more sharp. Some men learn from history. Some men run from it. And the GOP has chosen feckless flight.

Mr. STALBAUM. An even more interesting article is one from the Los Angeles Citizen of September 2 entitled "Ronald Reagan: An Extremist at Work" by Robert L. Coate. It starts out by stating that here are examples of Ronald Reagan's proextremism. It goes on for perhaps more than two newspaper columns just detailing items and statements which this man has made supporting the far right position and the far right groups during the recent past in his move to come to the fore in the Republican Party. In 1964, for instance, he attacked moderate Republicans as traitors for failing to back Barry Goldwater and at a meeting of the extremists of the Los Angeles Young Republicans he said:

We don't intend to turn the Republican Party over to the traitors in the battle just ended.

This is the belief of the man who has succeeded in getting the nomination to be the Republican candidate for Governor of our largest State.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this article be placed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

RONALD REAGAN: AN EXTREMIST AT WORK

(By Robert L. Coate)

Here are examples of Ronald Reagan's pro-extremism:

Reagan joined forces with a score of top members of the John Birch Society's National Council and other extremists two years ago on a committee to keep the ultra-right-wing magazine, "Human Events" afloat. (1)

Reagan told the Chicago American, in an interview published on March 21, 1965 (2), that if he decided to run for Governor of California he would accept support from the John Birch Society. The Hartford Courant reported last October that Reagan "said frankly in New Haven that he would welcome its (the Society's) support." (3)

Reagan serves on the national advisory board of the right-wing "Young Americans for Freedom" (4) together with a dozen nationally prominent John Birch Society leaders. The Y.A.F. advocates state right-to-work laws; Newburgh, New York-style welfare reforms; student loyalty oaths; continued nuclear testing; opposes Federal Aid to Education. (5)

Reagan was a speaker at planning sessions of the violently rightist "Project Alert," together with Bircher John Rousselot and other extremists. (6)

Reagan was the main speaker on May 26, 1965, at the right-wing "Town Meeting for Freedom, Inc." in Burbank as the organization presented awards to D. B. Lewis, the late Birch leader, patron of extremists and contributor to Reagan's campaign. (7)

Reagan journeyed to the Deep South in 1964 to campaign and raise funds for the GOP segregationist candidate for Governor of Louisiana, oilman Charlton H. Lyons (8), against Democrat John J. McKeithen. McKeithen was elected.

Reagan attacked moderate Republicans as "traitors" in 1964 for failing to back Goldwater. U.S. Senator KUCHEL, who had refused to endorse Goldwater, was his prime target. At a meeting of the extremist Los Angeles County Young Republicans, Reagan said:

"We don't intend to turn the Republican Party over to the traitors in the battle just ended. We will have no more of those candidates who are pledged to the same goals of our opposition and who seek our support: . . . turning the Party over to the so-called moderates wouldn't make any sense at all." (9)

Reagan starred in special film recordings attacking "State Welfarism" distributed by the Church League of America (10), of Chicago, another extreme right wing group which maintains over 850,000 cross-referenced index cards of organizations and individuals suspected of "subversion." The League supports a program of "Christian Americanism."

Reagan condemns the graduated income tax as "Marxist," (11) a position identical with that of the sponsors of the "Liberty Amendment."

Reagan campaigned in 1962 for the election of his "warm personal friend," Congressman John Rousselot (12), who was running as an avowed John Birch Society member. Rousselot is now the national public relations director of the Society.

Reagan appeared as a speaker in Los Angeles in 1961 in support of Fred Schwarz' "Christian Anti-Communist Crusade." (13)

Reagan was state campaign chairman for Loyd Wright (14), extremist who tried to unseat Senator KUCHEL in 1962 as an alleged Socialist. Wright called for preventive war with the Soviet Union and all out endorsement of the John Birch Society during the Reagan-directed campaign.

Reagan has not repudiated the endorsement of his candidacy by the leader of the neo-facist "Soldiers of the Cross," which collaborates with the para-military "Minuteman." Kenneth Goff, extremist leader of the "Soldiers of the Cross," meeting in Kansas City with 300 extremist leaders last July 3–4, at the call of Minuteman organizer Robert B. DePugh, told the press his organization's 20,000 membership in California would back Reagan for Governor. (15)

Although Goff's salute to Reagan was prominently published in newspapers, the actor-politician has remained silent.

REFERENCES

1. "Human Events"—Jan. 9, 1965
2. United Press International, published in Sacramento Bee—Mar. 22, 1965
3. Hartford Courant—Oct. 2, 1965
4. Y.A.F. brochure
5. Y.A.F. "New Guard"—July 1962
6. "Project Alert" Brochure
7. Monrovia News—May 20, 1965
8. Press reports from Louisiana
9. L.A. Times, Nov. 11, 1964
10. Church League Leaflets
11. Speech before U.S. Savings and Loan League, Nov. 7, 1963
12. Reagan statement to Downey Young Republican meeting, Aug. 27, 1965
13. Leaflet
14. Wright Campaign Leaflets
15. L.A. Times, July 5, 1966; National Observer, July 11, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. A few weeks ago Drew Pearson in his Washington Merry-Go-Round had an article entitled "An Actor Is Groomed To Be President." This is an article which ends by saying:

This is the Republican candidate, ruddy and rugged of face but faceless on issues, who may be the next Governor of California.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this article be placed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AN ACTOR IS GROOMED TO BE PRESIDENT

(By Drew Pearson)

LOS ANGELES.—Out here in California, conservative Republican leaders are carefully grooming a Hollywood actor to be President of the United States.

For the moment they are not advertising that this is their long-range goal. They are taking a step-by-step approach, and the first step is to make their man, a likeable, B-picture star and former TV announcer, Governor of California.

This strategy is probably the most important development inside the Republican Party and is almost certain to rip it wide open. For while Ronald Reagan, the rightist, was getting votes from the anti-Negro backlash in California, the Republican Party in Massachusetts was nominating a Negro, Edward Brooke, to run for Senator; and in Michigan, George Romney announced for re-election as Republican Governor on a militant platform of fighting rightwingism.

In Tennessee, Howard Baker, Republican candidate for the Senate and son-in-law of Sen. EVERETT DIRKSEN, (R-Ill.), has a chance of defeating Gov. Frank Clement, Democrat, if he gets enough of the Negro support which he is trying desperately to win.

Such is the problem which Reagan's candidacy poses for the Republican Party around the Nation.

MODERATES BOW OUT

Here in California, Reaganism has already split the Republican Party wide open. When Reagan was scheduled to announce his candidacy formally on Sept. 9—a date he picked

after consulting the stars—it was planned that former Gov. Goodwin Knight, a highly respected Republican, would appear publicly to introduce the candidates.

But Knight refused. He told Reagan leaders, "If you bother me I'll blast the hell out of your candidate. I'll vote the Republican ticket but I'll have no part of Reagan."

Mrs. Henry Salvatore begged Knight to change his mind. Her husband is chairman of the Reagan finance committee and she has been a Knight supporter in the past. But the former Governor stood pat.

Another Californian made poignantly unhappy by Reagan's right-wingism is Sen. TOM KUCHEL, Republican whip of the Senate.

In the last election, KUCHEL, a moderate, rolled up the second biggest vote in California history, exceeded only by the record vote of his friend Earl Warren when running for a third term as Governor. Today, Reagan backers make no secret of the fact that they are out to defeat KUCHEL when next he comes up for election. He is much too moderate for them.

This brings up the question of what Reagan stands for, what his experience is, what policies he would follow if elected governor.

Governing a state of this size and with such complicated problems is not easy. Yet Reagan is the only candidate for Governor of California who has never held any kind of government office, never even been a member of a State commission or State committee.

REAGAN'S RECORD

If you look up what Reagan has stood for you'll find that he is against the progressive income tax, believes that Medicare is "one of the first steps in imposing statism on our people," considers Chief Justice Earl Warren a "lousy justice," has described Federal aid to education as "a tool of tyranny," and welfare recipients "a faceless mass waiting for a handout."

Of conservation he once said, "A tree's a tree. How many more do you need to look at?" And of the John Birch Society which other Republican leaders, from Nixon to Dewey, have repudiated, Reagan said, "I don't believe I have any moral justification for repudiating them."

That is a cross-section of the Reagan basic philosophy of government. But under shrewd coaching by his right-wing handlers, who have hired the public relations firm of Spencer & Roberts, he has succeeded in blurring this image.

Today he veers away from the blunt right-wingism that used to feature his statements. Recently when asked what he thought of Chief Justice Warren he parried: "You mean Earl Warren the Governor or Earl Warren the Chief Justice?" Then he proceeded to draw a distinction between the two, though Warren as Chief Justice has followed exactly the same liberal philosophy which he followed when Governor.

This blurring of the Reagan image is the result of a decision by the Reagan brain trust that Barry Goldwater's chief mistake was in being too honest. Goldwater called a spade a spade, even when unpopular.

Reagan's handlers have coached him to avoid this, and like a good actor he has carefully followed the cue of his director. "Human Events," organ of the right wing, reports that he has given a "blueprint for conservatives" by "purposely staying clear of issues."

This is the Republican candidate, ruddy and rugged of face but faceless on issues, who may be the next Governor of California. If he wins, it will be the first step toward making him President of the United States.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most interesting point which can be made on this candidate in the State of California is the fact that he has flatly refused to turn his back on the John Birch Society. We find this is typical of this kind of candidate throughout the Nation. Those who have joined me in remarks this afternoon I am sure will find, as I have, that candidates in their own districts have refused to repudiate this secret group, a group that is so far right that one would think they would have no influence. Yet they are out to influence strongly the next election.

I have before me an article from the Washington Post of September 17 entitled "Nixon Defends Reagan's Decision To Accept Birch Society Support." This evidences the fact that not only is the candidate for Governor of California willing to accept support from this far-right group, but here is a man who aspires to move on and hopefully get the nomination for President and is also catering to this group and defending Mr. Reagan in his position.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this article be placed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

NIXON DEFENDS REAGAN'S DECISION TO ACCEPT BIRCH SOCIETY SUPPORT

(By William Chapman)

BURBANK, CALIF., September 16.—Richard M. Nixon stepped back into the enduring California Republican wrangle over the John Birch Society today by strongly defending gubernatorial candidate Ronald Reagan's controversial decision to accept Birchite support.

Nixon thus backed a more pliable approach to the Birch Society than he had taken himself four years ago, although he said he saw no basic differences between his position and Reagan's.

Nixon told a California press conference that Reagan's position was justifiable because the former movie star had repudiated the Society's philosophy.

Reagan, who is running a close race with Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, has said he will accept support from all California Republican candidates, even those who are members of the ultra-conservative organization.

In 1962, in the Governor race with Brown, in which he was defeated, Nixon repudiated the Society and said he would never endorse its members or appear with them in public.

He repeated that vow today in what he jokingly described as the 115th news conference in which he had encountered the question.

The California Democrats hope to make considerable mileage this fall by pinning Reagan to his conservative past, and his statement on the John Birch Society has renewed their zeal.

That statement, Nixon said, showed that Reagan "has rejected the positions of the leaders of the John Birch Society. He didn't reject their support—they could vote for him if they wanted to—but he made it clear that he was not accepting their positions."

Barnstorming through the West for Republican Congressional candidates, Nixon flew into the Los Angeles area tonight on a commercial airliner after his charter plane developed engine trouble and had to be abandoned in Salt Lake City.

In Salt Lake City, Nixon spoke to an enthusiastic audience of 1400 Republican Party workers in a motel ballroom. Despite the warm reception, local Republican leaders said Nixon is demonstrably less popular in Utah than his possible rival for the 1968 presidential nomination, Gov. George Romney of Michigan.

A recent poll conducted by professors at Brigham Young University for the Utah Republican organization showed that Romney, a Mormon, would receive 57 percent of the total vote in a contest with President Johnson in this area, which has a large Mormon population.

If Nixon ran, the poll showed, he would receive 42 per cent of the vote, as against 43 percent for Mr. Johnson. The University's polling organization also found that Nixon trailed Romney by similar or larger margins in three other Western states.

The former Vice President appeared in Salt Lake City to endorse former Congressman Sherman Lloyd, who is in a tight struggle to unseat Rep. DAVID S. KING (D-Utah).

Nixon once again found loud applause for appeals to get the war in Vietnam over sooner than the five years he estimates present policy would require. His loudest response came when he demanded that foreign aid be ended for those countries that continue trading with North Vietnam.

"Our fighting men in Vietnam come first, and any nation that trades with the enemy should have its aid cut off and cut off now," he declared.

Mr. STALBAUM. That the John Birch Society is still active hardly needs to be stated. Shortly after the 1964 election an article appeared in many of the papers. I have a reprint here from the Boston Herald dated March 2, saying, "Birchers Plan Political Action in 325 Districts—Welch Seeks $12 Million for '66 Elections." That refers to Robert Welch, the president of the John Birch Society. Now, if you divide $12 million by 325 districts, this is some $40,000 per district, if my arithmetic is correct. I have here a tear sheet from the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education which I would like to place in the RECORD at this point. The article is entitled "They're Playing for Keeps."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THEY'RE PLAYING FOR KEEPS

The extremist John Birch Society is taking a $12 million gamble on the crucial 1966 congressional elections.

Its goal: To take over Congress—or, at the very least, to destroy the present liberal majority.

The Birch Society is betting on three things:

Its own proven effectiveness. (It became a powerful force in a major national political party in 1964, and it has been supremely effective at the local level in capturing control of PTAs, school boards and even some city councils.)

The pattern of off-year congressional elections which sees a swing away from the party in control of the White House. (Average loss over the past 60 years has been 37 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives, five seats in the U.S. Senate. Any comparable loss of liberal congressmen this year would achieve the Birch Society goal.)

The usual voter drop-off in congressional election years from presidential years, a drop-off that's heaviest among working people and their families. Average drop-off in recent congressional election years has been more than 15 percent.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, a haven for many of these far-right

spokesmen has now become the Americans for Constitutional Action. It is interesting to note that after the 1964 election, this group expanded its board of directors to take onto that board a number of former national legislative officeholders both here in the Congress and the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the Americans for Constitutional Action are well known as a far right group. They have opposed such programs as medicare, expanding the education program, the civil liberties program, they opposed the antipoverty program, the Food Stamp Act, and they opposed civil rights legislation, and almost all the programs designed to help the low-income groups.

Mr. Speaker, I want to only by reference indicate the names of the new directors and some of their background, people who were added to their group since the 1964 election.

I find, first, Mr. Bruce Alger, who served in this House of Representatives for nearly 10 years.

Also added to their board of directors was Ralph Beerman, from Nebraska and who served in the House of Representatives for 4 years.

There was also added Joe H. Bottum, who was appointed U.S. Senator from the State of South Dakota, but who was unsuccessful in his efforts for reelection.

There was added James C. Davis, who served in the Congress for 15 years and who has an ACA rating from the State of Georgia; Charles B. Hoeven, an Iowa attorney, but who served in the House of Representatives for 22 years and who had a 92-percent ACA rating.

There was added Edwin L. Mechem, three times Governor of the State of New Mexico, and who was appointed to the Senate to fill a vacancy left by the death of Senator Chavez, but who was defeated in his bid for reelection.

He had an ACA rating of 97 percent.

There was Katherine St. George who served in the House of Representatives for many years, but who is one of the new directors of the Americans for Constitutional Action and many other conservative groups.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there was Henry C. Schadeberg from my district but who was defeated in the 1964 election. He was added to the board of directors among this group of conservative ex-Congressmen and ex-Senators.

Mr. Speaker, these people in my opinion were added to give them a forum and to give them a base from which to operate in the 1966 elections and subsequent thereto. Several of these men are again running for reelection.

Mr. Speaker, along with the others I have previously mentioned, there were other interesting parties added to the board of directors at the same time, such as Clarence B. Carson, professor of American history at Grove City College, whose social view can be summarized as follows, and I quote from the statement he made in his series on "The American Tradition":

Let me be more specific. Remove the welfare and unemployment program, and nature will take over shortly. For men grow hungry in only a brief interval, and this will be a sufficient prod to drive them to seek remunerative employment. Repeal the minimum wage laws and the onerous bookkeeping imposed on employers, let the hungry man make himself attractive to an employer, and the "unemployed" will soon be busy doing the millions of jobs that are not now done because it is too expensive or too troublesome to hire someone to do them.

Remove the exemptions and protections from labor unions, rigorously and impartially enforce the law, and they will no longer be able to create crises in the Nation.

Others, of course, have made similar statements, but it is interesting to note those directors on the board who are former Members of either the House or the Senate, were brought together at the same time along with the other directors who were brought in and are the type which I previously mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, other Members of Congress have joined me in this colloquy this evening.

I have a statement by a colleague of mine, the gentleman from New York, Mr. LESTER WOLFF, on the extremist influence in our schools. It is a very well done and documented statement in this regard.

I would ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTREMIST INFLUENCE IN OUR SCHOOLS

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the youth of America, indeed of any nation, is its greatest asset. The future of civilization as we know it rests in the hands of our young people.

No task is of greater importance than that of nurturing the minds of our young people, of cultivating the source of ideas and actions from which the future is fashioned. Traditionally, we have entrusted our public education system with this vital responsibility.

Education is the tool with which future leaders are enabled to build a better world. Anything that threatens to dull that tool or to prevent a progressive improvement of it is to be regarded with the utmost concern.

Regrettably, there exists today in our nation a grave threat to our basic system of public education. It conspires to capture the free minds of our nation's school children.

That threat is extremism—of the right and of the left. Presently, it is reaching proportions that require our utmost vigilance, lest it subvert our education system and destroy one of America's most precious institutions.

Our educational system is, in fact, in danger of subversion from within by the lies, the scare tactics, and the vicious distortions perpetrated by members of extremist groups who are determined to impose their various brands of ideology upon the susceptible minds of our school children.

The importance of eliminating the insidious influence of these extremist groups from our local boards, parent teacher associations, and other local educational organizations cannot be overemphasized.

I am not suggesting that the sacred right of free expression be denied these purveyors of extremist ideas. Their right to dissent from the mainstream of thought and belief in our nation is unquestioned. As Cardinal Richard Cushing said recently, "the right to dissent is among the most precious of our national values and must continue to be preserved at whatever cost."

But these radical groups have not been content merely to register their disapproval with our society; they have forcibly and in the most devious manner hampered the legitimate function of our school board. They have created unwarranted fear with highly subjective appeals to our patriotism, to our basic loyalty, by levelling charges of "subversion" by their extremist opposites.

Tragically, their invidious schemes have been all too frighteningly successful to date. And their methods—intimidation and coercion—are often as destructive as their goals.

Moreover, during the past few years, these extremist groups have revised their tactics to render them more effective, more devastating. At one period, their main objective had been to gain control of the local PTA. This they accomplished through parliamentary delay, disruption—often employing character assassination, bigotry, harassment, sometimes even violence. No community was immune to their efforts.

Recently, they have begun to aim at capturing positions of control on local school boards. With control, they realized, they are able to choose school superintendents who, in turn, pick teachers, books, and select curricula.

The National Education Association completed studies in 1965 that revealed attempts by extremist groups on both fronts—control of the local PTA and through the school board—had been more successful, more prevalent than ever.

NEA estimates are that one out of every 30 communities 'had experienced some sort of attack, opposition or attempt to infiltrate the schools by extremists and dissident critics." School districts damaged by these incursions rose from nine percent in 1957 to sixteen percent in 1965, and the overall increase of this kind of dissent for the same period from forty-nine percent to fifty-six percent.

According to the NEA, in 1965 these efforts were centered in California, Michigan, and Ohio. These states suffered from fully ninety percent of the extremist charges of "subversion" in their schools. Also, these three states experienced the greatest right-wing book censorship activity.

Attacks on our school system emanate from the entire radical spectrum, right to left. For some reason, the extreme left groups tend to aim at our colleges and universities. The ultra-right groups concentrate on local school boards.

The arsenal of weapons ruthlessly employed by the radical right has been hinted at by the Director of Public Relations for the Arizona Education Association, Joseph Stocker, "extremists of their right may be expected to continue their thrust at the public schools with the object, plainly and simply, of controlling the curriculum and brainwashing children . . . they will continue to seek these ends through election to school boards, control of PTA and censorship of the content of education."

A pamphlet entitled, "Extremist Groups", published by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, documents some of the devious techniques employed by these rampant extremist organizations.

According to this informative pamphlet, an almost universally used subterfuge employed by extremist groups to effect control of local educational organizations and school boards is the front organization. It is the purpose of these front organizations to avoid the odium which would attach to the extremist group by the forthright use of its identifying name. Characteristically, a front organization adopts an inoffensive, preferably noncontroversial civic name. The purpose of the misnomer is to disguise narrow, unenlightened views.

Because of this deception, many unsuspecting, well-intended and civic minded citizens are duped into supporting a power grab by a group whose real beliefs and intentions they would find repugnant. In effect, they are led to believe that they are preserving our schools when actually they

have become the unwitting tools for their destruction.

Another fraudulent technique used by a front organization for an extremist group is the so-called speakers bureau. Under the camouflage of the respectable name, for example, better schools association, community taxpayers organization, Committee for the Preservation of Suburban Schools, the front supplies those who, under the guise of objectivity, effectively peddle extremist propaganda.

The tactics used by the extremists and their shadow or screen organizations are many; infiltration is undoubtedly responsible for their major successes.

A favorite trick is to capture the key posts (for example, policy or program offices) of a PTA or other democratically structured organization. Front group representatives attend PTA meetings and harass the speakers with loaded questions. They heckle, obstruct, prolong meetings and make minority decisions after exasperated opponents have departed. They appear as indignant parents critical of the activities or comments of teachers. They proffer extremist literature to school libraries and criticize texts and school curricula.

Targets of their criticism are usually labeled with the epithets "communist" or "atheist" or "unpatriotic".

Evidence of extremist activity in a local school can be identified: A sharp rise in school board meetings attended; an influx of out of town critics of school activities and PTA meetings; sudden, excessive criticism of individuals, school officials; children using concealed tape recorders in class rooms; the receipt by school personnel of anonymous letters or threatening phone calls; the dissemination of hate literature among children, parents, and school board members.

The favorite strategy of extremist groups and their front organizations is the classic one of divide and conquer. By deprecating state and national organizations and culminating their leadership, they isolate local associations and take them over.

By encouraging irrelevant debates and programs within a school or civic organization, extremist agents disrupt the legitimate function and purpose of the organization.

The pattern of divisiveness is described by the national school boards association "when extremists launch an attack on the schools, it is aimed at dividing the community for the purpose of gravely hampering the educational progress of the children. Administrative teaching staffs sometimes quit; school board members are frequently forced to resign after controversy and harassment; parents become suspicious of teachers; children are instructed to spy on teachers."

The result of these tactics is to generate confusion, discontent and distrust among the citizens. Doubt and suspicion become rampant and, gradually, support for the school board is eroded. The use by the extremists of innuendo, invective, distortion, and half-truths can cause the most intelligent citizen to entertain doubts about school authorities.

Another divisive tactic employed by the extremists is the use of a black list and the fear label. The personal histories, political affiliations and private lives of educators, clergymen, civic and community leaders are researched and differences are exploited by labeling the public figure "subversive", "un-American", "radical", "pinko", and the like. Augmenting the smear campaign with the distribution of literature, poison pen pamphlets, the extremist element wreaks havoc in the community.

Where civic groups, local government and competent school boards have created a good, progressive educational system to save their children, divisiveness and the resultant take-over is often accomplished by the "straw man" tactic, in conjunction with the methods already mentioned.

The "straw man" tactics consist of injecting fanciful, non-existent or extraneous issues.

A classic example of this is evident in the recent injection of the so-called "school busing" issue in the current political campaign. The principal target for this attack of the extremist was our suburban areas. By spreading rumors of a Federal attempt to destroy local school autonomy by forced inter-district and long distance busing in order to bring about racial balance in the schools, the extremists and their front organizations succeeded in generating considerable publicity for the candidates they support—and activating the so-called backlash. They pushed their fear and smear campaign in the face of the truth, despite the continued reassurance by responsible Federal authorities that no such busing plan existed.

They persisted even in the face of the existence of firm congressional safeguards against a federal attempt to destroy local school system autonomy.

On numerous occasions the Congress has made it perfectly clear that it intends to preserve local control of our schools. Title I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act specifically states that: "In the administration of this section, the Commissioner (U.S. Commissioner of Education) shall not exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of any school or school system."

The extremist cries of alarm continued even in the face of U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II clarification and assurances on the matter. In a communication to me on September 23, 1966, he stated: "Thank you for calling to my attention an allegation that the U.S. Office of Education is planning to introduce legislation to require busing of students to achieve integration or for any other purpose. This is not true. Additionally, I want to reaffirm clearly and explicitly our conviction that educational decisions reside in the local community as they traditionally have over the years. The role of the Office of Education in these matters is to stimulate innovative planning and to help support local schools in their search for better methods to create quality and equality of education for all youngsters in their community. The means to these ends are completely within the discretion and control of the local community itself."

Despite this widely-publicized statement by Commissioner Howe, the extremist element continued, indeed intensified, its cynical campaign of defeat, fraudulent assertion, misrepresentation and outright lie.

Nor did the recent act of the House of Representatives in adopting amendments to the 1966 Elementary and Secondary Education Act which clearly restates and reaffirms, in the most definitive language possible, the intent of the Congress to safeguard traditional local school autonomy, deter the extremist element from their determination to confuse and frighten the public.

In my own District, the bogeyman conjured by an extremist front group is still abroad.

An extremist is one who tries by any and every means to prevent the expression of views counter to his own. In the words of the PTA, they are committed to "rule by their own minority."

Miss Mary Anne Raywid of Hofstra University in my District has commented that "they are unwilling to permit the majority to rule, and indeed recognize no obligation to do so."

The dire threat to the Democratic principle posed by these extremist elements is clear. Our political system assumes, first the continuance of disagreement and conflict. Second, it assumes that disagreement and conflict will be carried on according to ground rules agreed to by all.

Only by observing these ground rules can we carry on the dialogue, the exchange of ideas from which progress emerges.

Obviously, the extremist groups in our nation are not willing to abide by these ground rules. Therein lies their destructiveness.

Their shameful attack on our school system is doubly dangerous because it threatens to destroy the institution charged with inculcating these ground rules in our youth.

Our public schools have the responsibility of engendering in our youth the understanding of the importance of the free exchange of ideas—according to the ground rules.

When we allow radical forces to erode the caliber of our educational system, to hamper the education of our children, we permit them to strike at the very roots of our democratic society.

We cannot afford to permit this attack upon the very basis of our democratic society. The education of our children must continue in an atmosphere free from the pollution of extremism.

I end by quoting the words of Senator CLIFFORD CASE of New Jersey on extremism. Senator CASE has said: "There are only two ways to meet extremism: full exposure to the full light of day and demonstrated competence by those who oppose extremism to deal with the problems and concerns of the American people. Extremists can gain no standing as champions of American interests, unless we abdicate our responsibilities."

Mr. STALBAUM. I mentioned the financing which the John Birch Society will be giving to the campaign this year, and I mentioned the figure of $12 million. We have not seen figures as to how much they have contributed, because they give it to various groups, although much of it is coming through the Republican Boosters Club. I would particularly like to call the attention of the Members to a statement of a colleague of mine that he made on this floor only last week on Monday, October 3, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], on campaign finances in which he clearly shows the money which is coming from some of the John Birch groups. I will not—in order to avoid duplication—reprint his statement here at this point, but I would like to include in the RECORD a story on it from the Washington Post of October 5, entitled "GOP Gets Twitted on Bircher Gifts."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

GOP GETS TWITTED ON BIRCHER GIFTS

Rep. JAMES G. O'HARA (D-Mich.) twitted Republicans yesterday for accepting financial support from John Birch Society members for the fall elections.

GOP complaints of a Bircher's contributions to the Democrats, O'HARA charged, were akin to "Mrs. O'Leary's cow voluntarily bringing up the subject of the Chicago fire."

House Republicans had complained of a $6,000 contribution by J. Edward Martin, a Birch Society member from Los Angeles, to the Democratic fund-raising President's Club. They sought to link the contribution to Government contracts for Martin's architectural-engineering firm.

House Minority Leader GERALD FORD (R-Mich.) added last week that he had returned a subsequent $1,000 contribution Martin sent him for the Republicans.

O'HARA called this a good start, but challenged FORD about other contributions.

He said $2,000 was given to the Republican Congressional Boosters Club by Mrs. Harry Bradley of the Allen-Bradley Corp., which regularly buys full-page ads in the John Birch Society's monthly magazine, "American Opinion."

Among the other Boosters Club contributions O'HARA listed were $2,573 from Gen. Robert E. Wood, whom O'HARA linked to groups "somewhat to the right of Louis XIV," and $12,000 from J. Howard Pew and his family.

Pew, O'HARA said, has been regularly listed as a member of "American Opinion's" editorial advisory board.

In returning Martin's $1,000 GOP contribution, FORD had said conditions attached by Martin made it unacceptable. He also told a reporter yesterday he did not consider contributions to the Democratic President's Club comparable to those given the GOP Boosters' Club. "We are in no position to offer any favors," FORD said.

Mr. STALBAUM. All of the evidence we see this year shows that the Republicans are going to be easily able to outspend the Democrats in spite of all the hue and cry they make as to the Democrats about the amount of funds that they have available.

On Sunday, September 25, the Washington Post had an article whose heading sums it up well when it says "GOP Spending Heavily on Campaigns in Congressional Races, Democrats' Dollars Are Outnumbered Almost 10 to 1," and then the details on this particular point.

It seems odd, Mr. Speaker, that the Republicans are making a big hue and cry about the President's Club when they are going to be able, according to this article, to outspend the Democrats almost 10 to 1 in the current campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this article may be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

GOP SPENDING HEAVILY ON CAMPAIGNS—IN CONGRESSIONAL RACES, DEMOCRATS' DOLLARS ARE OUTNUMBERED ALMOST 10 TO 1

(By George Lardner, Jr., Washington Post staff writer)

If money makes the man, Republicans should have no trouble at the polls this fall. The GOP is pouring more money into congressional races than ever before.

In the House, a spokesman for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee sadly observes, Republican dollars outnumber the Democrats' by almost 10 to 1.

Political spending reports filed with the clerk of the House for the first eight months of the campaign year bear him out.

They show, for example, that House Republican campaign committees had spent more money on four Iowa races by Sept. 1 than their Democratic counterparts had invested in every House contest in the country.

The GOP Congressional Boosters Club, which concentrates on bumping incumbent House Democrats, and the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, which sends money to GOP incumbents, reported a combined war chest of $2.33 million so far this year. They have spent $1.84 million with roughly $475,000 more, primarily in Boosters' Club money, left for the final stretch to election day.

By contrast, the Democratic Congressional Committee, which has to finance both incumbents and Democratic hopefuls, reported income of only $239,000 for the year. By the start of the month, it had spent only $38,050, almost all of it in earmarked funds contributed with the understanding that it be passed on to a particular candidate.

Perhaps the best measure of the Democrats' plight is the fact that, aside from the funds raised at the big Democratic congressional dinner this May, the biggest single contribution on the House side came from the American Medical Association's Political Action Committee.

AMPAC, which made a similar $5,000 contribution to the Republicans, made it clear it wanted none of the money going to Democrats it doesn't approve of.

All of the Democratic money for House races reported so far has gone to incumbents in 46 congressional districts. Only two Congressmen, JAMES MORRISON (D-La.) and WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY (D-Maine), got as much as $2,000 for the fall campaigns. Most had received only $500.

Meanwhile, the GOP Boosters' Club, the records show, has singled out 127 congressional seats—those held by Democrats, vacant or newly created—for top priority spending. These are the districts where GOP hopes are highest. Twenty-four of the Republican challengers have gotten as much as $10,000 each so far, with more on the way.

FIVE THOUSAND DOLLAR INSTALLMENTS

The contributions are split into $5,000 installments, directed to separate committees for each candidate, to maintain a semblance of observing Federal laws limiting spending by House candidates to $5,000 each. Only state laws limit spending for the candidates by local political committees.

The Republican Congressional Committee has done its share by sending money to 103 GOP House members seeking re-election. For them, $2,000 contributions are the rule, not the exception. Rep. JAMES B. UTT (R-Calif.), an ultraconservative Republican in perhaps the safest Republican district in the state, got $5,000.

"It's my impression this is the most the Republican party has ever put into individual campaigns," said Kenneth Harding, director of the House Democratic Campaign Committee.

The Republicans agree. But they add that with only 139 seats in the 89th Congress, they have to make that extra effort, to show their devotion to the two-party system.

For the Senate races, the disparity isn't so great, but the GOP still shows a decided edge.

The Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee reported income up to Sept. 1 of $591,000, with $379,000 spent so far. The Democratic Senate Campaign Committee shows income of $310,000 and spending of $244,000.

DEMOCRATS FEEL PINCH

The Senate Democratic Committee says it's feeling the pinch most in helping to finance candidates who aren't incumbents. The Senate Republican Committee, for example, has sent Wyoming Gov. Clifford Hansen $7000 so far. The Democratic Committee has scratched up only $1000 for Hansen's opponent, Rep. TENO RONCALIO, in what shapes up as a toss-up race.

The Booster Club reports show GOP spending concentrated on the 63 House seats the Republicans lost in 1964 by margins of five per cent or less, and many others that promise to be close contests.

Former Rep. Steven B. Derounian (R-N.Y.) has been given $10,000 to do battle against the man who unseated him, Rep. LESTER WOLFF, who holds perhaps the shakiest seat in the New York Democratic delegation.

The Republicans are also going all-out to bring Iowa back to the fold. Four GOP candidates, including former Reps. John Kyl and Fred Schwengel, have been given $10,000 each to win seats the party lost. A fifth candidate, William J. Scherle, who won the GOP nomination only last week, can probably expect a check soon. Only the opponent of veteran Rep. NEAL SMITH (D-Iowa) seems to have been written off.

In North Carolina, the Republicans have also invested $10,000 to unseat Rep. HAROLD COOLEY (D-N.C.), Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, who won in a close race in 1964. The four Republican candidates for the House from Mississippi have received $2500 each.

In Georgia, where GOP prospects are bright with Rep. HOWARD H. (Bo) CALLAWAY running for Governor, five Republican candidates for House seats have been sent $5000 each and another, $2500.

Contributions totaling $10,000 were forwarded to Alaska for Republican Howard W. Pollock's campaign against Rep. RALPH J. RIVERS (D), the State's only Congressman. RIVERS won by only 2000 votes in 1964 over Lowell Thomas Jr.

The Boosters' Club has poured $66,000 into California, $67,500 into New York, $41,000 into Michigan, $45,000 into Pennsylvania, $37,000 into Texas, $30,000 into North Carolina and $27,500 into Connecticut in the all-out drive to win new districts or recapture old ones.

All the campaign reports show that contributions are being doled out with a money-changer's impartiality.

The Senate Republican Committee has given $1000 to Rep. PRENTISS WALKER (R-Miss.) in his campaign against Sen. JAMES EASTLAND (D-Miss.) although Committee Chairman THRUSTON MORTON (R-Ky.) had said that WALKER wouldn't get a penny.

The Senate Democratic Committee expressed its preference for incumbents by giving more than $10,000 to Sen. ROSS BASS (D-Tenn.) before his primary battle with Democratic Gov. Frank Clement.

BASS, who campaigned as an all-out supporter of the Great Society, lost to Clement in August but Clement has yet to get any money. Sen. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN (D-Ark.) also got $10,000 although he faces no Republican opposition.

A spokesman for Democratic Committee Chairman WARREN MAGNUSON (D-Wash.) said the money was raised primarily "to help incumbents."

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, another article on this point appeared in the Wall Street Journal of September 22, 1966, giving a complete rundown on campaign stories entitled "Campaign Cash," and the subheading, "GOP Bests Democrats as Parties Seek Funds for Congress Races."

It goes on, and makes a comparison in this particular article on the Republican Congressional Boosters Club stating that it has quietly collected $1 million from its fat cats, and earmarked all this money for nonincumbent candidates in close House races.

With a statement like this from the reputedly well-known conservative paper, the Wall Street Journal, it is interesting to note that the Republicans apparently like to work quietly in this direction, but that they have been very quick to point out the efforts that the Democratic Party has made in this area in collecting funds.

I would like to include this article entitled "Campaign Cash" in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

CAMPAIGN CASH—GOP BEATS DEMOCRATS AS PARTIES SEEK FUNDS FOR CONGRESS RACES—REPUBLICANS IN CLOSE CONTESTS DUE MORE AID THAN FOES; PRESIDENT'S CLUB STIRS IRE—COCKTAILS FOR CONTRIBUTORS

(By Norman C. Miller)

WASHINGTON.—The underdog Republicans have already won an important contest that may well have wide influence in November's Congressional elections—the race for campaign cash.

With big and little GOP contributors coming through handsomely, Republican candidates in close House races can now expect to receive from the national party perhaps five times as much money as the Democrats will shell out to their standard-bearers.

In Iowa the five GOP challengers seeking House seats—Robert Johnson, Wiley Mayne, William Scherle and former Reps. John Kyl and Fred Schwengel—are scheduled to get as much as $15,000 each, "far more than we've ever been able to give any House candidates before," says one party official.

Victory on the fund-raising front, of course, doesn't necessarily lead to triumphs at the polls. But Republican strategists are convinced the party's well-heeled condition at this stage of the campaign gives GOP candidates an important jump on their Democratic foes in many of the 67 House races that have top priority in the Republican comeback attempt. The situation is a sure source of comfort for National Chairman Ray Bliss, Congressional Campaign Chairman BOB WILSON, and scores of party candidates.

NERVOUS FRESHMEN

Whether or not the GOP analysis is correct, the Republicans' comfortable cash position is giving many Democratic Congressmen, particularly freshmen facing close contests, a bad case of the jitters. Loud wails about a shortage of money and bitter bickering over fund-raising techniques are rocking the party. Some Democrats warn the party's skimpy financial support of its candidates indicates a dangerously complacent attitude about the elections.

Generally, though, high Democratic strategists contend the publicity, patronage and pork-barrel advantages enjoyed by incumbent Democrats will enable almost all of them to solve their money problems themselves. "If a Congressman can't raise his own campaign money, maybe he doesn't deserve to come back to Washington," says one flint-hearted guardian of the party's funds.

In any event, the current financial situation is presenting considerable irony.

Item: The hullabaloo about the President's Club, which by some accounts has netted the Democrats over $2 million from sales of memberships at $1,000 and up, is an embarrassment particularly hard for Democratic Congressmen to tolerate. It's not that they worry so much about Republican charges of influence peddling to "fat cat" contributors; what really galls them is that Democratic Congressmen haven't got their hands on a cent of the President's Club cash. The Democratic National Committee says that most of the money has been used to reduce the party's huge 1964 campaign debt.

THE GOP WORKS QUIETLY

Meanwhile, the Republican "Congressional Boosters Club," GOP counterpart of the President's Club, has quietly collected $1 million from its fat cats and earmarked all this money for non-incumbent candidates in close House races. And the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee has raised another $1 million for publicity services and direct cash aid to incumbent GOP Congressmen.

Item: The Republicans have successfully tapped small contributors for funds through massive direct-mail appeals, while the Democrats have leaned increasingly on big givers. The Republican National Committee says it now gets 70% of its operating funds from contributors of $10 to $20; gleeful GOP officials say the flood of small checks is adding up to as much as $40,000 a day. But the Democrats, according to recent estimates, are receiving only 30% of their money from small givers. Belatedly, the Democratic National Committee is cranking up its own direct-mail campaign and last week party workers across the nation went doorbell-ringing to appeal for "dollars for Democrats." But the grass-roots drive is more of a public relations gesture, to shine up an image of "the party of the people," than a serious fund-raising effort, Democrats concede.

Item: All the emphasis by the Democrats on contributions from big givers hasn't wiped out the party's 1964 campaign debt of some $4 million: National Committee officials says the party still owes "under $1 million." The debt is particularly bothersome because the National Committee since last December has been sitting on $600,000 that it's afraid to spend for any party purpose.

"SHAKEDOWN" CHARGES

The $600,000 was netted from corporate advertising in a party booklet entitled "Toward an Age of Greatness." Charges that the publishing venture was a "shakedown" of companies caused such a flap that Congress felt compelled to ban tax deductions for ads in party publications, thus effectively ending the practice. The Democrats are still wondering how they can spend $600,000 without risking another flap.

While the Democrats are pondering their financial problems, the Republicans already are dishing out substantial sums to their candidates. The GOP is convinced that the early availability of large amounts of money can give its candidates a crucial edge. "Money is second in importance only to the candidate himself," says a top Republican strategist. "With our contribution, a candidate can hire a campaign manager, buy billboard space, reserve air time for commercials and get his own fund-raising appeal off the ground."

Moreover, he says, firm assurances of hefty contributions from the national party were decisive in persuading "at least a half-dozen of our best candidates" to run for House seats. (The identity of these men is a closely guarded secret, as party leaders fear the candidates could be vulnerable to Democratic charges that they were "bought.")

Cagey GOP chieftains aren't passing out all the money as fast as it comes in, however. After an initial $5,000 allotment, candidates in key races are required to demonstrate they're running strong before they get another installment. A good deal of money will be held in reserve for the campaign climax and then poured into districts where strategists figure a blitz effort might tip the scales for the Republican candidate. "A quick $5,000 for more TV time can make the difference," figures one GOP official.

Such talk is having a decidedly unsettling effect on Democrats. The party's National Committee has promised Congressmen facing tough races that it eventually will give them some money, but Election Day is less than seven weeks away and on Capitol Hill these promises are being written off. "All I hear is 'yak, yak, yak' from the National Committee, but I don't expect to see one damn nickel," says a disgruntled freshman Representative supposed to be high on the committee's aid list.

Democrats can expect little more help from the party's Congressional campaign committees, which parted company from the National Committee early this year to run independent fund-raising campaigns. An official of the House Democratic Campaign Committee glumly says the group has only "tidbits" of money to hand out to selected Congressmen, a situation particularly irksome to many Democrats who grumble that crusty Rep. MICHAEL KIRWAN of Ohio, the committee's chairman, has a habit of passing out money more on the basis of friendship than need.

DEMOCRATS MISS GOLDWATER

Democrats are hoping that current fund-raising appeals by various liberal groups, plus contributions from labor's political war chests, will ease their financial pinch. But these organizations aren't likely to match their 1964 performances. "I can't see how we'll do as well as two years ago," says Rep. JAMES G. O'HARA of Michigan, the fund-raising chairman of the Democratic Study Group, an organization of House liberals that hopes to aid some 50 of its Members running in closely contested districts. In 1964 the Study Group raised almost $100,000, but, says Mr. O'HARA, "All we had to do then was link a Republican candidate to Barry Goldwater and the liberals reached into their pockets."

The paucity of money from regular party sources has led to a proliferation of individual fund-raising appeals by incumbent Democrats. In Washington Democrats have been holding so many dinners, cocktail parties and cookouts at which the lucky guests are asked to cough up as much as $100 each that one party official who helps arrange such affairs remarks: "If I had to go to these things myself, I'd have to give up my job to find the time and steal to find the money."

The lobbyists who attend these affairs apparently feel they can justify their expense accounts more easily by reserving big donations for veteran members of Congress. This situation frequently leaves many first-term Democrats, who feel they have the greatest need for money, grasping at straws. Freshman Rep. RAYMOND CLEVENGER of Michigan recently staged a fund-raising "non-event," appealing to 2,500 Washington Democrats for $15 each for the chance to "avoid the gruesome ritual . . . of gulping a few drinks and gobbling a few raw shrimp" at a party he promised not to hold. Unfortunately for Mr. CLEVENGER, his non-event was good for only $2,000, far less than he hoped for.

Fund-raising gimmicks also are multiplying at the grass roots. At the state level the ban on tax deductions by companies advertising in party publications struck hard at both parties and left politicians scrambling for alternatives.

SETBACK IN CALIFORNIA

"There isn't anything that will replace our almanac," complains Craig Truax, chairman of the Pennsylvania Republican Committee, which normally grossed $300,000 a year from ads in its "Pennsylvania Almanac." The demise of the "California Yearbook" formerly published by the state Democratic Party "set back our fund-raising by 50%," laments Eugene Wyman, California's Democratic National Committeeman.

With campaign costs rising sharply, however, most state parties feel forced to think up new fund-raising gimmicks. The Wisconsin Republican Party is selling cookbooks at $2.50 each, and last Saturday Connecticut Republicans auctioned off such items as old baseballs autographed by Babe Ruth.

But these efforts are scarcely replacements for the lucrative ad booklets. The fund-raising problem on the state and local level is likely to lead to a serious drive in the next Congressional session for tax incentives to encourage contributions by ordinary people to political parties. President Johnson's proposal for individual tax deductions of up to $100 arrived too late on Capitol Hill to get anywhere this year.

The current success of the national Republican Party in reaping significant sums from small contributors, even without the enticement of a tax incentive, has led to new enthusiasm in both parties for such schemes. Our Democratic Party official cites a survey indicating that only 15% of all voters have ever been asked to contribute to a political

party and enthusiastically declares that "the potential of direct-mail fund-raising campaigns is almost unlimited."

Of course, mass-mail campaigns risk infuriating some voters. The Republicans acknowledge that they have got back at least one letter filled with mud instead of money. And the Democrats got nothing but a horselaugh from South Carolina's Republican Sen. STROM THURMOND, who switched parties in 1964, when he received a Democratic appeal this year to "back your beliefs with money" to help "re-elect the legislators who can complete the job of making the Great Society a reality."

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly interesting to note the specific areas where this money is being spent. There are 16 Republican candidates for reelection this year who were defeated in 1964. And I wish to incorporate as a part of my remarks at this point a rundown of these 16 Congressmen showing their name and their State, the amount of money they have received from the Republican Boosters' Club, and a brief résumé of the voting record they had while they served in Congress.

Suffice it to say their records are extremely conservative; that all of them voted against virtually all of the major forward-looking legislation of that time. We have, in the interest of brevity, taken only the major legislation which they voted against.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to incorporate this summary in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

RUNDOWN ON 16 REPUBLICANS DEFEATED IN 1964 SHOWING (1) GOP CONTRIBUTIONS TO THEIR DISTRICTS AND (2) MAJOR NEGATIVE VOTES IN 1963 AND 1964:

BROTZMAN, COLORADO

(1) Received $10,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Food Stamp bill, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, Anti-Poverty bill.
(3) 1963: Voted against tax cut.

SIBAL, CONNECTICUT

(1) Received $10,000 from Republican Boosters Club. ($5000 to Sibal and $5000 to Sibal Committee)
(2) On list for $1,000 from Miss Frick.
(3) 1964: Voted against Food Stamp bill.

KYL, IOWA

(1) Received $10,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Food Stamp bill, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, Anti-Poverty bill.
(3) 1963: Against Clean Air Act.

SCHWENGEL, IOWA

(1) Received $10,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) On list for $1,000 from Miss Frick.
(3) 1964: Against Food Stamp bill, anti-poverty bill.
(4) 1963: Against tax cut.

SNYDER, KENTUCKY

(1) Received $10,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Civil Rights Act of 1964, Food Stamp bill, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, anti-poverty bill, Housing Act of 1964.
(3) 1963: Against Clean Air Act, Higher Education Facilities Act, Tax Cut.

WYMAN, NEW HAMPSHIRE

(1) No contribution listed from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Against Civil Rights Act of 1964, Food Stamp bill, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, Anti-Poverty bill.
(3) 1963: Paired against Clear Air Act; against Tax Cut.

OSMERS, NEW JERSEY

(1) $5,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Food Stamp bill; paired against Anti-Poverty bill.

BARRY, CALIFORNIA (ORIGINALLY FROM NEW YORK)

(1) Received $5,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Against Food Stamp bill and Anti-Poverty bill.

DEROUNIAN, NEW YORK

(1) $10,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Food Stamp bill.
(3) 1963: Voted against Tax Cut.

PILLION, NEW YORK

(1) $5,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Food Stamp bill, Urban Mass Transportation Act, Anti-Poverty bill, 1964 Housing Act.
(3) 1963: Voted against Clean Air Act and Tax Cut.

TAFT, OHIO

(1) $5,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Food Stamp bill, Urban Mass Transportation Act, Anti-Poverty bill.
(3) 1963: Voted against Clean Air Act and Tax Cut.

GOODLING, PENNSYLVANIA

(1) $5,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Food Stamp bill, Urban Mass Transportation Act, Anti-Poverty bill.
(3) 1963: Voted against Clean Air Act, Higher Education Facilities Act, Tax Cut.

WEAVER, PENNSYLVANIA

(1) $10,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Food Stamp bill and Anti-Poverty bill.

LLOYD, UTAH

(1) $5,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Food Stamp bill, Urban Mass Transportation Act, Anti-Poverty bill.
(3) 1963: Voted against Clean Air Act, Higher Education Facilities Act, Tax Cut.

SCHADEBERG, WISCONSIN

(1) $5,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Food Stamp bill, Anti-Poverty bill, 1964 Housing Act.
(3) 1963: Voted against Clean Air Act, Higher Education Facilities Act, and Tax Cut.

HARRISON, WYOMING

(1) $5,000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1964: Voted against Civil Rights Act of 1964, Food Stamp bill, Urban Mass Transportation Act, Anti-Poverty bill, 1964 Housing Act.
(3) 1963: Voted against Clean Air Act and Tax Cut.

GARLAND, MAINE (DEFEATED IN 1962)

(1) $5000 from Republican Boosters Club.
(2) 1961: Against Emergency Feed Grains Bill, Area Redevelopment Act, conference report of Minimum Wage bill, 1961 Housing Act, Peace Corps Act.
(3) 1962: Against establishing Urban Affairs Department, 1962 Tax bill, Trade Expansion Act.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, another colleague of mine who had to leave earlier in the day, and who desired to make some comments on this entire matter, and on the moneys coming into this campaign, is Congressman HELSTOSKI of New Jersey. He has left his statement, which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this particular point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are only four weeks away from the election in which the people of the United States will decide whether our Democratic Party has presented a good program for the people or whether the conservative and ultra-conservatives of the Republican Party can do a better job in the Congress.

As we approach election day, the "true blue" conservatives are taking a more and more active part in the election campaign. Last year there was formed an organization which calls itself the United Republicans of America. This organization, through its executive director, D. Bruce Evans, announced that it would financially support any conservative Republican who was faced with liberal opposition. It has gone so far as to mark 77 liberal Democrats as their target for defeat during this Congressional election.

I object very strenuously to the statements made by these conservatives that this Congress is a rubber stamp for the President's proposals to assist the people of our Nation. I have voted for these programs because I felt that they were worthwhile progressive legislation. We cannot say that we are neglecting our schools and their educational potential. We cannot say that we have thrown the elderly citizens aside. We cannot say that we are unconcerned about clean air and clean water. These are but three of the proposals set out by this Administration for a better way of life of the people which we represent in this Congress.

Yet, in spite of the record we have made here, these conservative groups are committed to support the Republican conservative candidates through large donations to defeat the liberal candidates seeking to return to Congress.

The United Republicans of America, which, as I stated before, were organized last year, listed several Republican members of this House as members of their advisory board. Within a few days after this announcement was made, two of the Members of Congress announced that they have disassociated themselves from the group. Is it possible that these advisory board members were just drawn out of a hat, on a come be chance basis?

Now let me ask you where is this money coming from to finance these conservative candidates' campaigns? Well, the New York Times of Wednesday, June 8, 1966 told the story. It states that fifteen GOP hopefuls, chosen by the former Vice-President as prime prospects for victory this fall, have opened their mail in recent weeks and found unsolicited $1,000 checks from Miss Helen Clay Frick. Each check contained a note from Mr. Nixon expressing the hope that this money would be of aid to the candidate's campaign.

Miss Frick is the only surviving daughter of Henry Clay Frick, the multimillionaire industrialist who was the principal figure in the United States Steel, the Pennsylvania Railroad and other giants of the 19th century industrial expansion. She is a long-time supporter of Republican causes and her latest contributions to this cause failed to elicit any light on the reason for her "generosity" to Republican conservatives.

This Congress made sure that millions of Americans would not be deprived of the

many substantial landmarks bills enacted in 1965 and thus far in 1966.

Obstructionism in the 89th Congress was exercised daily by ultra-conservative Republicans already in the House. If this group had been larger by some 30 more members, vital programs such as medical care for the aged and the anti-poverty program would not have been laws of the land today.

Just look at the record votes of some of these ultra-conservatives on the major legislation passed by this Congress. You will find a definite pattern to kill these programs. They would vote for recommital of legislation, which in many cases means the death knell to a bill, and, failing that, changed their mind and voted for the legislation. With this vote on the record, they can go back to their districts and, in honesty, say they voted for these liberal measures. But, there has never been any mention of the previous roll call on the killing of these programs.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Republican Party repudiate, once and for all, all ultra-conservative candidates attempting to attain or recapture public office with the support of right wing funds and workers.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting items which the Republicans have attempted to throw at those of us who are serving in this Congress is our voting record.

I think it only fair that we show that even in this Congress, in spite of their defeat, as shown in my summary of 1964, that we have a tremendous record of obstructionism and negativism by those who are here. This can best be shown by tabulation of their voting records on the major legislation which has been before us during 1965 and 1966.

I have had summarized a tabulation record of obstructionism and negativism in the 89th Congress showing the percentage of votes of Republicans as against legislation both in the House and in the Senate on all of the major legislation we have had.

I ask unanimous consent that that be incorporated in my remarks at this particular point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

RECORD OF OBSTRUCTIONISM AND NEGATIVISM IN 89TH CONGRESS

HOW REPUBLICANS VOTED IN 1965

Antipoverty

Ninety percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Eighty-two percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Ninety-six percent of Senate Republicans against final passage.

Elementary-secondary education

Sixty-eight percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Seventy-three percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Forty-four percent of Senate Republicans against final passage.

Medical care-social security

Ninety-three percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Fifty-three percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Fifty-two percent of Senate Republicans against final passage.

Voting rights

Eighty-five percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Department of Housing

Ninety-six percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Ninety-three percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Sixty-six percent of Senate Republicans against final passage.

Omnibus housing

Ninety-seven percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Eighty-one percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Seventy-three percent of Senate Republicans against final passage.

Public works and economic development

Ninety-two percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Seventy-five percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Thirty-five percent of Senate Republicans against final passage.

Appalachia assistance

Sixty-eight percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Eighty-one percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Fifty-eight percent of Senate Republicans against final passage.

Omnibus farm program

Eighty-nine percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Eighty-five percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Forty-seven percent of Senate Republicans against final passage.

Foreign Assistance Act

Eighty-nine percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Sixty-six percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Thirty-four percent of Senate Republicans against final passage.

HOW REPUBLICANS VOTED IN 1966

Civil Rights Act of 1966

Sixty-three percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Forty-five percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Extension of 1964 Urban Mass Transportation Act

Fifty-three percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Department of Transportation

Ninety-six percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Minimum wage

Seventy-two percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1966

(Included funds for rent supplements and Teacher Corps)

Ninety-five percent of House Republicans to recommit bill.

Sixty-five percent of House Republicans against final passage.

Unemployment compensation

Seventy-one percent of Senate Republicans against final passage.

International Education Act of 1966

Fifty-four percent of House Republicans voted against final passage.

Food for freedom

Ninety-five percent of House Republicans voted to recommit bill.

Highway authorization

Ninety-six percent of House Republicans voted to recommit bill.

Tax Adjustment Act of 1966

Eighty-three percent of House Republicans voted to recommit bill.

Sixty-six percent of House Republicans voted against final passage.

Mr. STALBAUM. In spite of all this conservative background and development and control, the Republicans in this campaign apparently are intent on giving the impression that they are something other than what they are.

This was best illustrated by a secret campaign document which they put out in the State of Pennsylvania and which, unfortunately for them, fell into Democratic hands. It is my understanding that a similar statement was put out in the State of Colorado.

I do not have a copy of that statement before me at this time, but our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES], on September 29 has placed the Pennsylvania statement in the RECORD together with his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask only because it is so vital to the point we are making here that only the statement itself be reprinted at this particular point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN STRATEGY

OUR YEAR IS 1966

The year 1966 is one of victory—of reckoning—of setting right the errors of the past and restoring a proper sense of values to the American scene.

While the opportunity is national in scope, realistic estimates for victory in Pennsylvania exceed all hopes of previous years.

The breaking of the strangle-hold of entrenched unionism is a prospect that is imminent—if we do not make the mistakes which have characterized our efforts in the past.

Not all that we have done has been wrong. Even the Goldwater fiasco has had its useful and productive aspects.

One thing is clear—from a political view, at least. It is more hazardous to advocate the conservative view than it is to implement it.

The voters may have rejected Goldwater—but not the Goldwater viewpoint.

Actually, the margin for Johnson nationally and in Pennsylvania, as well, came about by reason of a shift of the large body of voters in the center. The center—or moderate—group was reluctant to hazard support for a man who so vigorously advocated a course of action and a set of public values with which they—the people—had much sympathy.

One must recognize that our tradition has its roots in a set of laws and moral standards which cannot be defied or flaunted—no matter how irksome or irritating they may be in terms of personal comfort, desires or preferences.

IMPLEMENTATION VERSUS ADVOCACY

Thus the public figure who advocates a public policy which runs counter to the "proper" concepts of justice and equality imperils his cause—even though there may be sympathy on the part of an overwhelming majority of the voters for such a position.

To be sure—these concepts of justice will vary from area to area. Nevertheless, the proposition applies to Pennsylvania—providing of course that adjustments are made to accommodate local tradition, history and circumstances.

In terms of these considerations, we can better evaluate the various factors in Pennsylvania which are pertinent to our

over-all objective, namely—to this state and for the uninhibited growth of industry and commerce.

WHAT IS IT WE SEEK?

Perhaps it would be prudent for us to restate our goals.

The enactment of Right-to-Work legislation in Pennsylvania is not an ultimate goal—but rather a step—albeit a large one—in the right direction.

What we want is to change the climate—the atmosphere—so that membership in a union is not regarded as necessary or desirable. What we want is the creation of social standards under which union membership by the working man is unnecessary, if not actually undesirable.

Of course—legislation banning the union shop must be regarded as important—and perhaps necessary. But by no means can we view this as the ultimate goal toward which we strive.

The Indiana story is an appropriate and timely illustration of shortcomings of such a limited objective.

The solutions to our problems are to be found in the political arena. It is here where we must devote our major efforts and resources.

The immediate goal, it recurs, is the political victory which will combine the understanding of a friendly Governor with the cooperation of a friendly General Assembly.

Such a victory is now in the making through a combination of circumstances, some of which the Democratic and labor bosses helped to create and others which the Republican leadership—finally aware of the realities of political life—have skillfully, intelligently, and carefully preserved.

We need to make certain that no intervening recklessness or blundering will derail such a victory.

PROSPECTS FOR 1966

As has been already reported, our surveys reveal that Republicans can win the November 1966 elections as follows:

A Republican Governor.

A Republican Secretary of Internal Affairs.

Two Republican Superior Court Judges.

A Republican Congressional Delegation consisting of at least 4 to 7 seats in addition to the 12 already held by Republicans.

General Assembly—Under any reasonable reapportionment plan, firm control of both chambers as follows:

A Republican State Senate consisting of from 33 to 36 seats instead of the 28 now held by Republicans. (26 are needed to pass legislation.)

A Republican House of Representatives consisting of from 120 to 135 seats instead of the 93 now held by Republicans. (102 are needed to pass legislation.)

These are not assured gains—they are however, realistically attainable—if we do not yield to the usual tendency to become careless in the face of apparent success.

A SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

A number of conclusions, previously discussed, bear repetition—in summary form:

1. Political victory is essential to our goals. Hence, the emphasis should be on winning—and in doing what it takes to win.

This means that, if an honestly conservative position will not produce victory in Pennsylvania (and the record is clear on that score) our candidates must present themselves as moderates or "center-of-the-road" liberals.

2. We have had repeated demonstrations of the effectiveness of the course followed by the "Pennsylvanians for Right-to-Work." It will be remembered that we counseled against the selection of a well-known Pennsylvanian to head up this activity. The choice of James Scott—unknown in this state until his appointment, and the selection of an equally undistinguished group of Pennsylvanians as officers and directors has proven to be effective in a most critical manner. It has made it possible for our friends in office to disclaim any affinity with our objective—or at least to maintain silence.

This has deprived the Democrats and the labor bosses of an otherwise valuable political weapon in a state where the proportion of union members to the total labor force is so high. The value of this position was evidenced in the 1962 elections. It will be even more important in 1966.

It is a foregone conclusion that Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act will not be repealed in 1966. Thus, the emphasis will shift to the Pennsylvanian scene and we must safeguard the imminent victory against any effective intrusion of this issue into the campaign.

In this connection, it is hoped that the right candidate is selected to head the ticket. Every effort should be made to blunt the thrust of the Schweiker forces and to make secure the Shafer nomination. In any event, even Schweiker, at the head of the ticket, will not be too damaging if we can head off the emergence of a vigorous anti-Schweiker hostility among our friends. This would only serve to strengthen Schweiker's prejudices and perhaps make him rigid and intractable should he be elected Governor.

3. The Democrat mess in the House of Representatives could not have been more complete if we had planned and manipulated their actions. To be sure, the 1965 session, despite the image it has gained, is not without merit or accomplishment. But the Democrats have failed to gain such identification in the public eye and remain, instead, "guilty" of obstruction, insincerity, partisan selfishness, etc. We could not have planned it better, had we written the script.

The best weapon at our disposal is the tag of "big-city-bossed" control of the Democrat majority in the House. This should be constantly invoked—at every turn. It is clear that if we can't connect it up—the Smith-Lawrence axis will help us. The role of the press, which had expected quite a different show, has been most helpful.

Our candidates must, for their own part, seek to be free of such an identification. There should be frequent public dissent and disagreement—so that individual candidates can be free of the charge of domination. Demonstrations of this in Dauphin, Montgomery, Delaware, Allegheny, and other counties as well as the suggested differences between the Republican leadership, the Governor himself, have benefitted all concerned.

The "labor" factor must be properly understood and dealt with. First of all, there is no need to molest the leadership of unions in Pennsylvania. These leaders are, in the main, vain, insecure, and frequently too lazy to undertake genuine, effective, political activity.

The State AFL–CIO is in reality a "paper tiger." It has no real teeth of its own. Its effectiveness lies with the local rank and file members with whom it has only a casual relationship. And, deprived of real issues, it can do little to arouse the locals throughout the state to any appreciable degree.

As previously indicated, only an issue as basic as the U.C. revision could enable the state organization to promote such intensive local stimulation. Without a similar "cause" the State AFL–CIO would find it impossible to approach anything reminiscent of the "March on Harrisburg." It is important that we avoid creating such an issue around which local leadership and membership could be rallied.

(There is general agreement that it was then correct to avoid entrapment in another U.C. fracas. We observed pointedly that all the "steam" had gone out of the ardent push by the state labor bosses to rally support for a return to previous U.C. standards. There is an apparent lack of interest in pushing H.B. 1147, and the paucity of "mail-from-home" is a demonstration of such indifference. We again recommend that the Governor and his associates, together with the Republican legislative leaders, take pains to avoid involvement in unwarranted, unnecessary debates with the labor bosses. Any reference to a favorable balance in the U.C. fund should be casual, at best, and always, without variation coupled with a report on full employment, decreased joblessness, and declining Public Assistance rolls. This is really not an issue that the Democratic leaders can or even want to exploit and they know it. We should not forget this—particularly in the heat of the '66 Campaign.)

At the local level, where the strength of labor lies, we have an opportunity to do our best work. There is no reason for Republicans to be at odds with local union leaders. There are many opportunities for the establishment of rapport.

With a little imagination and resourcefulness, labor leaders at the local level can be neutarlized—if not actually won over. The offer of jobs or "bribery" in any of its forms is worthless—it just doesn't produce the desired results.

Quite to the contrary, a little recognition—not necessarily of Republican labor leaders—but of the established, recognized leadership—will do the trick simply and effectively.

There is no reason for our friends in the service clubs to avoid bringing these leaders into such groups—as members. There is no reason for our friends to avoid public demonstration of friendship and recognition. A little of this will go a long way in neutralizing the leadership in many communities where open hostility now exists.

5. With respect to public posture on Right-to-Work, it is totally unnecessary for Republican candidates to say anything at all. Moreover, the statewide position of Republican leaders is fairly well established and can be referred to when a challenge is made. The action of our Republican women was most imprudent and hazardous—particularly since it was gratuitous and unnecessary. By all means—we must be vigilant against any recurrence of such unprovoked, unnecessary enthusiasm for a cause—no matter how valid—when silence would have served our purposes so much better.

6. We should have learned by now that we can oppose programs and policies without the need to denounce or otherwise agitate against them.

We do not need to oppose Medicare—rather—we must attack the manner in which it is being administered.

We should not be fighting the Appalachia programs or the "War on Poverty." We can more effectively denounce the waste and incompetence which characterize the implementation of these programs.

Under no circumstances should we be drawn into a quarrel with President Johnson on Vietnam. It will gain little for us—and in addition—Senator DIRKSEN and the Republican National Committee can and will be doing a far more effective job in this field.

We should do more—constantly—to destroy the hold of the Democrat effort, we will have the help of the leadership of Minority groups. In this effort we will have the help of the Democrats who are unable to cope with the demands of the minority groups on one hand—and the fears of the big city white groups who are resisting what they regard as capitulation of the Democrats to these minorities. Wherever possible we should not become involved in integration problems as they affect schools and housing. It should be remembered that the big-city Democrats are responsible for the solutions—(which do not come easily)—and it is our right to appropriately call them to account for vacillation, evasion, and insincerity.

Adroitly handled—with appropriate restraint—Republicans can make huge inroads in the so-called Democrat strong-holds among Negro, Italian and Irish Catholics and Jewish sections of the large cities.

The imminence of a Specter victory in Philadelphia and a Lindsay win in New York should be the basis for a careful review and evaluation of our posture with respect to these minority groups.

Finally, we should avoid joining publicly in denouncing the United States Supreme Court. We should be careful not to become embroiled in the "one man—one vote" imbroglio. The State Supreme Court will apportion Pennsylvania and the rest is academic. There will probably be no return to the old days—and we should seize present opportunities to win in 1966—particularly because we can win.

It should be remembered that the public referendum route is not the way to win abolition of the union shop. Ohio, Oklahoma, Washington, and California have all provided us with enough evidence of such folly. (Remember Knowland and Bricker?)

We can accomplish more by virtue of friendly control of the Governor's office and the General Assembly.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I have attempted not so much by words or statements but by documentation and by the documentation of those of our colleagues who have also participated in showing that the Republican Party and the leadership of the Republican Party is still having a love affair with the far right extremist groups and that this has not minimized itself at all since 1964 but rather it is as strong as ever.

It is high time, and this is the purpose for my taking this time today, to show the American people that in spite of anything that might be said, the Republican Party is still the same conservative group that nominated Barry Goldwater in 1964; and that in almost every instance where a challenge has been made to this conservative group in the country, they, the conservative group have been successful in getting their candidates nominated.

Let no one be deluded into thinking that there is a new Republican Party, or a forward-looking Republican Party, or a Republican Party of ideas because the efforts of any such groups as my colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] has pointed out as well as my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCARTHY]—the efforts of those groups are usually beaten down within the Republican Party. Furthermore, we can see from the voting record, which I have filed as a part of my statement here today, that even in this Congress the voting record of the Republican Members is far more reactionary than one would believe from the statements that they attempt to put out.

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH], is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this special order for the purpose of calling to the attention of the Members of the House and to others the approaching 10th anniversary of one of the most significant events in the 20th century. I refer to the Hungarian revolution which erupted 10 years ago in Budapest on the 23d day of this month. It is a date that should not be overlooked in our country and in the Western World. It is a date that free men should not ignore although there are those who would wish to forget and permit it to slip by unnoticed.

Kipling in his immortal "Recessional," in that oft-quoted verse, would observe:

The tumult and the shouting dies,
The Captains and the kings depart,
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Host, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, Lest we forget.

I mentioned that there would be those to whom the 10th anniversary of this revolution would have special meaning. It will have special meaning for different reasons. I would like to discuss some of these reasons and some of the interested parties who are tied into this great historical event.

First. It will have deep and perhaps tragic meaning to thousands of Hungarians who for a brief instant in history threw off the shackles of a tyrant. It will have meaning to those who felt the devastation of war and resulting imprisonment because of their actions. It will have meaning to those Hungarians whose relatives gave their lives to a noble cause.

It will have special meaning to thousands of Hungarians who fled their country and sought refuge in the West. To them, it will recall moments of great risk, fear, courage, suspense, and terror.

This anniversary will have meaning to the Assembly of Captive European Nations, an organization who by its being symbolizes resistance to Soviet tyranny and which keeps before the free world the reminder of democratic regimes whose national destinies have been buried in a graveyard established and maintained by Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Mao, Castro, and Ho Chi Minh.

Second. This 10th anniversary will have an ominous meaning to the Communist bloc countries and the Soviet Union in particular. It will haunt them and recall to mind how really fragile and shaky is their empire that holds hostage the people of East and Central Europe. As they look back over this event, and look at those who participated in the Hungarian cause, it will reaffirm again the distrust of creative freedom and the power of ideas. Because they know, notwithstanding all of their protestations to the contrary, that those who toppled the Hungarian Communist regime and for a few brief days challenged successfully the power of the Russian Army, included in this brave group the writers, the journalists, the engineers, the athletes, the students, and the artists.

As John McCormac from the New York Times on the 4th of November 1956, writing from Budapest, would observe in his column:

This Hungarian revolution was not one from the top. It came from the bottom. It originated among the intellectuals. It was started by the writers and journalists, as was the Polish. The university students participated here, as they did in Poland. The workers—the base on which communism is supposed to be built—trailed behind.

Third. The Hungarian revolution should have a special meaning to America and to the Western World in their pursuit of freedom and international peace. Because the Hungarian revolution proves that international peace will only be obtained when it has been achieved so as to make men free. This is why we are in South Vietnam: to achieve peace and freedom.

We must not forget the words of Rousseau, who would write nearly 200 years ago in the 18th century:

Man is born free, but everywhere he is enslaved.

For those of us in America, we must not forget that man is still enslaved and who enslaves him. How permanent can any peace be when you accept the Soviet version of peace with the muffled tramp of the boot in the police state that seeks to crush every human aspiration of creativity, individual opportunity, and basic justice?

The Hungarian revolution will always be remembered as one of the great events in history that needs no tribute that we might pay it here on the floor today; however, our tribute can best be paid by the lessons it teaches a decade later.

Now, 10 years later—10 short years—we find ourselves in the spirit of detente with the Russian Bear. Now the easing of tensions and detente can be a very good thing in a troubled world faced always with the terrifying specter of nuclear holocaust. But we must be certain it is not a one-sided detente and we must be certain that it does not involve a Trojan horse.

All of us are glad that the Soviets would release one of our Peace Corps volunteers, which has been described in the current issue of Newsweek, and I quote:

In an obvious gesture of good will, Russian authorities last week released an American Peace Corps teacher named Thomas Dawson, after holding him for 21 days for mistakenly stumbling over the Soviet-Iranian border.

An obvious gesture of good will? What about the treatment of that other young American who ventured across a Soviet border? I refer to young Mott. Was that in the spirit of detente?

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that we can only judge people by their actions, because their actions speak louder than words.

What has changed since Budapest, 1956? As we look at reassurances, and various overtures in reference to international air travel between our country and Russia; as we look at the possibility of a treaty with respect to the control

of proliferation of atomic weapons; as we look at the spirit of fellowship that is genuine between our athletes and Soviet athletes in international games; as we view the talent of Russian ballet in cultural exchanges; as we note the sincere friendship and admiration that exists between American people and Soviet people when they can meet at a personal level; as we look at the test-ban agreement; as we look at the struggle between China and Russia—all of which and many more have been cited as evidence of detente—let us also look at some of the other aspects of the last decade since Budapest, which I feel run contrary to the spirit of detente and which actions, I feel, speak louder than words, as the intent of our so-called friends at the Kremlin.

What about East Berlin? Have the Soviets ever ceased for one moment to hold down the Iron Curtain of Red slavery on this lonely stage? What about the recent Berlin crisis? When it was necessary for this Nation to recall to active duty some of its Reserves to meet the threat that was being posed there? What about the Berlin wall—that ugly monument that casts its shadow across all of Western Europe—erected not to keep people out, but to keep people in? Would it not be a fitting gesture of Soviet sincerity of friendship to evidence their good faith in the search of international peace under freedom that they would first tear down and reduce to rubble this ugly pile of concrete that men and women have died seeking to climb?

What about Cuba? The infiltration of that revolution that would subvert the real aspirations of the Cuban people as Lenin and the Bolsheviks would subvert the real aspirations of the Russian people of their revolution during World War I. How does the spirit of detente coincide with the indictment of the late Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai E. Stevenson, in describing the Cuban missile crisis using the following language:

> That shameful wall in Berlin, not to keep anyone out of the East but to prevent even greater numbers from fleeing to the West; and the Soviet Union's attempt in 1962, acting with stealth and deception, to transform Cuba into an offensive bridgehead of nuclear blackmail.

The Cuban missile crisis that nearly upset the balance of military power, that nearly outflanked the defenses of the Western World: What would our strategic situation be today had we not taken the vigorous action in this country we took under the leadership of the late President to meet that threat?

Has the Soviet Union, since Budapest, even in the last weeks, or last months or last year, reduced its worldwide espionage operations? Has it reduced its subversive activities in the various countries of the free world?

Have the leaders of the Soviet Union ceased to persecute the Jewish people of that nation? I submit that they have not.

Have they stopped building intercontinental ballistic missiles? In a recent publication of Orbis, a quarterly journal of world affairs, published by Foreign Policy Research of the University of Pennsylvania, was the following statement:

> Yet the Soviets appear to have embarked upon a major program to narrow and perhaps close the strategic gap. By 1968 they are expected to deploy more than 600 ICBM's. Moreover, it has been estimated that they have doubled their nuclear stockpile during the past year to about 12,000 megatons, while the United States has not increased substantially its nuclear stockpile of 25,000 megatons. Thus the Soviet Union, by 1968, may have reduced significantly the strategic margin that the United States enjoys. (Orbis, summer 1966, vol. 10, No. 2.)

Why do they continue to build with such earnestness an antiballistic missile system? Do they really believe that we would strike them first, or rather, are they developing their offensive and defensive missile capabilities in order to checkmate our retaliatory-strike capabilities and thereby upset the balance of nuclear power?

Have they, since Budapest, stopped their propaganda broadcasts containing repeated messages of hate and abuse of the United States and of the free world? In an article entitled the "Role of Intelligence in the Cold War," by Allen Dulles, former Director of the CIA, Mr. Dulles observes in the book, "Peace and War," published in 1965:

> With some of the most powerful transmitting stations in the world, they beam their messages to practically every major area of the world. They step up their propaganda to the particular target areas which they consider to be the most vulnerable, and adjust it as their policy dictates.

These messages, rather than carrying the message of peace and good will, are inflamed with prejudices, renew ancient hatreds, seeking to promote violence, revolution, and unrest. In the spirit of detente, why do they not cease and desist from this worldwide propaganda effort?

Then what of Vietnam? Are there evidences of detente, half a world away in this isolated piece of real estate that holds the destiny of all of southeast Asia? The evidence is to the contrary.

Is there a Soviet presence by way of support and assistance in North Vietnam? The answer is "Yes." That answer need not come from our own intelligence sources, because the Soviets have announced to the world that Russian antiaircraft equipment and military personnel are present in North Vietnam, assisting in taking the toll of American aircraft that we continue to lose at an alarming rate in that area of the world.

I read to you the following statement appearing in the News of the Week in Review section of the New York Times newspaper published Sunday last:

> Just before the aid agreements were announced, the Ministry of Defense released vivid reportage of how Soviet missile specialists are risking death side by side with the Vietnamese under U.S. bombing raids. The report in the military newspaper Krasnaya Zvezda (Red Star) confirmed what Washington had long known—that Soviet military support to North Vietnam includes personnel as well as materiel.
>
> These details of Soviet military aid to Hanoi come out only piecemeal and seemingly incidentally. Other indications come from Washington: that the number of batteries firing antiaircraft missiles has been increased from four last fall to 25 or 30 now; that the radar network over North Vietnam is more intensive than over Eastern Europe; that conventional antiaircraft batteries have more than trebled in the past year.

Is this the spirit of detente?

Since Budapest, have they given up their practice of economic warfare? Mr. Speaker, they have not. On the contrary, it is on the increase. Crude oil is one of the principal weapons of their economic offensive. In support of this, I call to the attention of the House a report of a special study mission to Europe chaired by the distinguished Member from New York [Mrs. KELLY] submitted to the House February 1963, which directed its attention to the "Soviet Economic Offensive in Western Europe"—the title, incidentally, of the study.

I direct particular attention to the manner in which prices of Soviet crude oil are reduced for markets that they seek to penetrate, and how these reduced prices are recouped by higher charges for crude oil furnished to the hostage satellite countries of Eastern Europe.

Has there been any letup of this economic offense?

What of the remark of the former Chief of State of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, uttered since Budapest, "We will bury you." Khrushchev has been deposed, but has any responsible leader of the Soviet Union repudiated this remark? Mr. Speaker, they have not.

Since Budapest, are there free elections in Eastern Europe or in the Soviet Union? There are not.

How peaceful is peaceful coexistence? Does not this policy enunciated principally since Budapest aver that they will still pursue their aims of world domination, using means short of all-out general war, but specifically not excluding wars of "national liberation" of which Vietnam is a case in point? Have the Soviets not declared that they will support these types of conflicts, and does the record not show that they not only are supporting it by the supply of arms to North Vietnam, but seeking to inspire them in other places of the world and make us extend our forces and exhaust our resources?

In summary, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in the 10 years since Budapest, we have seen an acceleration of this conflict we call the cold war—a conflict waged economically, politically, psychologically, and militarily.

There are lessons for us in America and the West as we approach the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, and I submit to you that some of them are:

First. That this was a spontaneous outburst of a people disgusted with the abuses of a totalitarian regime;

Second. That within the satellite countries, there is a continuing restiveness and demand for freedom;

Third. That there is a popular support lacking in Communist countries for the Communist regime;

Fourth. That there is sham in the Warsaw Pact. Under the terms of the treaty of 1947 at the close of World War II, Russia was permitted to maintain occupation troops in Hungary in order to service lines of communication with Soviet forces in Austria. In the Austria Treaty of 1955, it withdrew Soviet forces from Austria. The Warsaw Pact was created for the purpose of maintaining Soviet forces in the satellite countries for the purpose of crushing local insurrection and for population control and not as they would have the world believe, to form a counterforce to the NATO defense establishment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian revolution made plain that the foremost colonial power of the world today is the Soviet Union; that they are not really revolutionaries but are the forces of reaction. It is a shaky empire built on feet of clay that runs contrary to every human aspiration.

Budapest will always be remembered in the cause of freemen. We can best remember it and pay tribute to it by learning from it. In the article of Mr. McCormac of the New York Times which I mentioned previously, he closed his dispatch from Budapest with the following words:

AGAINST COMMUNISM

Although the demonstrators were mostly university students and admission to the university was restricted largely to the sons of workers and peasants, they demonstrated that theirs was not in any sense a Communist demonstration. The banners they carried, the songs they sang and everything they did showed that they were demonstrating against communism. It was communism they hated and they began to hate the Russians only when these were called in by their Communist rulers.

From the first day of the revolution, the revolutionaries with whom the writer has talked have insisted that there must be a multi-party system in this country and that the Hungarian Communist party must participate in free elections. Their obvious intent is to demonstrate that, when the voter is given a free choice, he will vote against communism.

Why do not the Soviets give the people this choice?

Until they do, can we afford to take the risks that this may be a one-sided detente? Can we seek to establish normal international relations and agreements so long as they provide the sinews of war to forces that oppose us and other nations who seek freedom and international peace. We cannot engage in an Alice in Wonderland type of foreign policy by seeking accommodations with a regime that in other areas of the world seeks to do what it did in Budapest and what it has declared it seeks to do here.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these are some of the things that Americans and all freemen who want to continue to be free should keep in mind as we approach the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the last war many of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe have lost their freedom and are being subjected to Communist totalitarianism. For more than two decades they have been suffering under Communist governments, imposed upon them by the Kremlin and kept in power by Soviet forces in these or in nearby countries. Because of this fact, the presence of Soviet troops in their midst, the peoples of these countries have not been able to throw out the detested Communist regimes and establish their own democratic governments. Up to now none of these captive peoples have succeeded in doing this, and only the Hungarian people made the daring attempt 10 years ago, only to find themselves worsted and literally smothered by the ferocious might of the Red army. Fortunately that sad fact has not robbed the Hungarian people of their right to freedom, and they are among the most dauntless champions of liberty in all Central and Eastern Europe today.

By mid-1956 the Hungarian people felt they had more than their share of Communist rule. On October 24 the uprising, a veritable revolution, began in Budapest, and before the end of that day it spread to many parts of the country. It was so carefully planned and well executed that in a matter of hours the Government in Budapest was overthrown; its leaders either fled the city or went into hiding. This initial phase of the uprising was successfully carried out. Government troops at once sided with the revolutionaries, and this happened in the case of garrisons in many military establishments. Then the new leaders of Hungary formed a new government. Thus in a little more than a day Communist totalitarianism ceased to exist in Hungary, and once more democratic forces were victorious. In the course of the next few days the new government was able to establish its authority over the entire country, and everywhere it had the solid backing of the people. Of course, everyone was overjoyed by their sudden success; no less jubilant were all friends of freedom and democracy in the free world. All eyes were fixed at these startling and heartening events in Hungary, and everyone was anxiously awaiting to see the behavior of Soviet forces in Hungary. And the free world did not have to await long for the bloody action of the Soviet troops.

As soon as the uprising proved successful and the new government was established in Budapest, it asked the Soviet authorities to withdraw the Soviet forces from the country. The initial and somewhat evasive reply of the Soviet authorities was that this would be done in due time. Meanwhile, however, it seems that Soviet commanders in Hungary had orders to maneuver for positions to attack the Hungarians as soon as stronger and fresh Soviet units were sent to Hungary. This was done by the second of November. The Hungarians, sensing the arrival of additional Soviet troops, called for immediate and effective foreign intervention. It was most important that action was not taken at that time by the United Nations. At that time I urged that representatives of the United Nations be sent to Hungary, but vision and courage was lacking. The Soviets, knowing this, ordered their bolstered forces in Hungary to go into action. This they did on November 4, and, as the Hungarians could not possibly cope with the overwhelming Soviet force, they died by the thousands, fighting for their freedom and democracy. Today, on the 10th anniversary observance of that uprising, and its glorious but short-lived success, we pay tribute to the memory of those gallant Hungarian fighters. The efforts for restorations for Hungary and her people of full sovereignty and freedom will continue until this great end is obtained.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, 10 years have passed since the courageous uprising against Communist tyranny by the freedom-loving people in Budapest, Hungary, on October 23, 1956. The events of the 13 days following that memorable event will always be remembered as one of the most vivid examples of patriotism and love of liberty in the world.

In the face of Soviet troops and tanks, these brave men fought with a few small arms, and whatever weapons they could muster; and for a brief period, they succeeded in throwing off the chains of totalitarian government, and established a democracy that truly represented the aspirations of the nation. The victory was short lived, for Communist oppression prevailed after a week's time.

However, the spirit of patriotism and liberty did not die with the suppression of the uprising. Although thousands died, and hundreds of thousands fled the country, there are still many freedom-loving Hungarians who hope that someday the tyrannical bonds will be broken and they can live in freedom, independence, and democracy.

I feel deeply honored to pay tribute to the courageous people who took part in this ill-fated revolution and sincerely hope that the future will bring a successful realization of the liberty-minded Hungarians' present hopes and dreams.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the fire, the inspiration, the whole emotional impact of events fades with the passage of time. In some cases this is a healthy phenomenon. In others it is a danger to be avoided. The revolt of Hungary in October 1956 is one case which should never be forgotten.

At the time of the gallant and tragic rebellion against a horrible Communist dictatorship the world was thrilled by the efforts of the Hungarian heroes. As time passed, it would be quite understandable if free men, losing the fervor of the moments of high drama of late 1956, were to lose track of the importance, the glory, and the horror of those days. We who live on the free side of the various Communist curtains, should never let ourselves forget the suffering and the aspirations of the Hungarian people at that time. Nor should we allow the desire for freedom in such sorry lands as Hungary is today to die for lack of support.

In all parts of this land, and especially in these Halls of deliberation of the representatives of the American people, it is fitting that we recall the passionate emotions of those days a decade ago. More than that, it is incumbent upon us to keep faith with our own ideals, which so

closely parallel those of the Hungarian patriots of 1956.

Let us never forget the perfidious actions of the aggressors against Hungary's national self-determination. By cunning lies, and cruel disregard for their own pledged word, the Soviet leaders at first raised high the hopes for Hungary's liberation. Then, when they were better prepared for their blitzkrieg, they ordered arrests of men promised free passage, and unleashed their tanks against the almost defenseless Hungarian people.

All classes of the populace rose up to fight against the reimposition of the shameful type of police state which had just been overthrown. The people of Hungary did not want a return to a rule by such men as they had just overthrown in righteous vengeance. The youth, the military, and the workers were in the forefront of the hopeless but determined fight against the Communists.

Thousands died in Budapest and other locales within the stricken nation. Thousands more were treated to that peculiar Russian device of punishment—banishment to the immense wastes of Russian Asia. Others were executed for wanting things which we Americans take lightly—human dignity and national freedom. Other tens of thousands were able to make an escape from the new barbarism descending upon their unfortunate nation. In sum, the toll in human suffering was terrible. It was inflicted by a brutal, merciless system which cannot abide dissent, especially when such threatens the power position of the ruling minority.

Mr. Speaker, on the 23d of October we celebrate the 10th anniversary of the great Hungarian revolution. As we recall the high aspirations of the patriots and their sad ending, it should leave us with a humble feeling toward those brave men and women, old and young, who showed that the human spirit is still strong enough to face all dangers for the very rights of human beings which we ourselves hold so dear. I wish to express my profound sympathy for the Hungarian people and my best wishes that very soon their great effort begun 10 years ago will be crowned with success.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, every American schoolchild knows of the words of Patrick Henry:

> Is life so dear, or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?—Forbid it Almighty God!—I know not what course others may take, but, as for me, give me liberty or give me death.

Ten years ago, in October 1956, the Russian-enslaved Hungarian people asked themselves the same question, and their answer was the same as it has always been when subjugated people seek the universal end of man: freedom with human dignity.

Surprised by their decision and their action, the world watched as a nation chose liberty or death. Their effort, however, was not as successful as have been the efforts of other nations and, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian people gained death and not liberty.

The history of the Hungarian people is marked with great achievement. The events of October 1956 take nothing away from these noble people, but rather adds to their reputation as lovers of liberty and freedom. By the end of October the Hungarian people had received from their Russian masters a conciliation; namely, they could have their own self-government. The world joined the Hungarian people in their joy. Soviet domination and enslavement in Eastern Europe had been broken. The future for not only the Hungarian people, but for the world, looked brighter.

We know now that those first waves of joy were premature, and that the world was to see again the treachery of the Communists. In early November the Red army received its orders:

> Hold back no longer—crush the revolution at all costs.

We all recall the gallant pictures of human determination in the face of overwhelming odds. Those pictures were in all the newspapers of the world to see: soldiers shooting into crowds; the "freedom fighters" facing Soviet tanks and machineguns with sticks and stones. The free air of Hungary was being replaced again by the stultifying air of oppression and slavery. The revolution of 1956 was broken.

While freedom lost the battle in Hungary 10 years ago, it did not lose the war, for if the Hungarian revolution did nothing else, it served to remind us of two important points—indeed, two lessons of modern history. One, the true stripe of the Communist mentality was exposed in both theory and practice as one that can neither tolerate nor accept the desire of men to be free, and two, it showed again the belief that men everywhere have a basic need to live their life in liberty with dignity.

On this 10th anniversary we send to the Hungarian people our best wishes and the thought that they also will someday live in freedom.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH], for securing the special order which makes it possible for Members of the House to take note of the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution against Communist tyranny.

I well remember the valiant effort of the Hungarian patriots which succeeded briefly in supplanting Soviet tyranny with a free government. Although that government was soon crushed by overwhelming Soviet military might, the struggle against fantastic odds proved that the brave Hungarians will never willingly submit to oppression.

Today, 10 years later, the Soviet has to still maintain large forces in Hungary to prevent another attempt by these courageous people to achieve their liberty. The people of Hungary have our sympathy and admiration. They have become a great symbol for freedom-loving peoples everywhere. In every true democracy, the wish is fervently held that someday this fine and gallant people will achieve the goal of their national aspirations.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today the House commemorates the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution.

All of us can remember that bleak October of 1956 when the world waited, hoped, and prayed for the valiant men and women who pitted themselves against the overwhelming forces of the Soviet Army in order to free their nation. They were fighting for all of us, and we knew it then and now.

The Hungarian freedom fighters became the symbol of man's unconquerable faith in himself and his future. Dreams of liberty cannot be quenched under a hail of bullets, bombs, and mortars. Man will endure privation, but ultimately he will be free.

As brutal as the Communist forces were in crushing the rebellion, this fact had to be acknowledged. The captives of the Communists, forced to live behind an Iron Curtain and shut away from the rest of the world, would never submit their free will to the dictators in power. This fact was abundantly clear to Moscow.

Today, 10 years later, Hungary, while still far from free, is slowly, gradually, inexorably becoming part of today's world.

Ideas cannot be suppressed forever; man's mind will not be chained to a common ideology or thought; man's curiosity about himself and his neighbors on earth can never be denied.

The Hungarian freedom fighters fought for all those who believe in honor and in liberty. They died shouting their belief in a better world to the four corners of the earth. Their cry of defiant faith was heard by all men, everywhere, slave or free.

That cry kindled a flame which swept the hearts of men. Dreams of liberty, as old as man's history, will persist as long as men try to force others to their will. Conquerors may never rest easy. Always there will be men to plan a new method to break the bonds of oppression; a more ingenious attack to secure freedom.

The Hungarian freedom fighters now are part of the magnificent history of man's struggle to free himself from tyranny. We honor them and their memory today, for they gave renewed strength to others to pick up the standard of liberty and press forward until that day when men of all nations are truly free to seek their own destiny.

I am proud to join with my colleagues in publicly commemorating this debt of honor to the Hungarian freedom fighters.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep feeling that I join my colleagues in tribute to the inspiring heroism of Hungary's freedom fighters and in warm commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution.

Ten years ago all men who cherished freedom looked with anticipation toward Budapest, filled with hope and expectation that the promise of the freedom fighters would be fulfilled.

The expectations of this revolution, the hopes of the freedom fighters, were not achieved, not because of any shortcomings on the part of the Hungarian

people, but because of the overwhelming might of the Soviet military machine. Within a matter of hours after Soviet intervention, the revolution was crushed, and once again Hungary lapsed back into the status of a satellite state of the U.S.S.R.

In those few days of hope and catastrophe, of heroism and brutality, of promise and disillusionment, the world was given an object lesson that ought never to be forgotten. All mankind was shown that communism in Hungary was not a matter of free choice of the Hungarian people, but that it was a system imposed upon them by their Soviet conquerors and their political associates.

If peoples of the underdeveloped areas of the world had any doubts about the relationship between human freedom and communism, they were given a good case study upon which to make their judgment in the events in Hungary during early November 1956.

This, then, is one of the many lessons of the Hungarian revolution: it exposed the false claims of communism to speak for human freedom.

On this 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, we in our land and the people throughout the free world send greetings of warm friendship to the people of Hungary. Resolutely we stand behind them and with confidence look forward to the day, not far away, when again they will be free.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, few events have so stirred the hearts of man as the Hungarian revolution of 1956. Although 10 years have passed since that event, the world continues to marvel at the courage of a people who rose up to defy tyranny. In the courtroom of world opinion the Soviet Union stood condemned by the civilized world for its brutal suppression of the revolution and for its flaunting of United Nations action.

On October 23 several thousand Hungarian students gathered in Budapest before the monument to the Polish general, Bem, who was the hero of the Hungarian revolution of 1848. These students thus sought to express their hatred of the police state in which they lived and of foreign domination by the Soviet Union. Their peaceful appeal was shattered by shots, an action which transformed their gathering into a revolution.

As the police fired upon the innocent students, more and more Hungarian students and citizens joined the group. From the outskirts of the city came workers, armed with makeshift weapons. Suddenly the long years of oppression erupted into a great popular uprising. Budapest became a battleground between communism and freedom. From the workers' organizations, from the universities, from the young people erupted a great outpouring of emotion. The workers, in whose name the regime had claimed to govern, attacked. The scholars wrote diatribes, denouncing their oppression. The young threw themselves before bullets and tanks in order to win their freedom.

From the free peoples of the earth poured wonderment and sympathy for the embattled Hungarian patriots. As Sir Leslie Munro of New Zealand declared:

> All mankind has been reminded, at a time when many had lost the capacity to believe it, that cruelty, no matter how effectively and soullessly imposed, can never prevail over men determined to wait, to fight, for the restoration of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian people lost their fight for freedom. By the end of November the cold of winter and of oppression had once again frozen the beautiful land of Hungary. The daily tide of refugees flowing into Austria swelled until more than 200,000 people, about 2 percent of the entire population, had left their homeland. Sickening episodes of firing on peaceful gatherings and would-be fugitives continued to occur. In Budapest alone this 7 weeks' war was said to have rendered 40,000 families homeless and killed perhaps 25,000 Hungarian patriots. Hungary would never recover from the loss of her valiant children.

Although the Hungarian revolution was crushed, its meaning will always live in the hearts of free people. By their sacrifices in that tragic fall of 1956, the Hungarian people delivered a valuable message to the world. By their actions they laid bare the tyranny and hypocrisy of the Communist myth.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our Hungarian brothers on this anniversary of their revolution.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this month, world opinion was profoundly moved when the Hungarian people rose in rebellion against a detested regime supported by the tyranny of a foreign power. This heroic action in the cause of liberty will stand as one of the landmarks in man's constant quest for political freedom.

Ever since the end of World War II, the Hungarian people had seen their country occupied by Soviet troops, their farmers and small businessmen expropriated, and their workers exploited to support the Soviet economy. By October 1956, their suffering and accumulated resentments could no longer be contained and, throwing caution to the winds, they rebelled against this oppression and planted the banner of freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

For days, an admiring world held its breath as the Hungarians dared what none had thought possible. And then, admiration for the courage of the Hungarian freedom fighters gave way to a sense of foreboding as Soviet intervention came—swiftly and brutally. As all the world watched, Soviet tanks and soldiers moved into Budapest to install a Soviet-picked regime to shore up by force their crumbling empire. The Hungarian revolt was crushed. But not before it had shaken the Soviet-imposed order in Eastern Europe, and had shaken the world as well. Nothing has been quite the same since.

Change is at work in Eastern Europe, and it is the kind of change that cannot be snuffed out by tanks and troops. In large measure, the sacrifices of the Hungarian people on October 23, 1956, prepared the way for this dramatic change. On this 10th anniversary of that heroic revolution, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the great Hungarian people for their steadfast courage, and their unfailing devotion to freedom.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, October 23 marks the 10th anniversary of the gallant fight of the people of Hungary to rid themselves of their Communist captors. What started out to be a peaceful demonstration by workers and students seeking the removal of Erno Gero, the Hungarian Communist Party secretary, became in short order a bloody revolt when the secret police opened fire on the demonstrators. The Russian Army was summoned by the frantic Hungarian Communists who could not stop the revolt as it spread across the country. In 5 days it appeared that the revolt was a success. Premier Nagy announced that the Russians had agreed to withdraw their troops from Hungary and, indeed, the Red army started to pull out of Budapest. Hungarians were jubilant and the rest of the free world shared their happiness. But it was to be short lived.

In 3 days the Russian tactics became clear as a massive 200,000-man army equipped with 2,500 tanks ringed Budapest. Despite pleas and protests from Premiere Nagy and other officials on November 4 the Russians opened their attack on the city turning it into a gory battleground. Hungarian freedom fighters fought back with what they had—rifles against tanks; homemade fire bombs against armored cars. Despite a heroic stand the revolution collapsed and the Communists once again controlled Hungary. However, before the Communists could close the borders many thousands of these brave people made their way out of the country, most of them to eventually wind up in the United States. Mr. Speaker, the courage of these people stands as its own monument. On the slimmest hope of freedom they risked all, demonstrating once again that countries and bodies can be held in captivity, but minds cannot. Many of the refugees who made their way here are now proud to call themselves American citizens. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should be the ones who are proud to call them Americans.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, a decade has passed since those fateful days of October 1956, when Soviet tanks rolled through the streets of Budapest, killing the flower of Hungarian youth, crushing that brave nation's bid for freedom.

Who amongst us will ever forget those tense and tragic days? The people of Eastern Europe seemed poised on the threshold of a new life. The days of suffering, of enduring repeated indignities at the hands of foreign-imposed Communist regimes, appeared to be coming to an end. All who treasured freedom looked to Budapest, waiting anxiously for the outcome of the revolution, believing that it had to succeed and bring independence to all of Eastern Europe.

Those hopes were to be disappointed. Soviet domination over Eastern Europe was not to be broken that quickly. More time had to pass, more efforts had to be exerted, before the character of Communist rule over Eastern Euprope was to be changed.

Yet change it did. And the Hungarian revolution, while failing in its immediate objectives, opened the door to a new era which, in the years that followed, witnessed the lessening of overt repression, an increase in travel and contact with the West, some modest improvement in the level of living, and some small progress on the road to a better life for the people of Eastern Europe.

All of those changes, while welcome, do not alter the fact that 21 years after the end of World War II, Europe remains divided and millions of people—from Estonia to Albania, from Czechoslovakia to the Ukraine—continue to be deprived of the right and the opportunity to fashion their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing the National Conference of Editorial Writers in New York City on October 7, President Johnson said:

> The one great goal of a united West is to heal the wound in Europe which now cuts East from West and brother from brother.

I fully share in his sentiments on this subject.

As history has shown, however, the wound of Europe will not be healed, that breach repaired, until respect is shown once again for the basic human rights of the people of Eastern Europe—and until those people are given the chance to direct the destinies of their nations.

Mr. Speaker, on this 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to those who suffered—and those who died—for the cause of freedom.

May they know that we in the United States have not forgotten their courage and their sacrifices—and that we will continue to work for the cause of freedom, with justice, for all men.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this month we commemorate a sad occasion, the 10th anniversary of the heroic struggle of the people of Hungary against their Communist masters.

Is there anyone in this Chamber who can forget the agonizing hours the world spent during October of 1956, awaiting the latest news bulletin with respect to what was happening in Budapest?

The brutal suppression of the Hungarian freedom fighters by Soviet tanks and troops has become a symbol of the worst aspects of communism. The struggle against Communist totalitarianism goes on and we ourselves are now engaged in war to keep that totalitarianism from taking over another country—this one on the other side of the world.

I proudly join with our colleagues in commemorating today the magnificent efforts of the Hungarian freedom fighters 10 years ago and extend to their many friends and relatives who have settled in this great Nation the sympathy and respect for their courage which is so justly deserved.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, all peoples captive behind the Iron Curtain and held down by Communist totalitarian tyranny are naturally resentful and restive. They all hope for their freedom but they also know that only a miracle will enable them to attain their goals. In the fall of 1956 the Hungarian people believed that the miracle was in the making, and with their united efforts they thought they could attain freedom. So late in October they successfully overthrew their Communist overlords, established their own government, and then asked the detested Soviet troops to leave.

These startling events took place in a matter of days, and before the Russians were disposed to leave, Hungarians were in control of their destiny. But an unfortunate turn of events resulted from the presence of Russian troops. Russian commanders promised to leave, but instead of departing, they maneuvered for position and marked time until they were reinforced by additional Soviet troops. The Hungarians, anxious to see the Soviet troops retire, were suddenly faced with a formidable Soviet force. The Hungarian Government was then given short notice by the Soviet commanders to surrender. Of course the Hungarians refused to do this, and in the ensuing fighting, brave Hungarians went down like heroes, fighting for their lives and for Hungary's freedom. By the first week in November the country had experienced a veritable bloodbath in which Communist totalitarianism once more gained the upper hand. The freedom gained by the Hungarians vanished into thin air, and again they were subjected to Communist tyranny.

Today in observing the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian uprising of 1956, we show our admiration to these intrepid and gallant people and pay tribute to those who made the ultimate sacrifice for freedom and democracy.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to add my voice to those other Members of the House on this 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution. Like many of history's earlier revolts, the Hungarian revolution erupted after a band of patriotic and gallant men could no longer abide by the forced tyranny and brutality imposed by an outside power. Those men, women, students, laborers, intellectuals, and all the rest valued life and security just as we do. But they valued one thing above anything else—the liberty of their beloved Hungary. To that end they saw no sacrifice too great; no expense too costly; no pain too extreme. True, their revolt was crushed, and many of Hungary's finest citizens were killed, jailed, or forced to flee the country. But their selfless efforts were not in vain, for they have carved out a place of honor in Hungary's long and glorious history. Their example of placing their country first is one which many others might do well to emulate.

The Hungarian revolution contained many lessons, but one which we should constantly keep before us is the fact that freemen will spare no sacrifice to achieve and preserve their country's freedom. The actions taken by the Soviet leaders in putting down the revolt once again demonstrated to us the fact that a dictatorship knows only one response when opposition is raised—brutal and naked force. The extreme and deceitful tactics employed reminded the world of the true face of communism, one which Hungary so desperately wanted to expel.

Mr. Speaker, in this month of October, a full decade later, we know that the Hungarian revolution, though an unsuccessful one, was instrumental in reviving the spirit of liberty and justice which have long persisted in Hungarian life. Those fallen Hungarian patriots will never be forgotten, and it is to their memory that I dedicate these words.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution should have special significance for Americans, for it stands both as a landmark and as a blight on the history of the free world since World War II. This revolution symbolizes not only the reality of Communist rule in these countries, but it also must stand as an example to us not to accept this kind of "peace" ever again. This 10th anniversary is particularly significant now, when nations around the world condemn our actions to stop a similar type of suppression of freedom which is being carried out in a similarly demonic fashion. Yet no one except the United Staes will recognize its existence and stand up to its challenge.

In 1956, the Hungarian people of themselves rose up in physical and moral condemnation of the system that was imposed upon them, and shouted out to the world of the freedom they wanted and of the liberty they lacked.

The shot fired round the world on this day 10 years ago has not and cannot be forgotten.

What has transpired in the 10 years that have gone by is a memorial to those people who were senselessly murdered in the streets of Budapest. These people cried out against the tyranny that they were subjected to, and though they did not completely bring to fruition the dream of freedom and liberty, the reality of which they once knew, they brought to the peoples of the world the truth of what Communist tyranny was like.

It was a shock and a surprise to many of us, at that time, and it served to increase our efforts on behalf of these poor enslaved peoples.

Now, 10 years later, the peoples of the Iron Curtain countries live much better than they ever have before. They are enjoying the fruits of economic and social progress made by the individual countries. Moreover, they are beginning to feel the freedom of movement within the Communist organization which they never felt before. This is a major accomplishment for them.

Yet, wherever one goes, and with whomever one speaks, a certain malaise can still be sensed. There is still the tension and the frustrations, still the bureaucracy and the police, still the limitations on freedom, and in one word, there is still the supression of freedom and liberty as we know it.

So as time passes, and as the Hungarian revolution grows further in the past, let us not forget what those people died

for; let us not overlook the minor restraints on liberty, and the petty annoyances that they feel in their everyday lives, but rather let us remember them, and let us remember the Hungarian revolution as the all-inspiring symbol of a downtrodden people yearning to be free.

Peace reigns now in Hungary, as it does throughout the Soviet bloc in Europe. But it is not a true peace, it is a peace that is constantly calling for redefinition, for reevaluation.

These brave peoples fight no more in the streets, yet their desire to be free and independent has not been lost.

The cultural and historical heritage of these eastern countries cannot be dissolved by military might nor by bureaucratic edict.

Our concern for their independence is not forgotten in this period of quiet; it is intensified.

The memorial to the people of Hungary who died in the streets 10 years ago is living in our thoughts, and with their people in this country.

Let this day stand both as a reminder to us and as a warning to others, that the United States shall not let freedom disappear from this planet.

This is the message of the Hungarian revolution, and this is the hope of the world.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a scant 10 years ago, a proud people, the Hungarians, arose as one body and took back the reins of their Government which for over a decade had been held by the Russian invaders in the name of communism. If the revolt had been successful, if these hard-fighting, gallant people had been able to retain their positions despite seven divisions of Russian troops, today a free Hungary would confront and inspire the remaining Communist-held countries.

But their freedom lasted only for 1 short week. Homemade bombs, confiscated handguns, and human flesh could not turn back the tanks and mobilized units of the Russian Army. Hungary was again and is today, ruthlessly submitted to the forces of militant communism.

However, despite the Hungarian people's failure to overcome those insurmountable odds, there remains to this day a story, an idea, a proven theory which marks this episode as one of the most significant in the 20th century. The real significance of the Hungarian revolt lies in the fact that it happened; that poorly armed, ill-equipped, supposedly converted, loyal Socialists can and always will rebel when their ideals, their hopes and their sense of humanity and dignity are being forcibly taken away. Freedom and independence cannot be eradicated from the mind of man.

Remember, this was a revolt and not a declaration of war. The Hungarians were not fighting as an arm of the West in order to switch to the other side of the Iron Curtain. They did, indeed, ask for realistic aid from the Western countries but only because they knew that without heavy arms they could not succeed. To the Hungarian people, this was simply an attempt to regain the control of the government for themselves; to decide themselves, which bloc, if any, they wished to join; to determine, themselves, which type of government and economic order they needed.

Today, the effects of this revolt are still felt and much discussed in both blocs, the East and the West. Many of these freedom-loving people escaped before the revolt was crushed and are in the Western countries contributing to the ideological fight against communism. The Eastern bloc of nations can be seen enjoying a limited freedom today which would not have evolved without the impetus of the Hungarians' bid for freedom.

That fight, that rebellion, is not yet ended. What man is satisfied with only the taste of freedom? These people cannot remain enslaved and will continually assert themselves until the freedom and independence which means more to them than life, is again their own.

I join my colleagues and all freedom-loving people in paying tribute to the Hungarian people, their heroic uprising and their continuing fight to regain their country and their independence.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, a decade has now passed since the people of Hungary rose up against Soviet oppression and imperialism. But the glorious deeds of those few days of liberty are as vivid in all of our minds as if they had happened yesterday.

The revolution began on October 23, 1956. Its rapid initial success, not only in Budapest, but throughout the country, was stirring testimony to the Hungarian people's intense desire for political freedom and national independence. The massive student demonstration of October 23 aroused an enthusiasm that the resistance of the authorities only amplified. A large crowd gathered in front of an important radio station and spokesmen for the demonstrators asked to be allowed to broadcast their message.

Then the first shots were fired. It was these shots that turned an appeal into a revolution. Soviet troops were powerless against the united might of people demanding their independence. The Hungarian people had risen and the revolution appeared victorious. Concession after concession was forced from those who sought to rule Hungary. On October 29 the imminent withdrawal of Soviet troops was announced.

Soviet humiliation was compounded by the destruction of certain Communist myths. For the regime fell victim to those very people on which it had tried to depend; the students, the intellectuals and the workers. The regime had offered money and honor to the intellectuals, had preached of a glorious Marxist future to the students, and like all Communist regimes, had supposedly governed in the name of the proletariat.

Such destruction of cherished Communist myths the Soviet Union could not endure. The Soviet fist had recoiled only to brutally hit and defeat the Hungarian revolution. Massive Soviet tanks thundered through the streets of Budapest accompanied by troops. In a campaign waged without mercy the Soviets tracked down and destroyed the Hungarian freedom fighters.

The bright flame of freedom was put out. But in a larger sense the Soviets failed to achieve their purpose and overcome their tremendous propaganda defeat. That such massive weapons and huge number of troops were necessary to defeat the Hungarian people only underlined communism's failure to achieve popular support. Two hundred thousand ordinary, but heroic Hungarians, from all walks of life, fled to the West and gave lie to the Communist claims that this was a rebellion of the old reactionaries.

The brave Hungarian people have not forgotten their days of glory. Nor have other peoples enslaved by dictatorial systems in Eastern Europe and elsewhere. Nor have we who enjoy the blessings of liberty.

For the success of the Hungarian people, however brief, showed the world that victory over totalitarianism is not an impossibility. We must continue to believe that lesson and to keep the flame of freedom alive in the hearts of men everywhere.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, in just a few days we shall be commemorating the 10th anniversary of the noble efforts of the Hungarian freedom fighters. Those gallant youths who tried so desperately to throw off the yoke of Soviet tyranny are mature men now. They probably live in just the same despair, and yet with just the same hope that drove them to try to fight off Russian tanks with sticks and rocks only 10 years ago.

We ought to ask ourselves, on this occasion, the question: "Why should we be concerned, as Americans, for the plight of people in such faraway places as Hungary?" We have many problems of our own to solve. We are engaged in a military action in southeast Asia. And besides, what can we do about the people of Hungary, short of a major war with the Communist world?

I think the answers to these questions come from the deepest roots of our country's history. For the work that was begun just 190 years ago is still going on today. It is spreading around the world.

I am reminded of the words of Emerson in his "Concord Hymn," when he said:

By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard 'round the world.

The sound of that shot still rings throughout the world. For in the goals of our revolution we crystallized the deep aspirations of every man in every nation and in every age. Our revolution is still going on. And so is theirs. And that is why we cannot turn our backs on them. They are following in our battle paths. And we dare not let them down. Our revolution, and their struggles to throw off the yoke of tyranny are part of the same universal battle of mankind for freedom, for spiritual fulfillment, for peace, for prosperity, and for progress.

And if we be true to our own principles of democracy and of individual responsibility and individual liberty, and to our own system of free enterprise, we must believe that every people should

have the opportunity to choose for themselves a system of government. They must be allowed to adapt to their own cultures the universal concepts of free self-government.

We have often said in this country that if even one man lives in fear or in tyranny or does not enjoy the full opportunities afforded by our Constitution then we all live in fear and tyranny. In our free society if one man is robbed of his unalienable rights or of his dignity, then all men become victims of the same crime.

And this principle ought to be applied to the world as a whole. For if the freedom of one nation is destroyed then the freedom of all nations is in jeopardy. And if any people anywhere suffer from the burdens of captivity, then all people everywhere are in some measure held equally captive.

Therefore, we see that the plight of the captive peoples of Hungary, of all of eastern Europe, and even of southeast Asia, becomes the plight of free men everywhere. Their struggle becomes our struggle. Our stewardship of democracy becomes their hope of freedom. That is why we cannot neglect the millions of people held captive by Communist colonialism. That is why we must resolve on this 10th anniversary of the Hungary revolution to renew our efforts on all fronts to extend the frontiers of freedom. We have grown too accustomed to living in a world half free and half slave.

There can be no peace in the world; no peace among nations; no peace in the hearts of captive people until all the world—every nation—and each person is free.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the month of October 1966 is the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution. It is right and just that we all pay tribute to the courageous Hungarians who gave their lives in the valiant but futile effort to extirpate the Communist tyranny which rules their nation.

We are mindful of our commitment to the purpose of the Hungarian revolution by the presence of nearly 50,000 refugees from that revolution who are now living in our country. These people by their presence add even greater wealth to our own national culture.

We are reminded of the more than 24,000 Hungarian freedom fighters who died in the revolution of 1956 and of countless thousands of other brave patriots who were jailed or deported by Soviet forces which overran Hungary and deterred her revolt against communism.

All freedom-loving people acclaimed the courage of the people of Budapest and prayed for their success at that time. Even though victory was not theirs, the spirit, heart, and mind of the Hungarian people will never be controlled or suppressed by the Communists. The spirit of freedom can never be extinguished in the Hungarian soul.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for the peoples of Hungary and for freemen everywhere, this week marks the 10th anniversary of a monumental expression in the cause of liberty and justice—the Hungarian revolution of 1956. Those brave men and women who challenged oppression and the armed might of the Communist dictatorship have provided an example of courage, determination, dedication, and the never-ending quest for human rights and self-determination. This example is cherished in the hearts of democratic peoples everywhere. Today, may I join my colleagues in honoring the Hungarian freedom fighters who raised the gauntlet of democracy and cast it in the face of tyranny.

Since the 11th century, under the leadership of Stephen I, the Hungarian nation has continually and unremittingly sought those rights and privileges due all men which we in this Nation have enjoyed since our own revolution for independence. It is a tribute to the people of Hungary that they still pursue this struggle for liberty despite the awesome character of their modern adversary. Like tiny Davids armed with stones, rifles, and clubs, they faced a Goliath of armored tanks and cannon, but, in 1956, history failed to repeat itself. The strength of the Russian giant soon overpowered in 2 bloody weeks of brutal warfare the insufficient slings armed only with courage and hope. That voice of freedom died in 1956 but the spirit that motivated the voice still lives and it is to that spirit that we pay homage.

Those who died in Hungary and those who languish in prison have not relinquished their freedom in vain. They serve, Mr. Speaker, as an illustration to all men of the earth that liberty is worth the price. We shall look forward to the day when there is a free and independent Hungary, unencumbered by the shackles of a ruthless tyranny.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great pleasure to join my distinguished colleague from Virginia and other Members in commemorating the event 10 years ago which, for all times, destroyed the myth of the Communist monolith and gave hope to the weak hearted that human freedom and individual dignity cannot be extinguished in man's heart by brainwashing or even by crude terror.

This glorious event, restoring the faith of man in the eternal validity of the Judeo-Christian heritage on which Western society, including our Nation, was built, had been the Hungarian fight for freedom. Commencing on October 23, 1956, it reached its climax in the withdrawal of Russian troops from Budapest and other major cities and in establishing a regime committed to democratization and national self-determination. And it ended in the desperate, but unequal, struggle of the lightly armed freedom fighters against the rested and ruthless armies of the Soviet Union invading Hungary on November 4, 1956.

International politics changed somewhat since 1956, in part because, and in part despite the heroic fight of a small nation jealously guarding their rights to national independence and individual freedoms against the Eastern invaders. Today, both blocs are in the process of partial fragmentation, and freedom on other continents has been restored almost to all except the Hungarian people. This is the case despite over 20 resolutions of the United Nations demanding the withdrawal of Soviet Russian aggressor forces from Hungary and requesting that popularly elected government be restored to that nation which fought so valiantly for its freedom and dignity.

Popular resentment and conscious slowdown of work by the Hungarian people moved even the Kallai-Kadar regime put into power by Russian bayonets to extend a small degree of internal freedom while retaining ultimate control over political, economic, and societal life for a small party oligarchy alien to the traditions of the Hungarian nation.

Under such circumstances, free elections would be a travesty, even if the regime would change its one-party policy. There are still 75,000 to 85,000 well-equipped Russian troops in Hungary, ready to crush by overwhelming power any attempt to gain self-determination for Hungary.

Thorough economic reform rekindling the spark of initiative of the Hungarian worker, a must for increased productivity, is also impossible in an occupied country, as is the restoration of political freedom, and liberty of religious life.

The crux of the Hungarian question lies in solving the central issue: the withdrawal of the Red army units. The maintenance of armed forces in another country with which the state is not at war can only be based upon free consent of that country's government. Otherwise it becomes an act of aggression, a clear violation of international law and has been officially condemned as such by the United Nations. Today, there is no legally acceptable basis for the presence of Soviet Russian troops in Hungary, as there is no democratic basis for the existence of the Kallai-Kadar regime.

We, as Americans, both as a leader of the free nations of the world and as the recipient of so many Hungarian talents both in our history and as a consequence of the Hungarian revolution of 1956, have a special obligation to act in the direction of achieving a withdrawal of Red army units from Hungary.

Of course, it must be realized that such a withdrawal cannot take place in a political vacuum, but the issue must be raised with Moscow. The present time might not be inauspicious, for even some of our NATO allies and ourselves are forced by Communist aggression in Asia to open a dialog on a partial withdrawal of our troops from Western Europe. Seen in this context, the demand on Moscow to live up to U.N. decisions is not an inconceivable one, and its implementation would be the greatest victory of the forces demanding freedom and national self-determination in Europe. I hope that the administration will do its utmost to make this state of affairs come true.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this month, in late October 1956, the people of Hungary rose in revolt against their tyrants—domestic and foreign—who had held them in bondage

since the end of World War II. Their revolt was not an isolated act of defiance by a small group of conspirators. It was the revolt of a whole people—of workers, peasants, intellectuals and even disenchanted Communist Party officials. Their revolt had not been carefully planned in advance; nor had it been anticipated in East or West. If it had been planned or anticipated the revolt would probably have never occurred. But it did occur. A united people suddenly rose in a spontaneous act of protest; an exasperated people took up arms to assert long-denied rights against overwhelming odds.

October 1956 was not the first time Hungarians had contested oppression. Only little more than a century before, in the revolutionary year of 1848, the Hungarian people had revolted against the rule of the Austrian Hapsburgs. Inspired by the words and deeds of the great Hungarian poet Sandor Petofi, they had asserted their right to freedom and independence, and had set up the Free Hungarian State. The odds against them at that time were also overwhelming, and the Free State soon fell before the advancing Russian and Austrian armies. It was not for another 20 years that the Hungarians were able to obtain at least autonomous status within the Austrian Empire. And only following World War I did they accede to true independence.

But during the long period when true independence was denied, the burning desire for self-government was never snuffed out. The words of the poet Petofi along with hopes for freedom were carried from generation to generation. It is easy to understand then why Hungarians could not sink into resignation and despair when a new and more terrible oppression descended on them following World War II. Even the techniques of Stalinists totalitarianism could not root out the cherished traditions of the Hungarian people. When it seemed that rule by puppets imposed by Moscow could no longer be borne; when it seemed that the stationing of Soviet troops in Hungary could no longer be tolerated; when it seemed that a halt must be brought to exploitation and expropriation, action became imperative and the consequences insignificant.

And thus in the waning days of October 1956, Hungarians young and old gathered about the statue of the poet Petofi in Budapest and took up arms in the cause of freedom and self-government. Today, 10 years hence, this historic event is still fresh in our minds. We have not forgotten and cannot forget the bravery and courage of the Hungarian freedom fighters. The Hungarian revolution of October 1956 was cruelly and cynically suppressed by Soviet Armed Forces. But it helped to set in motion forces of change in Eastern Europe that are still at work. And it showed to all the world that the Soviet Union had been unable to stamp out desires for independence and free government in Eastern Europe. Those desires, I am convinced will never disappear. And one day, Hungarians as well as other East Europeans will again taste the liberties for which the Hungarian freedom fighters fought and died so nobly in October 1956.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian uprising in October 1956 marks a very high stage in man's struggle against forces of tyranny, and as such it constitutes a landmark in East European postwar history. After being oppressed by a Communist regime for nearly a decade, the Hungarian people—brave and daring descendants of Hunyadi and Kossuth—openly challenged that regime, and in the course of 1 day overthrew it. This was done with relative ease because the people of Hungary were united in casting out the stooges of the Kremlin and then establishing their own democratic government.

The news of this startling uprising and its instantaneous success was flashed through the free world with great joy. But before the days of jubilation were over, there began the treacherous move of the Soviet Government. A few days after the uprising, the Soviet forces in Hungary were reinforced with additional soldiers, and by early November these ruthless troops far outnumbered the forces under the Hungarian Government. On November 4, the ferocious Soviet attack got underway, and as the Hungarians could not possibly withstand this onslaught, the best fighters among Hungary's youth gladly made the supreme sacrifice for the freedom of their country and for the cause of democracy.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for one to accept that fact that 10 years have passed since that terrible autumn when Russian military forces put down the Hungarian revolution. Yes, it is true that a decade has passed into eternity, but the spirit of the Hungarian freedom fighters will surely endure.

Their willingness to sacrifice and innumerable examples of courage demonstrated by the Hungarian people will stand as a landmark of human opposition to tyranny. Our times have witnessed many struggles against oppression, but few have had the poignancy and shocking effect as the abortive Hungarian revolution. For here was a nation whose history and culture dates back for many centuries and has been held captive by the Soviet Union since the end of World War II. Suddenly, the Hungarian people rose to challenge their captors, the most powerful state in Europe. No longer were the people willing to accept Russia's mastery over their beloved Hungary.

Surely the Hungarians were aware of the near impossibility of their goal. And though the goal was perhaps impossible, the Hungarians achieved one thing in that the world was able to witness Soviet reaction to a people's cry for freedom. Hungary had suffered psychologically and spiritually under Soviet domination and the freedom fighters decided to move. Russian might prevailed, but the example of the Hungarian patriots will live on through the ages to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Members of Congress have taken time out to recognize the attempt by the Hungarian people to regain their freedom. I hope that it will remind all free men how blessed they are and will teach them that freedom is not a cheap commodity to be taken lightly.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, October 23 is the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution and freedom fight. This great uprising marked by national heroism was doomed to failure when Soviet troops were permitted to crush the revolt. Therefore, on this 10th anniversary the Hungarian people remain in bondage. It is gratifying to note that Hungarian organizations across this country and throughout the free world are effectively working together toward the day when freedom can be restored to their homeland and a legitimate government once again created by the people of Hungary.

Mr. Speaker, the Iron Curtain remains as full evidence of the colonial practices of the Soviet Union. Hungary and the other non-Russian peoples of Eastern Europe are held in colonial bondage by the Communist rulers in Moscow.

As we near the close of a long congressional session, it would be most fitting for us to rededicate ourselves to the development of a foreign policy unlike the present one of coexistence; rather, a foreign policy based on the necessary redevelopment of freedom in Eastern Europe and wherever communism maintains dictatorial control.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, a decade has passed since the Hungarian Revolution took place, and yet it is as fresh in the memories of freedom-loving people as yesterday's events. Nor will that memory soon wither. It will remain an inspiration to all oppressed peoples, a reinforcement of the dedication of democratic peoples to the preservation of their freedom, for as long as Communist totalitarianism and oppression exist.

Today Hungarians throughout the world are commemorating the anniversary of that revolution, with grief for the many thousands of their countrymen who died before the Soviet onslaught and remorse at the stillness of many voices of American legislators not raised at this time of trial, with sympathy for those Hungarians who remain enslaved on Hungarian soil and with pride in the Hungarian commitment to liberty that the revolution so unequivocally demonstrated. And today we share with the Hungarians these sentiments, and in addition, wish to express the deep respect we hold for their valiant courage.

Indeed, the Hungarian people demonstrated an immeasurable courage when one recalls the events that transpired during that tragic period in their history. The revolution burst forth spontaneously, unplanned, and unexpected. It began with a peaceful student demonstration in Budapest and grew to encompass the entire nation. At first Hungarian security troops were ordered to fire on the demonstrators. As the demonstration erupted into a full-scale revolution the Soviet Union rushed in tanks and forces. According to later reports, over 1,000 Soviet tanks and around 10 Soviet divisions were used to

crush Hungarian resistance, while the Hungarians continued to struggle, virtually unarmed, against these overwhelming odds for almost 2 weeks. The atrocities committed against the Hungarian people by the Soviet Union will forever remain an indelible stain on the world's image of communism, as well as a prime example of man's indignity to man.

The abortive Hungarian revolution ended in tragedy for the Hungarian people. Around 30,000 Hungarians were killed; nearly 200,000 fled in search of refuge; and those Hungarians who remained were subjected first to retributions by the Communists, then even more oppressive controls than those exercised against them prior to the revolution. Yet this further subjugation of the Hungarian people will never destroy the spirit of these brave people, nor their hope for and convictions in liberty and freedom.

May we once again express our limitless admiration for these proud people and add our moral support and prayers to theirs for the restoration of their independence, sovereignty, and human dignity, which they so unquestionably deserve.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, often in the history of the world, men have revolted against the chains of slavery and oppression in order to secure their own freedom. In their search for self-determination, freedom-loving men have faced overwhelming odds at the risk of their lives in order to gain the most basic of human rights. Liberty is not confined to one nation nor is it the invention of one race, but has been pursued by the whole of humanity since the earliest record of civilized man.

As one reads history, he sees a recurring name among those peoples who have time and again challenged tyranny—the name of Hungary. The repelling of Romans, Mongols, and Turks, the courage of St. Stephen 10 centuries ago, and the revolt of 1848 serve as illustrations that Hungary regards its freedom as a sacred right. Here is a nation that has never relinquished its claim to freedom although overpowered by kings and dictators, overrun by armies and war machines, or subjected to degrading servitude by unfriendly and power-mad tyrants.

Just 10 years ago, on October 23, 1956, the Hungarian people added yet another chapter to their history of man's quest for freedom when outnumbered and without weapons, they revolted against the Russian dictatorship. The battle raged for 2 weeks before the superior Russian forces crushed the rebellion and extinguished the brief Hungarian vision of liberty. Hungary's losses were heavy—30,000 died in the streets, another 200,000 became refugees—but the world gained from the Hungarian example.

As long as men and women like those brave souls in Hungary continue to act in the name of freedom by revolting against unsolicited authority, then all men can continue to hope that one day the world will be totally free. On this 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, we express our admiration for the courage, determination, and love of freedom of the Hungarian people.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my able friend from Virginia in paying tribute to the heroism of the people of Hungary as we near the anniversary of their revolt against Soviet tyranny. It was 10 years ago this month that this small country attempted to throw off the foreign yoke and secure its independence from Communist colonialism.

Intensive fighting between October 25 and 30, 1956, took about 10,000 lives. Fighting then died down until after November 4, which was the day that Soviet troops invaded and overran Hungary and ruthlessly crushed the rebellion. A new, pro-Moscow puppet government was installed.

Following the abortive revolt, more than 2,000 Hungarian patriots were put to death by the Communists. About 35,000 Hungarians are believed to have been deported to the Soviet Union.

By November 30, 1956, about 100,000 refugees from Hungary had entered neighboring Austria; the number had grown to more than 130,000 by December 9. Within 12 months, by November 1, 1957, a total of 178,897 refugees had fled from Hungary into Austria.

Of the refugees who found asylum there, 152,605 were later assisted to leave in order that they could begin new lives in other nations, as tiny Austria obviously could not permanently accept more than a small number. Among the countries that took in sizable numbers were the United States and Canada, which accepted 34,712 and 22,558, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, let us contrast the colonial policies of the Soviet empire with those of the United States. While the Soviet Union keeps its colonies in subjection with tanks and guns and denies their people such fundamental liberties as freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press, the United States has, through the years, pursued much more enlightened colonial policies.

Alaska and Hawaii, both of which we acquired during the latter half of the 19th century, joined the American constellation as our 49th and 50th States. Five years after the war with Spain we gave Cuba her freedom. Puerto Rico today has commonwealth status, as the overwhelming majority of its inhabitants prefer this rather than statehood.

The Philippines, which during the dark days of World War II demonstrated their loyalty to the United States, have enjoyed two decades of independence. Recently their President appeared before a joint session of the Congress to express the determination of the Filipinos to again fight side by side with Americans, this time in Vietnam.

May God speed the day that Hungary will throw off the chains of colonialism and resume its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, occasionally an event will unfold before our very eyes that will capture our imagination, arrest our thoughts, and shake or sustain our conception of man. Ten years ago this month such an event took place in Europe, the repercussions of which will, I am sure, profoundly influence the modern history of nations, states, and political ideologies.

I am, of course, referring, Mr. Speaker, to the glorious and partially successful Hungarian revolution of 1956.

Ten years ago we saw, for a brief moment in time, the empire built by the Soviet Army in Eastern Europe following World War II begin to crack. Demonstrations against the Soviet-installed puppet regimes in several countries took place, most notably in East Germany and in Poland, but it was in Hungary where the most violent, and most meaningful we should add, demonstrations against tyranny took place.

Ten years ago, the spirit of liberty and freedom was in the air in Budapest and in the countryside, and this spirit began to be felt by all who would turn their eyes and ears toward the East. The Hungarian people's demands for liberty and self-rule were heard in Moscow as well as in Washington, in Tokyo, as well as in London. For a brief moment, perhaps a week, these demands were met. The uprising had met with success. The world heaved a great sign of relief and expressions of joy were found everywhere.

Ten years ago that joy suddenly became sadness and the sighs of relief suddenly turned into grief, for as the new government began to be formed the Soviet Army, which had been standing in the wings all the while, was sent crashing onto the stage with but one order and one goal: crush the revolt at all costs and restore the Communist regime to power.

Ten years ago we saw the all too vivid pictures of what 20th century Communist tyranny is all about. The famous Hungarian freedom fighters, lacking the means but not the will, took to the streets with sticks and stones to do battle with the Red army tanks and machineguns. Demonstrators were killed or run down. Arrests were made during the night. Families were separated. Hungarians by the thousands fled their homes never to return. When the gunsmoke cleared away 20,000 Hungarians had lost their lives, tens of thousands had fled their country, and the Communists were back in power. The army had done its job: the revolution had been broken.

Ten years ago the Communist definition of freedom and people's democracies were shown by the events in Hungary to be exactly what they are: a topsy-turvy jumble of words, twisted thoughts, and perverted meanings that teach not democracy but tyranny, not virtue but inhumanity, not freedom but persecution. The revolution exposed the lie.

Ten years ago the revolution may have been broken, but it proved an inescapable conclusion; namely, that it is a universal goal of men everywhere to want to live their lives in human dignity with liberty. The Soviets, I think, learned what many of us have known for many years—the will to be free is a powerful force in the world today.

Today I join with my colleagues in sending best wishes to the great Hungarian people who have taught all of us a valuable lesson about freedom and liberty.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolt of October 1956 recreates vividly the mixed feelings of admiration and horror which an outraged world experienced in sympathy with the Hungarian people in that dark week between October 22 and October 28 a decade ago. More than that it offers occasion to review with some pride the actions of an aroused United Nations and the combined efforts of a number of individual nations to provide help, comfort, and even asylum for the victims—who numbered over 170,000—of the cruel repression by the Soviet Union of the brave effort of Hungarian patriots to restore the traditional freedom of their country.

Despite the small size of the nation, the independence of the Hungarian people had a history which could be traced back a thousand years when after World War II those proud people were brought under the yoke of communism. From the year 1001, when Pope Sylvester II sent the Holy Crown to St. Stephen, the King of the Hungarian people, while acknowledging that he was subject to the Pope in religious matters, had asserted the independence of the country in secular matters from the Holy Roman Empire. Down the centuries, despite the invasions of foreign princes and, at one time, the extinction of the national dynasty, Hungary managed to insist on government by its own laws and independence from the laws or interests of surrounding realms.

The independent thinking of the Hungarian people has been their dominant characteristic throughout their long history. With such a background it was not easy for the Hungarian nation to submit after World War II to the ruthless repression and tight control of Communists trained in Moscow who sought to pattern their country after the Soviet Union. Many Hungarians fled their homeland. But for those caught in the net of communism individual freedom and freedom of speech ceased to exist. Arbitrary imprisonment, methods of terror, and frequent executions became common where any opposition to the imposed regime was even suspected.

When in 1956, on a move from the U.S.S.R., there was a slight slackening in the police rule over Hungary, the response among the Hungarian people was immediate. With joy, enthusiasm, and what were at first peaceful gatherings they welcomed the announcement that certain student protestations and demands for more freedom were to be met with a relaxation of the unwelcome regime. The planned, peaceful demonstration drew some 200,000 persons, who showed no signs of other than peaceful dispersion. Suddenly, justly angered, they began to show their resentment. Then tear gas bombs rained upon them, and the secret police opened fire against them. An armed uprising ensued which lengthened into a 5-day battle. The casualties were numerous. The reprisals were brutal.

The world viewed with horror the treatment of this nation, which was but expressing its pent-up longing for the freedom it had known for centuries. The United Nations held special meetings passing resolutions condemning the use of Soviet military forces to suppress the efforts of the Hungarian people to assert their rights. The nations sent aid and comfort to the Hungarian nation, and provided homes around the world for the tens of thousands of refugees from the terror.

The courage and valor of the Hungarian patriots was hailed the world over, but more especially the evidence of the undying spirit of liberty which no amount of oppression could stifle. Ten years later we are honoring the occasion which illuminated the belief in freedom against all odds.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian uprising of 1956 clearly demonstrates that the spirit of freedom cannot be oppressed and extinguished for long by sheer force. Often when there is little chance of attaining freedom, oppressed peoples will still resort to uprisings and revolutions in order to attain that supreme goal.

At the end of the last war the Hungarian people were brought under the tyrannical yoke of Communist totalitarianism and particularly after 1948 they suffered under an oppressive government. By the fall of 1956 they were set to throw out their dictatorial government and substitute a democratic one. This they did successfully during the last days of October, and their new government asked the Soviets to withdraw their troops from the country.

Unfortunately as it turned out, it was easier to overthrow the Communist regime than to get rid of the Soviet troops. And it was these troops, quickly reinforced with heavier tanks and other equipment, that subdued the Hungarian uprising and the resurgence of freedom, and once more imposed upon the Hungarian people a Communist dictatorship. This was done in a most brutal manner, with much bloodshed in many parts of the country, in which thousands of Hungarians gave their lives for the noble cause of freedom and independence.

Today marks the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian uprising against communism, and in observing its anniversary the people of the free world pay tribute to the memory of those gallant Hungarians who died fighting for the noblest of human ideals, for liberty and democracy.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we hold in commemoration this week, the 10th anniversary of a valiant struggle for freedom. Just one decade ago the Hungarian people, determined in the cause of freedom, attempted to throw off a tyrannous government, but they were crushed by Communist suppression. More than 25,000 of their number perished in this revolution—25,000 who, though they died in the cause of freedom, stand as a monument to that very cause.

Today there are millions still behind the Iron Curtain—millions who are held by the bonds of Communism. Many have escaped to freedom, but many more remain as captives of Communist oppression. No people of any nation should have to escape to freedom. It should be the natural birthright of all mankind to live in freedom. This is what the Hungarians sought 10 years ago, and we commemorate their revolution in the hope that one day they and, indeed, all the people of the world might gain these greatest possessions—freedom from tyranny and freedom of choice.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1956, an event the entire free world can celebrate as a tribute to the indomitable spirit of freedom.

On October 23, 1956, dissident Hungarian workers and students sparked popular demand for the ousting of Erno Gero, Hungarian Communist Party secretary, and the formation of a new government by Imre Nagy. Their protest resulted in the appointment of Nagy, but demonstrations against Communist rule in Budapest developed into open revolution when the security police fired on the protesters.

Gero summoned Soviet Armed Forces to crush the rioting as revolutionary councils sprang up throughout Hungary. The insurrection appeared halted on October 28, when Nagy announced the Soviet Union had withdrawn its troops from Hungary. However, by November 1, Soviet forces had surrounded Budapest again and, despite Nagy's protest, launched a massive surprise attack against the Capital on November 4, with 200,000 troops and 2,500 tanks and armored cars.

Despite valiant resistance, the revolution was crushed and Hungary reverted to the satellite status in which it still remains today.

Mr. Speaker, we in the free world, watching with horror as those events unfolded in Hungary, were afforded a brief but stunning example of Communist beneficence in action during these October and November days a decade ago. While claiming to be the friends of the Hungarians, and while spouting vilifications of the Western imperialists and colonialists, the Soviets gave a naked display of their own type of colonialism for the entire world to see.

We note this anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution in order that the free world will not forget what took place in Hungary during that brief but inspiring uprising by men who would be free.

Mr. Speaker, in New Jersey's Second District, which I have the honor to represent, there now resides in the community of Linwood a man who has vividly described to the world the horrors of those autumn days of 1956 in Budapest.

Mr. Jozsef Kovago joined the Hungarian resistance movement when the Nazis occupied his country, became one of its leaders and was subsequently arrested by the Gestapo. Freed when the German occupation ended, he was elected

mayor of Budapest in 1945 and served until the Communist coup of 1947 ended Hungary's short-lived experiment in democracy. In May 1950 Mr. Kovago was arrested by the Communists and suffered imprisonment and torture at their hands for 6 years.

He was released "provisionally" a few weeks before the 1956 revolution, and was again elected mayor of Budapest on November 1, during that short interim of freedom in the midst of the revolution. Even after the freedom fighters were crushed by the Soviet tanks and guns on November 4, Mr. Kovago remained in Budapest, hoping to save what little might be salvaged from the gains of the previous few weeks.

But when he realized the futility of further opposition to Soviet might, Mr. Kovago, his wife and daughter, escaped into Austria, partly on foot, through frozen mud, across mine fields, and in constant danger of discovery by Russian and Hungarian outposts along the border.

Since the 1956 revolution, Mr. Kovago has devoted much time and energy to pleading the case of his country before the United Nations, throughout the United States, and in Europe. His book, "You Are All Alone," published in 1959, can serve as a reference volume for all who would know the terror of a people "captured" by the Soviets and of the inextinguishable light of freedom which burns in the breasts of once-free men.

Mr. Speaker, freedom is the normal condition of man, and free men need not propagandize. Slavery is an alien condition, and, therefore, the enslavers must resort to propaganda in their efforts to distort the truth. Therefore, while the propaganda mills of the Communists reiterate their never-ending theme of "Western imperialism," we must never allow ourselves to forget that it is the Communists, not the free Western nations, who are the imperialists and colonialists; it is the Communists, not the free Western nations who, by force and terror, maintain their totalitarian grip on nations who wish no connection with them.

The Hungarian revolution of 1956 was brief and ended sadly, but it contains for us a lesson that we should not forget—the lesson that free men will always strive to maintain that freedom, and tanks, guns, torture nor privation can cause that flame of freedom, however dim, to die. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to those heroic Hungarians who, without outside help, stood up to, and briefly routed, the Soviet Goliath 10 years ago.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, on October 23, 1956, freemen throughout the world were deeply stirred by the revolt of the Hungarian freedom fighters against their Communist oppressors. With awe-inspiring courage, with heartbreaking tenacity, the Hungarian people fought the military forces of the Soviet Union in an attempt to overthrow tyranny and regain their cherished freedom. There was great anxiety in the hearts of men while for 7 days these heroic people faced a force more powerful than they. But such is the desire for liberty that men will die for it.

The 10 years that have passed since those dramatic and tragic days have not lessened the impact of the revolt. The world will long remember the valiant stand of the Hungarian people against a tyranny that was imposed upon them. World communism suffered a greater defeat than did the freedom fighters of Hungary, who turned the eyes of the world on the real nature of Communist oppression. The tyranny and cruelty of communism stood bare for all to see.

And today, the Hungarian Communist Party continues its suppression of basic human rights in Hungary—but the struggle to regain freedom continues. The battle for freedom is worldwide and will not cease. History has shown us that liberty cannot be taken for granted, but must be vigilantly guarded.

On this 10th anniversary of the revolt of the Hungarian people, we reaffirm our support of those who, though still under the yoke of communism, continue their fight for freedom. We join with all free men in prayer for the ultimate liberation of these courageous people.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, October 23 will mark the 10th anniversary of the courageous effort of the freedom-loving people of Hungary to overthrow the Communist regime imposed upon them entirely against their will. It is one of the tragedies of history that this effort failed, not for want of strength or unity among the Hungarian people, but because of the ruthless intervention of the Soviet Union, which subdued the rebellion with hordes of troops and hundreds of tanks.

This 10th anniversary celebration, to be conducted here in the United States by the American Hungarian Federation, should serve a dual purpose as far as American understanding of the worldwide threat of Communist aggression and imperialism is concerned.

First, it should recall to our memory the savage brutality of the Russian invaders in their slaughter of the Hungarian freedom fighters in the streets of Budapest, and the subsequent execution of their immortal leaders, including Imre Nagy, who had succeeded in becoming installed as head of a free Hungarian government before its overthrow at the hands of the Kremlin.

Second, this anniversary should serve as a shining example of the dedication of a free people to carry on resistance to Communist oppression after a devastating defeat. The Hungarian people, and Hungarian refugees in our country and elsewhere, are determined to see the fight through until the day when their country is restored to freedom and independence.

There are two lessons here for the people of America: that the Communist goal of world domination will be pursued wherever it is deemed necessary by force and violence; and that we must stand firm and ever alert against the achievement of that goal, as well as in support of peoples in foreign lands who bear the brunt of Communist aggression.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago in Hungary, the gallant citizens of Budapest defied the might of the Communist empire. Almost emptyhanded and against the most hopeless odds, they fought the tanks and machineguns of the Red army. And for a few days, to the astonishment of the entire world, the outcome remained in doubt.

Unfortunately, however, mere flesh and blood could not prevail against the storm of steel and fire which was launched against the courageous rebels. Their uprising was quenched in blood and of those who survived, many were forced to flee their native country.

We, in America, were fortunate enough to receive a number of these wonderful exiles. Just as did their fellow countrymen who came to the United States in the 19th century following the unsuccessful revolution of Louis Kossuth, they have taken their place among the most esteemed citizens of our own country. And it is precisely those qualities of courage, endurance, and refusal to bow to tyranny that has made them so valuable an element in our population.

A number of these refugees have settled in my own district, in and around Akron, and there they are making their own impressive contribution to American ilfe and progress. All of us, I am sure, feel the deepest sorrow at the martyrdom they experienced 10 years ago, but I am equally certain that we are grateful that so many of these magnificent human beings chose to make their homes among us. Their heroism, like their present participation in our society, will never be forgotten by the people of America.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is the most blessed in the history of the human race. We enjoy material benefices far beyond those of any people, of any era. We are the recipients of a system of government and a tradition of protection before the law which is as fine as has ever graced the lives of a people. While we must still work, and many must suffer to preserve and widen our blessings, still it is a fact that most of us have had our birth in this country with so fine a way of life, and so much hope for future betterment, as inherited aspects of our existence.

Familiarity may breed contempt. It may well breed indifference. For Americans it is all too easy to forget that our greatest fortunes, our freedoms today and our hopes for the future, are based on the validity and acceptance of certain very fundamental principles. These principles are general, they apply to all peoples, at all times. They are best summed up in the words of the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

Mr. Speaker, the 23d of October marks the 10th anniversary of an event which dramatically demonstrated to all mankind that these rights are not universally applied. On that day in 1956 there occurred in the province of the Soviet Empire called Hungary a popular revolt against a native tyranny, sustained by

foreign military power. The despicable nature of the regime which had brutally ruled the ancient nation of Hungary was subsequently revealed to the world. From the accounts of the more than 200,000 people who fled the terror erupting in Hungary as the Russians returned, and from the reports of foreign visitors who saw the evil Communist despotism unmasked, we have learned of the depths to which fanatical, power-mad men will go to humiliate and subjugate their fellows. One particularly terrifying set of personal accounts is given in the book by Robert Michener, "The Bridge at Andau."

The sickening story of the nature of the Communist totalitarian regime told by the victims should never have to be repeated. It is a sad fact that it has been. By outright treachery the Soviets restored the old form of tyranny. Thousands of brave Hungarian patriots were exiled. Two leaders, Gen. Pal Maleter and Premier Imre Nagy were seized after being promised immunity. By some accounts, at least 30,000 Hungarians were killed in the revolt and its suppression. In less than 3 weeks the tanks and deceit of the alien oppressors had implanted a new native regime to carry on the denial of fundamental human rights.

Mr. Speaker, this outrage, and the nature of Communist despotism must never be forgotten by freemen. It would be a dishonor to those who gave so much in a temporarily losing cause, and a sign of our own lack of dedication to our principles if we did not cry out in protest against the crime of 10 years ago. We must not forget. We must never cease to do our utmost to keep the hope of deliverance alive in the millions imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain.

It is with great respect that we must observe the gallant uprising of the Hungarian people. It is with equally great regret that we must observe that the task is still not completed. On this anniversary of that memorable day 10 years ago, it is with deep humility that I offer my congratulations to the Hungarian nation for their dedication to freedom and my sincere wishes that their days of trial may soon be over.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the 23d of this month will mark the 10th anniversary of an event which must not be allowed to be forgotten. On that eventful day a decade ago there occurred in Budapest the beginning of a fatal crack in the monolithic ranks of communism. The people of Hungary rose against a hateful regime which had been imposed by brute force upon them by an alien state. The patriots of Hungary demonstrated to all the world that communism is not the wave of the future, that human freedom and national self-determination are the real motivating forces for peoples.

The Communists have always claimed to represent the interests of the laboring man. They have also believed that they could convince people of the validity of their creed if they could dominate the educational process. In Hungary they were given the opportunity. They were the absolute masters of that nation. They could organize society as they saw fit. Moreover, they could indoctrinate the youth with little fear of having to compete with conflicting views.

Mr. Speaker, with the outbreak of the national rebellion against the Communist puppets of Moscow the depth of the falsehood of these Communist tenets was exposed to an awe-struck world. Many of us can recall the poignant pictures of boys shouldering rifles to fight against the oncoming Soviet tanks. Such pictures are truly worth a million words. They should forever bury the myth put forth by the Communists and their apologists that communism is a rational system which can be appreciated by the youth of a country who have not been corrupted by the ideas of their elders.

The overt struggle for liberty was ended within a few tragic days. But, Mr. Speaker, the lesson is there for men to see and heed. The emptiness of Communist propaganda has been exposed. Men despise the cruel system which the followers of Marx and Lenin say they should love. We should take heart from the sacrifices of those forlorn heroes of Hungary. Their cause was not eradicated before 1956. And there is now no reason to believe it has since ceased to be held with a deep dedication by the Hungarian and other captive peoples.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, the names of two brothers were prominent in the field of professional football. I refer to the Gogolak brothers, Pete and Charlie, placekickers for the New York Giants and the Washington Redskins, respectively. Now it just might be that these two excellent athletes would have been relatively unheard of in America had it not been for the abortive Hungarian revolution of October 1956. That tragic event which took the lives of more than 30,000 Hungarians led to the exodus of thousands of Hungarian citizens from their country, including the Gogolak family. This marks the 10th year since that revolt and it is proper that we remember it and reflect on what lessons are in it for each of us.

To me, the Hungarian patriots demonstrated before the entire world how a people who have once tasted from the wellspring of freedom will not be satisfied with a denial of that freedom. The freedom fighters taught the world that liberty and justice are not always bequeathed by a benevolent colonial power. They showed that independence is not always the result of a peaceful protest or a demonstration or condemnation from the United Nations. They showed that human beings will fight with rocks or bottles or whatever means are available to regain their political and civil liberty. The Hungarians demonstrated once again that sometimes it requires the supreme sacrifice for the attainment of a free society.

Their revolt was aborted by Soviet might, but the Hungarians gained the respect and sympathy of the entire world. Their deeds will ever be remembered in the annals of human resistance to tyranny. It is my honor to stand here today and praise the revolution for which so many thousands so willingly gave their lives.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, October 23 marks the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1956 and the 118th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of 1848. Both of these uprisings were savagely suppressed by the intervention of massive Russian armed might. Even though history repeated itself in 1956, the sacrifices made then were not in vain, and very significant and lasting results come from this brave ordeal.

The revolution of 1956 at once dispelled the notion of the indivisibility and omniscience of the monolithic Soviet East European empire. Until this revolution, even serious students of European affairs tended to preach that this Soviet empire should be accepted as a de facto entity, and one which could be expected to last indefinitely. These experts failed to consider that no western people have ever been content to remain long under foreign domination, and certainly least of all the liberty-loving Hungarians.

The valiant actions of 1956 proved again the triumph of the human spirit, and that the desire for liberty can never be exterminated even in the face of enormous and unrestrained military power. This was an expensive lesson for the Kremlin masters and one which shook their empire to its foundations. It rekindled the desires for personal and economic freedom in the rest of Eastern Europe and started a drive for liberty which is ever increasing.

We may hope that in time the present Russian leadership will recognize that all people, those in the Soviet Union itself, as well as in its subject states, must be free to choose their own course, develop their economy and be guaranteed their national sovereignty. Until this comes about, the Soviet state will carry within it the seeds of its own ultimate demise.

The brave action of the Hungarian people in 1956 laid bare the true nature of Soviet imperialism for all the world to see. Thus, no longer could the Russian leaders divert attention from their ruthless brutality with a screen of falsehood and distortion concerning Western colonialism. The extent and severity of the Soviet imperialistic methods were shown in the persecution of patriots, secret trials and executions, unconscionable drives for collectivization of agriculture, violation of basic human rights, forced labor camps, and control and persecution of the clergy. While this created untold suffering for the Hungarian people, never again could there be any doubt of the lengths to which the Soviet Union would go in pursuing their own interests.

On the anniversary of this brave struggle for freedom, let us remember and honor the fallen heroes of 1956 and let us also rededicate ourselves to the ideals for which they died. The finest memorial we can create is to continue their struggle until all men are free.

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

Mr. MARSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Virginia is to be commended for taking the time at this hour to call to the attention of the Members of the House the dramatic, historical consequences of the Hungarian revolution. It is unfortunate that so many people have such short memories, and that the oppression of the Communists that brought about this spontaneous revolution is now treated by the Department of State as a force worthy of coexistence. I think the gentleman has provided a very necessary and interesting review of history. I would certainly hope that in addition to the Members who are joining him in this special order, that our standing European experts in our State Department take heed. I believe the gentleman is entitled to the commendation of all the Members for the leadership he is exercising in calling our attention to this historic situation.

Mr. MARSH. I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] for his complimentary remarks.

I am particularly pleased for his participation in the discussion that has taken place on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

The gentleman has long been recognized as an outstanding authority in reference to the problems of captive nations. He has been a vocal spokesman on their behalf and enjoys a well earned reputation as a champion of their cause.

HUNGARY 10 YEARS AGO

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to incorporate as part of my remarks an article of the Central Europe Journal of October 1966, entitled "Hungary 10 Years Ago":

HUNGARY 10 YEARS AGO

(By Paul Auer)[1]

Henry R. Luce, editor-in-chief of Life magazine, wrote in December 1956 about the Hungarian revolution: "The story needs rehearing and retelling from man to man and generation to generation, so that the priceless thing fought for may keep its central place in our hearts." After a lapse of ten years a short "retelling" of the events of October 1956 and an analysis thereof should be inspiring and instructive.

After the death of Stalin, the riots in Pilsen, the East German uprising, and 20th Congress in Moscow, and Beria's fall, symptoms of strong oppositional forces were apparent in Hungary. The most active elements were the intellectuals who formed the "Petöfi Club", so named after the great Hungarian poet and leader in the Revolution of 1848 who died on the battlefield in 1849 fighting for freedom. The cry of the Petöfi Club was for "greater freedom" and more "humanism". Even the words "Down with the regime!" could be heard at one of their meetings. "A strong wind must not be rationed into gentle little breezes", said one of the writers at the meeting of the 27th of June. On October 6th there was a solemn re-interment of the former Communist Minister of the Interior, Laszlo Rajk, who had been executed and was rehabilitated after his death. According to the Communist paper *Szabad Nep*, "the silent demonstration of the hundreds of thousands of mourners was our pledge not only to preserve pure memories, but to remember the dark practices of tyranny, lawlessness, slander und defrauding of the people." Events in Poland accelerated the reform movement, but no one dreamed it would end in revolution.

Everybody hoped for a peaceful transformation. On the 22nd of October, at a students' meeting at the University of Budapest, it was decided that the young people should stage a "silent demonstration" the following day to express their deep sympathy and agreement with events in Poland. The Petöfi Club also passed a resolution asking "for the democratization of the youth movement" at the meeting of October 23rd. On the afternoon of the historic day of the 23rd of October 1956, university students gathered in front of the Petöfi monument carrying banners inscribed: "Long live the youth of Poland!" Some sang the Kossuth hymn. Then they marched over to the statue of Bem, a Polish general who fought in 1849 on the side of the Hungarian revolutionists. There they were joined by other students, workers, writers and journalists shouting: "Send the Red army home!" "We want free elections!" "We want new leaders!" But this was still a peaceful manifestation of people carrying no arms. Its character changed only when the demonstrators learned of the speech of party leader Gerö who refused to join forces with those of the political police. Later on the entire Hungarian army joined the demonstrators and let them have arms from the barracks. Some Russian soldiers also helped them.

Thus a peaceful demonstration became a bloody revolution, victorious until the Russian aggression. It happened on the 4th of November, when, disregarding the provisions of the United Nations Charter, fresh Russian tanks and troops entered the country in spite of the protests of the new government. Hungarian youth and workers again fought with heroic courage, yet it was a hopeless struggle. In three days everything was over. About 20,000 Hungarians lost their lives in the fighting between the 23rd of October and the 7th of November, and 200,000 left the country to join those other 200,000 who emigrated in 1947 and 1948 after the Communist take-over. Prime Minister Imre Nagy and his associates who took refuge at the Yugoslav Legation were arrested by the Russians—in spite of assurances of safety—when they left the Legation. They were later executed. A considerable number of freedom-fighters were either sent to Russian camps or imprisoned. Thousands of them are still in Soviet camps, while others are in Hungarian prisons.

When the present Communist leaders speak about these tragic events, they use the term "counter-revolutions". Counter what? There was no revolution in Hungary during or after the second world war until 1956. Communism was brought to the country by the Russian army. When the war was over, at the end of 1945, there were elections in Hungary in the presence of the Soviet occupation troops. Nevertheless, and although Hungarian voters did not yet know what Communism really means in practice, the Communist Party only won 17 percent of the votes. Radical agrarian and other social reforms were voted by a parliament in which the great majority was non-Communist. Therefore a revolution would not have been justified and did not take place. In the summer of 1947, the Communist Party, protected by the Russian troops, seized power. In 1956, the Hungarian people again voiced its will; 98 percent of the population wanted a change.

The revolution proved that: (1) In spite of the heavy indoctrination, youth remained anti-Communist; (2) the working-class was opposed to the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat which is nothing but the dictatorship of the leaders of a foreign party; (3) The theory of historic materialism is erroneous, because the revolution did not break out for materialistic reasons. People did not demand more bread, but more freedom and independence. Idealistic motives can still attract and inspire people, even in this materialistic age.

The revolution had no leader and no prepared program. It was only on the 23rd of October that university students drafted a paper of 15 points outlining their demands. The most important ones were: (1) withdrawal of Soviet troops; (5) free elections; abolition of the one-party system; right to strike; (12) freedom of the press; the right to speak and criticize freely. The Writers' Association also prepared a memorandum embodying similar ideas. It urged "an independent national policy", "political and economic conditions for free membership in co-operatives," the people must elect their representatives in parliament, in the councils, and in all the autonomous organs of administration by free secret ballots. The Revolutionary Committee of Hungarian Intellectuals, formed on 28th October, demanded "the withdrawal of Soviet troops," "general and secret elections," "the candidates must be nominated by the people," and "absolute freedom of press and assembly." The Students' Parliament of Miskolc declared on October 26th that Hungary "should become a member of a Danubian Federation." Prime Minister Imre Nagy declared in his radio speech of 3rd October that the one-party system had to be abolished. He was also in favour of withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact and of accepting a neutral status for Hungary, modeled on that of Austria.

Ten years after this tragic blood-bath, not one of the aims for which so many heroes sacrificed their lives, has been achieved. A considerable number of Soviet troops are still stationed on Hungarian territory. There is still only one political party. The fundamental freedoms and most of the human rights are still not respected.

The Hungarian revolution opened the eyes of the Western world. Statesmen realized what terrible mistakes were made at Yalta. There was no lack of manifestations of sympathy. The writer of this article received the following as yet unpublished letter dated 10th November 1956 from the then socialist prime minister of France: "Mr. Minister, Thank you very much for your letter of 2nd November which touched me deeply. Believe me, the help which the French people and their government are trying to bring to the Hungarian people will continue. As a democrat and a European, I am profoundly grieved by the martyrdom which your unfortunate country is suffering. I myself, as well as my government, salute with admiration the courage of the Hungarian people who, once again, shows how highly it values the respect due to the essential rights of human beings and of the nation. Please accept . . . Signed: Guy Mollet. The then Foreign Minister of Eire, Mr. McBride, spontaneously cabled me, asking what his country could do for us. In the humanitarian field everything possible was done. But that was all. The fear of a world war and the Suez problem paralyzed the Western leaders. As we know now, the Kremlin made the decision to send fresh troops to Hungary only after very long discussions and hesitation, on the pressing demands of China; it is probable that energetic diplomatic interventions would have changed the situation. The resolutions of

[1] The author, former Hungarian ambassador, is now living as an exile in Paris.

the U.N. were not respected. A visa was refused to the secretary-general of this world organization.

Discontent is still general, not only in Hungary, but everywhere in Eastern Europe. Spontaneous outbreaks are always possible, in spite of the lesson of the revolution. Historical events do not always occur in the same place, in the same way, under the same circumstances, and do not always have the same outcome. It is time for the Soviet leaders to reconsider the situation in Central and Eastern Europe and to try to avoid new catastrophes by granting the right of self-determination in Central and Eastern Europe and by creating in this area a situation in which peace and security would be guaranteed for all, and this for her neighbors' sake as well as for her own.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Hungarian revolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL PULASKI: POLISH PATRIOT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the month of October brings to mind the name of a valiant fighter for the cause of American freedom. October 11 is the anniversary of the death of a great man, the Polish patriot, Casimir Pulaski.

Pulaski fought for freedom in his native land, a country that existed as a nation hundreds of years before many of its present-day neighbors. But Pulaski's fight for his homeland did not succeed, for then, as now, the forces of Russia imposed their might upon the courageous people of Poland.

Pulaski, with a price upon his head, made his way to Paris, where he met Benjamin Franklin. Through Franklin it was arranged that Pulaski should come to North America. The cause of freedom attracted Pulaski to a land thousands of miles from his home. To Pulaski, the love of freedom was not restricted by national boundaries.

Gen. George Washington was greatly impressed with Pulaski. He recognized the Polish patriot's military and personal qualifications. Assigned to Washington's army, Pulaski shortly achieved the rank of brigadier general.

On September 11, 1777, the Battle of Brandywine occurred and Pulaski was able to demonstrate his worth. Here he performed with bravery and distinction.

Later, Washington asked Congress to permit Pulaski to organize a cavalry force. Congress agreed and Pulaski proceeded with his task. The result of this was the formation of a separate command known as Pulaski's legion. This small force became famous for its intrepidity and daring. Its successes were many and today General Pulaski is known as the Father of the American Cavalry.

In 1779, he commanded the cavalry of both the French and American forces at the Battle of Savannah. Wounded severely on October 9, he died 2 days later. General Pulaski gave his life in the cause of freedom, just as he spent his life in that same pursuit.

As we honor General Pulaski today, we must not forget that he was not only an American patriot, but a Polish patriot as well. As we remember the Polish people for their great contributions to our country in the past, we must recognize that today the voice of Polish freedom, though muffled, is not dead.

An old saying puts it this way, "You may swallow Poland, but you cannot digest her."

Well, I suspect that the Communist overlords in Poland have been having some severe attacks of acute indigestion lately.

Two years ago the then Attorney General of the United States, ROBERT KENNEDY, paid a visit to Poland. The Communists were embarrassed at having the brother of the late President in their land, so they made no mention of it on the radio, television, or in the press. Officially, ROBERT KENNEDY was not there.

However, the news of his arrival spread by word of mouth, and thousands and thousands of Polish people walked many miles to see this representative of the free world. As one report described it, it was like an American political campaign, with the multitudes chanting in unison, "KENNEDY, KENNEDY, KENNEDY."

You can imagine how Gomulka liked that. I hear he has not slept well since.

Just this past spring, as Poland's deeply religious people prepared to celebrate their millennium of a thousand years of Christianity, the Communist government announced a program of their own, one designed to conflict with and block off any sizable participation in the religious activities planned.

What happened then is another example of the Polish conviction that no man owns their minds. The Polish people fought the Reds and supported their church. Once again Gomulka found out that the country, though controlled through the force of arms, nevertheless is not subservient to those who would seek to dominate it.

The United States, in recognition of the ties that bind the Polish people to the Americans, issued a stamp honoring the Polish millennium.

I was proud to be at President Johnson's side when he signed the bill authorizing the stamp.

I will be prouder still when the principles for which General Pulaski so nobly fought rip back the ties of bondage and restore Poland once again to a place among the nations of freemen.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the October 10, 1966, meeting of the House Republican policy committee, a policy statement regarding "Recommendations for the Reorganization of Congress" was adopted. As chairman of the policy committee, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the complete text of this statement:

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS, OCTOBER 10, 1966

We urge the immediate consideration of H.R. 17873, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966. This bill would implement the important recommendations contained in the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress which was filed with the Congress on July 28, 1966.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was established by unanimous vote of both the House and the Senate in March of 1965. It has held 41 public hearings and received the views of 199 witnesses. The testimony, together with the statements, documents and an index, is contained in 16 printed volumes totaling 2,435 pages. Between January 19, 1966 and the filing of the report on July 28, 1966, the Committee and its staff met in over 50 executive sessions to consider the proposed reforms and to formulate its recommendations. The work of this Committee has been thorough and complete. Without question, the recommendations contained in this report, if enacted into law, would make Congress a more effective institution for carrying out its basic functions.

The recommendations of the Joint Committee, as implemented by H.R. 17873, include:

1. The establishment of a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations with continuing authority to study the structure and procedures of Congress and to recommend additional reforms and changes.

2. The protection of the rights of the minority through the provision of additional committee staff, the right to present minority views and reports, the provision of equal time on conference reports, and the right to schedule witnesses during at least one day of Committee hearings.

3. The creation of a House Committee on Standards and Conduct which would have an equal number of majority and minority members.

4. The authorization of measures designed to assist Members of Congress in the performance of their Congressional duties. Such measures would include enlarging committee staffs, strengthening and improving the Legislative Reference Service, and authorizing committees to employ consultants on an interim basis in order to take advantage of expertise in various fields of knowledge.

5. The implementation of fiscal controls and budgetary reforms that would include a greater utilization of the General Accounting Office, a multiple-year financial projection of programs and the updating of the budget on June 1 of each year, and the testimony of responsible Executive Department officials before the Appropriations Committee of each House within 30 days after the budget is presented to Congress.

6. The establishment of a Bill of Rights for committees that would: require the announcement of record votes; permit the majority to compel the filing of a report or a bill; prohibit the use of proxies; and

require the printing of committee rules at the beginning of each session.

The Republican Members of the House of Representatives long have been interested in Congressional reform. At the outset of this session of Congress, a task force of the House Republicans on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing was appointed to study the matter of Congressional reform in depth. As a result of the work of this task force a book entitled "We Propose: A Modern Congress" has been published. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this book were presented in full to the Joint Committee and many of the recommendations of the committee stemmed from the work of the task force.

It is unfortunate that the Joint Committee rejected the recommendations by the Republican members that a Committee on Procedures and Policies be created. This Committee would be given the power to examine into and report back to Congress on the expenditure of Federal funds by the Executive Branch to insure that they are spent efficiently and in accordance with the law. The Chairman of the Committee would be a member of the minority party. This would insure that a thorough evaluation of the programs administered by the party in power would be made. It is difficult, if not impossible, for a committee of this type to conduct an effective investigation if the results are apt to reflect unfavorably on their own party's administration.

This is not a new idea. The House of Commons in Great Britain has a committee known as the Committee of Public Accounts whose chairman is by convention a leading member of the opposition. Also, in 1923, a Democratic Senator was designated to head the Teapot-Dome oil reserve investigation at a time when both Houses of Congress and the Executive Branch were controlled by the Republican Party.

We are also concerned by the fact that the Joint Committee failed to address itself to the problem of Executive Branch lobbying. Although the United States Code specifically prohibits the use of appropriated monies to influence Members of Congress "to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress," substantial sums have been used for this purpose. In the recent past, long and detailed telegrams have been sent by Executive Department officials to Members of Congress urging their support of certain legislation. Similarly, long distance calls have been made and Members have been personally canvassed regarding their intentions with respect to a particular bill. The loophole in the present law that permits this type of activity, or the failure to adequately enforce the present law, must be corrected.

This Congress should not adjourn until it has acted on the Congressional reform recommendations. This legislation must not be filed and forgotten. Congress needs strengthening and modernizing and time is of the essence. Reforms should be enacted now so that the next Congress may utilize the new institutions and procedures. We pledge our support and assistance in getting this important legislation enacted into law. We call upon the Democratic leadership to schedule H.R. 17873 for immediate House consideration.

FDA OVERSTEPS AUTHORITY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the regulations ordered by the Food and Drug Administration with respect to diet supplement should not be made effective until the Congress has conferred authority upon the FDA to make such regulations.

On June 13, 1966, Dr. James Goddard, Food and Drug Commissioner, told the Woman's National Democratic Club:

The Government does not and must not attempt to dictate what is to be sold to people.

Just 4 days later, on June 17, he did precisely what he said the Government should not and does not do. He issued an order to be effective on December 15, 1966, which will severely limit the amount, number, and combination of vitamins available without a prescription.

In addition, the position and the attitude taken by the Food and Drug Administration is in opposition not only to informed opinion, but also to data and evidence compiled and evaluated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies. These data were assembled and published at substantial cost to the taxpayers.

I have received numerous letters from my constituents in Florida objecting to these changes in regulations relating to labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements.

If certain safe and essential nutrients such as vitamins and minerals can be restricted as to kind and amount available, what is to stop the FDA from limiting our use of salt, sugar, and saturated fats on the grounds that they may be harmful?

A constituent of mine has projected this even further to the day that the FDA will tell us that Crispies are a more nutritious breakfast cereal than Friskies and thus take Friskies off our grocery shelves.

In any case, it seems that such regulations, if needed at all, should be imposed by Congress after debate and vote and not by the Food and Drug Administration.

These regulations, if put into effect, will hit hardest our senior citizens. These people often require special supplements in their daily diet and on a fixed income should not be burdened with the added expenses of doctors' visits and prescription fees. The retiree, whose pocket is already thinly worn by today's inflationary prices, can ill afford unnecessary expenditures.

This is just one more example in the growing list of the administration and its agents boldly taking it upon themselves to do whatever they please without regard to the consequences. Such significant decisions with such far-reaching effects should be the work of the Congress, if anyone. However, it is not clear here that any action needs to be taken. It is clear that such action should not be taken lightly by Dr. Goddard or any other bureaucrat. It is shocking that the President's own attitude of limitless power should serve as a model to so many others in his administration.

The implications of this sort of autocracy are frightening.

TAX CREDIT FOR EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to students seeking educational training is not a novel concept in this body. Our recognition of the importance of higher education and the problem of increasing costs to obtain one has become an important area of concern for the growth and progress of our Republic.

Today I have introduced legislation to help continue the tradition of sponsoring and encouraging education. My bill would allow a credit against income tax to an individual for expenses of higher education when paid by him to provide an education above the 12th grade for himself or for any other individual for whom he has a dependent obligation.

Our Nation can be proud of the fact that in the last 10 years our college population has doubled. The importance of this figure is self-evident. The percentage of individuals in our society who receive a higher education can directly affect the position of leadership our country maintains in the world community.

However, while the number of students attending schools has increased, so have their expenses. The July 16, 1966, issue of the Washington Star reported in an editorial that since 1954 the average cost, of attending a public institution for higher learning, per year has risen from $1,190 to $1,600, and for a private college from $1,700 to nearly $2,500.

To meet these increasing costs, Federal and State agencies, along with private lending institutions, have provided loan programs to students in an effort to help defray education expenses.

According to Dr. Robert Hall, chief of the programs and services branch of the Office of Education, the national defense student loan program, administered by the Federal Government in fiscal 1965, loaned $164 million to 317,000 students on the undergrad and graduate levels. The 50 States and the District of Columbia have similar loan programs. For example, under Governor Rockefeller, New York State alone in 1963–64 loaned a total of $177,625,000 to 250,091 students.

The private sector of our economy has also shared the burden of the high costs of education. Dr. Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, stated in a speech in October 1964, before the association's convention, that—

It is estimated that the State and private guarantee plans generated $150 million in student loans during the 1965–66 school year. A conservative estimate for the next school year would be that these plans will guarantee well over $400 million in student loans. And this doesn't count the many thousands of personal, mortgage and business loans whose proceeds are in fact used to pay college costs.

This record of Federal, State, and private assistance to students is certainly an outstanding one, but the challenge of providing an education for all who are capable is a continuing one. By 1970, our college population is expected to be about 7 million compared with the current figure of 4,800,000. New answers to the financial plight of our students must be forthcoming. I do not believe the answer is simply to increase the amount of loans available to students.

A survey, conducted by the Northwestern Life Insurance Co., of placement officials at 100 colleges across the country illustrates the possible ramifications on our college campus of increased student indebtedness.

In a summary of responses of the placement officials, Fordham University reported:

Considerable increase in indebtedness. As a result, some who graduate with heavy loan obligations are impelled to rate job opportunity solely on basis of immediate monetary return—particularly if they are compounding their situation with early marriage. Thereby career planning loses the flexibility it should have.

The University of North Carolina also reported that student indebtedness is increasing and that those from very low income families have difficulty repaying. Columbia University, notwithstanding a policy of encouraging students with debts to do part-time work, reported that student indebtedness, now 65 percent for males, is growing, with some problem cases occurring.

At a cost of $10,000 to $20,000 for 4 years of higher educational training, the student, upon graduation, may have incurred a debt averaging $15,000.

My bill, a copy of which follows at the end of this statement, would not solve this problem completely, but it would provide a significant contribution to education by aiding those students who are in need of financial help. The tax credit would help the student, regardless of whether the school is a public or private institution. This would eliminate the problem of increasing the Federal arm of control over the colleges and universities across the Nation.

To give assistance directly to the institutions themselves could be to create "federalized education." We want to aid education, not control it. Tax incentives help to create individual initiative to accomplish the goal of ability to pay for more higher education.

Senator RIBICOFF introduced a similar bill—Senate bill 12—in the Senate on January 6, 1965. Senate bill 12 provided a tax credit for individuals for expenses for a higher education paid by the individual to one or more institutions of higher education. My bill would expand this credit so as to make it applicable to individuals who are paying back to a Federal, State, or private loan agency the funds used for educational expenses before graduation.

Scholarships or grants may aid in paying for an education to some extent, but they may not be sufficient. The Commissioner of the Office of Education under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has stated that a family of four with a $13,000 income undergoes considerable financial strain if two children simultaneously attend a college or university. An estimated 24 percent of the family's income must be set aside before taxes to cover the expense. Thus, for many families, loans are the only answer.

This type of Federal assistance would not necessitate the formation of a new administrative agency and at the same time would allow private institutions to increase their loan assistance by making the student's burden somewhat lighter. Thus, my bill would not only provide direct financial help to individuals, but would also attract more private funds to subsidize the educational programs of our student population.

Mr. Speaker, there cannot be any doubt that more assistance must be forthcoming to offset the rise in educational costs. I was particularly disturbed with the Internal Revenue Service's proposed ruling on July 7, 1966, which eliminated some of the few tax deductions presently available for individuals for educational expenses. The Internal Revenue Service disallowed deductions for courses leading to a degree and for costs incurred for study or training to meet an employer's increases in occupational requirements. My bill would not only prevent an expansion of this rule, but it would completely overturn it. Revenue should not obtain a higher value rating in our society than education.

The proposed regulations have since been reconsidered by the Internal Revenue Service. The IRS revised proposed regulations and new set of proposed rules were published in the Federal Register, volume 31, No. 191, October 1, 1966, and follow at the end of this statement, together with an explanatory comment by the Internal Revenue Service. We should not allow this question to continue at the whim of the Internal Revenue Service, and the situation with regard to the deductibility of education expenses ought to be made clear in the law itself.

President Johnson stated in April 1964 that—

We have entered an age in which education is not just a luxury permitting some men an advantage over others. It has become a necessity without which a person is defenseless in this complex, industrialized society . . . We have truly entered the century of the educated man.

I hope this body gives careful consideration to the bill I have introduced today. I believe the tax credit system will serve as the best instrument of Federal assistance to education in this, "the century of the educated man." It will provide the necessary help for the individual student while increasing the amount of private funds available for assistance.

It is a small premium for the Federal Government to pay, for the insurance that the people of our country will maintain a higher intellectual plateau than ever before. For therein lies the foundation upon which this country can grow to the heights visualized in the minds of men, but not yet attained.

A copy of the bill I have introduced today and the revised proposed Internal Revenue Service regulations and new set of proposed rules referred to above, together with explanatory comment, follow:

H.R. 18288

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by redesignating section 40 as 41, and by inserting after section 39 the following new section:

"SEC. 40. EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) General Rule.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount, determined under subsection (b), of the expenses of higher education paid by him during the taxable year to provide an education above the twelfth grade for himself or for any other individual to whom he owes a dependent obligation.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) AMOUNT PER INDIVIDUAL.—The credit under subsection (a) for expenses of higher education of any individual paid (whether in repayment of a loan or otherwise) during the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) 75 percent of so much of such expenses as does not exceed $200,

"(B) 25 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $200 but does not exceed $500, and

"(C) 10 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds $500 but does not exceed $1,500.

"(2) PRORATION OF CREDIT WHERE MORE THAN ONE TAXPAYER PAYS EXPENSES.—If expenses of higher education of an individual are paid by more than one taxpayer during the taxable year, the credit allowable to each such taxpayer under subsection (a) shall be the same portion of the credit determined under paragraph (1) which the amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year is of the total amount of expenses of higher education of such individual paid by all taxpayers during the taxable year.

"(3) Double credit prohibited.—In the case of a taxpayer who is allowed a credit against tax under this section for amounts paid to an institution of higher education, such taxpayer shall not be allowed an additional credit against tax under this section for amounts paid to a financial or credit institution in repayment of a loan used to make those payments to such institution of higher education for which such credit against tax was allowed.

"(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'expenses of higher education' means—

"(A) any amount paid by the taxpayer to one or more institutions of higher education for—

"(i) tuition and fees required for the enrollment or attendance of a student at a level above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education, and

"(ii) fees, books, supplies, and equipment required for courses of instruction above the twelfth grade at an institution of higher education; or

"(B) an amount paid by the taxpayer in repayment of the principal of a loan made to him by a financial or credit institution (including an insurance company), subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State, which amount, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, is allocable to the portion of such loan used by the taxpayer to pay the expenses described in subparagraph (A).

In the case of amounts paid to an institution of higher education, such term does not include any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for meals, lodging, or similar personal, living, or family expenses. In the event an amount paid to an institution of higher education for tuition or fees includes an amount for meals, lodging, or similar expenses which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount which is attributable to meals, lodging, or similar expenses shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4))—

"(A) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade, and

"(B) contributions to or for the use of which constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170(c).

otherwise taken into account under subsec-

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS AND VETERANS' BENEFITS.—The amount tion (a) as expenses of higher education of any individual during any period shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (b)) by any amounts received by such individual during such period as—

"(A) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income, and

"(B) education and training allowance under chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code or educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title.

"(2) NONCREDIT AND RECREATIONAL, ETC., COURSES.—Amounts paid for expenses of higher education of any individual shall be taken into account under subsection (a)—

"(A) in the case of an individual who is a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction for which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree, and

"(B) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(3) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed on the taxpayer for the taxable year by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than under this section and section 31).

"(e) DISALLOWANCE OF EXPENSES AS DEDUCTION.—No deduction shall be allowed under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) for any expense of higher education which (after the application of subsection (b)) is taken into account in determining the amount of any credit allowed under subsection (a). The preceding sentence shall not apply to the expenses of higher education of any taxpayer who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, elects not to apply the provisions of this section with respect to such expenses for the taxable year.

"(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 40. Expenses of higher education.
"SEC. 41. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

[Reprinted from Federal Register, Vol. 31, No. 191, Oct. 1, 1966]

PROPOSED RULEMAKING—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

[26 CFR Part 1]

EXPENSES FOR EDUCATION

Notice of proposed rulemaking

Pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, approved June 11, 1946, regulations proposed to be prescribed as § 1.162–5 and § 1.262–1(b)(9) were published in tentative form with a notice of proposed rule making in the FEDERAL REGISTER for July 7, 1966 (31 F.R. 9276). Notice is hereby given that such proposed regulations are withdrawn.

Further, notice is hereby given, pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, that the regulations set forth in tentative form below are proposed to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate. Prior to the final adoption of such regulations, consideration will be given to any comments or suggestions pertaining thereto which are submitted in writing, in duplicate, to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Attention: CC:IR:T, Washington, D.C. 20224, within the period of 30 days from the date of publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER. Any person submitting written comments or suggestions who desires an opportunity to comment orally at the public hearing which will be held on these proposed regulations should submit his request, in writing, to the Commissioner within the 30-day period. Notice of the time, place, and date of the public hearing is published simultaneously herewith. The proposed regulations are to be issued under the authority contained in section 7805 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (68A Stat. 917; 26 U.S.C. 7805).

[SEAL] SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

In order to provide more specific rules with respect to the treatment, for Federal income tax purposes, for expenditures for education, § 1.162–5 (relating to expenses for education) and § 1.262–1 (relating to personal, living, and family expenses) of the Income Tax Regulations (26 CFR Part 1) are amended as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Section 1.162–5 is amended to read as follows:

§ 1.162–5 Expenses for education.

(a) *General rule.* Expenditures made by an individual for education (including research undertaken as part of his educational program) which are personal or capital expenditures, or which have elements of both, are not deductible. Educational expenditures included within this category are described in paragraph (b) of this section. On the other hand, expenditures made by an individual for education (including research undertaken as part of his educational program) which are neither capital nor personal expenditures are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses (even though the education may lead to a degree) if the education—

(1) Maintains or improves skills required by the individual in his present employment or other trade or business, or

(2) Meets the express requirements of the individual's employer, or the requirements of applicable law or regulations, imposed as a condition to the retention by the individual of an established employment relationship, status, or rate of compensation.

(b) *Nondeductible educational expenditures*—(1) *In General.* Educational expenditures described in subparagraphs (2) and (3) of this paragraph are personal or capital expenditures, or have elements of both, and, therefore, are not deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses even though they may maintain or improve skills required by the individual in his present employment or other trade or business or may meet the express requirements of the individual's employer or of applicable law or regulations.

(2) *Minimum educational requirements.* (i) The first category of nondeductible capital or personal educational expenses are expenditures made by an individual for education which is required of him in order to meet the minimum educational requirements for qualification in his present employment or other trade or business. The minimum education necessary to qualify for a position or other trade or business must be determined from a consideration of such factors as the requirements of the employer, the applicable law and regulations, and the standards of the profession, trade, or business involved. The fact that an individual is already performing service in an employment status does not establish that he has met the minimum educational requirements for qualification in that employment. Once an individual has met the minimum educational requirements for qualification in his present employment or other trade or business, he shall be treated as continuing to meet those requirements even though they are subsequently changed.

(ii) The minimum educational requirements for qualification of a particular individual in a position in an educational institution is the minimum level of education (in terms of college hours or degree) which under the applicable laws or regulations, in effect at the time this individual is first employed in such position, is normally required of an individual initially being employed in such a position. If there are no normal requirements as to the minimum level of education required for a position in an educational institution, then an individual in such a position shall be considered to have met the minimum educational requirements for qualification in that position when he becomes a member of the faculty of the educational institution. The determination of whether an individual is a member of the faculty of an educational institution must be made on the basis of the particular practices of the institution. However, an individual will ordinarily be considered to be a member of the faculty of an institution if (a) he has tenure or his years of service are being counted toward obtaining tenure; (b) the institution is making contributions to a retirement plan in respect of his employment; or (c) he has a vote in faculty affairs.

(iii) The application of this subparagraph may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example (1). General facts: State X requires a bachelor's degree for beginning sec-

ondary school teachers which must include 30 credit hours of professional education courses. In addition, in order to retain his position, a secondary school teacher must complete a fifth year of preparation within 10 years after beginning his employment. If an employing school official certifies to the State Department of Education that applicants having a bachelor's degree and the required courses in professional education cannot be found, he may hire individuals as secondary school teachers if they have completed a minimum of 90 semester hours of college work. However, to be retained in his position, such an individual must obtain his bachelor's degree and complete the required professional education courses within 3 years after his employment commences. Under these facts, a bachelor's degree is considered to be the minimum educational requirement for qualification as a secondary school teacher in State X. The following are examples of the application of these facts in particular situations:

Situation 1. A, at the time he is employed as a secondary school teacher in State X, has a bachelor's degree including 30 credit hours of professional education courses. After his employment, A completes a fifth college year of education and, as a result, is issued a standard certificate. The fifth college year of education undertaken by A is not education required to meet the minimum educational requirements for qualification as a secondary school teacher.

Situation 2. Because of a shortage of applicants meeting the stated requirements, B, who has a bachelor's degree, is employed as a secondary school teacher in State X even though he has only 20 credit hours of professional education courses. After his employment, B takes an additional 10 credit hours of professional educational courses. These courses do not constitute education required to meet the minimum educational requirements for qualification as a secondary school teacher.

Situation 3. Because of a shortage of applicants meeting the stated requirements, C is employed as a secondary school teacher in State X although he has only 90 semester hours of college work towards his bachelor's degree. After his employment, C undertakes courses leading to a bachelor's degree. These courses (including any courses in professional education) constitute education required to meet the minimum educational requirements for qualification as a secondary school teacher.

Situation 4. Subsequent to the employment of A, B, and C, but before they have completed a fifth college year of education, State X changes its requirements affecting secondary school teachers to provide that beginning teachers must have completed 5 college years of preparation. In the cases of A, B, and C, a fifth college year of education is not considered to be education undertaken to meet the minimum educational requirements for qualification as a secondary school teacher.

Example (2). D, who holds a bachelor's degree, obtains temporary employment as an instructor at University Y and undertakes graduate courses as a candidate for a graduate degree. D may become a faculty member only if he obtains a graduate degree and may continue to hold a position as instructor only so long as he shows satisfactory progress towards obtaining this graduate degree. The graduate courses taken by D constitute education required to meet the minimum educational requirements for qualification in D's intended trade or business and, thus, the expenditures for such courses are not deductible.

Example (3). E, who has completed 2 years of a normal 3-year law school course leading to a bachelor of laws degree (LL.B.), is hired by a law firm to do legal research and perform other functions on a full-time basis. As a condition to continued employment, E is required to obtain an LL.B. and pass the State bar examination. E completes his law school education by attending night law school, and he takes a bar review course in order to prepare for the State bar examination. The law courses and bar review course constitute education required to meet the minimum educational requirements for qualification in E's intended trade or business and, thus, the expenditures for such courses are not deductible.

(3) *Qualification for new trade or business, position, or specialty.* (i) The second category of nondeductible capital or personal educational expenses are expenditures made by an individual for education which is part of a program of study being pursued by him which will lead to qualifying him in a new trade or business, position, or specialty. A change of duties does not constitute a new position or specialty if the new duties involve the same general type work as is involved in the individual's present employment. For this purpose, all teaching and related duties shall be considered to involve the same general type of work. The following are examples of changes in duties which do not constitute new positions or specialties:

(*a*) Elementary to secondary school classroom teacher.

(*b*) Classroom teacher in one subject (such as mathematics) to classroom teacher in another subject (such as science).

(*c*) Classroom teacher to guidance counselor.

On the other hand, a change in duties from a classroom teacher to principal constitutes a new position. Thus, if a classroom teacher undertakes a program of study which will lead to qualifying him to become a principal, the expenditures for such education are nondeductible even though some or all of the courses in the program also satisfy requirements for the retention of his teaching position.

(ii) The application of this subparagraph to individuals other than teachers may be illustrated by the following examples:

Example (1). A, a general practitioner of medicine, takes a course of study which qualifies him as a specialist in pediatrics. A's expenses for such education are not deductible because of course of study qualifies him for a new specialty.

Example (2). B, a self-employed certified public accountant, attends law school at night and after completing his law school studies receives a bachelor of laws degree. The expenditures made by B in attending law school are nondeductible because this course of study qualifies him for a new trade or business.

Example (3). Assume the same facts as in example (2) except that B is employed by an accounting firm, rather than self-employed, and that his employer requires him to obtain a bachelor of laws degree. B intends to remain as an employee of the accounting firm. Nevertheless, the expenditures made by B in attending law school are not deductible since this course of study qualifies him for a new trade or business.

Example (4). C, a general practitioner of medicine, takes a 2-week course reviewing new developments in several specialized fields of medicine. C's expenses for the course are deductible because the course maintains or improves skills required by him in his trade or business and does not qualify him for a new specialty within his trade or business.

(c) *Deductible educational expenditures*—(1) *Maintaining or improving skills.* The deduction under the category of expenditures for education which maintains or improves skills required by the individual in his present employment or other trade or business includes refresher courses or courses dealing with current developments. In addition, a deduction may also be allowable under this category for expenditures for academic or vocational courses provided such expenditures are not within one of the categories of capital or personal expenditures described in paragraph (b) of this section.

(2) *Meeting requirements of employer.* An individual is considered to have undertaken education in order to meet the express requirements of his employer, or the requirements of applicable law or regulations, imposed as a condition to the retention by the taxpayer of his established employment relationship, status, or rate of compensation only if such requirements are imposed for a bona fide business purpose of the individual's employer. Only the minimum education necessary to the retention by the individual of his established employment relationship, status, or rate of compensation may be considered as undertaken to meet the express requirements of the taxpayer's employer. However, education in excess of such minimum education may qualify as education undertaken in order to maintain or improve the skills required by the taxpayer in his present employment or other present trade or business (see subparagraph (1) of this paragraph). In no event, however, is a deduction allowable for expenditures for education which, even though for education required by the employer or applicable law or regulations, are within one of the categories of capital or personal expenditures described in paragraph (b) of this section.

(d) *Travel as a form of education.* In general, an individual's expenditures for travel (including travel while on sabbatical leave which travel has no direct relationship to the conduct of the individual's trade or business) as a form of education are personal in nature and, therefore, not deductible.

(e) *Travel away from home.* (1) If an individual travels away from home primarily to obtain education the expenses of which are deductible under this section, his expenditures for travel, meals, and lodging while away from home are deductible. However, if as an incident of such trip the individual engages in some personal activity such as sightseeing, social visiting, or entertaining, or other recreation, the portion of the expenses attributable to such personal activity constitutes nondeductible personal or living expenses and is not allowable as a deduction. If the individual's travel away from home is primarily personal, the individual's expenditures for travel, meals and lodging (other than meals and lodging during the time spent in participating in deductible educational pursuits) are not deductible. Whether a particular trip is primarily personal or primarily to obtain education the expenses of which are deductible under this section depends upon all the facts and circumstances of each case. An important factor to be taken into consideration in making the determination is the relative amount of time devoted to personal activity as compared with the time devoted to educational pursuits. The rules set forth in this paragraph are subject to the provisions of section 162(a)(2), relating to deductibility of certain traveling expenses, and section 274 (c) and (d), relating to allocation of certain foreign travel expenses and substantiation required, respectively, and the regulations thereunder.

(2) *Examples.* The application of this subsection may be illustrated by the following examples:

Examples (1). A, a self-employed tax consultant, decides to take a 1-week course in new developments in taxation, which is offered in City X, 500 miles away from his

home. His primary purpose in going to X is to take the course, but he also takes a side trip to City Y (50 miles from X) for 1 day, takes a sightseeing trip while in X, and entertains some personal friends. A's transportation expenses to City X and return to his home are deductible but his transportation expenses to City Y are not deductible. A's expenses for meals and lodging while away from home will be allocated between his educational pursuits and his personal activities. Those expenses which are entirely personal, such as sightseeing and entertaining friends, are not deductible to any extent.

Example (2). The facts are the same as in example (1) except that A's primary purpose in going to City X is to take a vacation. This purpose is indicated by several factors, one of which is the fact that he spends only 1 week attending the tax course and devotes 5 weeks entirely to personal activities. None of A's transportation expenses are deductible and his expenses for meals and lodging while away from home are not deductible to the extent attributable to personal activities. His expenses for meals and lodging allocable to the week attending the tax course are, however, deductible.

Example (3). B, a high school mathematics teacher in New York City, in the summertime travels to a university in California in order to take a single 3-hour mathematics course the expense of which is deductible under this section. A full course of study for the summer session is 12 hours. Since B is pursuing only one-fourth of a full course of study and the remainder of her time is devoted to personal activities the expense of which is not deductible, absent other compelling circumstances, the trip is considered taken primarily for personal reasons and the cost of traveling from New York City to California and return would not be deductible. However, one-fourth of the cost of B's meals and lodging while attending the university in California may be considered properly allocable to deductible educational pursuits and, therefore, is deductible.

PAR. 2. Paragraph (b) of § 1.262–1 is amended by adding a subparagraph (9) at the end thereof which reads as follows:

§ 1.262–1 Personal, living, and family expenses.

* * * * *

(b) *Examples of personal, living, and family expenses.* * * *

(9) Expenditures made by a taxpayer in obtaining an education or in furthering his education are not deductible unless they qualify under section 162 and § 1.162–5 (relating to trade or business expenses).

[F.R. Doc. 66–10800; Filed, Sept. 30, 1966; 12:51 p.m.]

[26 CFR Part 1]

EXPENSES FOR EDUCATION

Notice of hearing on proposed regulations

The proposed amendment to the regulations under section 162 of the Code relating to expenses for education appears in this issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER (supra).

A public hearing on the provisions of this proposed amendment to the regulations will be held starting on Tuesday, November 15, 1966, at 10 a.m. e.s.t., and continuing if necessary on November 16. The hearing will be held in the Auditorium of the Smithsonian Institution, Natural History Building, 10th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Persons who plan to attend the hearing are requested to notify the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Attention: CC:LR:T, Washington, D.C. 20224, by November 10, 1966, telephone (Washington, D.C.—area code 202–964–3935).

Lester R. Uretz,
Chief Counsel.

BY: JAMES F. DRING,
Director, Legislation and Regulations Division.

[F.R. Doc. 66–10801; Filed, Sept. 30, 1966; 12:51 p.m.]

REVISED TREASURY-PROPOSED REGULATIONS ON DEDUCTIBILITY OF EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES OF TEACHERS AND OTHER TAXPAYERS

BACKGROUND

On July 7, 1966, the Treasury Department issued proposed regulations regarding the tax deductibility of educational expenses incurred by employees and self-employed individuals. The purpose of these regulations was to set forth clear and concise rules for determining the tax status of these expenses and thereby eliminate the inconsistencies which have developed, both at the administrative and judicial level, under the existing regulations.

Comments were received on the proposed regulations to the effect that they were an unduly restrictive interpretation of present law. Particular stress was put on the point that the proposed rules did not give adequate recognition to the fact that continuing education is inherent for those in the teaching profession and, therefore, realistically the costs of the continuing education represent an ordinary and necessary business expense which should qualify for a tax deduction under present law.

As a result of a re-evaluation of the proposed regulations in light of the comments received, the Treasury Department has withdrawn these proposed regulations and issued a new set of proposed rules in their place. These new proposed regulations were published in the *Federal Register* for October 1, 1966, along with a notice that a public hearing on them has been scheduled beginning on November 15, 1966. This action was taken because it is believed that this matter can be materially expedited by making available, prior to the public hearings, the revised proposal reflecting the Treasury Department's consideration of the comments received.

SUMMARY OF REVISED PROPOSED REGULATIONS

Basically, the revised rules would permit an income tax deduction for an individual's education expenses where the education serves to maintain or improve skills required in his present position or is undertaken to fulfill additional educational requirements imposed on him by his employer.

Under this general provision, if a state requires its teachers to continue to take educational courses or to obtain a higher level of education, the costs of this education will ordinarily be completely deductible for income tax purposes. Similarly, the cost of specialized courses which a state may require its teachers to take will usually be deductible if the teacher otherwise meets the basic level of education required for her position. If a teacher or other taxpayer voluntarily undertakes additional education to improve his skills, the costs he incurs for this will also generally be deductible. Moreover, unlike the first set of proposed rules, the revised rules do not measure the tax deductibility of particular educational courses by whether or not they will lead to a degree. In this regard, the proposed regulations recognize that continuing education is, in many instances, an essential tool in an individual's trade or business.

Two qualifications are provided to this rule of deductibility, under which an individual will not be granted a tax deduction for the basic or minimum education necessary initially to qualify him for his job or for education which will qualify him for a new trade or business, position, or specialty. The following is a more detailed discussion of these two qualifications as well as of the application of the revised rules in different situations.

(1) Minimum Educational Requirements for the Individual's Present Employment. The first category of non-deductible expenses are those incurred for education which is required of an individual in order for him to meet the minimum educational requirements for qualification in his present position. In the case of teachers, the rule for non-deductibility extends to courses which she must take to bring herself up to the minimum level of education (in terms of college hours or a degree) which is normally required of an individual initially being employed in such a position. For example, if a state normally requires that beginning teachers have at least a bachelors degree, but because of a shortage of applicants, hires an individual with only three years of college on the condition that she obtain her fourth year, the expenses incurred by this teacher in obtaining her fourth year of college would not be deductible. On the other hand, once she has obtained her bachelors degree, the expenses for any additional education, such as a fifth year of college, which she may be required to take by her employer in order to maintain her position or which maintains or improves her skills as a teacher would ordinarily be deductible. The one exception would be if this further education is part of a program of study which will lead to qualifying her for a new trade or business, position, or specialty, as explained below.

If an educational institution has prescribed no normal educational qualifications, then this non-deductible category covers the education which an individual is required to take in order to qualify as a member of the faculty of the institution. Once he has so qualified, expenses for any additional education which is required by the institution or which maintains or improves his teaching skills will also be deductible, unless the education is part of a program which will lead to qualifying him for a new trade or business, position, or specialty.

(2) Education Qualifying an Individual for a New Trade or Business, Position or Specialty. The second category of nondeductible educational expenses are those incurred by an individual for education which is part of a program of study being pursued by him which will lead to qualifying him for a new trade or business, position, or specialty. Thus, if a public school teacher should go to law school for a law degree, the expenses for this education would not be deductible. On the other hand, the mere fact that educational courses undertaken by a teacher may qualify her to teach a different subject or at a different grade level or will qualify her for a position related to teaching (such as a guidance counselor) will not disqualify the expenses for such education from a tax deduction.

* * * * *

In summary therefore, the revised proposed rules recognize that continuing education is an inherent and necessary aspect of many positions, especially those in the teaching profession. On the other hand, they would not extend the tax deduction to the basic or minimum education which an individual is taking in order to equip himself for his intended profession or to education which will qualify an individual for a new profession or specialty. These two instances represent types of education which all individuals must take to qualify themselves for their future profession or employment. If an individual takes such education before accepting employment, it is clear that he does not receive a tax deduction. It would appear

to be an inequitable application of the tax laws if a tax deduction were allowed to an individual for this type of basic education merely because he accepts employment while still obtaining the basic education.

WARNING ON NONPROLIFERATION TREATY TALK

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today's headlines, "United States, Russia Near Nuclear Pact," "Push Treaty To Bar Spread of A-Weapons" developed out of talk yesterday at the White House between President Johnson and Andrei Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister, should not be allowed to generate a state of euphoria over the prospects of a nonproliferation treaty. It was only the latest of hundreds of sessions at Geneva, the United Nations, and elsewhere during which the two countries have kicked around the subject for the last 3 years.

My reasons for this assessment are the following:

First. The Soviets have consistently and solidly held out as the price for such a treaty the essential abandonment of the U.S. nuclear umbrella over Western Europe deterring Soviet armed aggression. If one side or the other has backed down on this issue, it is more likely Washington than Moscow. The cost of the treaty in this event would be by a large measure more dangerous to the peace of the world than continuing things as they are without a nonproliferation pact.

Second. Yesterday's conversation in the White House should be taken in the context of its timing—just 3 weeks and 1 day away from the November 8 election. Mr. Johnson has strived mightily to pull the Vietnam peace rabbit out of his hat to improve his party's prospects at the polls. Failing that, one reasonably might suspect some last-minute peripheral effort by the President to establish a peacemaker image by some other means. In the context of its timing, yesterday's event might well be such a move. This is particularly so since State Department spokesmen indicate any formal treaty negotiation lies far beyond the November 8 deadline.

Third. In any event the actual negotiation of a nonproliferation treaty would have little substantive effect on loosening basic world tensions. China has boycotted negotiations, likewise the French. Either of these powers have the capacity to make great mischief in the area of proliferation. At least 95 percent of the nuclear have-nots who would be signing such a treaty have not a chance to become nuclear powers anyway. They have neither the scientific, industrial, or financial resources to do so. It is unlikely nations which have the greatest potentiality to go nuclear would sign the treaty or, if they did so, take its prohibitions seriously when and if the chips were down.

I have in mind such countries as India and Pakistan, the UAR, Israel, Switzerland, Sweden, and others. As a matter of fact, any country depending on NATO for its existence might be induced to go nuclear to gain some measure of independent self-defense if the aforementioned price of abandoning the nuclear umbrella is, indeed, under serious discussion with the Soviets.

HS 820

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times for Monday, October 3, and the Chicago Daily News for Monday, October 10, both carried editorials in support of the efforts of our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAUL FINDLEY] for a congressional investigation of the Defense Department's purchase of the German machinegun, the HS 820. I have unanimous consent that both editorials be made a part of the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 3, 1966]

STORY OF A GUN

Congressman PAUL FINDLEY of Illinois deserves high marks for his persistence and thoroughness in probing into the strange history of a 20-mm. gun, first urgently required by the Army almost six years ago and not yet delivered.

The gun—a small financial item in a defense budget of $60 billion—offers nevertheless a case history of what's wrong in the Pentagon. Long delays, in part caused by the layering of command and staff echelons; the influence of international political considerations upon what should have been purely military technological and procurement judgments; some poor decisions—and then *ex post facto* attempts to paint the lily have cast a long shadow over the new gun.

The weapon in question is the 20-mm. Hispano-Suiza, manufactured in West Germany and now scheduled for delivery in small quantities next spring or summer, many years after the threat it was intended to meet—a new Russian gun—has been in operation. The Army compiled a long "white paper" to rebut and refute the criticism, but as Mr. FINDLEY has pointed out, it contains self-contradictions, half-truths or prevarications and does not answer some of the main criticisms. Most important: Why, six years after an urgent need was stated for a gun superior to a Russian model, is the United States purchasing a gun that is still technologically unsatisfactory and that when delivered will still be outranged and outperformed by comparable Soviet weapons?

[From the Chicago Daily News, Oct. 10, 1966]

STRANGE DEAL ON CANNONS

If there is one thing the Pentagon is more intent on than selling West Germany weapons that the Germans don't want, it must be buying German arms that Americans don't want.

The Germans have been trying to get out of their commitment to spend $675,000,000 every year on American arms, which is meant to offset the cost of stationing American troops in Germany. As a sweetener, the United States is supposed to spend more than $73,000,000 in Germany over the next three years for a 20-mm. cannon plus ammunition and parts for it. Since 1961, the need has been clear to replace the twin .50-caliber machine guns now carried on the M–114, the Army's armored, tracked scout vehicle.

Five years ago, the Army decided that a German weapon, the Hispano-Suiza 820 cannon, might be modified to fill the gun gap for the time being. But the modification of the HS–820 has been as honeycombed with flaws as a curbing on the Northwest Side. Rep. PAUL FINDLEY (R-Ill.) has aired a number of flaws in his tireless campaign to get a better weapon for American troops.

After five years of testing and at least three of modifying, the Army couldn't find targets big enough to test the accuracy of the HS–820's burst at a range of 1,000 meters. The HS–820 malfunctioned at the rate of 7.1 every thousand rounds when tested at Fort Knox and 4.7 every thousand at Aberdeen—an unacceptable ratio judged by the accepted standard of one malfunction every thousand.

The Army handled all complaints simply: It lowered the standards for the weapon and ordered its ordnance people to stop talking. Which may not improve the HS–820 very much, but does a lot for German-American relations.

Not all of us may be able to see that the principal function of a new weapon is to improve this country's relations with the Federal Republic of Germany. Somewhere on the list of priorities for a weapon, there ought to be room for its usefulness in protecting American soldiers and helping them to accomplish their mission.

The Pentagon's inflexible insistence on the HS–820, along with its highly flexible standards of performance for this weapon, do not inspire much confidence in its ability to put first things first.

According to FINDLEY, the Pentagon is also planning to mount the HS–820 on the Marine Corps' new landing craft and on 300 of the Army's M–113 personnel carriers. The malfunction rate seems to be increasing—in the Pentagon.

ADDRESS BY REV. CORNELIAN DENDE, OFM

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last, it was my privilege to attend the annual banquet honoring Gen. Casimir Pulaski in Scranton, Pa. On that occasion an inspiring speech was delivered by Rev. Cornelian Dende. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House and to the people of the country:

PULASKI DAY DINNER—SCRANTON, PA., OCT. 9, 1966

(By Rev. Cornelian Dende, OFM Conv. of Buffalo, N.Y., director of Fr. Justin Rosary Hour, a religious network program now in its 36th year)

I am delighted to be with you this evening at your annual Pulaski Day Dinner. I consider it a privilege to address you as you commemorate the 187th anniversary of the

death at Savannah, Georgia of a hero of two continents: General Casimir Pulaski.

Each year your organization faithfully commemorates the memory of this great Polish General as a patriotic duty. This year however, his anniversary should be and is observed in the perspective of Poland's Millennium: the thousandth anniversary of Christianity in Poland.

A millennium—one thousand years—is indeed a very long period of time. Many generations have passed. During that time Poland—the land of our forebears—has lived through periods of great victories as well as disasters, ascents and falls, through periods of joy and suffering, through times of great hopes and moments of despair. In this way, the centuries have formed and shaped a special Polish character and spirit within the framework of Christian principles and ideology.

During the millennium year the person of General Pulaski emerges from history as a symbolic figure. General Pulaski stands before us here in America and before the world at large, as a typical representative of the Polish nation. His virtues, his traits, are indicative of the traits of the Polish soul engrained and nurtured in the same environments and Hardships of life.

Very often we of Polish ancestry are accused of being overly sentimental because of our constant referral to our religious and historical past. Such is the trait of the Slavic soul. Poles are very expressive of their sentiments, this is evident in our customs and traditions. In contrast with other nations, particularly those of northern and western Europe we might at times be even accused of being irrational as we dwell on our past. We are oftentimes told that we focus so much of our attention on our past that we lose vision for the future.

Yes, the Polish soul is sentimental but nevertheless it is intelligent, imaginative and colorful in its sentimentality. Our emotional side complements our personality and is indeed a beautiful trait envied by those who by nature are more conservative and restrained. This is one reason why today we see a growing interest on the part of the West in the slavic nations of central and eastern Europe . . . the two largest of which are Poland and Russia.

Delving into the past, delving into history is not sentimentality nor a waste of time. Roman philosophers time and again pointed out that history is the magistra vitae—the teacher of life. President Kennedy repeatedly reminded us to study our past and benefit from its lessons, lest we repeat the mistakes of the past in the future. However, the most eloquent exhortation to examine our past—our Polish past in particular—was offered by His Holiness Pope Paul VI during the Millennium Mass at St. Peter Basilica in Rome several months ago—on May 15th to be exact. Speaking to thousands of Polish pilgrims from all parts of the world who like himself were barred entry into Poland by the Communists, Pope Paul stressed that "it is a most noble obligation to listen intently to the voice of centuries past."

This voice carries an eloquent message from one generation to another. Thrilling indeed is this voice which reechoes our glorious past. Its penetrating sound rises from every Polish town, from every historic monument, from every Polish grave. It is a voice which proclaims: Poland still lives! A voice which sings out: Poland is ever united! A voice which laments: Poland suffers. A prayerful voice which humbly confesses: Poland is Catholic! It is the voice of her most noble sons: the voice of heroes, scientists, statesmen, the voice of artists, the voice of youth. Especially during this millennium jubilee this voice of Poland's past breaks out into a solemn hymn of thanksgiving.

Each succeeding century bears eloquent witness to Poland's fidelity to God and Church repeating consistently: Blessed be God. . . . now and forever. Niech bedzie pochwalony Jezus Chrystus. . . . na wieki, wieków!"

Such were the fatherly exhortations of Pope Paul to his Polish children, admonishing them never to forget their splendid past, to always listen intently to the voice of their glorious Christian history which began in 966 when their first leader, Mieszko I received the gift of faith for himself and for his nation through the sacrament of baptism.

The millennium celebrations at Czestochowa and at St. Peter's in Rome launched similar celebrations in nearly every diocese throughout the civilized Christian world. Here in the United States, the highlight of the millennium celebrations was to have been the personal appearance of Poland's courageous Primate, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski. Here again the Communists by their refusal to grant Cardinal Wyszynski a passport to come to our country attempted to undermine and frustrate the efforts of Polish-Americans to commemorate the Millennium. Unable to leave Poland Cardinal Wyszynski appointed as his representative to our country Bishop Wladyslaw Rubin, spiritual protector of Poles-in-exile residing in Rome. Just a few days ago I had the privilege of meeting Bishop Rubin and his party in Buffalo. He was extremely pleased with the enthusiastic welcome that he received where he traveled. I asked him what is impressions were following his two-month visit in America and Canada. He told me of the enormous throngs of faithful, many in traditional costumes, that crowded auditoriums, stadiums, churches. They reminded him of the wide expanses of Polish wheatfields swaying in the gentle wind . . . speckled with colorful wild flowers.

But all these external manifestations, the long parades, the pageants, the colorful floats which represented a panorama of scenes from Polish history, candlelight processions, banners and flags fluttering in the breeze and many other wonders that appealed to the eye and ear . . . all these are but an elaborate artistic frame bringing into perspective the real picture, the real meaning and essence of the Millennium celebrations . . . which is a prayerful thanksgiving by Poles in Poland and abroad for the gift of Faith received a thousand years ago.

Bishop Rubin noted that we who are privileged to live in these historic days when Poland celebrates its millenium, are aware of our obligation to speak in the name of generations past; in their name we now thank God solemnly for the treasured gift of Faith; in their name we humbly ask pardon for Poland's past transgressions and moments of weakness.

Bishop Rubin also pointed out that above the glitter and din of the receptions and celebrations he took part in, what stands out in prominence is the altar, the cross, the portrait of Our Lady of Czestochowa, Patronness and Queen of Poland. The highlight and climax of these religious and civic manifestations is always the holy Mass—the solemn sacrifice of Thanksgiving offered God on His altar through his Divine Son and through the intercession of our Heavenly Queen of Czestochowa . . . We thank God for granting Poland the grace, the strength and the courage during the past ten centuries to be ever faithful to God, to His Gospel, to His Cross and to His divinely instituted Church . . . and for the enviable and singular distinction of being the "Bulwark of Christendom", "God's Army on earth."

In retrospect we realize that the reception of baptism by Mieszko I ten centuries ago and the introduction of Christianity into Poland was the decisive factor in crystallizing and forming the Polish nation. Fidelity through the centuries to the Catholic Faith shaped the destiny not only of the Polish nation but also of the Polish soul. The grace of faith offered strength in times of trial, gave patience during persecution and occupation, courage in struggle, offered hope in times of despair, faith inspired the Polish soldier to champion the cause of liberty for himself and for his fellowman . . . within the boundaries of Poland and outside of Poland wherever liberty was threatened or suppressed.

This Polish spirit molded within the framework of Christian principles is especially evident in the Polish Constitution of May 3rd. In this millennium year we observe its 175th anniversary. It is no wonder then that when America was fighting for its survival and for its independence it found a kindred spirit in the hearts of men like Pulaski and Kosciuszko who crossed the ocean and offered their lives to champion the cause of liberty . . . in the New World.

As we consider our noble heritage during this millennium year we rightfully feel sentiments of pride. We realize that if we benefit from the lesson of history, namely, if after the example of our forebears we remain faithful to God, His Gospel, the Cross, His Church and to our Heavenly patronness, we need not fear for the future.

The millennial values that we hold as our heritage must continue to enrich us individually as citizens of this great country of ours.

I know that your organization has as its purpose to bring out in relief our Polish heritage and its contribution to your community and to our country. Your efforts, your intentions are specially expressed in your resolution to erect a monument in honor of General Casimir Pulaski, who as I mentioned at the beginning of my talk, manifests in his person the true spirit of the indomitable Polish nation.

Let this millennium year then be a year of renewed dedication to the Christian ideals that initiated, sustained and now and still continues to vitalize the nation of our forebears and these United States, both committed to freedom and justice for all. I thank you.

FEDERAL CONTROL AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL

Mr. HUTCHINSON. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, early in October discussion of the Federal guidelines for education, busing, de facto segregation, and various allied topics was much in evidence in the press and here on Capitol Hill. To provide further background on this very hot issue, I inserted extensive material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the title "Don't Be Fooled—Bureaucrats Do Intend To Bus Your Children." Two days later on October 6 the House passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966 bill after first eliminating proposals which would support the transportation of pupils to overcome racial imbalance. Thus, at least for the present, a major attempt by a Federal agency

to effectively direct and revamp our national system of neighborhood schools has been thwarted. I repeat—at least for the present.

As I pointed out in the October 4 remarks, I am sure very fairminded citizens will agree with the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Harold Howe, when he stated that—

The first priority is to make sure that the schools which serve our neediest citizens are at the very least equal to the schools that serve our most fortunate.

But I very much disagree with the methods proposed to attain this very worthy end. To tamper with our long-established neighborhood school system is hardly the approach to use in seeking a fair and equitable solution to the problem. That the neighborhood school was a real target in the Howe program is certain, judging from his remarks on May 13, 1966, in Chicago:

And we are particularly interested in finding one or two great American cities that are adventurous enough to join us in planning the educational park of the future. These entities will house 20,000 or more pupils and will cut across all geographic, economic and social boundaries to draw students.

With specific reference to the neighborhood school, he continued:

While such a park would deny the neighborhood school, it would express the vitality, the imagination, and the cultural mix that every vigorous city exemplifies. Students in such a facility would attend a genuine city school in the deepest sense instead of a school in one section of the city which is untouched by the broader influences of metropolitan life as a whole.

Those who have made light of the dangers of Federal control of education in the past should profit from this latest episode in the area of national education. Future Federal proposals on education must be viewed with a healthy and hardnosed objectivity. Better still, the merit of other approaches to educational assistance should be accorded consideration. Such proposals as tax credits and the retention of Federal taxes in the States would radically reduce the Federal Government's penchant for coveting State and individual responsibilities and jurisdictions.

On October 9, the Sunday Chicago Tribune summed up adequately the recent skirmish between Congress and the Office of Education. I insert this editorial, "Congress Instructs Mr. Howe," to be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS INSTRUCTS MR. HOWE

Both houses of Congress, in passing the multibillion-dollar school aid bills, reaffirmed the principle that the money may not be used to require the transportation of pupils to achieve racial balance. This action should dispose of the blueprints for vast educational parks and other fanciful schemes which Education Commissioner Harold Howe II and the federal office of education have been preparing.

Democratic leaders in both houses agreed to strike from the school aid bill a provision that special consideration be given to schools desiring to correct racial imbalance. The House went further, adopting an amendment which prohibits the commissioner of education from requiring "assignment or transportation of students or teachers to overcome racial imbalance."

Another House amendment requires a public hearing before funds may be withheld from a school district. This provision reflects the national indignation which arose a year ago when 31 million dollars was withheld without explanation, from Chicago schools.

These efforts of Congress to spell out its intentions should have been unnecessary because the civil rights act of 1964 set precise limits on measures to end racial discrimination. The act provided that "nothing herein shall empower any official or court to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance."

The act also provided that no federal assistance may be withdrawn until the federal agency involved files a written report of the circumstances to the committees of the House and Senate having jurisdiction over the program.

The recent debate in Congress clarifies the intent of that body on the question whether federal laws prohibiting segregation imply a responsibility of federal agencies to force integration.

The 1964 civil rights act forbids discrimination in public accommodations. Does this mean that a certain percentage of the rooms in every hotel must be reserved for Negroes and a certain percentage for whites?

The law forbids discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Does this mean that every employer must integrate his working force by certain percentages of whites, Negroes, males, females, etc.?

The law forbids racial discrimination in the schools. Does this command every school board to have the races mixed, according to a certain percentage, in every school?

Nobody has suggested that Congress ever intended to require hotels or employers to have an affirmative policy of mixing white and Negro guests and employes. Nevertheless there has been much agitation that a law forbidding discrimination in the schools requires an affirmative policy of mixing pupils by race, even if it is necessary to transport them long distances.

Twice the United States Supreme Court has refused to review lower court decisions upholding the policy of assigning pupils to schools according to the neighborhoods in which they live. One of these decisions, in a case originating in Gary, was cited in the 1964 civil rights act debate by Vice President HUMPHREY, then a senator.

While the Supreme Court never has ruled explicitly whether school officials may transport children to a distant school for the purpose of ending "de facto" segregation, there is no question how Congress stands on the question. Congress is against using federal funds to achieve this purpose.

The office of education now should try to administer the school aid law as Congress wants it to be administered. The billions of dollars in school funds come from the pockets of the taxpayers, not from the federal office of education.

THE REPUBLIC OF FREE CHINA CELEBRATES THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REVOLUTION OF OCTOBER 10, 1911

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, the Republic of Free China celebrated the 55th anniversary of the revolution of October 10, 1911, which resulted in the overthrow of the Manchu Emperor and the founding of the Republic of China in which Sun Yat-sen served as the first President.

The Republic of China established a government of elected officials, and following the final defeat of the war lords, the Republic prospered until the incident of the Marco Polo Bridge on July 7, 1937, when the Japanese war began, followed by World War II.

Communist agitation in China and the aftermath of World War II brought about the tragic rise of the Chinese People's Republic with the Republic of Free China carrying on from Taiwan under the courageous leadership of President Chiang Kai-shek.

Americans join with the people of Free China in observing the 55th anniversary of the revolution of October 10, and in their hope for the restoration of the Chinese mainland to the Republic of Free China.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT BILL SHOULD BE DEBATED

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, some legislation suffers from overexposure and some from underexposure. In my judgment, the much-lobbied, often maligned Community Development District Act—S. 2934—suffers from both maladies.

Throughout the Nation, the need for regional cooperation and comprehensive economic planning is greater than ever before. In the last several years, we have taken a number of significant steps to encourage and expand such planning in our great cities, in depressed areas, and in particularly troubled regions such as Appalachia. Our brief experience under these acts has shown us that self-help, coupled with the technical and financial resources of the States and the Federal Government, can make some measurable progress toward durable economic growth.

While we have focused on the problems of underdeveloped regions, and on the particular difficulties of our metropolitan areas, planning in our smaller towns and rural areas has grown somewhat haphazardly, under a variety of auspices and programs, and without the benefits of full congressional review. Citizens from Garrett County, Md., for example, were shuttled from office to office and from pillar to post when they sought help in water and sewage matters.

It now seems time to complete our review and provide guidance for future work by clarifying the congressional directives on how smalltown and rural planning should best be done. Debate over S. 2934 would be an appropriate occasion for such clarification, and for this reason I suggest that the majority leadership discharge its responsibility by providing for debate on the bill before adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2934 is designed to extend to rural communities, under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture, all the comprehensive assistance that is already available through the Department of Housing and Urban Development to large urban areas for regional planning. The bill as reported by the House Committee on Agriculture provides for local and State initiative in the designation and organization of a development district, and for the election of a planning board by the governing bodies of the localities comprising the district. When these requirements and others have been met, the district would be eligible for a 3-year planning grant from USDA out of funds appropriated for the 701 planning program of HUD.

It has been argued that adequate regional planning in districts embracing small towns and adjacent rural areas cannot be assured without the establishment of such new districts and new machinery. On the other hand, opponents of S. 2934 assert that sufficient planning programs are already available, through the 701 program itself, through the Economic Development Administration, through the community action programs of OEO, and through the technical and financial assistance offered by other agencies within USDA. Questions have also been raised about the compatibility of the proposed new districts with others set up under these other laws.

These are honest doubts and candid questions; they deserve answers. Neither the statements of the Secretary of Agriculture nor the debate in the other body has produced a consensus.

Mr. Speaker, without a full debate on S. 2934, we cannot determine whether this proposed program would encourage or hinder comprehensive planning; whether it would ease the burdens on local officials, or simply create new and cumbersome bureaucracy; whether it would complement or conflict with existing planning machinery; whether it would impose unduly on 701 funds; and whether this is indeed the best way to encourage expansion of rural community services.

The need for development of our rural areas is uncontested, but the way to this development is not clear. The challenge to constructive action is before the majority leadership and the administration, and the burden of failure to shape a positive program will find the same location.

TO PROHIBIT DESECRATION OF THE FLAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the measure prohibiting desecration of the American flag, I would like to urge my colleagues to join in signing the pending discharge petition No. 6 so that, hopefully, the House can act on this meritorious proposal before final adjournment.

The legislation would outlaw public mutilation of the flag, and provides penalties of not more than 1 year imprisonment and a fine of not more than $1,000.

The petition, to discharge the committee from consideration, was filed last July 20. It seems to me that the merit of the legislation is so self-evident that the matter can be swiftly resolved.

It is unbelievable that we have no existing statute outlawing mutilation of the American flag, the very symbol of our national being and heritage. Congress should move swiftly to correct this puzzling and longstanding omission.

I do not see where and how opposition could possibly arise on legislation of this nature, and there is no justifiable reason for delaying full consideration by the House. I urge Members to join those of us who have signed the petition to help bring about House passage prior to adjournment.

DOCUMENT TITLED "1961–65—THE WORST 5-YEAR PERIOD FOR THE AMERICAN FARMER IN THE HISTORY OF MODERN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Frank LeRoux, 5 years General Sales Manager of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, issued a most remarkable document titled "1961–65—The Worst 5-Year Period for the American Farmer in the History of Modern American Agriculture."

This most complete document was released at the time that Mr. LeRoux resigned from the USDA in protest. I should like to quote Mr. LeRoux in his introduction:

I came to Washington in February of 1961, having been asked to serve as general sales manager of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I did not come because of the need of a job, but rather because this appeared to be a real opportunity to be of service to the American farmer.

It was not long before I became increasingly alarmed at what I saw and learned in Washington. The direction in which agriculture was being administered raised many doubts in my mind. This report attempts no debate on the state of agriculture. It simply lays out the facts in an eye-opening graphic form so that you can form your own opinions. By almost every possible economic measurement that I can apply to our national agricultural situation, it all seems to come out about the same, the 1961–1965 period has been the worst five years in our modern agricultural history.

This remarkable document by Mr. LeRoux has not come from one who is uninformed about agriculture. He has had 30 years' experience as a farmer, businessman, and civic leader. His extensive farming experiences have included the production of both dry land and irrigated crops as well as livestock.

He owned several wheat, feed grain, hay, and livestock ranches in the Pacific Northwest which are now leased out. He was selected as one of two in December of 1960 by the Farmers for Kennedy Organization covering the 11 Western States to represent business and farm thinking in agriculture in Washington, D.C. So it is evident that Mr. LeRoux does not speak from a partisan point of view. He is a Democrat.

Mr. LeRoux in the 60-page document comes to these conclusions:

From 1961–1965 the farmers had their worst five years in history. They received these remarkable lowest marks: lowest share of gross national products; lowest return in gross sales; lowest return in total capital investment; lowest return in capital investment per farm; lowest share of the consumer dollar; lowest share of the food dollar; lowest level of parity of income; lowest return for farmers versus government salaries; lowest return for farming versus other major businesses; and lowest performance on campaign promises.

He concludes the presentation by explanation and by graph of the worst 5 years for the American farmer in the history of modern American Agriculture by this interesting page:

The Agriculture Secretary, speaking in Spencer, Iowa, on June 18, 1966, has this to say, quote:

"Some misinformation may come to you innocently, passed on by the unknowing or the unthinking. Some misleading reports have appeared in certain big city newspapers. And still other faulty information has been exploited for political purposes, in the election year, by those who would like nothing better than to break up the effective working relationship between the farmers and their Government.

"So beware of those who belittle the progress we've made these last five years. Remember that most of them are the same people who were telling you the farmer never had it so good in those bleak years between 1952 and 1960 when prices dropped through the floor and surpluses pushed through the ceiling. Their real purpose is not to improve the farmers' prices . . . but to destroy the voluntary programs we have struggled so hard to build. So beware!"

The damaging flood of misinformation that has been passed on to the American public and to the world over the past five years is just what we have been covering in this report. The facts and figures clearly point out where most of the misinformation has been coming from and the detrimental effect it has had.

The record has shown just what can happen when an agency of government is exploited for political purpose, and it has shown to what lengths this exploitation can be carried when success is written into almost every departmental statement regardless of the facts.

It has been the lot of the farmer throughout history to face the many uncertainties of his profession. With but a bare minimum of protection, many of the unpredictable happenings of nature can wipe him out almost overnight.

These things the farmer deals with as a matter of course. Only when he sees the economy of the nation as a whole continually moving ahead without him, and his own

agricultural officials dealing with his problems in an unfair, unrealistic and unfriendly manner does he become disturbed.

In spite of all this, the farmer has stuck to his task and has accomplished the most outstanding agricultural achievements in the history of the world and is entitled to more than just idle political chatter.

Thus concludes Mr. LeRoux in his remarkable exposé of how farmers have suffered under the present administration.

What Mr. LeRoux has outlined in such great detail is just what many of us have been saying for years. As you may recall, I addressed the House Members on this very subject on April 26, 1966.

Now, hard on the heels of Mr. LeRoux's disclosures, comes further proof of what he, my colleagues, and I have been saying for months.

In the past few weeks the price of wheat has dropped a dramatic 30 to 35 cents a bushel, one of the sharpest breaks in history. This gives proof to Mr. LeRoux's charges that the present administration is engaged in a deliberate campaign to depress the market price of wheat.

It came about this way. Leaks and rumors out of Washington by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and other administration leaders touched off that collapse.

There was the published report that the U.S. Government had informed its embassies abroad that 25 percent less wheat will be available under foreign aid programs this year and that recipient nations should not be encouraged to ask for larger allocations. There has been no official confirmation of this, but the rumor is apparently widely accepted in trade circles.

It seems strange that the market price remained strong until the majority of winter wheat farmers had planted their increased wheat acreage. Now that the crop has been planted in many areas, it would appear that the USDA is again pulling the rug out from under the wheat producers. The recent drastic decline would indicate that.

It is clear to me that the conspiracy to depress farm prices runs all through the USDA. It is a tragedy indeed that the USDA should be used as an economic tool by the present administration to try to take the heat off its inflation-producing policies.

IN DEFENSE OF THE AMERICAN WAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in defense of the American way of life. It is with regret that I recognize the need for its defense. Today we are overwhelmed with criticism of America with no equating of what is good in America.

I personally am sickened by beatniks—educated in the greatest schools in the world on scholarships paid for by American taxpayers—debasing their flag and giving aid and comfort to the enemies of freedom.

I am disheartened by Americans in positions of national leadership who will take any position for a few words of condescending acceptance from our enemies and fair-weather friends, and disgusted by those who condone mob violence and make public statements calculated to bring disrespect to our great country and aid to the enemy.

I am fed up with nations saved from their own stupidity by the blood of American fighting men and American dollars—nations we have fed, clothed, and rebuilt—repaying our kindness by lecturing the United States as though it were a truant child.

Right here on Capitol Hill a few weeks ago we saw beatniks, Communists, hoodlums and self-styled intellectuals violently challenging a committee of the U.S. Congress. They tried to break up proceedings during which witnesses were being questioned on proposed legislation to make it illegal to send aid to our enemies or to block troop and military supply trains.

RACIAL TENSION AND ANTIWAR MOVEMENT

Some demagog occasionally compares the racial struggle in the United States with our involvement in Vietnam. There is no philosophical connection between the riots, murder, and arson in Watts, Cleveland, Chicago, and New York, and the war in Vietnam; but enemies of the United States—within and without—have encouraged both those riots and the antiwar demonstrations in a vicious plan to bring disrespect for America abroad and shame to the people at home.

The Communists have rephrased the old saying, "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad," to "Whom the Communists would destroy they first make ashamed."

OLD-FASHIONED LAW ENFORCEMENT WOULD GAIN RESPECT

America should keep in mind that lawlessness begets lawlessness. We cannot tolerate the violation of law just because the violator does not approve of his country or its laws. Jesse James, Bluebeard, Jack the Ripper, Judas Iscariot, and Benedict Arnold obeyed the laws which they approved and disobeyed the laws which they did not approve.

Too many of our leaders have condoned violence and crime committed in the name of social or philosophical ills. This tendency toward approval of unrest certainly will bring chaos and anarchy if it continues. We cannot achieve the orderly society to which all law-abiding citizens are entitled until all law violators are treated the same—firmly but fairly—and no longer mollycoddled.

ANTI-AMERICAN DEMONSTRATIONS

Our immediate concern is with anti-U.S. demonstrations in this country. America is in Vietnam for a sincere and unselfish purpose. There can be honest argument on whether we should be there or whether we have bungled, but there can be no doubt that the American people and their Government are sincere in their effort to prevent the destruction of freedom in South Vietnam.

Demonstrations abroad can in most instances be discounted as directed by foreign governments or the Communist Party itself. But there is a strong tie between them all, in both purpose and procedure, no matter where they occur: Peking, Moscow, Budapest, Warsaw, Paris, London, Cleveland, Washington, Ann Arbor, Berkeley, or at the Communist convention in New York City. Regardless of the language, the signs all say the same thing: "End the War in Vietnam. Withdraw the Troops Now."

We have seen hundreds of student and nonstudent demonstrations in the United States, in all parts of the country, and in all sizes. It must also be added that some of these student demonstrations have had leaders who are in no way connected with student bodies or universities. Generally, student demonstrations get the most publicity.

The actions of the demonstrators have covered a wide range. They carry the Vietcong flag and spit on and mutilate the American flag. They have collected and sent money to Ho Chi Minh, along with messages of support and encouragement for the Vietcong. They have blocked troop and supply trains, publicly burned their draft cards, broken up patriotic award meetings, disrupted campus ceremonial functions, rioted in congressional committee hearings, staged sitdown strikes in the Department of State, and in the administrative offices of various colleges where they are being educated.

Ironically, a large number of them are being educated with Government aid. A University of California professor named Smale, who was active in protest work at Berkeley, was awarded a National Science Foundation grant, went to Moscow for a mathematics meeting and in front of the news correspondents from Hanoi, bitterly attacked his own country. Since the incident, the National Science Foundation has refused to withdraw Smale's grant and so he will return to Russia next year.

When Vice President HUMPHREY visited Australia recently, the leader of the anti-U.S. demonstration was an American woman studying in that country on a taxpayer-financed scholarship.

Some demonstrators are quiet and peaceful, neat and well-dressed. Others are threatening, vile, dirty and generally repulsive. But the demand is always the same: that the United States get out of Vietnam.

COMMUIST PRESS LAUDS ANTI-U.S. DEMONSTRATIONS

Anti-American demonstrations within the United States are of particular interest to the Communist news media, who waste no time in giving these demonstrations full publicity and take a special delight in quoting antiwar remarks made by prominent Americans.

The Communists appear to think that the wave of protest and demonstrations means that we cannot long withstand this heavy internal pressure. The enemy believes our will to fight is breaking down and they expect some mammoth social revolution to occur in the United States that will force our Government to withdraw from Vietnam.

The damage this totally wrong evaluation has done cannot be measured. It has encouraged the Vietcong to fight on, to pour more men into the fight, because

to them we seem on the verge of internal collapse, unable to fight much longer.

Personally, I have too great a faith in the will and moral fiber of the American people to think that any significant number have been influenced by these demonstrations.

WHAT HAS AMERICA DONE TO JUSTIFY THESE ATTACKS?

Before believing and yielding to these anti-American attacks on our great and mighty country, we should ask ourselves, what has America done to deserve this?

In the last two centuries, the United States has produced the greatest, the most generous, the wealthiest, and most powerful nation on earth—a nation whose problems are those of surplus rather than those of scarcity, a nation that has attained for its citizens a higher standard of living than the world has ever known and a greater freedom for its people, a nation that has contributed more to the assistance of mankind than any other nation.

Let us also remember that four times in this century the United States has sent its finest young men abroad to protect the freedom of others and has later rebuilt the ravages caused by the war, restoring the economy of our friends and enemies alike. There are few nations on earth which have not received U.S. assistance in the feeding and care of their unfortunates. Every nation in the world today that is a sworn enemy of the United States has, at one time or another, accepted our assistance. Humbly proud of our great resources and of the great opportunity that God gave us, we have lent a helping hand. All of this has been done without desire for one foot of territory or one dollar of another country's goods.

America has certainly at times been foolish and too altruistic in overextending our aid, assisting those who do not merit our assistance, and trusting those who do not deserve trust, but our mistakes have been those of kindness and faith in those who do not measure up. Our actions are in absolute contrast to the insatiable greed and cunning manipulations of the Communist countries whose cause our demonstrators are supporting whether intentionally or unintentionally.

WHY DO AMERICANS DEMONSTRATE AGAINST THEIR OWN COUNTRY?

It has been difficult to understand why Americans should give aid and encouragement to our enemies. No doubt some of the demonstrators are, in plain language, traitors. It is a harsh word, but these are harsh times, and the consequences of these demonstrations are harsh. Every generation has its traitors. Christ had Judas among the Disciples; Washington had Benedict Arnold. Fortunately there are relatively few traitors, but often the treacherous acts of a few, if they are in a position of trust, seriously harm the actions of the many who are loyal.

Some people turn against their own country because they bitterly resent the success of others and are perpetually against everything. Others cannot appreciate, or adjust to, their native land. Others will join anything for the thrill of it, and lend their support without any real regard or concern for what it is or what it means. And some individuals who get involved with antisocial protest movements simply lack the courage and stamina that living in a hostile, unsettled world demands.

Some demonstrators are sincere. They believe that their marching and demonstrating will help to bring peace.

There was no battle at Valley Forge where the clash of arms might have stirred men to action. But enough of our poorly fed and poorly equipped troops had the courage and dedication to remain there throughout the terrible winter to carry our country through to its independence.

Can freedom be handed to posterity or must each generation go through its own Valley Forge to earn it? We cannot be sure. There are trying times in this period of our existence, just as there have been in the past. All we can be sure of is that freedom requires bravery and strength of heart, and the finest and best in those who would keep it.

SO-CALLED NEW LEFT IS NOT NEW

The name generally given to certain segments of the rebellious youth movement in this country is new left. Some persons are fond of thinking it is merely a spontaneous, amorphous collection of restless young people. It is not. Most of its leaders are activists, instigated, controlled, and manipulated by disciplined Communists adhering to Marxist philosophy.

The theories of the new left are not new; they are basically the theories of communism, as old as slavery and just as deadly. This ideology has been forced upon the people of Russia, China and other countries, and its leaders and exponents would force it on all mankind. It is a form of overall rule which our ancestors overthrew back in feudal days. A privileged few, under this system, dispense the necessities of life to the serfs.

Milovan Djilas, a Yugoslav, one of the most brilliant Communist leaders of all time and a Marxist student, finally realized that communism as practiced today is a selfish deviation from Karl Marx's famous dictum:

> From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs.

In his book, "The New Class," Djilas, referring to the Communist elite, had this to say:

> In communism, power and ownership are almost always in the same hands . . . This is a class of Communist leaders whose power over men is the most complete known to history . . . Its methods of rule fill some of the most shameful pages in history . . . When the new Communist hierarchy leaves the historical scene—and this must happen—there will be less sorrow over its passing than there was for any other class before it. Smothering everything except what suited its ego, it has condemned itself to failure and shameful ruin.

NEW LEFT DEVELOPS COMMON CRIMINALS

The best-known student demonstrations originated at the University of California's Berkeley campus. It is a little difficult to see how some aspects of this so-called student revolt in 1964 could lead to higher student ethics as some of our starry-eyed liberals have maintained. I could not see a high moral tone in the filthy-speech movement and some other equally antisocial activities.

Many people looked fondly on the student revolt as a striving for higher ideals and individual identity. However, 1 year after the revolt, campus crime rose 39 percent, compared to the city's 11-percent increase. Almost one-half of all arrests in Berkeley in 1965 were students—3,000 of them.

Burglaries and thefts skyrocketed. The Maoist student group bragged about shoplifting. The head of the new left student party was found guilty of stealing from a bookstore and blamed it on the system, whatever that was supposed to mean. A nonstudent founder of the movement dedicated to obscenity was arrested for shoplifting. In the words of a detailed article in a national magazine:

> Guerrilla warfare was waged against small storekeepers, aged landladies, the university's grading system and selective service.

Now these are the acts of common criminals, dregs of society, who prey on their law-abiding fellow citizens. It is high time for our Government to stop making excuses for this sort of behavior—and all other law-breaking as well—and treat the question of maintaining a lawful society as a matter of strict law enforcement, not some sort of game with automatic handicaps put on the police.

NEW LEFT WOULD DESTROY AMERICAN HERITAGE, GREATNESS, AND PRIDE

The new left espouses change—any change—and would disregard all lessons of the past. It even has changed the accepted meaning of words. Just a few years ago, in the game of cops and robbers, the cops were the good guys and the criminals the bad guys. Apparently, the philosophy of the new left would reverse this. The goals of the new left would bring disrespect to law enforcement officers and scorn to the concepts which generations of American schoolchildren have been taught to revere as part of our heritage. Words such as "patriotism" become, in the mouths of the new left, an epithet to be coupled with the foulest of obscenities. Terms like "love of country, of home, and of church" are denounced as obsolete and parochial.

NEW LEFT FINDS NO WRONG IN COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Members of the new left see nothing but unmitigated evil in America's involvement in Vietnam, yet keep silent on the Communist record of aggression which has destroyed the freedom of half the world. They ignore the millions in subjection under the Communist yoke and the thousands who died in the Hungarian revolt. There is nothing on the demonstration placards to show sympathy for the thousands of women and children murdered by the Vietcong.

Is theirs a sincere protest and dissent against evil in the world? No, it is not,

and no amount of distorted logic can make it so.

WHAT WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM WITHOUT ADEQUATE SAFEGUARDS WOULD REALLY MEAN

It has been made plain time and again that if North Vietnam would cease its aggression against South Vietnam, our troops, literally, would come home tomorrow. Our commitment there is of long standing and, if our enemies suddenly found our commitment and our word to be the false promise of a paper tiger—which is exactly what withdrawal would lead them to believe—America would truly become the paper tiger of all time. Our enemies would despise us and our friends would not trust us. The dangers that would face us then would make our present situation look safe and sound by comparison.

Mao Tse-tung has said that when the Vietcong defeats the United States, wars of liberation can succeed anywhere. More is at stake in South Vietnam than just the welfare of the countries now involved.

The new left demonstrators constantly demand that we negotiate with the enemy, ignoring the fact, as does the enemy, that we have requested such negotiations hundreds of times. They also ignore the fact that the North Vietnamese and Vietcong need only to withdraw north of the 17th parallel, as they agreed to do at the Geneva Conference in 1954. The new left offers no logical path to negotiations except our complete and total surrender.

ERRORS IN VIETNAM DO NOT DETRACT FROM ALTRUISTIC GOALS OF THE UNITED STATES

Much criticism of the Vietnam war is based on errors made in our prosecution of the war itself. Some aspects of the war have been inept causing embarrassment and loss of prestige at home and abroad for the United States. But none of this should overshadow our purpose for being in Vietnam, nor the unselfish goals that our commitment seeks to fulfill.

We have been assisting South Vietnam by supplies and training advice since the Truman administration, but not until December 1961—after the Bay of Pigs fiasco—were the first Americans deliberately killed by the Vietcong.

We have given justification to paper tiger charges from Peking and Hanoi by announcing a containment—which really means no win—policy to meet aggression. Any oriental military mind sees this at once as a clear indication of a physical and moral weakness which can only lead to ultimate surrender on our part.

The Secretary of Defense has often set certain dates by which the war would be ended. I am certain he was sincere and I believe that we could have had victory by these dates if our defense establishment had displayed the same will and determination that the enemy has shown. We have continually increased our troop strength but have not used them with sufficient force to bring victory and stop the war. Such action is like cutting off 1 inch of the dog's tail at a time so it will not hurt him so much.

A typical action by the Secretary of Defense that has injured the morale of our Armed Forces, disheartened our friends and allies, and encouraged our enemies was the refusal of the Defense Department to allow the destruction of enemy surface-to-air missile sites during the 3-month period in 1965 that they were being constructed. It was only a matter of time until missiles would be fired from those bases at American planes. But even today if an American plane is fired upon from one of those bases the pilot is forbidden to return fire if the base is located in the enemy sanctuary created by Secretary McNamara. Needless to say, the enemy has located a substantial number of its bases within that sanctuary.

UNLESS "NO WIN" POLICY IS CHANGED, WE WILL NEVER ACHIEVE A MEANINGFUL PEACE

This is a unique approach to warfare, this idea of containment, but it was warned against by the great Chinese military writer, Sun Tzu, over 25 centuries ago:

When you engage in actual fighting, if victory is long in coming, the men's weapons will grow dull and their ardour will be damped . . . Thus, though we have heard of stupid haste in war, cleverness has never been seen associated with long delays.

The Pentagon planners have failed in several critical aspects including inadequate plans for procurement, transportation and delivery of sufficient supplies, ammunition, armament, and equipment; emasculation of our Reserve Forces; inability to approximate the extent of our involvement; closing of bases; cessation of manufacture of certain needed military items, such as planes; failure to properly train and build up adequate forces. This is not our grandest hour.

We are sincere in our search for peace, but we deal with an enemy whose goals and procedures seem to escape our understanding. The only thing our enemies respect is determination to use our available forces for victory. That is the only persuasion that our enemies understand; nothing else will bring the North Vietnamese and Communists to the peace table with any intention of working for real peace. Apparently the Pentagon does not understand this fact, or it chooses to ignore it.

ANTI-AMERICAN DEMONSTRATIONS PART OF ANCIENT PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE TO BREAK WILL TO RESIST

The Communist world has deliberately taken its present course—a psychological war of nerves—to break our morale and will to resist. This art of war was developed in China, where it became a way of life and was written down 25 centuries ago by Sun Tzu, the great Chinese military writer. This military philosophy was carried to Russia by the Mongols; it still dominates military planning in Peking and Hanoi.

Sun Tzu in his book, "The Art of War," once stated:

Reduce the hostile chiefs by inflicting damage on them.

This statement was expounded upon 1,000 years ago by Chia Lin, another Chinese military writer, in his commentary on Sun Tzu:

Introduce only traitors into his country, that the government policy may be rendered futile. Foment intrigue and deceit, and thus sow dissension between the ruler and his ministers. By means of every artful contrivance, cause deterioration amongst his men and waste of his treasure.

Sun Tzu's book, "The Art of War," treats the use of spies and traitors in some detail. Chapter 8 is entitled, "The Use of Spies," and its several subtitles include "Local Spies," "Inward Spies," "Converted Spies," and "Making Use of Officials of the Enemy."

Tu Mu's—another Chinese military writer—commentary on Sun Tzu enumerates the following classes—including both civilian and military officials—who do good service as spies:

Men who are aggrieved at being in subordinate positions or who have been passed over in the distribution of posts, others who are anxious that their side should be defeated in order that they may have a chance to display their ability and talents, fickle turncoats who always want to have a foot in each boat.

Spies, subversion, it is all the same. I believe you could find many of the new left among such malcontents and traitors. Our country may have made mistakes over the years in the conduct of its foreign policy, but we certainly have done nothing that would justify such an outpouring of hatred and contempt that anti-American demonstrators heap upon us.

WE MUST NOT IGNORE THE PLANS OF THE ENEMY

We had sufficient warning in Hitler's "Mein Kampf" to give us a clear picture of what he would do and pretty much how he would do it, but we ignored it. The price of our ignorance was hideous.

As an officer in the Asiatic-Pacific theater during World War II, I became interested in and carefully read and studied Japanese military philosophy. This was of great help to me in understanding our adversary at that time.

It has been said that you must study your enemy to understand him. Today I subscribe to the Worker and the Peking Review. I have in my personal library the works of Mao Tse-tung and also "Primer for Revolt," the work of the North Vietnamese military writer Truong Chinh, which is probably the best book on the philosophy of guerrilla warfare ever written.

ENEMY "SONGS OF HATE" SHOULD GIVE US PRIDE

If every American would study the works, thoughts, and philosophies of our enemies—and their daily actions, statements and pronouncements—it would be clear that their main purpose and goal is to break us down from within. They cannot hope to vanquish us by their military or economic might, both of which are far less than ours. Once we see the role of anti-American demonstrations and all aspects of the hate America movement—at home and abroad—in this general pattern of strategy, then we could well consider it for what it is and know how to meet it. Our enemy's attacks against us should arouse

pride in Americans rather than shame, for these vile attacks demonstrate their fear of our freedom and of our economic and military strength.

WE MUST RETAIN CONFIDENCE IN OURSELVES AND OUR COUNTRY

I believe all we have to fear today is loss of confidence in ourselves and in our country. We cannot and must not allow our enemies, by whatever means, to shake this faith. We must never allow the enemy to guide our actions or our destiny.

The experiences of the past form accurate guideposts for the road ahead. Many fail to look for or to read these guides. Some suffer from myopia that distorts the signs. Others do not see them at all, due to their own egomania. Even more are so involved in selfishness and greed that they see mirages, rather than realities. In each case, they are doomed to destruction.

In an address to Congress in 1793, George Washington said:

> There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be . . . lost by the reputation for weakness. If we desire peace, it must be known that at all times we are ready for war.

ENEMY VICTORY AT THE CONFERENCE TABLE

It is becoming increasingly clear that the enemy soon will seek a victory at the conference table which they know they cannot win on the battlefield. American armed action in Vietnam, while principally a position of containment, has gradually expanded until there are battles going on over most of South Vietnam. As American forces have gained in battlefield experience they are proving themselves equal to the Vietcong in jungle fighting and certainly superior in all other facets of the war. The enemy has suffered heavy casualties and is finding it more and more difficult to supply food and ammunition to its guerrilla forces.

Because of the bloody purge going on within its own country and its problems of decreasing production, Red China will not enter the war in Vietnam unless convinced that the United States is a paper tiger. Other evidence that China is reluctant to increase her participation is the fact that while today she is as weak or weaker than she has ever been in several years, she has recently issued her most vile threats since the beginning of the war. China, for centuries, has followed the military advice of Sun Tzu, who said:

> All warfare is based on deception. When you are near you must make the enemy believe that you are far away; when ye are far away, you must make him believe that you are near.

Red China's friends in Europe are now placing increased demands on the United States to stop our bombing and try to negotiate peace, ignoring the fact that the enemy is proclaiming louder and louder that they will never reach agreement with the United States. It appears that the enemy will attempt to gain their conference table victory either during or soon after President Johnson's coming trip to southeast Asia.

MANILA CONFERENCE CAN WORK TO AMERICAN SUCCESS OR TO HER DISMAL FAILURE

There is mounting evidence that we are approaching the hour of decision in the Vietnam war. Despite our errors of the past, it is obvious that we can win a military victory. The slowly increasing confidence in America from the countries of southeast Asia is strong evidence of that fact.

The plan of President Marcos of the Philippines to hold an all-southeast Asia conference on Vietnam, and his invitation to President Johnson to attend, could be of great value. It could also be the groundwork for what would appear to be a satisfactory peace but what would be, in reality, another Communist victory at the conference table.

The countries of southeast Asia are vitally interested in the outcome of the Vietnam war, for on that outcome may depend their own freedom. They fear China's territorial ambitions and want her aggression blocked. Yet none of these countries, without unity with a power such as the United States, could withstand Chinese aggression. Because of their weakness and their concern over our reluctance to win, they have been cautious in showing friendship toward the United States or in taking a firm stand against China. They will not openly support our position in the defense of freedom until they are satisfied that we are sincere—the answer to which neither our friends nor our enemies are certain.

IS THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP SINCERE?

It seems harsh to question the sincerity of our President on a matter of such vital importance to America as a meaningful peace in Vietnam. But failing to recognize that the timing of the President's trip—just before an election in which his Vietnam policies are a leading issue—is being questioned by many Americans would be playing the ostrich and sticking our heads into the sand.

The fact that the Chief of State has the sounding board of the news media raises additional questions on the timing of this trip.

We are all aware that in the dramatic move he is making the President will dominate the news media for the entire month before the elections. Will he use that media to bring the truth to America or will it be used for partisan purposes to bring a selfish view to the American electorate?

Only time will bring the true answer. The American people can only hope that the President is sincere and that this is not merely a game to gain temporary political strength by pretending a peace which is in fact phony or a victory which is in reality a defeat.

Regardless of our personal views, we must trust the President in his trip to southeast Asia. Any open demonstration of a lack of trust at this time can avail nothing except further embarrassment to our country in foreign affairs. We must keep in mind that by our Constitution the President is the architect of our foreign policy and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. No one can act in this field except the President. We must pray that he will sincerely and prayerfully represent America and the interests of freedom; that he will remember the blood that American boys have shed in Vietnam; that he will keep ever in mind the errors of trust which were made at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam; and that he will not make commitments for the future which will give nothing to the cause of America and freedom except dissolution and despair. Let us pray that he will remember Santayana's words:

> Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

THE ROAD FOR THE UNITED STATES

Freedom is not a devisable thing, nor is it something to be carelessly and arbitrarily tampered with or restricted under the cloak of national necessity. We must—and we will—keep our tolerance of belief and our right of free speech. But tolerance must not extend to latent treason and subversion.

America is the strongest and greatest country on earth and there is no reason why we cannot keep it that way. We have the strongest economy and strongest military might that the world has ever known, but to properly utilize these forces to the benefit of ourselves and all mankind we must maintain our spiritual strength and keep it as great or greater than our economic or military strength. We must fulfill our responsibility and our destiny, but in doing this we must act with commonsense, keeping ever in mind our debt to our own country and our own people and not overextending our capabilities by mixing in controversies all over the world.

I have no fears for our country if we remain determined toward strength and freedom. I do not doubt the basic wisdom, good faith, and intentions of the American people. Above all, we must retain this faith in ourselves. I firmly believe that we will meet problems that arise in a manner that leaves us stronger within as well as without. Nor do I fear that in haste we will approve ill-considered, totalitarian measures that resemble those of our enemy and by their adoption defeat our very purpose.

As a nation and as a people we must and will move ahead. We must accept change when it is for the good but refuse it as a temporary expedient leading only to mediocrity or destruction. We must keep our eyes on the star of hope and dedication to a better world, but at the same time plant our feet on the solid ground of reality.

FLOOD INSURANCE

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time Hurricane Inez has finally moved inland causing the destruction we all knew it would.

It has, as all hurricanes have, once again dramatically illustrated the need for a national program of flood insurance for our American homeowners who live along our coastlines that have proven to be in the path of killer hurricanes.

That such a program is needed today is clearly evident. You do not have to convince the thousands of homeowners on the Gulf of Mexico that flood insurance is needed.

The residents all along the southern part of the United States waited anxiously for 2 weeks in fear that their homes were in the path of the hurricane. Fortunately they were spared. Unfortunately many citizens of Mexico felt the brunt of the storm.

I have introduced a bill (H.R. 18213) that would provide a national program of flood insurance and I urge the support of it from all Members of the House.

I consider this one of the most important bills I have introduced in my 22 years in Congress.

The bill would create a joint Government-private insurance industry program of flood insurance for property owners. The Boggs bill springs from recommendations listed in a 9-month study ordered by Congress in the wake of Hurricane Betsy. The study was part of the Southeast Disaster Relief Act of 1965, which has provided more than $120 million in loans to more than 26,000 hurricane victims.

The legislation provides that the National Government:

First. Pay the difference between reasonable premium rates on policies of flood insurance issued under the bill and the actuarial cost of such insurance;

Second. Assume the obligation to pay all claims in excess of a fixed amount covered by insurance issued under the bill in return for the payment of a reasonable fee by the companies offering such insurance; and

Third. Make loans at reasonable rates to replenish the reserves of an insurance company which are depleted because of heavy losses on property covered by the bill.

The measure specifies that preference be given to those areas and States expressing positive interest in flood insurance and urges cooperation with State and local planning bodies in developing long-range, land-use plans.

The bill also provides that the Government agency directing the program, "to the maximum extent practicable, shall use the facilities and services of private organizations and persons authorized to engage in the insurance business under the laws of any State * * *." It does prohibit the issuance of new insurance on a home where flood insurance can otherwise be obtained at a reasonable cost.

In order to minimize the hardship caused by floods, the Government is directed to encourage private insurance companies to develop nonsubsidized flood insurance programs. The bill directs the Government to identify within 2 years all flood plain areas, including coastal areas, which have special flood hazards and vulnerabilities.

This bill is a means to plan ahead for future hurricanes, and that is what insurance is for. When private enterprise like the insurance industry cannot offer insurance at reasonable rates, it is time for the National Government to establish a program to protect potential victims from the devastation of flood waters.

VIETNAM IN THE BALANCE

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the lead article in the current issue of Foreign Affairs, entitled "Vietnam in the Balance," is by Bernard B. Fall, professor of international relations at Howard University. Professor Fall is a French citizen who served in the French underground during World War II. He has visited North and South Vietnam on various occasions and has written six books on the subject.

In my judgment, Professor Fall's article in Foreign Affairs is must reading for anyone who is trying to understand what is going on in Vietnam today. He points out with what seems to me to be irrefutable logic that the National Liberation Front is a major entity in the picture, whose interests and policies do not necessarily coincide with those of Hanoi, and he argues that a major element of our policy should be to "make the Saigon government and the Liberation Front leaders the center of all future negotiations, with the United States and North Vietnam in a backup position, just as was the case with the Laotian factions and third powers at the Geneva Conference of 1961–62."

Professor Fall's article was written before Ambassador Goldberg's recent outstanding address at the United Nations, but it remains a timely and cogent presentation of some of the basic realities in Vietnam. In my judgment, we will never be able to untie the bloody knot of Vietnam unless we face up to these realities.

Professor Fall's article follows:

[From Foreign Affairs magazine, Oct. 1966]

VIETNAM IN THE BALANCE

(By Bernard B. Fall)

It may well be the opinion of future historians that the small but fierce engagements which in late 1965 pitted newly-arrived American troops against the *Chu-Luc* (Main Force) units of the Viet Cong and of North Viet Nam were the First Battle of the Marne of the Vietnamese War. The Battle of the Marne in September 1914 halted the seemingly irresistible onslaught of the Kaiser and thus foreclosed the possibility of an immediate end of the war through a collapse of the French; but the Great War, with its immense human and material losses, still ground on for four years and the enemy would often again come close to victory. The same happened in World War II before Moscow in the winter of 1941, or at Guadalcanal a few months later: no "turning point" as yet, but a halt to the runaway disaster.

In South Viet Nam, after being stopped at Chu-Lai, Plei-Mé and the Ia-Drang, the Communist regulars lost enough of their momentum for the time being not to be able to bring about the military and political collapse of the Saigon government late in 1965—a situation which would have altogether closed out the American "option" of the conflict. But just as at the Marne 52 years ago, or before Moscow a quarter-century ago, nothing had been decided as yet. Years—perhaps a decade—of hard fighting could still be ahead. And the political collapse of the government in Saigon is still a distinct possibility. It is, however, important to assess in detail the military and political elements on which this precarious balance rests and what *real* possibilities for manœuvre (as against wishful thinking on one side or party rhetoric on the other) exist at present in the Viet Nam situation.

II

On the American and South Vietnamese side, two main events dominated the scene between the first deployment of major American combat units in September 1965 and the Saigon government's attempt at providing itself with the beginnings of a representative base in September 1966: the government of Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, by surviving for more than one year, provided planners both in Saigon and Washington with a political "peg" on which to hang some of the reform programs deemed essential to any counter-insurgency effort worthy of the name; and also the increasing effort by the United States to shift the whole main burden of the war as far north as possible. The latter was being achieved by committing the bulk of the American forces to the Central Vietnamese mountain and coastal areas under the jurisdiction of the South Vietnamese II Corps, and by "raising," in the words of President Johnson, "the price of aggression" which North Viet Nam would have to pay for her participation in the war. What this meant became clear on June 29, 1966, when American bombers attacked oil storage depots within the city limits of Hanoi and Haiphong and unleashed an air offensive outstripping in intensity most of the bombing operations of World War II.[1]

The decisions which led to this situation were based on the clear realization in Washington that, earlier optimistic predictions to the contrary notwithstanding, the South Vietnamese were in the process of being defeated in an operation which was a carbon copy *not* of the French defeat of 1954 but of the Chinese Nationalist defeat on the mainland in 1948–49. And exactly as in the case of China, it was American prestige which now was at stake. Opposite views were strong even within the American military, however, where advisory support for friendly local ground troops was considered with favor over the commitment of large American ground forces. As late as August 1964, that viewpoint was clearly expounded as official policy in a pamphlet jointly issued by the State and Defense Departments, which explained the Viet Nam problem in question-and-answer form. The answer to the then hypothetical question as to why no

[1] According to Secretary of Defense McNamara, the 1966 "bombing plan" for Viet Nam involves an expenditure of 638,000 tons of aerial munitions. In comparison, the whole Pacific theater expended 600,000 tons throughout all of World War II.

American combat units were committed to Viet Nam reads in full as follows:

"The military problem facing the armed forces of South Viet Nam at this time is not primarily one of manpower. Basically it is a problem of acquiring training, equipment, skills, and organization suited to combating the type of aggression that menaces their country. Our assistance is designed to supply these requirements.

"The Viet Cong use terrorism and armed attack as well as propaganda. The Government forces must respond decisively on all appropriate levels, tasks that can best be handled by Vietnamese. U.S. combat units would face several obvious disadvantages in a guerrilla war situation of this type in which knowledge of terrain, language, and local customs is especially important. In addition, their introduction would provide ammunition for Communist propaganda which falsely proclaims that the United States is conducting a 'white man's war' against Asians." [2]

That perceptive statement of the basic liabilities involved in using massive numbers of white troops is beyond doubt as true today as it was in 1964. One can, therefore, only guess at the sudden deterioration inside South Viet Nam—or the suddenness with which the worsening situation was finally perceived in Washington—which compelled the Administration to do in 1965 what it felt was unwise only six months earlier. But the decision was made to commit large American forces to the land battle as being the lesser of two evils: 300,000 were in Viet Nam by September 1966, and another 100,000 could be there by the end of the current year.

The immediate net result of that American influx was that the brunt of the major encounters was now to be borne by the American troops instead of the South Vietnamese, just as on the other side infiltrated regular units of the People's Army of Viet Nam (PAVN) now assumed the larger part in engagements in the II Corps area and the northern section of III Corps. The argument that South Vietnamese forces still suffered heavy casualties—they suffered 11,000 dead and 21,600 wounded in 1965—must be modified to include the fact that the bulk of the South Vietnamese Army (ARVN) casualties are suffered passively, *i.e.* by units garrisoned in forts or ambushed on roads rather than engaged in offensive operations.[3] A 1965 net desertion rate of about 93,000 out of about 600,000 troops, which by all accounts further increased during the first half of 1966, also indicates that the ARVN has yet to become a stabilized force, let alone a diplomatically stabilizing factor in the way the South Korean Army became during the negotiations of 1952–53. How much indeed the war had become "American" is also shown by the relatively high casualties suffered by the U.S. combat forces in the field: out of a total of 240,000 troops in Viet Nam in the spring of 1966, about 50,000 at most were actual combat troops. Yet they had suffered, in less than one year, the bulk of America's 4,000 dead and 21,000 wounded. Losses of combat leaders were even more severe, as shown by statistics covering 1965 only, when it turned out that the officer death rate was 23 percent, as against 5 percent for U.S. Forces during the Korean and Second World Wars,[4] while the French officer death rate during the Indochina War amounted to about 3 percent.

On the civilian side, a thorough perusal of the testimony given by senior Administration officials before various Congressional committees shows that, like Abbé Sieyès during the French Revolution, the Saigon government had survived but had done little else besides. To be sure, some particularly optimistic observers already felt a year ago, a bare three months after Ky's rise to power, that "there is genuine enthusiasm generated by the imaginative programme worked out by [the government's] civilian advisers," and that "a social, economic, and political revolution" was finally under way.[5] The hard statistics and observed facts paint a somewhat different picture. Economically, the country experienced a 130 percent inflation in less than a year, which finally led to a strong devaluation of the South Vietnamese currency in an effort to keep prices from rising uncontrolledly. And while there are, as in the past, hopes of future improvement, they have as yet to materialize in Viet Nam for anyone who is not in the war-economy circuit—that is, working for the big building contractors who construct runways and bases, or, for instance, serving as a barmaid. Land reform has never gotten off the ground; there have been at least four distinct reforms, all of which stalled, over the past decade or so. While the Diem régime expropriated a total 457,000 hectares (2.47 acres per hectare) and the French Government gave South Viet Nam between 225,000 to 246,000 hectares of formerly privately French-owned land as early as 1958, only some 248,000 hectares have thus far been redistributed, according to a recent A.I.D. report,[6] *i.e.* the equivalent of the French-owned land. According to a recent American observer who was an adviser in Viet Nam, much of the unredistributed land was kept under government control and "commonly put up for rent to the highest bidder." [7]

While it is obvious that the middle of a war is not the best place to start such reforms, it must be realized that in Viet Nam the choice no longer exists, for the reforms are as essential to success as ammunition for the howitzers—in fact, more so, because the failures of land reform create an almost hopeless vicious circle. With only 25 percent of the non-urban population under effective government control, a large mass of landless peasants stands to lose a great deal the day Saigon reëstablishes control over the countryside and thus restores the old tenant-landlord relationship, as invariably happened in the past wherever government troops reoccupied a given area. (In fact, in some such areas the landlords arrived in the supply trucks of the troops and some unit commanders could be persuaded to launch a clearing operation in an area where the returning landlords promised to share the proceeds with them.) Hence, the certitude of a genuinely "peasant-oriented" land reform, including a freeze on land holdings already distributed by the Viet Cong, would do more to change the allegiance of the peasantry than probably any other single counter-insurgency measure. And the much graver problem then arises as to whether the landlord-oriented leadership group in Saigon—regardless of whether it is made up of generals or medical doctors, as seems to be alternately the case—is *intellectually* capable of engineering that kind of revolution.

Finally, South Viet Nam must face up to political problems which, even in the absence of the Viet Cong insurgency, would leave it in the precarious position of the Dominican Republic a year ago. To blame the French colonial legacy for all the present ills has become a sort of ritual to which every writer in this field pays automatic homage. It does not, unfortunately, explain why North Viet Nam, similarly saddled with French colonial holdovers, does not suffer from administrative disintegration; nor does it explain how twelve years of extensive public-administration training in South Viet Nam—staffed and financed by America—has apparently made no dent in the problem. The reason is that South Viet Nam's ills are of a more fundamental nature.

Regionalism in Viet Nam is a fact of life which no amount of centralization can paper over. For some unfathomable reason, the decision was made in 1954 to replace what was on the whole a well-decentralized administrative system [8] by a truly French-patterned, highly centralized administrative structure. More and more power was heaped on the fragile shoulders of Saigon's central bureaucracy, while such "natural" units of government as the region or the district were either abolished or lost all effective power. The village, which had been the real cradle of a Jeffersonian type of representative government in the country (the French found a well-operating local election system and, like all colonial powers, left village life to its own devices), was deprived of its elected officials by Ngo Dinh Diem's fiat in June 1956 and for the first time felt the full brunt of central arbitrariness and maladministration without the relative compensations of a rapidly improving economic situation. On a broader plane, the Hoa-Hao and Cao-Dai sects were in a state of more or less overt anti-Saigon dissidence until Diem's murder in November 1963, and those two sects number about 3,000,000 people between them and live over a vast area north and west of Saigon. The mountain tribesmen of the vast plateau area which covers almost 65 percent of South Viet Nam were the object of political and economic oppression which American experts as early as 1957 considered tantamount to genocide. They formed an organization known as FULRO (Front Unifié de la Lutte des Races Oprimées) which, like "Black Nationalism" in the United States, has pathetic overtones of a curses-on-both-your-houses attitude, and which resulted in two major rebellions quelled in the nick of time by well-liked American advisers who found themselves in the strange position of being honest brokers between two "Vietnamese" ethnic groups.

But by far the most serious regional problem is that of Buddhism and Catholicism. The term "regionalism" is used advisedly, for in South Viet Nam today Catholicism is largely associated with the North Vietnamese civilian refugees of that faith (almost 600,000 out of a total of 850,000), while Buddhism, though practiced lackadaisically throughout Viet Nam, finds its most fierce and tradition-bound adherents in the Central coastal area around the ancient imperial capital of Hué. People are rarely tolerant about their religion, and the Vietnamese possibly less tolerant than most. This, added to the fact that the Catholics, though only perhaps 11 percent of the population, were in power under Diem for almost a decade and that the ARVN's officers corps is over 50 percent Catholic to this day, would be sufficient to create an explosive situation

---

[2] Department of State Publication 7724 (Dept. of Defense, Gen.-8), Viet Nam: The Struggle for Freedom. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964, p. 21.

[3] According to the *Weekly Summaries* prepared by the Department of Defense, the average number of ARVN-initiated battalion-size operations has slightly decreased over the past year while the number of Vietnamese under arms went from 493,000 to 640,000. At the same time, the number of U.S.-initiated battalion-size operations has trebled.

[4] *The New York Times*, January 19, 1966.

[5] P. J. Honey, "Viet Nam Argument," *Encounter*, November 1965, p. 69.

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 10, 1966, p. 5559.

[7] Stanley Andrews, "Red Tape and Broken Promises," *The Reporter*, May 5, 1966.

[8] Cf. the little-known but excellent study by Vu Quoc Thong, *"La décentralisation administrative au Viet-Nam."* Hanoi: Presses Universitaires, 1952.

anywhere. In Viet Nam, in the absence of a broadly accepted government, people of necessity must fall back on the *one* structure of society they can trust—their religion. It was a foregone conclusion, then, that the Buddhists would attempt to gain power, just as far smaller groups have previously done with great success.

The argument that perhaps the Buddhists are not "ready" to assume the reins of government is by-and-large irrelevant. After all, Buddhists as individuals—including Premier Ky, who is a North Vietnamese Buddhist—have been in positions of power all along. What is, however, true is that the Buddhist political organization in Saigon, grouped around the *Vien Hoa Dao* (Institute for the Implementation of the Dharma), has yet to find a political program which it can openly proclaim. That is meant in the literal sense of the term, for many of the Buddhists are known to be in favor of a negotiated solution to the war, but under presently-existing legislation any utterance to that effect is likely to earn its maker a prison term of up to five years. Not being able to stand openly on a platform of moderation or neutralism, the Buddhists are condemned to vague utterances about "social revolution," "true democracy" and other similarly noncommittal slogans. But that is not the kind of program likely to rally the war-weary Vietnamese 'round the flag for a supreme effort against the Viet Cong, or, for that matter, against Saigon. And perhaps the supreme refinement of the dilemma came last spring when the Central Vietnamese Buddhists were cornered by ARVN troops into abject surrender: at that time there were better than five North Vietnamese regular regiments in the I Corps area which, had the Buddhists and the mutinous 1st ARVN Division chosen to go over to their side, could have wreaked utter disaster in almost half of Viet Nam, with incalculable consequences in Washington and Saigon, not to speak of the rest of the world. But the Buddhists chose the likelihood of political destruction and the detention of their key political and military leaders by Premier Ky against the highly speculative possiblities of entering into an alliance with the National Liberation Front (N.L.F.), the political arm of what is commonly called the Viet Cong.

Yet the very extremism which the government of Premier Ky showed late in July 1966 when he suddenly resumed harping on a theme dear in 1964 to one of his predecessors, General Nguyen Khanh, *"Bac Tien!"* ("Let's March North!") may have a maturing influence not only on the Buddhist leaders but also on the moderate Catholics of Father Hoang Quynh and lead to an alliance between the two religious groups. This in turn could become a base of political power owing nothing either to an alien ideology or to the massive presence of foreign troops.

III

It is against this South Vietnamese backdrop of frustration and upheaval that the military effort which has been made over the past year now must be measured, and *not* simply against it own abstract yardsticks of increasing troops present, ammunition expended, enemy killed, "structures" destroyed, rice confiscated, weapons captured and weapons lost or acres of rice fields defoliated. Not that such indicators are wrong per se; but they are simply meaningless in terms of what is going on.

First of all, the war must be judged against its progress toward its initial objectives. If the objective was—as was contemplated in 1961—to "pacify" South Vietnam with the help of an eighteen-month counter-insurgency plan, then the operation already has failed. This is also true if Vietnam is judged against Secretary McNamara's target date, announced on October 2, 1963: "The major part of the United States military task [in Vietnam] can be completed by the end of 1965. If the next set of objectives was to nip the rising insurgency in South Vietnam merely with an increased American advisory effort and perhaps with the "antiseptic" help of American-manned airplanes and naval craft, that policy failed in 1964. The same can be said of such tactical measures as the bombing of North Vietnam. It first was explained as a retaliatory measure against a guerrilla attack on the American base at Pleiku, then as a measure designed to cut off the flow of North Vietnamese manpower and supplies to the insurgents, and, finally, as simply a political measure designed to bring the North Vietnamese to the conference table.[9] Since it was clearly admitted that the retaliatory aspect of the raids was at best a temporary rationale, only the two other criteria need to be judged. Secretary McNamara, in explaining the bombing of the storage depots near the former Hanoi and Haiphong "sanctuaries," stated that during the previous year of bombing Communist supply deliveries had increased by 150 percent and troop infiltration by 120 percent, and President Johnson, two days later at Omaha, stated that what hitherto had been jungle trails had in many places become fully motorable "boulevards."

Obviously, then, as with operations "Strangle" and "Choke" in Korea 15 years ago, air operations failed to effect decisive results in spite of a 1965 bomb tonnage (255,000 tons) far exceeding what had ever been used before on so small a target area. As for the political effectiveness of the air operations, the record is plan: more intransigence from Hanoi and a gradual increase in the Russian commitments to Hanoi, at least in the field of air defense.

All this could well delineate the conditions for a stalemate, were it not for the fact that, contrary to what happened in Korea, the American build-up in Viet Nam is at the present moment open-ended. Neither budgetary nor manpower ceilings seem to have been arrived at and whatever limitations there are appear to be imposed more by the difficulties of finding suitable deployment areas and logistical support facilities than by a lack of will in Washington to provide massive reinforcements. Even so, manpower requirements are likely to become extensive this autumn: by late September, about 165,000 men now in Viet Nam will have fulfilled their one-year tour; that, added to the 400,000-man strength considered desirable for the end of 1966, would mean that at least a quarter-million new troops must be moved to Southeast Asia fairly rapidly.

All this, of course, is perfectly feasible for the United States, and so are the many "search-and-destroy" and spoiling operations which are said to have prevented the Viet Cong from launching a "monsoon offensive." (Ironically enough, the North Vietnamese claim that the American "dry-season 'counteroffensive'" had likewise met with failure.) [10] Enemy losses are heavy, and may well reach 60,000 dead this year; but the present infiltration rate may match this, and local recruitment inside South Viet Nam still amounts to 3,500 men a month, while the total number of Viet Cong and PAVN forces rose over the past year from 110,000 men to 270,000. The present American pincer operations, with their net results of a few hundred enemy killed in return for a commitment of often more than 10,000 troops for ten days, are by and large no more efficient than similarly large French operations were (the French using paratroop battalions where the United States uses helicopter-borne units). They are unlikely to achieve gains of strategic importance until a troop saturation ratio is attained which permits the permanent reoccupation of cleared areas in strengths which deter attack. Expert advocates of such tactics, notably Hanson W. Baldwin, feel that they can be the only logical conclusion of present policies and estimate that one million American troops would provide for an adequate saturation ratio. Interestingly enough, that view is likewise shared by the opposition. In an interview granted in January 1965 by the Chairman of the Liberation Front, Nguyen Huu Tho, he made the cogent point that "it is not bombs and artillery that win wars; it is infantry that can occupy territory." [11]

Let us then reconstruct the military-political landscape which the Communist planners in Hanoi or in the N.L.F.'s jungle headquarters might see before them. In spite of severe casualties, their troops and underground administrative structure have held on to much of what they held last year and, with minor tactical adjustments, they are still capable of attacking. Aerial bombardment, north as well as south, hurts but has yet to cut deeply into their supply and replacement system (they have Secretary McNamara's word for it). The American ground effort has foreclosed the chances of a headlong rush to victory, but is not yet of a size to make a Communist defeat certain. Saigon, for all the beautiful plans on paper, has yet to come through with effective reforms. And abroad, the dark outlines of more massive Soviet help (with a concomitant Russo-American worsening of relations) appear discernible.

If the Communist interpretation of the situation is *anywhere* near this estimate, as it is very likely to be, then it can be easily seen why both Hanoi and the N.L.F. would be highly reluctant to accept negotiations which offer them literally nothing but the complete and permanent dismantling of the whole South Vietnamese Communist apparatus in exchange for a minor share in an economic development plan which contemplates a total expenditure equivalent to the cost to the United States of fifteen days of war in South Viet Nam. Much depends, then, on whether Hanoi and the guerrillas in the south view the development of the war *exactly* in the same light, for the sacrifices they are expected to make at the conference table, as well as, for the time being, on the firing line, are of an entirely different nature.

IV

A major part of the whole Viet Nam argument revolves around a clear identification of the character of the enemy—for it is that identification which pins the label of "aggressor" on North Viet Nam (and thus justifies military action against it) or, conversely, makes the conflict largely a civil war, with the United States as the major foreign "interventionist."

A recent issue of *Foreign Affairs* presented an unusually well-argued and sophisticated case for the first view.[12] But precisely because it is so well argued, it unconsciously presents some of the arguments for the opposite viewpoint as well. And since it is almost impossible to discuss the possible rational outcomes of the Viet Nam situation as long as the true character of the adversary is in doubt—it is this writer's own belief that it lies somewhere between the two extremes presented above—the nature of the Viet Cong must be explored further before it can be definitively dismissed as "faceless."

---

[9] Secretary McNamara's press conference of June 29, 1966.

[10] *Viet Nam Courier* (Hanoi), Nos. 60 and 61, May 26 and June 2, 1966.

[11] Wilfred Burchett, "Viet Nam: Inside Story of the Guerrilla War." New York; International Publishers, 1965, p. 240.

[12] George A. Carver, Jr., "The Faceless Viet Cong," *Foreign Affairs*, April 1966.

It can be conceded in advance that any Communist member of the National Liberation Front in South Viet Nam is likewise a member of the *Lao Dong*, the Vietnamese Communist Party, and that North Viet Nam, which had without a shred of doubt won the war against France in 1954, fully expected to gain control of South Viet Nam as well either by the elections slated for July 1956 or at a later date. I am, however, inclined to doubt that Hanoi's decision to intervene in South Vietnamese affairs was prompted by any "increasing disparity between political life north and south." For it became obvious even to the blindest of optimists that, unfortunately, the political lives of both Viet Nams, far from becoming "disparate," began to resemble each other as only two extremes can, with their gradual falsification of representative processes and, finally, with their concentration camps and persecution of religious groups. The existence of a "Central Reunification Department" in Hanoi of which much is made is surely revelatoy of something—until one becomes aware that West Germany, for example, has a Ministry for All-German Affairs to which, of course, East Germany and the Soviets ascribe equally sinister motives, even though it can be safely assumed that the *Ministerium für Gesamtdeutsche Fragen* is more innocuous than any Hanoi committee with the same purpose.

It is likewise very much open to question that the intervention of Hanoi was first evidenced by a terror campaign directed against small South Vietnamese officials. In actual fact, Diem began to become oppressive as early as January 1956, when a concentration camp ordinance (No. 6 of Jaunary 11, 1956) gave the régime almost unchecked power to deal with the opposition—and the non-Communist opposition, least inured to clandestine operations, was hit hardest. It took until May 1966 for a U.S. Government agency, the Public Affairs Office in Saigon, to state candidly what was a well-known fact all along—to wit, that some of the so-called "political-religious" sects provided the hard core of the early opposition:

". . . Ten of the eleven [Cao-Dai] subsects had opposed Diem, and their leadership fled to Cambodia or went into hiding. . . . The members of the other ten sects made up the bulk of the early NLF support, although the alliance was at all times an uneasy one . . .

". . . The [Hoa-Hao] sects in 1952 formed the Social Democratic Party as its political arm. It too challenged Diem, and its armies were smashed by ARVN in 1956. Like the Cao Dai, it was an early and major participant in the NLF, . . .

". . . The third of the esoteric sects of Viet Nam, the Binh Xuyen, which was also smashed by Diem, also worked with the NLF in its early days." [13]

The decision by Diem—probably his most pregnant in terms of its future consequences—to abolish elected village government in June 1956 (again before the July 1956 election deadline, at a time when the Communists were on their best behavior) did the rest. The hated appointees became a prime target for local resentment and by March 1958 over 400 had been murdered by guerrillas who indeed, as Carver points out, "harped on local issues and avoided preaching Marxist doctrine." When it is remembered that there were enough "local issues" around to cause the South Vietnamese Army itself to try at least three times to murder Diem, it becomes understandable why South Viet Nam appeared to Hanoi ripe for plucking. In other words, there can be no doubt but that Hanoi or even South Vietnamese stay-behind Communist elements, took advantage of Saigon's glaring weaknesses after 1959. But the Communists can hardly be held responsible for the incredible stupidity of the Diem régime and the somewhat surprising blindness to its faults of its American advisers. And it is equally hard to deny that there was plenty of motivation *inside* South Viet Nam, on the left as well as on the right, for a revolutionary explosion.

The next point which requires clarification is *not* whether the insurgency in South Viet Nam is abetted, directed and aided from North Viet Nam (it is to a large extent), but whether such outside controls preclude the existence of *real* objectives which are specifically those of the insurgents rather than of their external sponsors. Here, the recent British revelations as to the truly enormous extent of the control of the French Resistance in France by the Special Operations Executive (S.O.E.)—the 1940–1946 British equivalent of the Central Intelligence Agency—shows what is meant. According to the now-published official history of S.O.E. in France, "till 1944 the British had a virtual monopoly over all of de Gualle's means of communications with France," and the French "could not introduce a single agent or a single store" without Allied permission and help, and "anything [they] planned with marked political implications was liable to be vetoed by any of the three major Western allies." Yet, having substantiated exactly what both the Vichy French and the Nazis had said all along, *i.e.* that the French Resistance was nothing but an "Anglo-Saxon conspiracy" and the resisters (this writer included) nothing but foreign agents, the official history makes the key point: "All these victories by and through resistance forces in France had a common basis: overwhelming popular support." [14]

The hard historical facts which emerge from the French Resistance and which appear to apply to the Viet Cong are (a) that in spite of overwhelming technical control by the Allies, de Gaulle succeeded in winning political and military loyalty among the diverse guerrilla forces in France, and (b) that even de Gaulle's own views and desires had to accommodate themselves to those developed by the internal resistance in its four-year fight, in which it bore the brunt of the struggle and suffered the bulk of the losses. The differences of view between Viet Cong leaders who have now been in the fight for six years (and some of them for twenty!) and the Hanoi theoreticians and conventional military commanders go in many cases far beyond normal internecine party struggles or mere tactical disagreements.

A glance at factual examples is interesting: there have been three changes of N.L.F. secretaries-general at times when Hanoi was in the throes of no purge whatsoever. There was the N.L.F. five-point manifesto of March 22, 1965, whose "jungle version" was rebroadcast later by Hanoi with 39 extensive amendments or text changes, softening some of the N.L.F. statements. There were the spontaneous reactions of N.L.F. leaders when faced with respected Western observers on neutral ground, openly explaining why they disagreed with the "narrow-minded commissars in Hanoi." And there is the fact that while the United States and Hanoi are now officially wedded to a return to a Geneva-type conference (and, presumably, its two-year election clause), the N.L.F. has thus far left Geneva out of its program, preferring a flexible formula of eventual reunification in negotiated stages.

It is easy to dismiss those differences as being mere camouflage (after all, some people believe that the Sino-Soviet split is nothing but a grand deception foisted on the easily-fooled West) and to belief the N.L.F. is indeed nothing but "a contrived political mechanism with no indigenous roots," as Carver avers. But in that case, the 220,000 Viet Cong who fight side-by-side with 50,000 PAVN regulars, and who over the past three years are said to have suffered almost 100,000 dead and 182,000 wounded, fight rather well for what must be a vast mass of remote-controlled and force-drafted recruits. Otherwise, desertion would be just as easy on the Viet Cong side as it is on the ARVN side, but thus far the V.C. desertion rate simply seems to keep pace with the increase of manpower on the Communist side.

That leaves, lastly, the argument of "facelessness": the N.L.F. leaders are men of little stature in their own society; they are unknowns. But four years ago only a few Vietnamese military men knew who General Ky was, and no one thought of him even two years ago as being of presidential timber. Clandestineness is not attractive to the sort of men who are national figures: aside from Jugoslavia's Marshal Tito, it takes real expertise to recall the names of European resistance leaders. In any case, N.L.F. propaganda has seen to it that its leaders should not remain anonymous: at least forty senior leaders' biographies have been published, along with their photos.[15] Their background shows the normal social background of Vietnamese leadership in general, from medical doctors and pharmacists, to lawyers and even army officers (though the sprinkling of Montagnards and women is more typical of the likewise classic "united front" picture). And they have one remarkable common characteristic which thus far no Saigon government has been able to match: they are all from south of the seventeenth parallel.

None of the foregoing justifies Hanoi's claim that the N.L.F. should be the "sole legitimate voice of the South Vietnamese people." But nothing justifies the opposite claim either, to the effect that without Hanoi's full support, the N.L.F. would disappear into thin air like a desert mirage. There can indeed be no quarrel with Carver's statement that "the Viet Cong organization is unquestionably a major factor in the South Vietnamese political scene." In that case, however, it must be treated as what it is—a political force in South Viet Nam which cannot be simply blasted off the surface of the earth with B–52 saturation raids, or told to pack up and go into exile to North Viet Nam.

There is one further consideration which argues against the likelihood of Hanoi being able (assuming it were willing, and it does not seem to be) to turn off the southern guerrilla movement like a water tap: Hanoi has, since March 1946, made four separate deals with the West at the expense of the South Vietnamese. The French-Vietnamese accords of March 6, 1946, provided for a Vietnamese "free state with its own government, armed forces and foreign relations" but left South Viet Nam proper (*i.e.* Cochin China) under French control and, as it turned out, severe anti-Viet Minh repression. The French-Vietnamese *modus vivendi* signed by Ho Chi Minh in Paris, September 14, 1946, further confirmed this seeming abandonment" of the South. In the Geneva Accords of July 1954, it was South Viet Nam which was left to the tender mercies of the Diem régime for at least two years, and we have Nguyen Huu Tho's own word in an interview with Wilfred Burchett to the effect that "there were mixed feelings about the two-years' delay over reunification." And when neither Hanoi nor Peking (nor the Soviet Union) made strong representations against dropping elections in 1956, it must

[13] U.S. Mission in Viet Nam, JUSPAO Planning Office, *A Note on the Vietnamese Sects*, May 1966, p. 2–3.

[14] M.R.D. Foot, "SOE in France." London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1966, p. xix, 33, and 442–443, *passim*.

[15] Commission for Foreign Relations of the N.L.F., *Personalities of the South Viet Nam Liberation Movement*, n.d. [1963], 44 pp.

have become obvious to even the most obtuse pro-Hanoi elements south of the seventeenth parallel that the North Vietnamese Communists are somewhat unreliable allies.

V

These are simple historical facts, not extrapolations of obscure paragraphs in three-hour speeches of Communist leaders. They make it somewhat difficult to explain by the tenets of the all-out "aggression" theory why the same Communist leaders (in Hanoi and at least Peking) should have chosen in 1958 to fight a highly risky guerrilla war in preference to trying to win South Viet Nam by a bitter political fight in 1956 (a call to the U.N. or for the reconvening of the 1954 Geneva Conference, or for the interpretation of the Agreements by the International Court of Justice; or simply by a vast propaganda offensive).[10] The fact of repeated abandonment goes a long way to explain why North Viet Nam is somewhat reluctant to come to the conference table: Washington has sometimes seemed to feel that a sudden convening at a conference table might well bring about the collapse of the South Vietnamese government's spirit of resistance, for the South Vietnamese as a people know only too well what their military posture would be without all-out American help. But, vice versa, in view of past performance, *any* peace conference in which Hanoi would once more speak for the southern insurgent elements and in the absence of their own full representation would raise among the Viet Cong the spectre of yet a fifth sellout of the southern guerrillas. Other countries too have "credibility gaps."

Yet is it precisely that symmetrical weakness which, in this writer's view, opens new perspectives on how to approach the Viet Nam problem as a whole. And while lapidary formulations have in the past been more confusing than helpful, it would perhaps be useful to say that a major attempt must be made to "politicize" rather than to further "militarize" the Vietnamese conflict and to treat it as what it really is—a local conflict with outside support which has gotten out of hand, not the Stalingrad or El-Alamein of a worldwide cold-war confrontation.

There is no more reason to believe that a free-world "victory" in Viet Nam is going to deter other revolutionary guerrilla wars than there was to have hoped that the Kaiser's defeat in World War I would teach Nazism a useful lesson in 1938; or to have expected that Communist guerrilla setbacks in Greece, Azerbaijan, the Philippines, Malaya or the Congo would "teach" guerrillas something in Cuba, Venezuela, Laos, Burma, Thailand or South Viet Nam. If it "teaches" them anything at all, it may well be this: that unless the local régime undertakes a measure of true reforms, even the hugest military power in the world can be successfully stalemated for a long period of time by lightly-armed peasant guerrillas and the infantry of a tiny underdeveloped country. That point might well be left somewhat less substantiated than it has recently been.

In that case, the present balance, including the American and PAVN forces in South Vietnam, can be used to establish a political starting point from which to approach the whole problem anew, perhaps along the following lines:

1. Make the Saigon government and the Liberation Front leaders the center of all future negotiations, with the United States and North Viet Nam in a back-up position, just as was the case with the Laotian factions and third powers at the Geneva Conference of 1961–62. (It will be recalled that the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina was a *military* cease-fire conference, like Panmunjom in Korea.)

2. Have the United States restate in less prolix language the promises contained in the State Department's 14-Point Declaration of January 1966, notably with regard to the non-permanence of American bases in South Viet Nam and the disengagement of *both* Viet Nams; and have this declaration filed with the United Nations as proof of good faith.

3. Prepare the Saigon government forcefully and publicly—just as Premier Ky informed the United States of his desire to carry the ground war to North Viet Nam—for the coming *political* contest with a well-organized native left-wing minority which can neither be evacuated nor exterminated. (*Vide*, France and Italy in 1945–47 having to face the stark fact of heavily-armed Communist ex-partisan forces, which to this day in 1966 have not really surrendered all their weapons.)

4. Encourage Liberation Front leaders to commit themselves to specifically *South* Vietnamese political and economic options in preference to North Vietnamese desires (again as was the case of the West European Communists in the early 1950's, in relation to Moscow) in exchange for a legal participation in the political life of the country.

5. Encourage the eventual creation of a "piastre common market" (as advocated two years ago by Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia) which would include North Viet Nam and thus satisfy its legitimate desire for contacts outside the Communist world, but which would include 26,000,000 people from non-Communist states as against North Viet Nam's 19,000,000. Postwar international organizations—even the Warsaw Pact—have shown that small strong-willed countries succeed far better in holding their own within such organizations, even when they include a large predatory country, than they can individually.

6. On the basis of President Johnson's Baltimore speech, restate and expand the idea of a flexible area-wide rehabilitation program, taking into account the immensely increased destruction which has taken place since last year. Include proposals for political normalization, such as those which the United States implemented in Germany and Japan, Britain in Israel, and France in Algeria. In that case, Viet Nam could set the pattern of a détente applicable to other divided countries as well.

None of the above is likely to produce a miracle cure for South Viet Nam's ills. If Saigon is still grimly determined to botch its land reform or to falsify its elections, not even a million American troops can stop it from doing so. Of course those troops at least could crush the opposition even if it were at the price of which Tacitus spoke when he said of the Romans in Britain, "You have made this a desolation and you call it peace."

It would indeed be a pity if so much ingenuity, diplomacy, blood and treasure should have been spent on trying to persuade Hanoi to abandon the insurgents in South Viet Nam, without a solid attempt ever having been made at getting the insurgents to modify their relationship with Hanoi in return for a specifically South Vietnamese solution that could be as honorable all around as it would be realistic. The only alternative to such an approach would be a further escalation both in terms of battleground and participating countries. And if Munich is not a good example of how to settle the Vietnamese conflict, neither is Guernica, or Sarajevo.

[10] It is totally forgotten today by those who support the "unilateral-aggression" theory that North Viet Nam on March 7 and December 22, 1958, addressed two long notes to President Diem conceding the temporary division of the country and offering a 4-point program involving interzonal trade, travel and nonaggression. Saigon refused to reply to the notes.

"THE LABOR MOVEMENT AND IMMIGRATION," BY PETER J. KELLEY, S.S.S.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently seen a report on the subject of the "American Labor Movement and Immigration" policy which I found to be quite interesting and very well documented. It was written by the Rev. Peter J. Kelley, S.S.S. of the Blessed Sacrament Fathers Seminary in Cleveland, Ohio, and shows evidence of much effort and concentrated research.

In the thought that it might be of interest to other Members of this body, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

INTRODUCTION

The American labor movement is intimately concerned with immigration. AFL founder Sam Gompers was an immigrant. So were Eugene V. Debs and Philip Murray, not to mention a great proportion of the rank and file union members, especially in the past generation.

Immigration presents, on a theoretical plane, a dilemma to organized labor. The effect of large-scale immigration on American unemployment statistics would tend to make the big unions favor restriction of immigration. On the other hand, the vast number of immigrants in the labor movement, even today, might well be offended by such tactics. This rather a priori consideration raises the question—what has been labor's stand on immigration, and what factors led to the adoption of this policy?

The point of departure for this study was the immigration law signed by President Johnson on October 3, 1965. The major concern therefore, was with labor's attitude toward's that bill's most important innovation, the rejection of the National origins quota system. Closely related with this problem was the refugee relief question. A third aspect of labor policy on immigration, the bracero or temporary alien farm labor program, had to be included for the sake of completeness.

A full understanding of American labor's view on present immigration policy, it was found, had to begin with the post-World War II era. After a twenty year lull in immigration due to several factors, new pressure to open the gates began to force a rethinking of American policy at that time.

Secondary sources of information turned out to be entirely lacking. Rather little, in fact, could be found even in the way of primary source material. What did turn up, however, sufficed to establish the official labor position on the three major immigration problems—quota system, bracero program, refugee relief—as it developed from 1946 to 1965.

CHAPTER I. THE SITUATION AFTER THE WAR

The years of World War II saw a radical decline in international migration, for reasons which are obvious. The dip in immigration volume beginning in 1931, was partly due to the national quota system, which

went into effect in 1929. But in large measure, the lull was the result of the Great Depression which then gripped this country.[1]

As World War II drew to a close, both labor and government leaders foresaw rising pressure for massive immigration into the United States.[2] The postwar scene revealed more than 800,000 displaced persons in camps throughout the devastated lands of Europe.[3] Some 250,000 of these people were the remnants of the Jewish population of Nazi-dominated lands.

On the home front, the wartime manpower shortage had drawn large numbers of alien laborers into the United States. The bracero program, importing agricultural laborers from Mexico, began to swell. By 1950, the volume of Mexicans entering this country, generally for work in the Southwestern States, reached 116,052, with another 5,121 men arriving from the British West Indies and a small number of Canadians (1,503) to make a total of 122,676 for that year. By 1960 this program was to swell to 447,207 entries.[4]

Government policy

The basic government immigration policy in effect during the late 1940's dated from the frequently-amended immigration restrictions enacted in the early 1920's. The principal elements of that legislation were a rigid limitation on the number of aliens permitted to enter the United States for permanent residence, the barring of orientals from eligibility for such entry or even from naturalization in cases where a person from the Asia-Pacific Triangle area had managed to immigrate, and the establishment of the national origins quota system. This system determined the number of immigrants allowed to enter from any given country by a fixed ratio of immigrants to foreign-born persons of the same nationality in the United States at a given date.

The 1921 Act, which was the first to set such a ceiling on immigration, based itself upon the 1910 census. This Act set the quota for each nation at 3 percent of the number of United States residents who were born in that nation. The 1924 Act reflected dissatisfaction with the "racial mix" of the 1910 census, and based its calculations upon the 1890 census, which was taken before the turn-of-the-century influx of immigrants from Latin and Slavic nations. Instead of a 3 percent allowance, which had resulted in a total quota of 356,995, the 1924 legislation set each national quota at 2 percent of the United States residents born in any given nation. However, when the Act took full effect in 1929, the system properly called "National Origins Quota System" took over. The number of immigrants in a foreign nation's quota was set at the same percentage of 150,000 (the approximate total quota) as the residents of the United States born in that nation in relation to the total United States population, based on the 1920 census.

This, in effect, meant the lowering of the quota to one-sixth of one percent of the foreign-born population from any given nation. A minimum quota of 100 was extended to all nations, with the exception of oriental states, whose citizens were entirely refused admission to the United States.[5]

In addition to race becoming a criterion for admission to the United States, the total barring of certain races from this country, and the low total annual quota, the overall immigration itself remained low because of an added factor: there was no machinery whereby quotas not filled by a nation within the fiscal year could be pooled for the benefit of low-quota nations where there were waiting lists of persons seeking entry into the United States. Nor could unused quota numbers be credited to the following year. Consequently, when the postwar situation made it imperative, for the first time since the restrictive immigration laws were passed, to open American doors to some proportion of those who had suffered under Nazi or Communist rule, the United States found itself without the machinery to accomplish the task. Rather than create such machinery within the existing legislative framework—which would have been equivalent to entirely rewriting American immigration laws—the next twenty years would produce an increasing stream of exceptions legislated to enable the United States to fulfill what has traditionally been considered one of its fundamental obligations: providing asylum for political and religious refugees.[6]

Labor opinion

At the close of the war American organized labor was split into two camps: the American Federation of Labor under William Green and William Schnitzler, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations led by Philip Murray, Allan Haywood, and James Carey. In 1946, when the first postwar mention of concern over immigration laws appeared in a labor convention of the AFL, George Meany was far down the list of Vice-Presidents—No. 14—and John L. Lewis was still in the AFL fold. The following year Lewis and his United Mine Workers were out of the AFL, and out of the scope of this paper, since no indication of UMW policy on immigration could be discovered from official non-official published sources in this union.

The 1946 convention of the American Federation of Labor set the pace for the labor picture on immigration in the postwar period. In the report of the Executive Council this statement summed up the AFL's official policy:

"When more shipping facilities are available, there no doubt will be large numbers of immigrants desiring to enter this country. The Executive Council recommends that any lowering of the immigration bars be opposed and the present restrictive measures continued.

"The Executive Council recommended to the 1944 convention 'that all phases of the traditional immigration policy of the American Federation of Labor be maintained.' This recommendation is reiterated and particularly stressed in regard to the so-called 'barred races who cannot be assimilated.'"[7]

The resolution was unanimously passed by the Convention. However dissenting voices, destined to grow louder as years passed, were heard at this meeting: A rival resolution by David Dubinsky and others representing the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union (ILGWU) urged the AFL to support President Harry S. Truman's effort to open the United States to the displaced persons of Europe. Truman asked for the admission of 50,000 DP's annually, and urged an additional 40,000 unused quota numbers to be put at their disposal each year. The ILGWU resolution cited the principle that we should share the burden of rehabilitation we demand of other nations, and appealed to the AFL as traditionally anti-Nazi and pro-minorities "regardless of creed, race, and national origins."[8]

The Committee on Resolutions revised the motion to harmonize it with the Executive Council's policy statement. Speaking of the plight of the refugees, especially of the Jews, the committee noted that civilized nations had a duty to give them the opportunity to start life again. However, the Committee demanded that such aid be in the form of immediate, temporary relief measures, and not by fundamental modification of the American immigration policy. The resolution, adopted unanimously, urged that the unfilled wartime quotas be validated for the use of displaced persons.[9] Slight attention was paid to the bracero question at this convention. A strongly anti-bracero resolution was watered down by the Committee on Resolution to a request for investigation of the matter by the Executive Council.[10]

Official CIO sources do not reveal any concern with American immigration policy or the displaced persons problem at this point. Not until the 1948 convention does the CIO enter the immigration scene.

Summary

The wartime lull in immigration to American shores was followed by an acute need for the means of admitting a fair proportion of the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons and refugees uprooted by World War II. The legal apparatus of the United States at this period could not provide for this need. As a result of the 1924 legislation, immigration to the United States was governed by the national origins quota system; some nations were entirely barred on racial grounds; and the total quota allotted annually hovered between 153,000 and 154,000; there was no way of transferring unused quota numbers from one nation to another.

A further immigration problem growing acute at this time was the bracero program, admitting thousands of Mexican agricultural workers to the harvest fields of the Southwest.

Labor's policy, judging from the AFL convention of 1946, urged the conservation of the current American legislative provisions. The need for helping the distressed in Europe was recognized to some extent. But little concern was shown regarding bracero competition with American farm labor.

CHAPTER II. REFUGE FOR REFUGEES

The 1945 congressional ledger included some 700 immigration bills, ranging from the ever-increasing plethora of private bills for hardship cases to full-scale revisions of policy. Out of this mountain of proposed legislation the AFL convention for 1947 could announce with satisfaction that the 79th Congress had passed only five public laws and thirteen private bills—with no injury to the national origins quota, the barred races policy, or other elements of the AFL-backed federal immigration policies.

Dead in committee after the 1947 session was the first attempt to provide for the entry of displaced persons. But the Senate did pass a resolution to investigate the matter. The McCarthy era was beginning, with its new awareness of Soviet hostility and its con-

[1] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, with the Social Science Research Council, *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957* (Washington: G.P.O., 1961) tables C–88 to C–283 Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1963*, tables 120–131; figures vi and vii.

[2] American Federation of Labor, *Report of the proceedings of the 65th Convention* (Washington: Ransdell, 1946) p. 201, 204.

[3] A conservative estimate. Other writers set the figure as high as 1,500,000.

[4] *Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1963*, table 128.

[5] *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1963*, p. 95–96.

[6] Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, in: U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 1, *Hearings on H.R. 7700 and 55 identical bills* (88th Congress, 2nd Session), 3–4.

[7] American Federation of Labor, *Report of the proceedings of the 65th Convention.* (Washington: Ransdell, 1946), p. 201.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 294.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 521.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 134, 544.

sequent security-consciousness. Deportation rules were stiffened.[11]

Labor policies

In 1947 the American Federation of Labor continued to be the only segment of organized labor actively concerned with immigration policy. In February, President William Green called for the admission of 400,000 to 600,000 DP's, as well as for American pressure on Britain to open Palestine to Jewish refugees. "There is only one answer to the heavy problem of the displaced Jews of Europe," said Green. "It can be summed up in two words—Palestine and America."[12] The AFL argued in favor of Truman's request for 400,000 DP visas as America's "fair share" of Europe's postwar burden. Out of the 850,000 persons in DP camps two years after the war's end, there were some half-million Catholics and a quarter million Jews. Half or more of the total were women and children—over 150,000 under the age of 17. The remainder would not constitute a serious problem of job competition with American laborers. The courage and love of freedom which led these thousands to refuse to return to Communist-ruled homelands despite ties of affection and UNRRA pressure, certified their worthiness to enter the United States.[13]

When the AFL convention met in San Francisco that October, the policy lines closely paralleled the stand of the 1946 convention.[14] Again David Dubinsky and the ILGWU delegation urged support of a liberal DP bill.[15] This year, the Committee on Resolutions presented a long brief on the immigration resolution, favoring H.R. 2910, which would allow 400,000 of the 900,000 unused wartime quota numbers to be validated for displaced persons.[16]

Meanwhile, the CIO's President, Philip Murray, had come out in favor of the displaced persons legislation in July, repeating the AFL argument that this influx of immigrants would not result in increased job competition.[17]

The first Displaced Persons Act, 1948

The Stratton Act, a half-loaf arrangement passed in 1948, allowed 202,000 displaced persons to enter this country over a two-year period. The measure immediately drew cries of anguish from all who had favored DP legislation, as well as from opponents of the bill.

Even before the impracticality of the measure could be shown by experience, the AFL had campaigned against several of its provisions. At the hearings for the Stratton Bill the AFL had pointed up a number of discriminatory clauses in the proposal. Among these shortcomings, the Stratton Act set Christmas, 1945, as the qualification date for displaced persons. No person entering a DP camp after that time could be considered eligible for a visa under the Stratton Act. Moreover, the Act required guarantees of employment and housing before a visa application would be considered. In addition, the new law did not provide sufficient time for processing so many visas, nor did it open the gates wide enough to accept what the AFL and numerous other groups considered America's first share of these refugees.[18] The Hatters' Union, led by Max Zaritsky, together with Reuben Soderstrom, head of the Resolutions Committee, pushed through a motion to demand that all 900,000 quota numbers not used during the war be available to displaced persons.[19]

At this point the CIO entered the scene—with vigor.

Philip Murray, who had favored a liberal DP bill in mid-summer, included a strong policy statement in his President's Report to the CIO's 1948 convention in Portland, Oregon. He called the 80th Congress's Stratton Act "unworkable" and affirmed that this measure would do more to exclude than to aid displaced persons. In addition to the principal objections voiced at the AFL convention the week before, Murray accused the Act of discrimination against Jews and Catholics, especially those from Baltic regions. A further sore point was the "mortgage" requirement, whereby the visas granted under the 1948 Act were subtracted from a nation's future quotas.[20]

The Celler amendments

The 1948 DP Act, however, weathered the storms of the following session of Congress. Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada, heading the powerful Judiciary Committee, delayed hearings on a series of amendments by Congressman Emanuel Celler of New York until passage was impossible before adjournment.

The American Federation of Labor briefly took cognizance of this maneuver in the Executive Council's report to the 1949 convention in early October.[21] A month later the CIO convention in Cleveland heard Philip Murray denounce McCarran for obstructionism.[22] Both conventions lent their weight to the Celler Bill, H.R. 4567.

The new legislation for displaced persons passed only in 1950. Again, however, the result was a compromise. Once more the national origins quota system was ignored in order to aid the many East Europeans in the DP camps. But the mortgage provisions were kept. The date for qualification as a displaced person was set at January 1, 1949, and over 400,000 persons were to be admitted by 1951.

The AFL Executive Council devoted six pages of its annual report for 1950 to immigration questions. The report took pleasure in announcing the passage of the AFL-backed DP amendments, and noted approvingly that their lobby in Washington had by and large succeeded in blocking any substantial change of U.S. policy.[23] Significantly, this report made the first formal plea from organized labor for the codification of the ever-increasing mass of immigration legislation encumbering the federal law books.[24]

The CIO convention, on the other hand, was not so sanguine in its view of the recent DP developments. While the new Act's provisions were satisfactory in general, the time limit set on the granting of visas needed to be extended. Due to the complex administrative requirements of the law, the United States would not be able to issue all 400,000 visas by July 30, 1951.[25]

On a somewhat lower level, 1950 brought an indication of dissent within labor ranks with regard to immigration policy. A sizeable group at the National Farm Labor Union's convention in January felt that an influx of displaced persons on such a large scale would depress the wage scale for farm labor. This dissent was overridden, but in the resolution endorsing the new bill the convention called for provisions to channel only professional persons, especially qualified nurses and physicians, to rural areas rather than flood the farms with surplus labor.[26]

The call for revision

The 1950 AFL convention had commissioned the Executive Council to produce a study of the McCarran proposals for revision and codification of American immigration legislation.[27] This report was presented to the following convention at San Francisco, held in late September of 1951. The fundamental position of the AFL remained unchanged. The organization clung to the national origins quota system, endorsing minor revisions to eliminate the more blatant forms of discrimination against orientals and to improve administrative procedures.[28]

The same report announced AFL opposition to the pooling of the unused quota numbers at the end of each fiscal year for the benefit of low-quota nations, since this "would have a tendency to disturb the ethnic equilibrium of this country."[29] The Executive Council recommended that the mortgage system introduced by the recent DP laws be eliminated, and that effective controls be instituted to curb illegal entries into the United States, which then amounted to some 500,000 each year, mostly from across the Rio Grande. On the basis of this policy, the report stated, the AFL had supported the McCarran omnibus bill at the hearings held the previous March and April.[30]

The Congress of Industrial Organizations did not consider immigration at their 1951 convention in New York City. The testimony in Congressional hearings of Hoyt S. Haddock, executive secretary of the CIO Maritime Committee, was not a policy statement on behalf of the CIO as a whole, but merely a request for consideration of the special needs of aliens serving aboard American vessels.[31]

The AFL stand on immigration and the CIO's apparent indifference contributed to the passage of the Walter-McCarran Act in 1952. This legislation left the refugee problem right where it was. Any provision for displaced persons or refugees continued to be made as an exception to the basic American policy. The national origins quota system became the more firmly entrenched, and security precautions were increased.

The result of this policy was soon to become evident. By 1953, only eight months after the McCarran Act became law, the Refugee Relief Act had to be passed to circumvent the national origins quota and allow the entry of 220,000 refugees into this country. No mortgage of future quotas was involved in this Act. 1957 saw the advent of another refugee act to convert thousands of first, second and third preference visas to non-quota status, and to validate all visas left unused at the expiration of the 1953 Refugee Relief Act. 40,000 Hungarian refugees had their status in this country changed from parolee to alien resident by a further act of Congress in 1958. The same

[11] AFL, *66th Convention, 1947*, p. 250.

[12] *The New York Times*, 20 February, 1947, p. 17, col. 4.

[13] Robert J. Watt, "America and the displaced," *American Federationist* 54 (May, 1947), p. 32.

[14] *AFL, 66th Convention, 1947*, pp. 250–252.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 36–37.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 611.

[17] *New York Times*, 10 July, 1947, p. 1, cols. 6–7.

[18] *AFL, 67th Convention, 1948*, p. 138.

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 327, 468.

[20] Congress of Industrial Organizations, *Proceedings of the 10th Constitutional Convention*, Portland, Oregon, November 22–26, 1948 (Washington: CIO, 1948), pp. 83–84.

[21] AFL, *68th Convention*, 1949, p. 206–207.

[22] CIO, *11th Convention*, 1949, p. 119.

[23] AFL, *69th Convention*, 1950, pp. 179, 181.

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 176–178.

[25] CIO, *12th Convention*, 1950, p. 337.

[26] *New York Times*, 16 January, 1950, p. 10, cols. 6–7.

[27] AFL, *69th Convention*, 1950, pp. 181, 453, 495.

[28] Walter J. Mason [AFL Representative], "Statement on proposed amendments to the immigration and naturalization laws," in: U.S., Congress, Subcommittees of the Committees on the Judiciary, *Joint hearings on S. 716, H.R. 2379, and H.R. 2816* (82nd Congress, 1st Session, 1951), pp. 661–666.

[29] AFL, *70th Convention*, 1951, p. 103.

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] *Joint hearings*, 1951, pp. 544–552.

year Congress legislated relief for homeless Portuguese in the Azores disaster and for the Dutch expelled from Indonesia. In 1959, immigration waiting lists were shortened when Congress gave non-quota status to all names that had been on the lists more than ten or fifteen years. The tally sheet of exceptions to the quota system grew in this vein year by year. By 1963, only 33% of those coming to our shores annually—103,000 out of 306,000 immigrants—arrived under the provisions of the national origins quota system.[32]

The story of the McCarran Act of 1952, presented here with relation to labor's views on the refugee problem, will return in suceeding portions of this paper, principally in the consideration of the evolution of labor policy on the national origins quota system. At that point the change in labor's policies on the refugee problem will become clearer. Until the McCarran era, refugee relief was considered a duty of the United States above and beyond its normal immigration policy. When reverence for the national origins system dissolved, the role of refugee relief in the total American policy picture was bound to change.

CHAPTER III. MEXICAN LABORERS IN THE UNITED STATES

The problem of temporary imported labor, especially from Mexico and Jamaica, took some time to become a full-fledged thorn in the side of American labor. But by 1950, the bracero program had taken its place alongside refugee relief and the national origins quota as one of the principal elements in AFL immigration policies.[33] The CIO was soon to join the fray.

The 1950 convention of the AFL was strong in its protest against bracero and wetback labor in American harvest fields.[34] The farmers who called for importation of seasonal labor based their demands on a false premise, the Executive Council reported. Actually, the shortage of field hands was caused by a wage scale and living conditions that no American laborer would endure, not by the lack of available manpower.

The 82nd Congress did pass remedial legislation in 1952. Both the AFL and the CIO conventions protested vigorously that the new law's teeth had been pulled because of "big farming" pressure.[35] The only reason for even this innocuous bill was that the Mexican Government had threatened to cut off the bracero program at the root unless labor conditions improved. The new law merely provided some feeble tightening of controls against illegal or "wetback" immigration.[36]

The following year saw very little action in the area of the bracero question. The enabling legislation was up for renewal. For the first time, labor made some headway in opposing the program, as Congress reduced the proposed continuance from three years to two.[37]

1954 represents a turning point in the labor approach to the matter. Both major union groups began giving the bracero program detailed consideration, and set more weight on this question in their policy statements to Congress.

In a review of the situation, the CIO's 1954 resolution urged the launching of a broad program to coordinate all the forces that opposed the importation of temporary agricultural workers. Among the measures suggested were:

(1) cooperation with other reform groups;

(2) support of legislation hitting at labor contractors, the housing situation, and educational opportunities for migrant workers;

(3) legislation to allow contract workers into this country only under a formal agreement and written contract;

(4) legislation to make it a felony to hire, transport or exploit wetbacks;

(5) legislation forbidding unilateral American determination of work conditions for foreign workers;

(6) laws requiring equal conditions and wages for all farm laborers, whether American or foreign.[38]

By December, 1955, when the American Federation of Labor held its 74th and last convention, Congress had passed a further extension of the Mexican Farm Labor Act, setting the expiration date at mid-1959. Labor contractors were allowed to recruit right at the Mexican border, encouraging illegal entry, rather than having to send to the interior of Mexico for labor. The volume of braceros in 1954 had risen to 309,033, an increase of 33% over 1953.

The AFL had sought a plan whereby, among other provisions, employers would be obliged to offer jobs to Americans before opening them to Mexicans, and ensuring that the terms for native or alien were the same, namely: (1) a written contract; (2) free transportation; (3) housing; (4) subsistence allowance; (5) guarantee of employment; (6) the right to representation for the maintenance of contract; (7) health and accident insurance; (8) medical care; (9) wages based on the prevailing scale.

Again, labor scored a limited victory in a compromise bill signed by President Eisenhower on August 9, 1955.[39]

The trend was by this time fairly well established. Succeeding conventions of the merged AFL–CIO recorded in dry, formal resolutions labor's continued opposition to foreign seasonal labor in American harvest lands. Meanwhile, the labor group on Capitol Hill continued to urge Congressional opposition to the bracero program.[40]

In 1964, the immigration reform legislation recommended by the late President John F. Kennedy allowed the admission of seasonal labor on a permanent visa basis under a "labor shortage" provision. The AFL–CIO policy statement presented at the House hearings requested that the law require that the jobs to be filled by aliens as a basis for their entry into the United States should be of a permanent nature, not merely seasonal or temporary.[41]

In the following session of Congress the same bill appeared under the sponsorship of Senator PHILIP A. HART and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER. The 1965 hearings elicited the same response from the AFL–CIO as the previous inquiries. The Executive Council issued a statement on February 25th, embodying the same points as Meiklejohn, the head of the AFL–CIO lobby, had presented to the subcommittee in 1964.

Among several labor leaders who testified at the 1965 Senate hearings was James B. Carey, President of the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE) and Secretary-Treasurer of the AFL–CIO. In the course of his repartee with Senator SAM J. ERVIN of North Carolina, Carey managed to make it quite plain that the AFL–CIO did not want the bracero program. And the reason for that was that the bracero program depressed the agricultural workers' wage scale.[42]

Three months later, in the course of the same hearings, Senator JACOB JAVITS of New York suggested to Meiklejohn that the AFL–CIO ought to see to it that adequate labor is available to supply the needs of American agriculture when and if the bracero program should be terminated.[43]

In a final recapitulation, AFL–CIO lobbyist Andrew J. Biemiller had outlined at the House hearings the basic big-labor policy:

(1) no braceros;

(2) alien labor for American jobs only when there is a real shortage and the jobs are permanent;

(3) discretion for determining labor shortage conditions to be vested in the Secretary of Labor directly, not merely by delegation from the Attorney General. Biemiller put it forcefully:

"Yet I say on behalf of the AFL–CIO, that our members are willing to pay higher prices for agricultural commodities if that is necessary to assure fair wages to those who work in the fields and in the plants.[44]

He then cited figures to show how small a fraction of food costs were due to the field labor element.[45]

Success came on October 2, 1965. Section 212 (a) of the Celler Bill embodied all labor had asked for regarding temporary alien laborers.

CHAPTER IV. THE NATIONAL ORIGINS QUOTA SYSTEM

The second chapter of this paper brought out the fact that the basic American problem regarding the displaced persons and refugee programs stemmed from the inflexible national origins quota system. Legislation to aid refugees from 1948 until the 1960's resulted in such a mass of exceptions to the national origins rules that the system could be considered to have been defunct long before it was supplanted by the 1965 legislation.

How organized labor came to hold this conclusion long before the law was changed is the subject of this chapter.

Oriental quota restored

At the end of World War II the AFL position on the "barred races" of the Asia-Pacific Triangle was made quite clear in the policy statement already cited.[46] Along with many other groups, the union leaders considered the orientals so culturally alien to the American way of life that they were "unassimilable".

However, consideration of the results of such discrimination upon America's image in foreign eyes led the AFL to favor a 1948 proposal to establish quotas for the eastern nations.[47]

The Congressional efforts in this direction dragged on into 1949. The new bill introduced that year was designed to give oriental

---

[32] Emanuel Celler, *House Hearings*, 1964, pp. 4–6.

[33] AFL, *66th Convention*, 1947, p. 252; *67th Convention*, 1948, p. 139; *68th Convention*, 1949, p. 207.

[34] AFL, *69th Convention*, 1950, p. 181.

[35] AFL, *71st Convention*, 1952, pp. 27–28.

[36] CIO, *14th Convention*, 1952, p. 126.

[37] CIO, *15th Convention*, 1953, p. 199.

[38] CIO, *16th Convention*, 1954, pp. 525–526.

[39] AFL, *74th Convention*, 1955, pp. 127–129.

[40] American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, *Proceedings of the 2nd Constitutional Convention*, 1957 (Washington: AFL–CIO, 1957), vol. I, p. 295; *4th Convention*, 1961, vol. II, p. 223.

[41] Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, Legislative Representative, AFL–CIO, [Statement] in: U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, *Hearings on H.R. 7700 and 55 identical bills* . . . (88th Congress, 2nd Session, 1964), p. 709.

[42] James B. Carey, [Statement] in: U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, *Hearings on S. 500* (89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965), p. 472.

[43] *Senate hearings*, 1965, p. 645.

[44] Andrew J. Biemiller, [Statement] in: U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, *Hearings on H.R. 2580* (89th Congress, 1st Session), p. 322–324.

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] Cited on page 4.

[47] AFL, *67th Convention*, 1948, p. 141.

nations nominal immigration quotas of 100, and to allow the naturalization of aliens of oriental extraction. At the AFL convention in October, held while Congress was still in session, the Executive Council continued to sponsor the yet unpassed legislation. The AFL recognized, the report said, that some concession was needed to protect America's image abroad. On the other hand, the present bill would have negligible effects upon the American culture and "racial mix".[48]

Orientals in the Walter-McCarran Act

The movement for the codification and possible revision of American immigration statutes resulted in a number of alternate omnibus bills before Congress in 1951 and 1952. The AFL submitted a lengthy policy declaration at the joint hearings in 1951. Among the reasons for opposing the pooling of unused quota numbers was found the fear of "a tendency to disturb the ethnic equilibrium of this country." [49]

Yet the AFL supported the grant of quotas to the nations of the Asia-Pacific Triangle, and even took exception to the McCarran Bill's section 202(a)(5), which based the immigration of orientals on their race, while other ethnic groups were judged solely on the basis of national origin. This support was due not only to humanitarian motives, but more especially on the fear that the Communists could capitalize upon this discrimination and harm our foreign relations with Asiatic countries.[50]

After the Walter-McCarran Act passed into law over the veto of President Harry S. Truman, the AFL Executive Council prepared a report on the matter for the 71st AFL convention in September, 1952. Pleased at having picked a winner, and pointing out among the new law's achievements the provisions that eliminated race as a bar to immigration and naturalization, the AFL policy makers noted approvingly that despite the relaxation of the total ban on Asiatics, "fixed limitations are provided to prevent an influx of Orientals." [51]

Ironically, a decade later, AFL–CIO representatives at a new set of immigration hearings would cite these same provisions as a major obstacle in relations between the United States and her closest Far Eastern ally, Japan, both on the government level and in the area of international labor union relations.[52]

"Traditional policy" of the American Federation of Labor

The demand for restricting immigration at the turn of the century was indeed backed by organized labor, and by the American Federation of Labor in particular, but the reason for labor's support was not primarily racial. The AFL, with a large immigrant membership, did not endorse the literacy test until 1897. From about 1906, Gompers and the AFL encouraged this and other methods of slowing the torrent of "new immigration" for economic reasons.[53]

The founder of the American Federation of Labor was urging the adoption of a literacy test, a head tax, the requirement of some visible means of support, and the abolition of the Distribution Bureau. Gompers observed that although laborers generally thought the United States would continue its policy of unlimited immigration, several considerations militated against such a policy. First, big business was taking advantage of the situation to import cheap labor and strikebreakers. The resulting fierce competition for employment between new arrivals and the older immigrants led to the deterioration of wage and living standards in many communities.[54]

However, Gompers was not entirely free from racial considerations. He wrote: "We recognize the noble possibilities in the poorest of the children of the earth who come to us from European lands. We know that their civilization is sufficiently near our own to bring their descendants in one generation up to the general level of the best American citizenship." [55]

After World War II, "traditional policy" became a sacred phrase in the AFL. This vague term covered many elements, based on the provisions of the 1924 legislation the organization had supported, especially the preservation of the national origins quota system and the oriental exclusion policy. This "traditional policy" was invoked in support of the AFL's stand in 1947, 1948, and 1949, frequently in the same breath as references to the need for offering the victims of war-torn Europe asylum in the United States.[56]

The Congress of Industrial Organizations only mentioned race in connection with the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, in a request that Congress "remove from the Act those features which discriminates [sic] against groups or individuals on the basis of race, religion or origin." [57] There is no attempt to base the CIO policy on a "tradition" of the ten-year-old organization.

The call to codify leads to reappraisal

The first plea from labor to organize the welter of legislation on the books came in 1950. Pat McCarran, as has been noted, introduced an omnibus bill that session. The AFL convention in 1950 requested a study of immigration policy. The CIO had already expressed its opinion of McCarran and of his attitude towards the national origins system,[58] but no formal statement on the proposed codification was issued by its 1950 convention.

At the 1951 AFL convention the "traditional policy" line continued to dominate: "Our main emphasis now is not only to substantially maintain the existing framework, but to strengthen and unify procedures. . . ." [59] A year later the AFL leadership announced its policy favoring the newly passed McCarran Act. What the AFL claimed it had opposed was not the national origins quota system but

(1) pooling (out of concern for the "ethnic equilibrium of this country");

(2) wetbacks and other illegal entries;

(3) the mortgage system;

(4) unlimited Western hemisphere immigration quota.

The AFL rejected the Humphrey-Lehman substitute bill because it was based on the 1950 census, which would have increased the total immigration quota by 70,000, and because it allowed pooling. Finally, the Executive Council listed six of the new measure's advantages:

(1) elimination of race as a bar to immigration;

(2) ending of discrimination by sex;

(3) giving of preference status for special skills;

(4) institution of broader grounds for deportation or exclusion;

(5) establishment of judicial review and changes in red tape;

(6) empowering of the President to suspend immigration at any time.[60]

The contrast between this position and that of the CIO is startling. The "President's Report" read to the 1952 CIO convention was written by Philip Murray, before his death less than a month previously. Murray stigmatized the McCarran Act as "one of the most severe blows to civil liberties, as well as to American relations with citizens of foreign nations. . . ." He went on to charge the new law with:

(1) racial discrimination;

(2) unreasonable new grounds for exclusion, deportation and even loss of citizenship;

(3) "star chamber" abuses, weakening the right to judicial review;

(4) smearing the foreign image of the United States.

Murray followed up with an accusation that the Judiciary Committees had avoided discussion of the Lehman Bill while rushing McCarran's proposal through Congress.[61] The convention responded with a resolution calling for the immediate repeal of the McCarran Act. At very least, Congress must provide for the pooling of unused quota numbers until such time as the national origins quota system could be totally abolished.[62]

The super-union emerges

"What's wrong with the McCarran Act" became a regular theme in CIO circles after 1952.[63] In time, new defects were discovered in the law. The principal ones were:

(1) red tape and overlapping jurisdiction, especially between the State Department and the Department of Justice;

(2) ambiguous standards;

(3) second-class citizenship for naturalized citizens;

(4) lack of a statute of limitations on deportation;

(5) total quota insufficient (should be at least 250,000).[64]

After the 1954 Congressional uproar in the course of which both political parties called for drastic immigration reforms, the AFL Executive Council called for a thorough study of labor's policies in this regard. Two other groups at the same convention went further, filing resolutions to repeal the new legislation or drastically change it. David Dubinsky labeled the McCarran Act "discriminatory . . . unsound and unjust." Both these strongly worded resolutions were referred to sleep by the appropriate committee.[65]

The American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations merged forces in mid-December of 1955. At the 74th and last convention of the AFL, held in New York City on December 1 and 2, the principal task in hand was putting the merger to a vote and ironing out the last-minute details. Among the details to be wrapped up was a spanking new look at AFL immigration policy.

---

[48] AFL, *68th Convention*, 1949, pp. 206–207, 209.

[49] *Joint hearings*, 1951, p. 664.

[50] *Ibid.*

[51] AFL, *71st Convention*, 1952, p. 260.

[52] *Senate hearings*, 1964, p. 468; *House hearings*, 1964, pp. 721–727; *House hearings*, 1965, p. 329.

[53] Maldwyn Allen Jones, *American Immigration* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), pp. 222, 254–255, 268–269.

[54] Samuel Gompers, "Immigration—up to Congress," *The American Federationist* 18 (January 1911), pp. 17–21.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[56] AFL, *65th Convention*, 1946, p. 521; *66th Convention*, 1947, p. 252; *67th Convention*, 1948, pp. 420, 121; *68th Convention*, 1949, pp. 209, 464.

[57] CIO, *10th Convention*, 1948, p. 386.

[58] CIO, *11 Convention*, 1949, p. 119.

[59] AFL, *70th Convention*, 1951, p. 103.

[60] AFL, *71st Convention*, 1952, pp. 259–260.

[61] CIO, *14th Convention*, 1952, pp. 131–132.

[62] *Ibid.*, pp. 277–279.

[63] Setting the pace within a month of the convention was "Why the McCarran Act is Unfair," *338 News* (December, 1952), pp. 18–20.

[64] CIO, *15th Convention*, 1953, pp. 543–544, contrast this with the AFL fear of opening the gates too wide with the Lehman Bill (1952 *Convention*, p. 259).

[65] AFL *73rd Convention*, 1954, pp. 109, 405, 421, 541.

The Executive Council reported on the study requested by the 1954 convention. In an unprecedented reversal of position, the report criticized the major elements of current legislation, particularly:

(1) the national origins quota system, under which 77% of the total quota went to five nations;

(2) the mortgage system; this had resulted in some quotas being halved for centuries to come; [66]

(3) a preference system that did not work: in theory, 50% of the total quota (over 77,000 visas) was reserved for skilled workers; actually only 1,429 aliens in this category immigrated in 1954;

(4) arbitrary powers to exclude or deport aliens vested in the Attorney General.

The report concluded with a request "that the traditional policy of the American Federation of Labor on this subject be reexamined." [67]

All the resolutions submitted to the 1955 AFL convention were referred to the proper committees of the coming first convention of the merged AFL–CIO. Nevertheless, this final gathering of the AFL produced a significant departure from "traditional policy" and established a new outlook in harmony with that of the CIO, which the new superunion would carry forward until the passage of the 1965 immigration reforms.

The AFL–CIO era

Congressional opposition to any alterations in the letter of the McCarran law with its national origins quota system continued through the next decade. The first AFL–CIO convention urged that "the McCarran-Walter Act be revised and liberalized, to reflect the democratic and humanitarian traditions of our country and to provide an immigration policy attuned to the present requirements of our own nation and of the entire free world." [68]

The following year saw some half-hearted attempts to pass reform legislation in Congress, but as the 1957 AFL-CIO convention put it in the Executive Council Report, Congress was "not ready to enact such basic reform." [69] Even President Dwight D. Eisenhower's compromise bill, further watered down in debate, failed to pass.

At the 1957 convention in Atlantic City, the unions set forth guidelines for immigration legislation:

(1) the United States can absorb at least 250,000 immigrants annually, without counting non-quota immigrants in this figure;

(2) the national origins system is discriminatory, and produces resentment abroad; it should be replaced by standards of family reunion, the technical and professional needs of America, refugee asylum, national interest in general, and resettlement;

(3) a balance must be struck between efforts to screen out subversives and fair, democratic administrative procedures, both for aliens and for naturalized citizens;

(4) temporary labor programs should be eliminated, or used as a last resort when the need is both genuine and great; such programs should be instituted "only under fully enforced international agreements"; the Mexican contract labor program needs a great deal of correction to protect both American and Mexican laborers.[70]

Finale

The evolution of labor's policy on immigration had reached its final stage by 1955, and the succeeding decade was merely to record the growth of similar opinions in Congress, influenced, no doubt, partly by big labor. In articles and statements in labor union magazines, in policy declarations by the Executive Council, in testimony before congressional hearings, the same policy recurs time and again until 1965. It took ten years, but America's immigration policy did finally change.

CONCLUSION

The immigration policies of the United States since World War II resolved themselves into three important issues: the national origins quota system, the bracero program, and the question of asylum for refugees.

The clear evolution in the immigration policies of the American Federation of Labor between 1946 and 1956 stand in sharp contrast with those of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which remained stable in that period. From a position steadfastly advocating the "traditional policy" of national origins quota, oriental exclusion, and drastically limited immigration, the AFL came to adopt a liberal standard, after a reappraisal of policy in 1954–1955. The new policy called for the abolition of discriminatory provisions in the immigration and naturalization processes of this nation, and requested a substantial increase in the total immigration flow to the United States. This corresponded closely to the policy endorsed several years previously by the CIO, and the reappraisal that led to the new AFL policy was completed at the convention that ratified the merger of the two organizations.

Because of the limited sources available, the scope of this study has been confined to fluctuations in labor's official positions. The story of factions within the labor movement in regard to immigration policies did not emerge from the material thus far published.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Federation of Labor, *Report of the proceedings of the . . . Convention.* Washington, D.C.: Ransdell, 1946–1955.

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, *Proceedings of the . . . Constitutional Convention.* Washington, D.C.: AFL–CIO, 1956–1963.

Congress of Industrial Organizations, *Proceedings of the . . . Constitutional Convention.* Washington, D.C.: CIO, 1948–1955.

Gompers, Samuel, "Immigration—Up to Congress." *The American Federationist* 18 (1911) pp. 17–21.

The New York Times, 1946–1964.

U.S. Congress, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Volume 111 (89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965).

U.S. Congress, Subcommittees of the Committees on the Judiciary, *Joint Hearings on S. 716, H.R. 2379, and H.R. 2816.* (82nd Congress, 1st Session, 1951).

U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization. *Hearings on S. 500* (89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965).

U.S. Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization. *Hearings on H.R. 7700 and 55 identical bills . . .* (88th Congress, 2nd Session, 1964).

U.S. Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 1. *Hearings on H.R. 2580* (89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965).

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957.*

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1963.*

"Why the McCarran Act is Unfair." *338 News* (December, 1952), p. 18-20.

[66] The report cited as examples: Latvia, quota halved for 320 years, until A.D. 2274; Estonia until 2146; Lithuania until 2090; Yugoslavia until 2114; Poland (quota of 6,488) until 2000.

[67] AFL, *74th Convention,* 1955, pp. 124–126.

[68] American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, *1st Constitutional Convention, 1955* (Washington: AFL–CIO, 1955), pp. 104–105.

[69] AFL–CIO, *2nd Convention,* 1957, pp. 294–295.

[70] *Ibid.*

GENERAL CASIMIR PULASKI—FATHER OF AMERICAN CAVALRY

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the memory of a great Polish patriot, Count Casimir Pulaski, who 187 years ago gave his life in order that our country might be free.

Pulaski was only 31 when he died from wounds received in the Battle of Savannah. Despite his youth, he had established a brilliant reputation in the field of cavalry and was foremost in the ranks of those wholeheartedly dedicated to the cause of liberty.

Pulaski once said:

Wherever on the globe men are fighting for liberty, it is as if it were our own affair.

And true to his words, Pulaski came to America to give his assistance to the colonists in their struggle for independence.

He first distinguished himself at the Battle of Brandywine, and then, in subsequent encounters with the enemy, he continued to demonstrate exceptional bravery and superb leadership under stress of fire. The Continental Congress, recognizing his contributions and ability, conferred on him the rank of brigadier general and placed him in command of all our cavalry forces.

General Pulaski then began the arduous task of reorganizing and improving the American cavalry. So thorough was he in discharging his responsibility that he even prepared a book of drill regulations and rules for officers and privates which still serves as the basis of cavalry drills in the U.S. Army.

Although he did not live to see America win her independence, Pulaski's gallantry in the field of battle and his complete devotion to the cause of freedom helped our country immeasurably in winning the ultimate victory.

In this millennial year, as the Polish people celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's nationhood and Christianity, it is especially fitting to remember Pulaski's courage in the face of tyranny, his patriotism, his warmth and generosity, for these are all characteristics that the Poles have demonstrated throughout centuries of strife and foreign domination.

I am particularly aware of these extraordinary qualities of the Polish people because in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, there are over 30,000 Polish-Americans who, together with Americans of Polish descent throughout the United States, have contributed much to the advancement of

our culture and the preservation of our Nation.

Pulaski was the embodiment of the best traditions of Polish courage and chivalry. The man who was destined to become the father of American cavalry and who twice saved General Washington's army from disruption, was a nobleman born to high social position and a life of ease and complacency. Yet he remained loyal to his ideals and chose a career of many hardships in order to advance the cause of liberty and uphold the fundamental rights of the individual. He is remembered as a hero of two hemispheres—in one for his valiant efforts to prevent the partition of Poland, and in the other for his outstanding contributions during America's war of independence.

With real pride and a deep feeling of gratitude, I join my colleagues in the Congress and my fellow Americans in commemorating the anniversary of General Pulaski's death. This great man made the supreme sacrifice in the age-old struggle for freedom. It now remains our task to rededicate ourselves to that noble cause.

THE FUTURE CITIES

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent at this point in the RECORD to insert the splendid editorial in yesterday's Washington Post supporting the demonstration cities bill which will be before the House later this week. The article underscores the urgency of the need of our cities for this legislation and I commend the editorial to our colleagues for its cogent and convincing arguments in support of this bill.

The editorial follows:

THE FUTURE CITIES

The rebuilding of the American cities is urgent business, and the Demonstration Cities Bill is urgent legislation. The Senate has recognized the necessity that attends this bill, and the House now has a clear duty to pass it. The Congressman who votes against this bill forfeits all future right to complain about the quality of city life, and the frustrations of city people.

The chief reproach against the Demonstration Cities Bill is simply that it is too small. It contains neither enough money nor enough public powers to do the whole job. But it at least makes a beginning, and requires both city and Federal authorities to take a far broader view of their responsibilities.

The reorganization of the urban programs is the truly essential purpose of this bill. City governments are being stunned by the multiplicity of new Federal programs, of which there are literally hundreds, and the complexity of each city's relationships with dozens of Federal agencies, of which each has its own peculiar internal procedures. The great service of this bill is that it begins to arrange the Federal programs for effective use by the cities, rather than for the convenience of tradition-bound Federal administrators. The passage of this bill is crucial to the new and sprawling Department of Housing and Urban Development; without this bill, HUD remains a conglomeration of agencies mainly interested in real estate and, particularly in the case of the Federal Housing Administration, mainly oriented to the suburban housing developers. The full public benefits of the creation of the new Department have not yet been felt because Congress has not yet passed the Demonstration Cities Bill.

The opponents of the bill, fearing defeat in any rational debate, have attempted to drag it into the race issue. The Republican Policy Committee charge, that the bill will lead to bussing school children, is wholly spurious and deserves only contempt.

The real issue is the determination and ability of Congress to fulfill its part in the Federal-local relationship, and to ensure that the American cities will be habitable and pleasant places to live in this time of great population growth. Most Americans are now city-dwellers; the Demonstration Cities Bill is a welcome and necessary new departure in building their world.

TWENTY-TWO LEADERS BACK MODEL CITIES BILL

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD, an article in this morning's Washington Post which gives us the most heartening news that many of the top business leaders in America support the demonstration cities bill which is scheduled for floor action this week. The 22 top business executives listed in the article comprise an honor roll of American business leadership and I wish to commend these splendid gentlemen for their forthright and statesmanlike position in supporting the President's demonstration cities bill which will give our cities and towns the helping hand they need to mount a successful attack on the critical urban problems which beset them.

The article follows:

TWENTY-TWO LEADERS BACK MODEL CITIES BILL

Twenty-two of the Nation's top business executives called for enactment of the Administration's demonstration cities bill yesterday in a statement terming the American city "the most pressing domestic problem of our time."

The legislation passed the Senate on August 19 and is slated for debate in the House on Thursday.

The group of businessmen said they are mindful of the need to hold down Federal expenditures but described the demonstration cities bill as "a fiscally responsible" measure that "America needs."

The statement was supported by:

Stephen D. Bechtel, chairman, Bechtel Corporation; Fred J. Borch, President, General Electric Company; Donald Cook, President, American Electric Power Service Corp.; Howard L. Clark, President, American Express Company; Justin Dart, President, Rexall Drug and Chemical Company; R. Gwin Follis, Chairman of the Board, Standard Oil of California; Henry Ford II, Chairman of the Board, Ford Motor Company; Thomas S. Gates Jr., Chairman of the Board, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company; Ben Heineman, Chairman of the Board, Chicago and North Western Railway; Edgar F. Kaiser, President, Kaiser Industries Corporation; David Kennedy, Chairman of the Board, Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company; Robert Lehman, Chairman of the Board, Lehman Brothers; Cyril J. Magnin, President, Joseph Magnin Company; John McCone, investment banker; Stanley Marcus, President, Neiman-Marcus; Alfred E. Perlman, President, Pennsylvania New York Central Transportation Company; Herman H. Pevler, President, Norfolk & Western Railway Company; David Rockefeller, President, The Chase Manhattan Bank; Stuart Saunders, Chairman of the Board, Pennsylvania Railway; Herbert R. Silverman, Chairman of the Board, James Talcott, Inc.; Jack I. Straus, Chairman of the Board, R. H. Macy, Inc.; and Thomas J. Watson Jr., Chairman of the Board, International Business Machines Corporation.

COORDINATION OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, when the House was considering H.R. 16715, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act, I made the following comments:

With the permission of the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], I wish to make a further commitment to this House, on behalf of the subcommittee. We are concerned over the lack of coordination between the Manpower Development and Training Act and related programs, including the war on poverty and others. At the beginning of the next Congress, it is the intention of the present members of the subcommittee to embark upon a thorough, detailed, professional study of the manpower training and work-experience programs financed by the Federal Government, with a view to eliminating duplication, increasing efficiency and developing an overall policy in this vital area. In this study, as in the preparation of this present bill, we look forward to working in the closest cooperation with the minority members of the subcommittee. It is our hope that at some point in the next Congress, we may be able to present to the House a series of basic amendments to the legislation in question, if basic amendments are in fact required; recommendations for administrative rearrangements, if they are in fact needed; and a broad, overall report to the Congress on manpower policy for the years immediately ahead.

A few days later, when the House was considering H.R. 15111, the bill to amend and extend the Economic Opportunity Act, I again discussed the vital question of coordination of manpower programs—a goal which I believe the provisions of that bill will help bring closer.

The latest issue of the Monthly Labor Report, a publication of the Bureau of

Labor Statistics, contains, among other fine articles, a portion of a paper by Mr. Harold C. Taylor of the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. Mr. Taylor has some constructive suggestions to make about the possibilities of greater coordination in the manpower area. I cannot make any definitive judgments on the merits of Mr. Taylor's suggestions, but certainly they are the kind of proposals our study next year should examine most closely.

Mr. Taylor's article reads as follows:

COORDINATION OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS

(By Harold C. Taylor of the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is taken from Dimensions of Manpower Policy: Programs and Research, a compilation of papers prepared by the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, to commemorate its 20th anniversary. The volume, edited by Sar A. Levitan and Irving H. Siegel, is to be published in mid-November by The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md. (267 pp., $6.95). A portion of the author's paper, "Perspective for Public Understanding of Federal Manpower Programs", the article describes by analogy some of the coordinating problems that may arise and some of the solutions proposed.)

At the Federal level, it is certain that the need for coordination of manpower programs is recognized and that efforts to improve coordination will have a high priority. In these efforts, we can take for granted there will be, or there have been, interagency committees, corresponding reasonably well to the operating committee in the electronics firm used as an illustration. These will, however, be interagency committees on manpower programs, rather than one over-all operating committee.

In the light of our discussion of how to cope with the problems of functional organizations, it is natural to wonder whether there might be a Federal "product manager" for manpower development programs. Would he be in the Executive Office of the President, assigned full time to worry about the various manpower programs, to act by information and persuasion, and, where necessary, to seek directives from the President or new legislation from the Congress? A Presidential assistant could, of course, perform these functions without having any title designating him as the product manager, though there might be some advantage in his being acknowledged by all as the man assigned to these functions.

Following the first Watts incident in Los Angeles, the Federal Government carried on an expediter operation that deserves serious consideration as a coordinating device. A high-level interagency team went to Los Angeles to determine what programs were needed to cope as effectively as possible with the adverse conditions that preceded the outbreak of violence. This team used information and persuasion to improve the program efforts of the State and local agencies involved in the Watts area. They determined also, in some detail, the financing efforts needed from all relevant Federal agencies and returned to Washington with tangible recommendations. Program financing for the Watts area was made available very promptly. If these same programs had been developed solely by the Los Angeles people and had been sent to Washington through the usual channels, they would necessarily have been subject to a delay of several months or more.

The great potential of this type of expediter team approach is almost self-evident. The approach has been continued, but only within the Department of Labor itself, in a "selected cities" program, and is regarded as quite successful. One is forced to assume, however, that the device would be rated even more successful if it could be extended to include other Federal agencies, especially the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity. At this moment of writing, such interagency coordinating teams are being established in a number of metropolitan areas.

In our discussion of functional structures at the Federal level, we must observe that the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), in several respects, does not fit the usual mold. It is in part a product shop or problem-oriented organization. Thus, it operates Job Corps centers directly, with its own funds and under its own supervision, although most training and educational functions of the Federal Government are channeled through the Office of Education or through parts of the Labor Department. On the other hand, for the recruitment and referral of Job Corps applicants, the OEO relies substantially on existing public employment offices. There is nothing inherently irrational about this. For instance, the electronics firm [a hypothetical industrial analogue set up previously by the author] could decide that, although its functional shops are good for most purposes, the whole hearing aid business is really something special and should be set up almost entirely as a separate business. Even so, a single employment office could refer applicants to all parts of the company, including the hearing aid division.

The Office of Economic Opportunity departs from the usual Federal pattern also in that its activities cut directly from the Federal level to the local level (thus essentially bypassing State governments). Furthermore, at the local level, it deals with private nongovernmental agencies as well as with public agencies.

Are these differences desirable or not? Perhaps the attitude of the electronics company will help us decide. Certainly, with an already established and generally excellent series of functional shops, the company would be very reluctant to jerk out the hearing aid business and set it up elsewhere. There would be duplication. For example, more punch presses would be needed, and more people to run them; and "duplication" is a bad word in business just as it is in Government. Even so, if the company is forced to conclude that the hearing aid business is really something special, not readily meshed with the other parts of the business, it must set up this activity separately or give up the hearing aid business.

The structure of OEO is neither to be criticized nor to be lauded just because it is different. The issue is simply whether it works better this way. This point of view doesn't carry us far toward an answer, but at least it poses the right question.

Another observation should be made with regard to the separateness of the OEO from the departments previously carrying on the Federal manpower programs. Being new, and having no long-standing commitments in terms of objectives and established procedures, the OEO might be expected to come up more readily with some fresh thinking and innovative ideas. Some observers believe that such new thinking is already evident and that it is beginning to permeate the thinking of the "old-line" and perhaps somewhat rigid agencies. If so, this is a plus mark of considerable importance.

STATE LEVEL

Let us turn now from Federal organizational problems and possible devices for coping with them to the State level. The multiplicity of functions being carried on at the State level seems even more confusing, if possible, than at the Federal level. If, for example, an agency official in some community wants to understand everything going on in his State in the new field of manpower development, there will be a half-dozen to a dozen persons whom he will have to contact before his information is complete. These will include officers of the State government, State officers of Federal agencies, regional officers of Federal agencies, and, in some cases, persons in the Washington headquarters of agencies.

Manifestly, the sheer problem of ascertaining where to go and whom to see is very nearly insurmountable. A few devices for coping with this difficulty come easily to mind. First, in each State there could be a manpower programs information office. In this one office, an agency official from a community should be able to obtain all the information he needs to answer any specific question he may have in mind.

Second, the Governor of each State could appoint a manpower coordinator or product manager to worry about the conduct and coordination of manpower programs in the State. This coordinator or manager, it must be noted, would have an even more troubled existence than his counterpart in industry because some of the matters with which he must concern himself (OEO programs, for example) are not under the management of his boss, the Governor. The State manpower coordinator could, as a part of his job, operate the manpower programs information office referred to above.

An innovation now being tried in West Virginia and Hawaii is the manpower authority set up by statute and having defined powers. This legislative charter distinguishes it sharply from the product manager role. The "authority" device is too new to evaluate at this time.

All these devices illustrate, but surely do not exhaust, the list of possible procedures by which functionally diverse programs at the State level may be encompassed and coordinated. Let us turn now to local problems and instrumentalities for handling them.

LOCAL LEVEL

It is at the community level, of course, that all programs are actually being conducted. Federal and State roles are largely those of establishing requirements, of financing, and, to some degree, of monitoring performance.

The manifold character and complexity of functions performed therefore become most sharply apparent in the community. Some of these functions—notably in OEO programs—are based largely on directives from Washington. Some agencies are instruments of the State—the employment office, categorical aids, and others. Some functions are administered by counties, some by municipal governments, some by independent school districts, and many by private nongovernmental agencies. The diversity is staggering. Let us note a number of community experiences and devices, largely to make clear how greatly the problems stem from the inescapable fact that organizational structures are mostly functional.

At the local level, the device of the product manager, a person designated to worry about all of the community's manpower problems, has some definite merits. However, the device does not seem promising, because there is no boss who has administrative control over any sizable proportion of the total range of programs.

There is in most communities a community services council, which, year in and year out, has the job of bringing about voluntary coordination among all the agencies, both public and private. On the other hand, citizens who have worked on council committees are painfully aware of the modest success that usually attends their efforts to direct "functional shops" toward the solution of multifunctional problems or multiproblem groups. A few of the community experiences

may offer some useful insights into what works and what doesn't.

In St. Paul, Minn., a fairly large-scale project was initiated in 1948 to focus the efforts of the functional shops in that city on the problems of the hard-core poverty families. This followed the discovery that about 6 percent of the city's families "were suffering from such a compounding of serious problems that they were absorbing well over half of the combined services of the community's dependency, health, and adjustment agencies."[1] The procedure, basically, was that each of the major functional agencies loaned a staff member to a task force, which directed its attention entirely to the 6,600 hard-core poverty families. This cadre of workers thus represented in part a little product shop, devoted to the hard-core poverty family. In part, also, this cadre had some of the advantages of an operating committee, since each member of the cadre could carry back to his own functional shop some good ideas whose conception was beyond his own limitations of time and scope.

The St. Paul voluntary cadre of functional agencies has long been regarded as a successful experiment and a useful pattern. Now, however, nearly two decades later, the procedure seems not to have inspired as much imitation as had been anticipated in 1950.

In December 1963, following the Studebaker shutdown in South Bend, Dr. Harold L. Sheppard of the Upjohn Institute staff was asked by the Area Redevelopment Administration to go to South Bend to act as Federal coordinator. The task was twofold: (1) to assist the people and agencies in South Bend to do all they could to cope with the emergency, and (2) to bring to bear quickly every pertinent Federal aid program. This role of Dr. Sheppard's will be seen immediately as analogous to that of the expediter in dealing with a large group of functional shops in South Bend, in regional offices of Federal agencies, and in Washington. Dr. Sheppard's report of his experiences displays considerable enthusiasm for the success of efforts within the South Bend community itself and considerable frustration and exasperation in moving the Federal agencies to action.[2]

In view of our earlier observation that community coordinating efforts usually meet with only modest success, why was the South Bend community successful in banding together? It has long been observed that communities do respond well to a crisis. The closing of the Studebaker plant certainly posed a crisis. While the crisis situation itself is not difficult, what is difficult is the slogging, year-in and year-out effort of inducing functional organizations to devote coordinated attention to hard problems when these problems do not involve a clear and present danger.

Why did Dr. Sheppard meet with frustration in his efforts to get prompt action from the Federal agencies? There are many reasons, no doubt. The process of getting things done in vast and ramified agencies is slow and tortuous at best. But, in terms of our analysis of organizational characteristics, we must note that a considerable amount of frustration is the inescapable lot of the expediter. In the electronics firm, the expediter of an order for hearing aids may have to go to the plastics molding department and try to persuade that department to drop whatever it is doing and put through a run of hearing aid cases. He believes that this is more important than the products being worked on at the moment, and, as we listen to the tribulations of the hearing aid expediter, we are inclined to sympathize with his point of view. But, if we could know the whole story, we might be forced to conclude that the order for hearing aid cases will just have to take its turn in the schedule. It is the expediter's job to push his order, but he will not always get what he wants.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER APPROACH

A coordinating device that offers perhaps more hope than any other at the community level is the neighborhood center. In the new manpower development and antipoverty programs, which express our present national concern for the seriously disadvantaged members of the population, such a center would be located in a geographic area characterized by high unemployment, poor housing, low incomes, low education, and so on. Its basic purpose is to consider all the problems of any particular client, and then to refer that client to whatever community service may exist to help him with each and every one of his problems. The client may, for example, need welfare payments, legal aid, medical attention, vocational counseling, vocational or other training, a job, or whatnot. Whatever his problem, the neighborhood center can "expedite" directing the client to the proper place for help.

The culturally deprived, and often suspicious, persons who compose the clientele of this neighborhood center require the expediter's duties to extend far beyond his physical office. He must seek out the clientele in "the field," often by ringing doorbells in the neighborhood. And he must go beyond referring the client to, for example, the public employment service. He may need to take the client to the employment office, take him to a job interview in a company, and take him to and from work for a few days. To return to our industrial analogy for a moment: this expediter is not dealing with the hearing aids that go through the factory in fine shape and come out as salable products. He is concerned with the ones that don't go routinely through the line—the ones that, except for his efforts, would wind up in the scrap pile and the reject bin.

The neighborhood center can operate exactly as just described—that is, as a fully client-centered agency, performing nothing but the expediter function we have set forth. On the other hand, it can go, step by step, beyond that minimum function if local attitudes permit such extensions. Let us illustrate. The public employment office can voluntarily send one or more of its own counselors or placement people to work in the neighborhood center 1 day a week, or oftener if the load requires. The welfare department can do the same, and so can the marital counseling bureau, the legal aid bureau, and other agencies too. The basic neighborhood center—the expediter service—can gratefully utilize whatever functional services are brought to it, and it can get along too when functional services are not or can't be brought close to the disadvantaged clientele in that neighborhood.

The important word characterizing these extensions, of course, is "voluntary." If the public employment service voluntarily assigns a man to work in the office of the neighborhood center and at the same time maintains its full complement of employees, its full budget, its flexibility, and its responsibility for the uniform conduct of public employment functions, its public image is undiluted and unconfused. Performance of all these is important not only to the manager of the public employment office but also to the community as a whole. Where community attitudes and agency interrelationships are favorable, the voluntary assembly of services operating in conjunction with a neighborhood expediter service has much to commend it.

Let us consider now a markedly different pattern for a local neighborhood center. This is one in which all the necessary functional services are under the management of the neighborhood center. The center runs its own employment service, its own family counseling, legal aid, and child guidance services, its own medical clinic, and so on. It is a little product shop. Perhaps this procedure is better than letting the whole job go undone; but, clearly, such a pattern would encourage much local criticism. It involves duplication, certainly. It breeds confusion since, for example, two local outfits would be running employment offices. It would stimulate interagency conflict since the two employment offices (or the two-family counseling services) would have somewhat different viewpoints and even engage in competition for clientele. The two sets of services would also be in competition for some of their funds, whether from Federal or from local sources.

Syracuse, N.Y., has had experience that may offer useful lessons to other communities.[3] Among many efforts in that city to give attention to the problems of youth, one was an organization called Crusade for Opportunity. This organization was set up [not only] to provide expediter services to youth (intake, counseling, and referral) but also to initiate and administer training programs, both institutional and on-the-job, for disadvantaged youth. The Crusade for Opportunity was, therefore, to some degree a product shop—that is, an operating organization devoted to the specific service of helping disadvantaged youth through the performance of various functions. Without detailing the woes of the Crusade for Opportunity directly, let us consider them in the context of our illustrative electronics company.

This company, largely organized as a series of functional shops, has concluded reluctantly through its leadership that the hearing aid business is so special as to require a separate establishment as a product shop; moreover, it has effectuated that decision. Within the hearing aid division, there is a training department devoted to selection, training, and placement of employees for that division. The head of the training department is responsible for carrying out these functions for the division. Down the street, however, is the big factory making everything else but hearing aids, and it has a big training department that is selecting, training, and placing people for every part of the business except the hearing aid division. The training department head in the hearing aid division now finds his ability to carry out his own plans severely limited. He cannot even get any money to run his programs without the approval of the big training department. He cannot select his own trainees: the management of the big training department thinks that it can do the job better. He cannot set his own personnel policies: for example, he cannot decide to dock his trainees for absenteeism unless the big training department agrees—and for several months it doesn't agree. He cannot pay his own trainees; the big training department insists that it must pay his trainees, that his trainees must even go to the

---

[1] Bradley Buell and Associates, *Community Planning for Human Services* (New York; Columbia University Press, 1952), p. 9.

[2] Harold L. Sheppard, Closing of the Studebaker Plant, South Bend, Ind. (U.S. Department of Commerce, Area Redevelopment Administration, 1964), ARA Case Book No. 5.

[3] Sar A. Levitan, "Syracuse Faces Its Youth Unemployment Problems," in U.S. Congress, *1965 Manpower Report of the President; Joint Hearings before Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and House Committee on Education and Labor* (89th Cong., 1st sess.), 381–393. Conclusions drawn in the present report are based on Dr. Levitan's description of conditions in early 1965, and do not take account of any developments that may have occurred in Syracuse since then.

office of the big department to get their money.

The above list of tribulations is, of course, derived entirely from experience of the Syracuse Crusade for Opportunity. But let us continue for a moment with the electronics company. The big decision for the company, obviously, was the decision to set up a separate hearing aid division. We have already noted that the company would arrive at that decision only with great reluctance. The company would prefer to cope with the hearing aid problems simply with such devices as expediter services and a product manager. But if the company should decide to set up a hearing aid division, then it would certainly have to give that division autonomous decisionmaking powers and explicit funds.

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY

We must go one step farther. A hearing aid company, or division, could operate successfully if it possessed nothing but its own decisionmaking powers and its own money. It could contract to an engineering firm the design of its hearing aid device. It could contract all of its production to a job shop, all of its transportation to a trucking organization, and all of its selling to a commercial merchandising organization. Similarly, a disadvantaged-youth-oriented product shop (such as the Crusade for Opportunity was, in part) could operate successfully with not much else but its own decisionmaking powers and its own money. It could contract, for example, with a local school administration to provide desired courses for disadvantaged youth. The important point is that the youth agency would make such contracts on its own terms (that is, without divided decision-making powers) and would pay the school for services rendered. The youth agency would not have to own school buildings or hire teachers on its own payroll. Similarly, it could contract for family counseling services, or testing and vocational guidance services, or on-the-job training courses in industry.

The disadvantaged-youth agency, as a product shop, would have to run its own client-centered expediter service, search for its hard-to-reach clientele, ascertain what help the clients needed, persuade them to accept help, and lead them through the process of getting help. The actual help—psychiatric counseling, vocational counseling, medical aid, vocational training, basic education, job finding, and so on—would be provided by existing agencies either as part of their already available services or by special contract, as requested, and paid for, by the youth agency.

One more qualification is needed before our discussion of organizational schemes and their inescapable problems is concluded. In discussing why some programs don't work very well, we have said nothing about government red tape, bureaucratic hardening of the arteries, and interagency jealousies. We have no thought of denying that such things exist. When programs run into difficulties, such explanations as these are always forthcoming, and often with the implication that they are sufficient to explain the trouble. Our point in this discourse is that these factors are not sufficient to explain the problems of running programs expeditiously. Organizational frameworks and their inescapable difficulties are in the picture too; and one might even make a case that these difficulties are more important sources of trouble than are the frailties of human nature.

THE ANACOSTIA DISORDER OF AUGUST 15, 1966

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, no fair-minded Member of the House wants to see any American denied his rights or an equal opportunity to participate in all aspects of our society. The way to equal rights and equal opportunities, however, does not lie in violence or in disobedience of the law.

The National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union, an affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union, has issued a report on the disturbances which took place in Anacostia on August 15, 1966. This report contains their views on alleged deficiencies in the handling of those disturbances by the Metropolitan Police Department and an appendix with a summary of the incidents discussed in the report.

I have examined this report and written to the chairman of the National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union the following:

OCTOBER 7, 1966.

Mr. WILLIAM WARFIELD ROSS,
Chairman, National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROSS: I have yours of September 21.

I have examined the report enclosed with that letter.

I am afraid that this report does not reflect the objectivity which has usually characterized the work of your organization. I believe one or two brief comments with reference to the report are in order.

I believe it is the duty of a police officer to make an arrest of a suspect whenever and wherever he sees that suspect. I also believe that it is the duty of every citizen whether in a crowd or alone to assist the police officer in making an arrest of a suspect. It is not for a citizen, in or out of a crowd, to determine whether the arrest is proper or lawful. This is for the courts to determine and, if we ever permit crowds to determine this question, law and order will disappear from this country and with it all of the liberties that we cherish.

There is all too much emphasis being placed upon what the police force should do and too little emphasis placed upon what the citizen should do. It is high time that we paid more attention to teaching the citizen community, in and out of crowds, to cooperate with the law enforcement officers and to let the courts make the decisions.

In the appendix attached to the report I find no mention of whether or not the staff workers and community organizers of an anti-poverty agency were the leaders or the organizers of these meetings and demonstrations, nor do I find any comment about what training, if any, these people had in teaching citizens their duties and obligations, as well as their privileges.

Why were these staff workers among the pickets?

How can any demonstration seeking the release by the police of persons who were arrested be lawful at any time? How can you overlook the fact that these demonstrators obviously were looking for trouble when you report that they were carrying stones, bricks and firecrackers? Were these demonstrators carrying them merely to play with? Isn't the conclusion inescapable that they were carrying these stones, bricks and firecrackers because they intended to throw them at the police and at the precinct house?

If this was to have been a peaceful demonstration, assuming for one moment that any crowd has the right to demonstrate against an arrest, except by a presentation to a court in a lawful manner, why didn't the staff workers in this crowd see to it that the stones, bricks and firecrackers were removed before they even arrived at the police precinct?

Why do you raise the question as to whether or not the facts are in dispute as to whether or not the crowd sitting in the intersection was orderly or disorderly? How can a crowd sitting in an intersection ever be orderly? They certainly are violating the law to sit in the intersection in the first instance. They had no right to be there, orderly or disorderly, whether they were noisy or not. They had no right to be there and that is the point you ought to make to these people.

You refer to the fact that the police officers, as they approached this crowd, were dressed in riot helmets. Was this intended as a criticism? Do you think these police officers should have gone in without riot helmets to disperse a crowd armed with stones, bricks and firecrackers? Could you look at a firecracker and determine from a distance whether or not it is a firecracker that may be harmless except for the noise it will make upon exploding or that it might actually be a much more effective weapon?

There may be plenty to criticize about some law enforcement officials but it is high time we gave them a little pat on the back when they deserve it and also a little support, both moral and legal.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

IRS REQUESTED TO HOLD UP

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will provide that teachers may deduct from their Federal income tax obligation the expenses incurred in taking courses or pursuing programs of educational value which will improve their competency in their profession. This would apply to teachers and college members alike.

This Congress has enacted meaningful and extensive legislation to aid education and insure quality education to every child and youth of this Nation. However, for these new Federal programs to be truly effective it is necessary that teachers be encouraged, whether on their own initiative or by school board direction, to take courses designed to aid their understanding of the children they teach, as well as the many new methods which are being developed by local schools throughout this country.

I believe that it only stands to reason, that we should act to aid the teachers and by so doing also helping the students. Since 1958, the Department of the Treasury has followed a policy that Federal income tax deductions would be allowed for teachers taking courses or pursuing programs of educational travel

and value which would improve their competency in their profession. However, on July 7, 1966, the Internal Revenue Service issued proposed regulations which, if enforced, would seriously curtail this practice.

Because of the reaction and overwhelming objection to those preliminary regulations, the Internal Revenue Service issued a modified version, which I still believe to be defective and unacceptable.

I am therefore requesting—and am hopeful—that the Internal Revenue Service revert to its original policy, until such time as Congress can enact definitive legislation.

THE 34TH ANNUAL MEETING IN ROME OF THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE, TUNNEL & TURNPIKE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the International Bridge, Tunnel & Turnpike Association held its 34th annual meeting in Rome during the last week in September, and it was my privilege, together with Representative KENNETH GRAY, of Illinois, and Representative JAMES HOWARD, of New Jersey, to represent the Congress of the United States at that meeting. The meeting was particularly significant to us, in light of the extensive hearings the Public Works Committee has held this year on toll roads in the United States.

Those hearings represent one of the most detailed and comprehensive studies of toll roads ever made, and their significance was recognized by the association, in an official invitation from the Italian Government to Mr. Salvatore D'Amico of our committee staff to attend the conference as a participant in the panel discussions. It was an interesting and enlightening meeting, and my colleagues will be reporting to you on various aspects of it.

One of the highlights of the conference was our special audience, along with the officials of the association, with His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, on September 26 in the Hall of the Consistory at the Vatican. The Holy Father addressed us in both Italian and English, emphasizing the significance of the work to which the conference was dedicated.

This gracious and gentle man reminded us that "Jesus himself defined himself as 'way, truth, and life,' thus giving the road itself a symbolic significance because all could thereby come to him."

Pope Paul recalled that 9 years ago, when he was still Archbishop of Milan, he had blessed the first stone of the Motorway of the Sun, the Italian description for their major expressway between Rome, Milan, and other points. The Holy Father also spoke of the value of the modern highway networks of the world in tending to reduce distances and thereby increase the comprehension, understanding, and brotherhood between peoples.

It was a particularly fruitful thought, for me, and I think it should be for most of us. We are so accustomed, here in our own country, to being able to travel great distances by automobile without inhibition or interference that we tend to forget, I think, the very real contribution highways can make to bringing people—even people in the same country—closer together.

GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the life of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Polish patriot and American Revolutionary hero, reminds us that not in age alone, but sometimes in youth, is found that noble spirit expressed in the concluding line of Tennyson's poem, "Ulysses": "To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield." When he came to join the American struggle for independence, at the age of 29, Pulaski was already a veteran leader of men and fighter for freedom. His brilliant generalship, and his inspiring political leadership, had brought the Polish revolt astonishingly close to success against the crushing force of Russian imperial oppression; and the final defeat of this strenuous and long-sustained effort had left Pulaski the idol of the freedom-loving youth of Europe. Having taken refuge in Paris, he could have taken advantage of this reputation, added to the advantages of noble birth and breeding, and, as a young and handsome man, lived gaily in Parisian society. But Casimir Pulaski was not the kind of man to waste his force and talents in trivial and self-serving activities. Forced to concede the final defeat of the cause of Polish freedom, for which he had fought so long and so well, Pulaski found his heart fired again by the same cause of human freedom, in the revolt of the American colonies against the oppressions of British rule. With the assistance of Benjamin Franklin, he made his way to America, and offered his services to the Revolutionary Army. With his training, experience, native ability and force of character, he soon rose to the rank of brigadier general, and was placed in the command of the American cavalry. In this post, he succeeded so well in the inculcating of cavalry tactics that he is regarded as "the father of the American cavalry." During the critical winter of 1777–78, the accomplishments of the cavalry under Pulaski, in skirmishing for supplies for the army encamped at Valley Forge, did much to make up for the disastrous deficiencies of the commissary department, and for the Continental Congress' failure to provide for the maintenance of the troops. The jealousies and bickering among his fellow officers, that plagued Washington throughout his command of the army, finally induced Pulaski to resign his command, but he soon was back in the saddle again, as organizer and commander of an independent corps of cavalry, the Pulaski Legion. This body, with Pulaski at its head, was sent in 1779 to the support of General Lincoln in South Carolina, and there played an important part in the defense of Charleston, and then in the assault upon the British works at Savannah, in which operation the French cavalry also were serving under his command. It was in leading this attack, on October 9, 1779, that Pulaski received his fatal wound. He was carried aboard the brig *Wasp*, and died, probably on October 11.

Pulaski's devotion to the cause of freedom, thrilling and inspiring to his contemporaries on two continents, has remained an inspiration to the youth of America, and a cause for just pride among Poles and Polish Americans. The story of his gallant devotion is a justly treasured part of the American heritage.

POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS 18TH NATIONAL CONVENTION

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on September 4, I had the great honor and privilege of addressing the 18th National Convention of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., at the Fontainebleau Hotel in my district in Miami Beach. This was a great convention of a great organization which has done much to exemplify and to preserve the sentiments of patriotism in our country; to assure the appropriate care and consideration of our veterans by our Government and to keep America strong; to preserve our way of life in our country and to protect the cause of freedom in the world.

I was privileged to tell this 18th National Convention of the Polish Legion of American Veterans of the distinguished Members of the House who are of Polish descent and whose dedicated and eminent careers have honored their Polish Association and immeasurably contributed to the strength and greatness of America.

It was also my happy privilege to address on the same date and at the same place the Ladies' Auxiliary of the PLAV which is carrying on in a splendid way the noble aims and aspirations of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, a statement of the action taken by the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., at this 18th convention, and the Ladies'

Auxiliary of the PLAV, meeting at the same time, in the election of their respective officers for the new year and a statement of convention highlights of this significant convention, including resolutions adopted by the convention; and I commend this statement and these highlights and resolutions to the consideration of my colleagues:

P.L.A.V. RE-ELECTS J. L. PUDLO, JR. AS NATIONAL COMMANDER; MRS. E. ROZANSKI, RE-ELECTED AUXILIARY PRESIDENT

On September 2, 3, 4 and 5, 1966, the Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A., and Ladies Auxiliary, held its 18th Biennial National Convention in the Fontainebleau Hotel in Miami Beach, Florida.

The Convention re-elected, by acclamation, Joseph L. Pudlo, Jr., of North Chicago, Illinois, as National Commander. Pudlo, 35, the youngest National Commander in P.L.A.V. History, is the first to be returned to office by a unanimous vote.

Meeting concurrently, the Ladies Auxiliary of the P.L.A.V., returned Mrs. Eugene K. (Evelyn) Rozanski to office for a second term.

The other officers elected at the Convention were: National Vice-Commander, Edward C. Szymanowski of Wyandotte, Michigan; National Vice-Commander—Americanism and Youth Officer, Casey Jaworski of Cleveland, Ohio; National Auditor, Julius A. Dybicki of Dearborn, Michigan and National Treasurer, Fred S. Skowronski of Chicago, Illinois.

Mr. Skowronski begins his 8th term in this capacity and Mr. Dybicki, his 5th term as the National Auditor.

The Zone Commanders selected by their individual P.L.A.V. Zones were: Bronislaus J. Tencza, of Mineola, New York; Zone II, Stanley J. Sternik, of Cleveland, Ohio and Zone III, Ralph A. Wozniak of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Wozniak will be serving a second term in this capacity.

The other officers of the Ladies Auxiliary of the P.L.A.V. are as follows: National Vice-President, Violet Paul of Garfield Heights, Ohio; National Secretary, Dorothy S. Kubit of Parma Heights, Ohio; National Financial Secretary, Mary Petraski of Wyandotte, Michigan and National Treasurer, Laverne Wozniak of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

The Zone Presidents chosen by their individual P.L.A.V. Zones were: Zone I, Rosalie Misiur of Elizabeth, New Jersey; Zone II, Julia Wlodkowski of Wyandotte, Michigan and Zone III, Frances Pycior of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

CONVENTION HIGHLIGHTS

This convention, one of the finest in PLAV history, was attended by nearly 1,200 members. Delegates heard National Commander Pudlo report that the organization had achieved its greatest membership and highest degree of solvency in its 47 year history. The convention banquet heard Deputy Administrator of Veterans Affairs, Cyril Brickfield, praise the P.L.A.V. for its support of the nations policy in Viet Nam. Mr. Brickfield also outlined future V. A. Programs and explained their effect on the veteran.

The convention adopted the following resolutions:

We believe that Democracy such as that practiced in the United States under our Constitution, is the best form of government ever devised by mankind. We have given of ourselves to protect this form of government and to fight communism on every front in all corners of the globe. Accordingly, we support our government's policies in fighting communism in Asia, Europe, South America and at home. Our domestic policies must be consistent with these goals.

Whereas Poland is currently observing one thousand years of its Christianity and its existence as a nation and Americans of Polish descent have joined in this observance;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Polish Legion of American Veterans support these patriotic activities in the United States and participate in them in every manner possible.

We urge that our government adopt such policies as will make Poland and the other countries behind the Iron Curtain less dependent on Russia for economic and political support. This can best be done by selling non-vital goods to these countries, so that they will not develop these industries within their own country and will cease to be dependent on Russia. We should actively support recognition of Poland's western border on the Oder-Neisse line.

Our military service demands good fighting men to protect freedom and democracy. Any plans to weaken the existing draft laws under the guise of protecting free speech, should be discarded. At the same time draft dodgers must be dealt with severely.

We urge that any act of disrespect or desecration of the Flag of the United States be a federal offense with appropriate penalties for violation of the statute.

Whereas, our comrades in arms are defending liberty in many far flung corners of the world and are being asked to pay the supreme sacrifice in leaving widows and orphans behind, and

Whereas, the Polish Legion of American Veterans is concerned with the welfare of both our nation's fighting men and dependents and being mindful of the fact than the Federal government is not doing enough for them,

Now, therefore be it resolved that the Polish Legion of American Veterans urge the Congress of the United States to increase the pay for all military servicemen by a substantial amount rather than the three per cent enacted by Congress and that a substantial bonus be paid for re-enlistment and that pay for combat and hazardous service be increased substantially.

Be it further resolved that the allowance given to widows of servicemen be increased so that the widow of every servicemen, regardless of his rank, will receive the same death benefits. This should not be less than that presently provided for the widow of the lowest grade commissioned officer.

The Polish Legion of American Veterans is mindful of the horrors and hardships of war and the resultant suffering and privation. Nevertheless, we commend the action of our present administration in carrying on the defense of the people of South Viet Nam and the resistance to communism and Red Chinese in Southeast Asian countries. It is through the firmness demonstrated by President Johnson and Secretaries Rusk and McNamara that we can keep the world free from Communism and totalitarianism. It is our sincere hope that the military action will be followed by establishment of democratic assistance to the affected countries so that the standard of living be preserved.

We urge the enactment of pending legislation to increase compensation and pensions of Veterans and their dependents by such amounts as will reflect the increased cost of living since the last revisions of these benefits.

We extend our profound sympathy and condolence, inadequate as they are, to the Gold Star Mothers of the Nation, and to all persons who suffered loss of their loved ones in defense of our Country, and we want to assure them by this resolution that all members of the Polish Legion of American Veterans and their Auxiliary are devoted to the ideals and principles for which they paid the supreme sacrifice.

We vigorously oppose any and all efforts to convert the Veterans hospitals, domiciliaries and medical facilities to Federal facilities, for use of various domestic and international beneficiaries. Any such conversions would destroy the traditional concept of a medical system for veterans and would thereby deprive eligible veterans of needed care and treatment.

We have maintained a constant vigil against any drives to close existing V.A. facilities. We owe this to our comrades who are in need and we must not permit the Bureau of the Budget to advance any further plans such as its ill advised and arbitrary order to close 32 facilities on January 13, 1965. The V.A. is the best judge of this need.

We again call on the establishment of a standing committee on Veteran affairs in the United States Senate. This should be patterned after the House Committee on Veterans Affairs.

We urge the re-opening of National Service Life Insurance for all Veterans of World War II and Korea, providing they meet the health requirements and pay an additional amount to administer the program, this program has been successful for the disabled veteran and should now be expanded to include all who qualify.

The PLAV stand for liberalization of the pension program for aged and totally disabled veterans. Income limitations and limitation on private and public retirement plans must be increased so as to assure that programs such as Social Security will not reduce or cut off pension payments for Veterans and their widows.

The PLAV has and will oppose all efforts to slash funds for the operation of the Veterans Employment Service in the Department of Labor. We will further oppose any attempts to circumvent and/or eliminate Veterans preference in Civil Service for Veterans presently employed, or for veterans who may seek work under Civil Service in the future.

We favor establishment of a National Cemetery Program under the jurisdiction of the V.A. These cemeteries are presently under the national parks division of the Department of Interior and in the case of Arlington, under the U.S. Army. Available space is rapidly being filled up. Millions of new veterans have been recognized as such by a recent act of Congress. They, too, will be needing burial space. A well organized program is sorely needed, therefore, joining with the National Commanders of other major veterans organizations, we urge on Congress to pass such a law with expedience.

We voice total opposition to H.R. 13643, a pending proposal, which would deny veterans burial allowance if he be entitled to a burial allowance under Social Security. This legislation would have the effect of reducing veterans to second class citizens. We point out that the Veteran has a vested interest in his burial allowance by virtue of his military service. Further, the Social Security allowance is the result of the payroll deduction made by him as a wage earner during his life time. It is based on sound business and economic principles.

At the close of the Convention, New York City was selected as the site for the 19th Biennial National Convention which is planned for September of 1968.

THE HUNGARIAN UPRISING OF 1956

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian uprising of 1956 was the most startling and heartening political event

in postwar Europe. It was at the same time the most shocking event in the Communist world. It marked the first instance in which a liberty-loving and proud people, singlehandedly and successfully, defied and then overthrew their Communist oppressors and instituted their own democratic government. All this took place late in October 1956, and before the end of the month the Hungarian people became once more masters of their own destiny in their homeland. It seemed that their dream had at last come true, and that they had succeeded, without any outside aid, in getting rid of their detested Communist oppressors.

To the outside world all this seemed too good to last, and under the circumstances, there seemed no other realistic way to look at this portentous event. It is true the internal situation of the country favored the Hungarians, but there was still a solid core of Soviet troops stationed in the country, and the question of getting them out proved to be impossible of solution. Eventually those troops, reinforced with larger additional Soviet units from Rumania, put an end to Hungary's 2-week-old freedom.

On November 4, the Soviet military machine began its attacks against the outnumbered and ill-equipped Hungarian force, and before the end of that day all seemed to be over. Turning the country into a bloodbath, the Soviets forced the Hungarian Government to flee; and the survivors of the gallant Hungarian fighters were literally smothered under the weight of heavy Soviet tanks. The last gasping voice of freedom from Budapest died out at the end of that day, and with it died freedom in Hungary.

Sad and tragic as was the end of their freedom, the Hungarians nevertheless proved once more to the peoples of the world that the spirit of freedom cannot be subdued and kept in chains for any length of time, if the people have the will and the determination to fight for its attainment. That is one lesson these gallant Hungarians meant to leave behind them, to other oppressed peoples. That is their legacy to the free world, and today on the 10th anniversary observance of that event, we express our admiration for their gallantry.

CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER STRONGLY SUPPORTS S. 3035, A BILL TO PRESERVE OUR HISTORIC SITES

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my complete and enthusiastic support of S. 3035 which would establish a program for the preservation of historic sites. This 4-year program which would help the States and local communities of our Nation identify and preserve historic sites is a critically important one. In my own State of Florida there is ardent and extensive support for this measure, since Florida is so richly endowed with the sites and associations of time and place that extend back to the earliest days of Europeans in the Americas.

The significant and needed legislation failed of passage in the House only because we were proceeding under a suspension of the rules and a two-thirds vote was therefore needed. I was happy to see that by another vote, this time requiring a simple majority, we were successful in passing this legislation.

Under present law, Federal assistance for the preservation of historic sites is limited to natural and historic properties determined to be "nationally significant." It is clear to everyone that only a limited number of properties meet this exacting standard.

There are literally thousands of others which are worthy of protection because of their historical, architectural, or cultural significance at the community, State, or regional level. They are not only worthy of protection, they must have such protection, and they must have it at once if they are not to be bulldozed out of existence.

It is all very well to assure ourselves that because we are a young country our sites and historic shrines need a few centuries more of aging, of seasoning, of ripening in meaning, of maturing in shared memories and associations, but those bulldozers and wrecking balls will not wait for anything of the sort. To delay the passage of this legislation would have meant that it need never be considered again in the future, because the things it was designed to protect will all be gone by then, destroyed forever, lost irretrievably.

A TRIBUTE TO CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the occasion today is one of great significance, not to Polish-Americans alone but to Americans in general. For on this day we hail the name of Casimir Pulaski—hero of the democratic revolutionary cause in Poland, his native land, and in America, the land of his adoption.

Unlike the Boston merchant or the farmer in the Piedmont, unlike the fisherman on the Carolina coast or the backwoodsman in western Pennsylvania, Casimir Pulaski was not himself a victim of British oppression in the year 1776. Indeed, he was at that moment far removed from oppression of any kind. Of noble birth, of wealth, and family distinction, he was free to live in peace wherever he chose. And yet, in those tumultuous times, peaceful complacency was not the mark of a man, and Pulaski was in truth a giant among men.

Having fought as a cavalry officer against the Russian domination of Poland, and having as a result been driven into exile, Pulaski ventured to France where he was advised of the impending American Revolution. Fired by the spirit motivating the American cause, and perceiving therein principles identical to his own, Pulaski offered his services to the Americans, who accepted them with gratitude.

By the summer of 1777, Pulaski was in America, ready for battle, and in September of that year took his place in the American line, as a volunteer at Brandywine, where his conduct earned him instant recognition as an outstanding military leader.

In the Battle of Germantown he was again prominent, and with all due haste he was appointed to a cavalry command. At Trenton, in the winter of 1777, Pulaski's cavalry fought brilliantly, and when the Colonial Army began its desperate foraging campaign of that dreadful winter, once again Pulaski played a major role.

It was noted by everyone concerned that Pulaski was a fiery spirit and a master organizer. Working well with fellow officers, he urged along the Revolutionary cause, bolstering the cavalry morale and ever confident of victory. Primarily, he was a demon in battle; a horseman of consummate skill, a swordsman of savage intensity, and a leader with a knowledge, intuition, and daring sufficient to the needs of the moment.

At Valley Forge Pulaski organized the cavalry force that was to become known as Pulaski's Legion. Stationed at Baltimore for a time, Pulaski grew impatient for battle and asked for a transfer to the scene of war. The request was granted and the legion moved north engaging the enemy in frequent battles, throughout New Jersey. When once again a lull developed, Pulaski asked again for transfer, and was dispatched quickly to the South, where the British were operating effectively out of Savannah.

In several sharp encounters in northern South Carolina Pulaski reinforced his reputation as a fighter of furious nature and great courage. And when the Americans moved against Savannah, Pulaski was foremost in the vanguard of the attacking columns.

Urging forward his men, in the midst of withering fire, he fell, seriously wounded. Removed at once to an American ship in Savannah Harbor, he was examined by doctors, but his wounds proved fatal.

So it was for this great man, Casimir Pulaski, whose dream of freedom was to benefit millions and millions of Americans to come, including a host of immigrants from his native land and their descendants. To men of such caliber we of this period must pay our respects, in the knowledge that without their insight, their fire, their courage, and their determination, we in America would have today far fewer sacred freedoms than we do. And as freedom-loving people we would find this intolerable.

Pulaski was indeed a hero in the classic tradition. If he had any shortcomings as a soldier, they were not apparent to

any but the most severe critic—for his gallant death served to ennoble even his mistakes in the eyes of posterity.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today we, as a nation, are paying special tribute to the heroic and honored memory of one of the great patriots of the American Revolution, Count Casimir Pulaski. Each year, by Presidential proclamation, the 11th of October is set aside in remembrance of this valiant Polish soldier, who gave his life and fortune in a fight for liberty which spanned two continents. I would like to join with the many others who will be expressing, today, our continuing gratitude as a people for his invaluable contribution to our heritage and our continuing determination to uphold the ideals of human freedom for which he died.

Count Pulaski was born into a period of political turmoil in Poland. After almost a century as one of the most enlightened and progressive countries in Europe, she had suffered the intervention of foreign powers led by the powerful hand of Russia's Catherine the Great. As the son of one of Poland's most able jurists, Pulaski had learned early the meaning of the struggle for freedom. Because of his father's part in the formation of the famed Confederation of the Bar, pledged to the redemption of Poland from foreign domination, the older Pulaski was arrested and put to death.

Determined to pursue the struggle for freedom, the struggle for which his father had sacrificed his life, Casimir became the life and leader of the Polish rebellion. He became famed as a cavalry officer and as Poland's leading military patriot. But despite the courage, bravado and daring of Pulaski and his followers, the Russian might was too great.

With death imminent and a price on his head, because of his devotion to liberty, Casimir Pulaski made his way to the New World. The year was 1777.

At the age of 28, this young, but experienced young soldier came to America to share in our struggle for freedom and independence, because, as he once said:

> Wherever on the globe men are fighting for liberty, it is as if it were our own affair.

His services to the Continental Army were immense. The valor and distinction which he displayed to George Washington in the Battle of Brandywine earned him the rank of brigadier general and the acclaim of Congress and the people. His successful reorganization of the colonial cavalry caused him to be immortalized as "the Father of the American Cavalry." The famed Pulaski Legion, which he organized as an independent corps of cavalry and light infantry and which he equipped and fed with the assistance of his own private fortune offers one of the most colorful chapters in the history of the Revolution.

With this legion he prevented the siege of Charleston, and later led it, together with the American and French cavalry, against the British at Savannah, Ga. It was at the head of this charge that Casimir Pulaski was fatally wounded on October 9, 1779. He lost his life 2 days later, on the day we are commemorating today.

This great Polish patriot had given a lifetime to the cause of liberty, and though exiled from his beloved Poland, he continued to fight for the kind of independence he hoped someday could be hers. He died on foreign soil, but his sacrifice helped to make the dream of a free and independent nation, one conceived in liberty a reality.

But as we remember the spirit of General Pulaski today, we must also turn our thoughts to his homeland, to the indomitable spirit of the Polish people and their relentless pursuit of liberty. For over 20 years these proud people have suffered the subjugation of Communist tryanny. Yet, they have steadfastly refused to relinquish their hope.

The year 1966 marks the Polish millennium, the 1,000th anniversary of the introduction of Christianity into Poland. The tremendous strength of Poland's religious conviction has failed to be diminished by Communist rule. Her religion and her hope for freedom have proved inextinguishable.

As we express our gratitude for the services of Count Casimir Pulaski, let us also express our hope that the people of Poland can soon enjoy the individual liberty and free participation in the community of nations which he helped us to achieve.

CARING FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the glories of an affluent society is its ability to adequately care for its senior citizens—to care for those citizens who generously contributed toward the greatness of our Nation and who have now reached the sunset of their lives and, consequently, have been removed from active participation in the further economic development of our Nation.

We are greatly indebted to them and subsequently, for the most part, are responsible for their well-being. And this, I might add, is the way it should be.

Because of its wealth and greatness, our Nation has progressively assumed greater responsibility for large numbers of people throughout the world. However, though we are making an admirable contribution to our foreign friends, we must always remember that our first obligation must be to our own citizens—particularly those whose past labors largely account for the strong position that we hold in the world. These are the people who are most worthy to receive the fruits of their labor in the form of adequate security benefits provided by a grateful nation.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I have said "adequate" benefits. There is no reason why an affluent society such as ours cannot provide adequate benefits to our senior citizens. When we can afford to send billions of dollars overseas, we have no excuse to offer for any failure to adequately provide for our deserving senior citizens. And, Mr. Speaker, much to my dismay, I think that we have failed to provide adequate security benefits to our senior citizens. We have failed to give them a just return for their labors.

Though our intent has been good, we have failed through the years since the inauguration of the social security program to make adequate and timely adjustments of benefits in accordance with changes in the cost of living.

Yes, we have made periodic increases in an effort to maintain the purchasing power of social security beneficiaries through the years, but such periodic adjustments have been far too few, too little, and too late.

How can we expect our senior citizens to get by on payments that were set at a time when the cost of living was far below that which we now know?

What is needed is a realistic and elastic system of social security payments that will closely adhere to our cost-of-living index. The bill that I am introducing today will, in my mind, provide such a system of payments. It accomplishes this by providing an escalation clause whereby any 2½-percent rise in the cost-of-living index will be accompanied by a matching rise in social security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the hour is late, that there is little probability that substantial action can be taken on this legislation so late in the Congress. Nevertheless, in view of the soaring costs of living that confront us, I feel, along with my other colleagues who have introduced similar bills, that this matter should be brought to the attention of the Congress at this time. It should be brought to the attention of the Congress at this time so that the matter can be placed in proper perspective, so that my colleagues can better appreciate the agony of trying to sustain oneself on a fixed social security pension while the cost of living leaps far ahead.

These increases in the cost of living create an extreme hardship for our senior citizens who must rely on a small fixed pension. It is our task to come forth with legislation that will effectively alleviate this problem.

During a 7-year period, beginning in 1958, we experienced an increase of over 8 percent in the Consumer Price Index while the cost of services, which mostly affects the elderly, increased over

16 percent. However, during this same period social security beneficiaries received no increase in social security benefits to offset these increases.

Let us begin to take the first step now while the matter is clearly in focus. Let us not stand idly by while inflation robs our social security beneficiaries of a decent standard of living.

SWEENEY CITES NEED FOR FEDERAL LAWS DEALING WITH MAIL-ORDER SMUT PEDDLERS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the mailing activities of one Louis Wolff Linetsky.

Recently, I have been contacted by a mother from Fostoria, Ohio, who directed my attention to the fact that her 14-year-old daughter had been receiving unsolicited mail, advertising certain obscene sex devices. I, in turn, took the matter up with the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Post Office Department.

In their reply, the U.S. Post Office Department indicated that it was quite aware of the fact that Louis Wolff Linetsky was one of the biggest mail-order smut peddlers known to the Department.

I am simply appalled and amazed that the Post Office Department has received over 150,000 complaints concerning this man's activities insofar as advertising, sale, and publication of sex devices is concerned. This man uses 12 to 14 trade names and styles to obscure his identity.

In 1962 he was indicted under the postal obscenity statute in the eastern district of Michigan. However, the Federal court granted a motion to dismiss the indictment on the grounds that sex devices were not obscene.

In 1963 he was again indicted for violation of the postal obscenity statute in the district of Kansas involving certain books and phonographic records. Once again the indictment against him was dismissed by the Federal courts on the basis that the exhibits were not obscene.

This man is still under surveillance by the U.S. Post Office Department.

Another smut peddler, Edward I. Winkler, ought to be identified. He belongs in the top 10 of certain peddlers in this country. He, too, operates under trade names and styles, and makes his money in the promotion of a variety of sex devices. The Post Office Department has presented the devices and promotional materials to the U.S. attorney at Los Angeles in an attempt to prosecute Mr. Winkler under current postal obscenity statutes.

The U.S. district attorney has concluded that this obscenity prosecution could not be successfully pursued under present law.

These pornographic practices apparently still go unchecked while the Federal as well as State authorities seem impotent to do anything about it.

The most startling fact of all is that in 1963 Mr. Linetsky spent approximately $225,000 in postage which represents the mailing of several millions of items of unsolicited smut to the kids of this country.

It is amazing that the ability of the Federal and State authorities to curb these pornographers is so limited.

DEAN OF THE WOMEN IN CONGRESS, THE HONORABLE FRANCES P. BOLTON

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to place in the body of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Star of Sunday, October 9, 1966. This article, written by Barbara Kober, a Star staff writer, is about the dean of the women in Congress, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON—the ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. I am privileged to serve on this committee with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

One may wonder why I insert this article in the RECORD, in view of the fact that Mrs. BOLTON is quoted in it as asserting that there is some disenchantment not only with our President and the administration, but also with the record of this great 89th Congress.

I believe in the right to dissent and I believe in a strong Republican Party and a strong Democratic Party. Therefore, as the dean of the Democratic women in Congress, I have no reservations about placing in this permanent RECORD of the Congress a well-deserved tribute which our colleague has earned many times over by her outstanding service to her district, to our Nation, and to the cause of human welfare.

AT 81, MRS. BOLTON IS AN ACTIVE CAMPAIGNER—DEAN OF WOMEN IN CONGRESS SAYS PUBLIC DISENCHANTED WITH ADMINISTRATION

(By Barbara Kober)

The dean of women in Congress, Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON, foresees Viet Nam and the "escalation of prices" as the main issues in current election campaigns.

"People are concerned about rising prices—how can they help it when the cost of vegetables, flour, eggs and other products have almost doubled in the past year," said the veteran of 26 years in the House of Representatives.

The two issues are running a "pretty even race for importance in the minds of the public," said Mrs. BOLTON who has served longer than any of the other nine women in the House and longer than all but 17 of the 425 men.

But, for herself, issues are no issue as she campaigns every weekend in her suburban Cleveland District to capture her 15th consecutive term.

"I don't bring up issues unless they are thrown at me," she said. "I talk America—what it means to be an American and the responsibilities of being an American."

CONSTITUENTS ASK

After more than a quarter century of service to her constituents, Mrs. BOLTON feels her people know what she thinks and if they don't, they ask.

At 81, Mrs. BOLTON is still an active campaigner—but only on weekends when the House is in session.

She usually flies out of Washington Friday night for speaking engagements before a variety of groups ranging from small community political clubs to a 1,000 guest testimonial dinner.

The chipper legislator, who used to practice yoga daily but now stands on her head only occasionally, speaks to as many men's groups as she does to women's groups. And miles of city driving going from one engagement to another.

Her estate in suburban Cleveland is the setting for clambakes and picnics. And when it gets too cold to picnic on the lawn, guests move into the barn.

"I like campaigning because I see my people," she said and added that during the weekend she may speak to anywhere from 2,500 to 5,000 constituents.

When confronted with questions about her stand on Viet Nam, the congressman, who avoids the word "congresswoman" like a scourge because "I was not elected as a congresswoman," takes a hard line.

"We must win," she declared.

Asked if she would condone the use of nuclear weapons to achieve victory, the ranking Republican member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee said:

HORRIFIED BY HIROSHIMA

"I was horrified at what the U.S. did in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and I have never gotten over that feeling. I don't really know whether we should use nuclear weapons in Viet Nam. If it were the only way to get victory, then perhaps I might go along with it."

Mrs. BOLTON described the change in attitude of American servicemen who are sent to Viet Nam.

"They are disgruntled and don't want to go," she said. "But when they get there they are glad they are there because they realize this is a war for freedom and they see the abject poverty of the people and the way they have been treated."

In a scathing attack on the Johnson administration, Mrs. BOLTON charged that the public is "beginning to be disenchanted with the President and predicted that the Republicans will 'win quite a few seats in Congress.'"

AN EMOTIONAL JAG

The Johnson landslide was the result of an "emotional jag" left over from the assassination of President Kennedy.

"A lot of freshmen in the House are trembling in their boots," she said.

Mrs. BOLTON asserted that the Great Society is not successful and never has been. When asked what is wrong, she said:

"Everything."

She continued:

"Everything is war to this man in the White House—war in Viet Nam, war on poverty. He has the idea that if we put out enough money, we can stop poverty. But no amount of money will stop poverty. Only changing the individual will help alleviate poverty."

THE PERSECUTION OF SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY]

may extend her 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 2, a public demonstration was held at the borough hall in Brooklyn, N.Y., to protest the persecution of Jews living in the Soviet Union and in other Communist countries.

I had the honor of participating in that moving profession of sympathy for Soviet Jewry—and that public appeal to the Soviet authorities to honor the guarantees of religious freedom embodied in the Soviet Constitution.

It is a strange occurrence, indeed, when citizens of the United States appeal to the Soviet Government to live up to its own Constitution.

Yet this is precisely what happened in Brooklyn the other Sunday—and in many other American cities as well. And it happened because of the contradictions which characterize life under communism.

Let me say a word or two about those contradictions.

Most of us see only the public image of communism. We see the attractive mask fabricated by Soviet propagandists which is customarily shown to the outside world.

That pretty mask is made up of propaganda themes about the equality of men, democracy, human dignity, justice and freedom, hard work and progress. We are told that these virtues characterize the Soviet society—and that they are, in fact, enshrined in the Soviet Constitution.

That Constitution, for example, guarantees each and every Soviet citizen freedom of conscience and of religious belief. To a gullible person, that constitutional guarantee is a part of the good life which allegedly exists in the Soviet Union.

But does it?

There is another dimension of life in a Communist society—but you can only see that dimension from the inside. This is the reality of life under communism.

You see this reality, where Soviet citizens of Jewish faith are concerned, not in the Soviet Constitution, but in the fact that the number of synagogues in Russia has declined from 450 to 80.

You see it in the fact that all Yeshivas and Talmud Torahs have been closed.

You see it in the numerous Jewish cemeteries which have been desecrated—or completely destroyed.

You see it in the suppression of the Jewish language, and in the prohibitions which the Soviet Government places on the manufacture and import of religious articles.

This is what life is really like in the Soviet Union. It is a hard life—especially for Soviet Jews, who are the object of a deliberate campaign on the part of the Soviet authorities to obliterate Judaism from the face of the Soviet society.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen enough of both faces of communism to know that the public face—those pretty images painted by Communist propagandists—bears only the vaguest resemblance to the reality of life under communism.

I have been behind the Iron Curtain. I also talked to hundreds of persons who lived in Communist-dominated countries—but who subsequently escaped to freedom.

It is because of that firsthand exposure to problems resulting from the Communist takeover of Eastern and Central Europe that I sponsored legislation in Congress which paved the way for the establishment of ICEM, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

As of this year, that Committee has helped nearly 1.5 million persons—many of them refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain—to relocate and to find the opportunity for a useful life in freedom.

My good friend, Walter Besterman, the longtime professional staff assistant of the Committee on the Judiciary, headed by my distinguished colleague, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, is serving presently as the U.S. Director of ICEM.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I also brought facts about Soviet communism to the attention of the American public—in the hope that, in this manner, we could bring the weight of public opinion to bear on the conduct of the Soviet Government.

Last year, for example, we held hearings on the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union and on the treatment of other religions in Communist-dominated lands.

Those hearings, carried out with the help of Rabbi Meir Felman, of the Synagogue Council of America; Rabbi Joachim Prinz, of the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry; Mr. Eric Goldhagen, director of the Institute on East European Jewry at Brandeis University; Mr. Monroe Sheinberg, of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, and many other informed persons, helped to expose the mistreatment of Jews in the Soviet Union.

Those hearings were helpful in securing unanimous approval by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and then by the entire U.S. House of Representatives, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, the so-called Ribicoff resolution.

And they also may have been helpful in prompting the Soviet Government to relent a bit. For, as we all know, this year, for the first time in our memory, thousands of Soviet Jewish boys and girls in Moscow were permitted to celebrate the festival of Simchat Torah, the day of rejoicing in the law. They celebrated it publicly, in the streets and in the synagogues, with dances and songs—and the regime allowed them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that I was able to play some small part in these developments.

I hope that our public demonstration at the borough hall in Brooklyn, and similar demonstrations throughout the country, will further help the cause of Soviet Jewry by prevailing upon the Soviet Government to abandon its harsh policies of discrimination and persecution, and to start paying some attention to the religious freedom guarantees of the Soviet Constitution.

CONGRESSWOMAN MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE 17TH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 89th Congress convened at noon, January 4, 1965, and adjourned October 23, 293 days later. The second session convened on January 10, 1966, and is still at work with no definite date for adjournment.

The length of time Congress stays in session each year is increasing. Part of the reason is the multifold problems of the Nation; part of the reason is the technicality of legislation. However, the limitation on time now demands that Congress give serious consideration to the responsibilities of its Members. A Member must have time to study; to perform legislative work; and to meet constituent obligations. The 89th Congress has created a joint committee to study the organization and operation of Congress. There is need for reform. I might add that we are going to have a House Ethics Committee. We expect that it will pass the House this week.

The 89th Congress has been termed the most productive Congress in history. During the last 2 years, it has enacted far-reaching legislation responding to national and community needs. The programs that have been established are not ends nor do they represent perfected answers. They are the efforts of a people to meet their problems. What remains is the challenge of development.

It is a great privilege for me to review some of the major domestic legislative enactments of the 89th Congress.

In 1961, the rate of unemployment stood at 7 percent. To counter persistently high unemployment, Congress cut taxes. The Revenue Act of 1964 made the largest tax reduction in U.S. history—$11.5 billion in individual income and corporate taxes. With some surprise, it did the job. Increased purchasing power put into the hands of the consumer increased demand, spurred growth, reduced unemployment, and helped to produce prosperity.

Last year, Congress further supplemented efforts in this direction. An excise tax cut was passed amounting to $4.7 billion annually when fully effective January 1, 1969. It immediately eliminated $1.7 billion of excise taxes on such items as cosmetics, wallets, pocketbooks, furs, jewelry, cameras, radios, and televisions. On other items, it established a phaseout schedule. The 10-percent

tax on automobiles was reduced in stages until reaching 1 percent in 1969. The telephone excise tax was similarly reduced, but to elimination in 1969.

Unemployment now stands at a low of 3.9 percent. The economy significantly has been directed toward expansion by tax policy. Yet, somewhere in the interim, a new problem has developed—the spiraling costs of inflation.

From 1961 to 1966, the cost-of-living indicator rose only 1.6 percent per annum. From mid-1965 to the middle of this year, the cost of living has gone up 2.8 percent. The Federal Government is now moving to curb investment and to hold the line on Federal expenditures. The House recently passed a 16-month suspension of the 7-percent tax credit on business investment and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. As early as March, Congress cleared the Tax Adjustment Act, suspending the scheduled reductions in automobile and telephone taxes until 1968, and providing a new system of graduated withholding rates for individual income taxes, and accelerated payments of corporate taxes.

One of the main aims and one of the chief problems of this Nation today is a high employment rate with stable prices. It is obvious that people will not tolerate either high unemployment or rising prices.

The Social Security Amendments Act of 1965 contained the most sweeping revision of social security in 25 years. The legislation provided a health care insurance program for the aged; increased social security benefits; and liberalized provisions of the social security law.

The medicare portion of the bill establishes two insurance programs for persons 65 and older—a basic hospitalization plan financed through a separate payroll tax and trust fund under social security; and a voluntary supplementary plan providing payments for doctor bills and other related health services, partly paid for by the user and partly subsidized out of the Federal funds of the Treasury. Major benefits of the basic hospitalization plan include 90 days of hospital care for each period of illness—60 days with a $40 deductible and an additional 30 days with a $10 deductible; posthospital extended care in a qualified nursing home totaling 100 days; postoutpatient diagnostic services; and posthospital health services with a maximum of 100 visits by a nurse. Major benefits of the voluntary supplemental plan include payment of 80 percent of the cost of doctor bills, after a $50 deductible, on services provided by physicians, surgeons, radiologists, pathologists, and other doctors in hospitals, clinics, and homes.

Changes in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program raised benefits by 7 percent affecting 20 million social security beneficiaries; permitted widows to receive an actuarially reduced benefit at age 60 rather than 62; permitted the extension of children's insurance benefits for those eligible attending school full time from age 18 to 21; liberalized eligibility requirements to provide benefits to persons 72 and older with only 3–5 quarters of social security coverage instead of the minimum of 6 quarters; authorized a wife's and widow's benefits to a divorced wife 62 or older if she had been married to a social security worker for at least 20 years; continued benefits to widows 60 and over and to widowers 62 and over who remarry; liberalized the disability eligibility requirements to permit payment of benefits to persons with a disability lasting 12 months rather than that the disability be of long duration or expected to result in death; exempted the first $1,500 that an individual can earn a year without losing social security benefits.

The enactment of this legislation has strengthened the economic security of every American family. In our 17th District, 41,000 became eligible for medicare, July 1 of this year.

Health problems were given special attention by Congress. The staggering toll of human life and suffering bears the urgent need to assure the advance of medical knowledge and to remove the barriers to health care.

The heart disease, cancer, and stroke amendments establish a 3-year program of grants for the planning and operation of regional medical centers to fight heart disease, cancer, and stroke, which account for 70 percent of the deaths in the United States each year. The encouragement of cooperation between medical schools, research institutions, and hospitals is to make available to doctors and their patients the latest developments in diagnosis and treatment of these diseases.

The health research facilities amendments extend the matching grant program for the construction of health research research facilities. Within the 6-year lifetime of this program, 1,236 construction grants totaling $320 million have gone to 399 institutions in every State.

Evidence produced by years of medical study on the consequences of prolonged tobacco consumption led to passage of the Federal Cigarette and Labeling Act, requiring the cautionary labeling of cigarette packages. The act provides warning to the public of the potential hazards of smoking.

Growing misuse of drugs is a daily contributor to deaths on our highways, juvenile delinquency, suicides, and crime. The Drug Control Amendments Act places stricter control over certain depressant and stimulant drugs to reduce illicit use and distribution. At congressional hearings, it was brought out that approximately 50 percent of the 9 billion barbiturates and amphetamine pills produced annually in the United States are sold illegally.

Each year, 120,000 disabled persons are being rehabilitated under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Congress now has approved legislation to expand vocational rehabilitation services to reach the goal of rehabilitating 200,000 annually.

In the field of mental health, grants have been authorized to meet initial staffing costs of professional and technical personnel in community mental health centers. In addition, Congress has expanded the grant program for the training of teachers of the mentally retarded and handicapped. It is hoped that the number of these teachers can be increased from the present 60,000 to the needed 300,000.

As a related part of its health program and conservation program, Congress launched an offensive attack on air and water pollution and the depletion of natural resources. The twin pressures of increased population and industrial growth have created critical problems for this generation. The facts are frightening. Every major river system is now polluted. Air, water, soil, and wildlife are being blighted by the poisonous chemicals of technology. Five million Americans, many of them in suburbs, have no sewers. President Johnson warned:

> The hour is late, and the danger is large.

The Water Quality Act strengthens control over water pollution by providing water quality standards for interstate streams. The bill, requested by the President, increases Federal aid for construction of sewage treatment plants and creates a Water Pollution Control Administration to concentrate the combined efforts of Federal, State, and local agencies, including conservationists, in the fight for clean water. The Water Resources Planning Act increases the maximum development of natural resources through coordinated, intergovernmental planning.

The Saline Water Conversion Act extends the life of saline water conversion program authorizing $185 million between now and 1972 to perfect processes for converting sea water into fresh water. Desalting is no longer a dream. Three of our cities already pressed for water depend on desalting plants for water supply. Our problem now is to find how to do it economically and on a larger scale.

The Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Acts attack two problems affecting the public health and welfare: First, air pollution, and second, solid waste disposal—garbage, rubbish, and waste from manufacturing plants. Machinery is established for controlling motor vehicle air pollutants; air pollution research is accelerated. A new program is created to find methods of disposing of solid waste, which is accumulating in urban communities at an astonishing half billion pounds a day.

In his natural beauty message to Congress, the President emphasized the importance of preserving the beauty of nature in an urbanized society. The purpose of the Highway Beautification Act is to see that the Nation's roads not only serve the flow of commerce, goods, and people in transportation, but human needs to touch and come close to nature. It provides for the gradual control of billboards and junkyards along Federally aided highways and fosters roadside and landscape development along such highways.

Mounting tragedy on our Nation's highways brought congressional action on highway and auto safety legislation. Automobile accidents last year cost the life of 48,000 persons—and this number does not include the injured, maimed, and disabled for life. The Highway Safety Act provides Federal assistance

for the development of State highway safety programs, covering such areas as driver education, testing, licensing, accident record system, traffic control, and vehicle registration and inspection. The Traffic Safety Act authorized the establishment of motor vehicle safety standards which are binding on manufacturers.

The 89th Congress directed the combined resources of the Federal Government, the States, and localities in a strengthened partnership to improve the quality of American education and to guarantee opportunity of learning. The scope of the educational effort is sketched in the following legislative enactments:

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act marks the first commitment by the Federal Government to improve elementary and secondary education. Aid is authorized to local school agencies for projects to meet the special needs of children from low-income families. Also authorized are programs to assist States in the purchase of textbooks, library resources, and other instructional material for the benefit of all children, and to develop supplemental education centers providing educational services not otherwise available in a community. Out of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, only one-half contain libraries. There are schools lacking in science laboratories. These deficiencies mean the difference between a good and a poor education; they are costly to the student and damaging to his future.

The Higher Education Act strengthens our institutions of higher learning and provides assistance to students in meeting the cost of a college education. The act doubles funds for the construction of academic facilities; provides aid to college libraries and developing institutions; authorizes a new program of educational opportunity grants ranging from $200 to $800 for exceptional but needy students; provides Government-guaranteed, reduced-interest student loans for students from middle-income families; broadens the college work-study program now providing 300,000 student part-time jobs; provides a new program of graduate fellowships for persons pursuing teaching careers; and initiates a National Teacher Corps composed of former teachers who will work under the direction of local school authorities in city slums and areas of rural poor.

The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act promotes support for cultural development. The act authorizes $20 million annually for a 3-year program of endowments for the creative and performing arts and scholarships in the humanities.

The Health Professions Assistance Act expands existing construction programs for medical and health teaching facilities and loan programs for students in health profession schools. The need for qualified health personnel is acute. Current health needs demand the education of 50 percent more doctors by 1975.

The Library Services and Construction Act Amendments authorize a 5-year, $700 million program of assistance to public libraries. In 1965, 363 local public library construction projects, costing $99.6 million, were approved. The Federal share of this cost is $29.8 million.

The Manpower Act broadens the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Congress enacted the job retraining program in 1962 to train workers—the unemployed and the underemployed—with skills necessary to find employment. While the Federal Government has contributed $95.8 million for Manpower Development and Training Act training programs, 53 percent of this sum already has been returned to the Treasury in taxes by trainees who have become working and tax-paying citizens.

National welfare is dependent upon the orderly growth and development of our urban areas. Today, 70 percent of the Nation's population live in 220 metropolitan areas. Interrelated are the problems of rising population, urban sprawl, housing, transportation, crime, and decaying central cities.

The Housing and Urban Development Act is one of the most comprehensive measures passed by the 89th Congress. Among its provisions, this $7.5 million act gives added strength to the FHA mortgage insurance program, and continues urban renewal for the redevelopment and rehabilitation of slum and blighted areas. Improved standards of housing are provided through new public housing for elderly and low-income families. In addition, a new program of rent supplements is authorized to pay part of the rent for persons with insufficient incomes unable to provide decent housing. It is estimated that 375,000 people including the handicapped and the elderly are eligible for this supplement.

To coordinate Federal programs and activities affecting urban-suburban problems and to assure sound development planning in our metropolitan areas, Congress created a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development. The office will give vital force and effectiveness to the growing effort in our cities.

In other areas affecting cities, Congress authorized increased funds for research and development in mass transit systems. It also extended the present law to assist communities in the development of programs to control and prevent juvenile delinquency and youth crime.

The 89th Congress has continued the war on poverty. In 20 months of its operation, it has reached the poor of this country with jobs, job training, and educational services. Administrative difficulties in the program have been recognized and Congress is attempting to correct them.

In general, the poverty program has created three-quarters of a million part- and full-time jobs for the poor; it has enrolled 720,000 preschoolers in Head-start projects for medical and education services; it has provided jobs to more than 500,000 youngsters through the Neighborhood Youth Corps, permitting them to remain in school, return to school, or improve their employability; it has established 103 Job Corps centers for vocational training of youth 16 to 21; and it has provided adult basic education programs in 45 States, now providing jobs and incomes to 100,000 family heads previously on relief.

Legislative steps were taken by the 89th Congress to insure the 15th constitutional amendment guarantee of the right to vote. The Voting Rights Act suspends literacy and other tests and devices in areas where such tests have been used to systematically deny the right to vote, and authorizes the appointment of Federal examiners in such areas to register otherwise qualified voters.

The assassination of President Kennedy awakened dormant interest to correct ambiguities in provisions affecting Presidential inability. Congress cleared for ratification by the States a proposed constitutional amendment which would permit the Vice President to become Acting President if the President were unable to perform his duties, and would allow the President to name a Vice President subject to confirmation by Congress if a vacancy were to occur in the Vice-Presidency. The proposed 25th amendment to the Constitution requires the approval of 38 States to become effective. At this time, 31 States have ratified the amendment.

The minimum-wage bill was passed amending the Fair Labor Standards Act. The law stepped up the nonfarm floor hourly wage rate from $1.25 to $1.60 by 1968 and extended minimum-wage coverage to an estimated 8 million additional workers.

Legislation to revise the Federal unemployment compensation system to extend coverage and broaden benefits cleared both the House and Senate. Amendments attached to the bill by the Senate have necessitated further action by both Chambers.

Pay raises averaging a 2.8- to 2.9-percent increase were effected for 1.8 million Federal employees including postal workers.

Military action in Vietnam focused attention on the problems of the serviceman and veteran. Major legislation approved included: a 10.4-percent pay raise for members of the uniformed services; free first-class postage for servicemen in Vietnam combat zones—this covered provisions of a bill I had introduced; a $10,000 life insurance policy for members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty; an increase in the amount of education assistance paid to the sons and daughters of deceased or permanently and totally disabled service-connected veterans under the war orphan's educational assistance program; a compensation increase for service-connected disabled veterans averaging 10 percent.

In addition, Congress passed a new permanent GI bill patterned after the successful GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict, to provide educational and other benefits, including guaranteed home loans, Federal job preference, and VA medical assistance for

veterans who have served in the armed services since January 31, 1955. Approximately 10,000 in our 17th District are eligible for the benefits and services of this program.

The House recently sent to the Senate the Veterans' Pension Act of 1966, providing increases averaging 5.4 percent in rates of non-service-connected disability and death pensions payable to veterans and their survivors. The bill did not raise income limitations and did not include my proposal to provide a full social security exclusion in determining income eligibility for a pension.

This has been a most productive and busy session of Congress. As you are aware, I spend most weekends in the city of Detroit. I would like to remind you again that my Detroit office is open from 9 to 12 and 1 to 5 daily, except Saturday. The Detroit office telephone number is Broadway 3-9151; the Washington office number is area code 202, 225-4961. I am available to help you, and I am available by appointment on Saturdays.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mrs. MINK), for Monday, October 10, 1966, on account of official business.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mrs. MINK), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BROOKS (at the request of Mr. YOUNG), for October 11 and October 12, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. BRAY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. QUILLEN, for 15 minutes, October 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. FINO in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARSH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. ROONEY of New York in two instances.

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. POWELL.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. SWEENEY.

Mr. RANDALL.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2358. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 266. An act to amend sections 404 and 406 of title 37, United States Code, relating to travel and transportation allowances of certain members of the uniformed services who are retired, discharged, or released from active duty;

H.R. 722. An act to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Environmental Science Services Administration to the Army and Navy so they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force;

H.R. 3596. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Skokomish Tribe of Indians;

H.R. 5297. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the revocation of retired pay of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7466. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8664. An act to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10633. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Quileute Tribe of Indians, including the Hoh Tribe, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10674. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10747. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Duwamish Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 109, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12437. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Nooksack Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15098. An act to amend Public Law 89-284 relating to participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16646. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates to certain individuals after considering their character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17119. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit members of the Armed Forces to be assigned or detailed to the Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce; and

H.R. 17788. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3423. An act to provide for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va., and for other purposes;

S. 3460. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for scientific and technological research, and for other purposes;

S. 3704. An act to provide for the striking of a medal in commemoration of the designation of Ellis Island as a part of the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York, N.Y.; and

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Federal land bank system in the United States.

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 October 10, 1966:

H.R. 15662. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended.

On October 11, 1966:

H.R. 8664. An act to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 17788. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 12, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2812. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1967 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H. Doc. No. 521); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2813. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the

United States as provided by various laws (H. Doc. No. 522); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2814. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a determination in the national interest that the Export-Import Bank issue guarantees in connection with the sale of U.S. products and services to various foreign countries, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2815. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal language relating to the liability of contractors for the repair of new pavements in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2816. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual financial report on the commissary activities outside the continental United States of the Department of Commerce, as represented by the Weather Bureau, during the fiscal year 1966; pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 596; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Committee on House Administration. Additional views on H.R. 17239. A bill to limit contests of elections of Members of the House of Representatives to contests brought by duly qualified candidates whose names appear on the official ballots (Rept. No. 2199, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 1007. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a report on international education by the House Education and Labor Committee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2218). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 1017. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional hearings and other materials by the Committee on Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 2219). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 1022. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled, "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?" without amendment (Rept. No. 2220). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. S. 3809. An act to authorize the Public Printer to print for and deliver to the General Services Administration an additional copy of certain publications; without amendment (Rept. No. 2221). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GRAY: Committee on Public Works. S. 3389. An act to provide for the establishment of the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 17588. A bill to amend section 8(g) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to assignments; without amendment (Rept. No. 2223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 18225. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 15304. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif., and to provide for the establishment of a plant materials center at a more suitable location to replace the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee of conference. H.R. 13448. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing privileges of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel overseas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2226). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Concurrent Resolution 313. Concurrent resolution to endorse the concept of World Farm Center; without amendment (Rept. No. 2227). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITENER: Committee of conference. H.R. 3314. A bill to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2228). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee of conference. H.R. 9985. A bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and hospitals or similar institutions in the District of Columbia of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons (Rept. No. 2229). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MULTER: Committee of conference. H.R. 10304. An act to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children (Rept. No. 2230). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Strengthening Wage-Price Guideposts" (Rept. No. 2231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of conference. S. 3158. An act to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2232). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.:

H.R. 18275. 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. FLOOD:

H.R. 18276. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 18277. 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.

H.R. 18278. A bill to provide a statute of limitations with respect to the deportation of aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and to remove certain distinctions made in the Immigration and Nationality Act between native-born and naturalized citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 18279. 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. MICHEL:

H.R. 18280. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 18281. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an alternative method of crediting earnings for purposes of determining an individual's insured status and benefit amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 18282. 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.

H.R. 18283. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 18284. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Federal Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 18285. A bill to provide for the establishment and development of the Kenilworth National Park in the District of Columbia for the benefit of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 18286. 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. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 18287. A bill to authorize grants to States for assistance to homeowners and businesses suffering property losses as a result of riots or other civil disturbances; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 18288. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 18289. A bill to assist local school districts in those depressed areas previously determined by the Congress and known as the Appalachian area to raise the salaries of those teachers whose salaries are currently below the average of all public school teachers in their State to the State average as a minimum; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER (by request):

H.R. 18290. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, transfer, convey, and lease certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States as sites for other international organizations and as sites for governments of foreign countries and for other

purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 18291. A bill to provide for the establishment and development of the Kenilworth Anacostia National Capital Park and Aquatic Gardens in the District of Columbia for the benefits of the people of the United States and in particular children; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 18292. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 18293. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.J. Res. 1315. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industry wide strikes and lockouts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H. Con. Res. 1036. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Res. 1046. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 17642, 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 Rules.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Res. 1047. Resolution authorizing the Committee on House Administration to sit, hold hearings, and issue subpenas in carrying out its duties; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. Res. 1048. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct certain studies in Far Eastern and Western European countries; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 18294. A bill for the relief of Domenica Carlucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18295. A bill for the relief of Rao Palumbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 18296. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ng Ho Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 18297. A bill for the relief of Harold Gilbertson, Raymond Nelson, Lawrence Powell, Marvin Holland, Erling Ellison, Haakon Pederson, Marvel Bilx, all of Cathlamet, Wash., and Charles F. Gann of Westport, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 18298. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0310090); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 18299. A bill for the relief of Lourdes Ysit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 18300. A bill to provide for the free entry of a strobsynchronolaryngoscope for the use of Ohio University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 18301. A bill for the relief of Mate Jericevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 18302. A bill for the relief of Calogero Tardanico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 18303. A bill for the relief of Nobuyoshi Higashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 18304. A bill for the relief of Thomas Hung Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18305. A bill for the relief of Louie Pon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18306. A bill for the relief of Vito Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18307. A bill for the relief of Martino de Benedetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18308. A bill for the relief of Magdalina Karabatsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 18309. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Alexopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 18310. A bill for the relief of John Kondros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 18311. A bill for the relief of Iain Colquhaun Macleod; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 1316. A joint resolution proclaiming Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski as honorary citizens of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Praise for House Publications Distribution Service Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1966

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, one of the chief functions of a Congressman is to communicate with his constituents. Especially does the Congressman have a duty to make a regular report to the district giving points of special interest to the people he represents. The physical distribution of this material is done through the House Publications Distribution Service. At the helm of this enormous operation is Eli Bjellos. Mr. Speaker, few men approach a job with more determination and dedication than this hard-working, most cooperative gentleman from Minnesota.

I am sure every Member at some time or another transacts business with the House Publications Distribution Service and somehow through the rush of it all Mr. Bjellos and his team get the job done. I think it is time that we in the House give public notice and due credit to this exceptional operation which already has sent out nearly 90 million pieces of mail this year. There is no doubt that this is a necessary service to the Members and on their behalf I want to salute the great job that is being done in our Publications Distribution Service.

This work somehow gets done, even though some of our machinery is antiquated and the repair of other machines has taken what seems like ages to repair, especially in face of the rush jobs and deadlines that have to be met.

Vincent J. DiMattina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened last Friday to learn of the passing of Vincent J. DiMattina, New York State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Vincent DiMattina was an extraordinary man and a good friend. He was a man who fought his way up from the Brooklyn docks to become a community leader and an outstanding citizen. At the time of his death he was counsel to the speaker of the New York State Assembly on military and patriotic affairs. He will be missed sorely by his many colleagues and friends. To his widow, Mary, his parents, and all his family I extend my deepest sympathy and prayers.

A Salute to the Business and Professional Women of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 11, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, because women are playing an ever-increasing role in our Nation's economy, as well as in civic and community activities, I would like to take a brief moment to salute the business and professional women of this Nation.

Next week will mark the annual observance of National Business Women's Week by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. I urge each of my colleagues to join